



3 1761 06891403 5



LIBRARY

OF

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL

LITERATURE.

EDITED BY

GEORGE R. CROOKS, D.D.,

AND

JOHN F. HURST, D.D.

VOL. I.—INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY
SCRIPTURES.

NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON.
CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & STOWE.

$$\frac{21741}{112192}$$

6

PUBLISHERS' ANNOUNCEMENT.

THE design of the Editors and Publishers of the BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY is to furnish ministers and laymen with a series of works, which, in connection with the Commentaries now issuing, will make a compendious apparatus for study. While the theology of the volumes will be in harmony with the doctrinal standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the aim will be to make the entire Library acceptable to all evangelical Christians.

The following writers will co-operate in the authorship of the series: Dr. Harman, on the Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures; Dr. Terry, on Biblical Hermeneutics; Drs. Bennett and Whitney, on Biblical and Christian Archæology; Dr. James E. Lattimer, on Systematic Theology; the Editors, on Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology; Dr. Ridgeway, on Evidences of Christianity; Prof. Little, on Christian Theism and Modern Speculative Thought; Dr. Crooks, on the History of Christian Doctrine; and Bishop Hurst, on the History of the Christian Church.

In the preparation of every treatise the latest literature will be consulted, and its results incorporated. The works comprised in the series will be printed in full octavo size, and finished in the best style of typography and binding. A copious index will accompany each volume.

The first volume, by Dr. Harman, on the Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures ; the second, by Dr. Terry, on Biblical Hermeneutics, and the volume on Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology, by the Editors, are already before the public. The others will follow as rapidly as practicable.

*Bibl. Lit.
Gen.*

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

VOL. I. OF THE LIBRARY.

BY

HENRY M. HARMAN, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK AND HEBREW IN DICKINSON COLLEGE.

NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON.
CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & STOWE.

COPYRIGHT 1878, BY
NELSON & PHILLIPS,
NEW YORK.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

IN the preparation of this volume I have relied upon original sources of information. The edition of the Greek and Latin Fathers which has been chiefly used is that of the Abbé J. P. Migne. From this nearly all the extracts from the Fathers are taken. The originals of the most important passages quoted are given at the foot of the pages. Other ancient authorities, in nearly all instances, are also quoted from the original authors.

For the Old Testament, in addition to the Hebrew text, my principal aids have been Tischendorf's edition of the LXX, the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel, Professor Lee's edition of the Peshito-Syriac version of the Old Testament, and Blaney's edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch. My chief sources for ascertaining the correct text of the New Testament have been the critical Greek texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles, copies of the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian Codices of the New Testament, and the Peshito-Syriac version—to which I added, before the New Testament portion of the work had passed through the press, Blanchini's edition of MSS. of the Latin version of the fourth and fifth centuries, and Schwartze's edition of the Memphitic (or Coptic) version of the four Gospels, with readings from the Sahidic (or Theban) version. The views of the Talmudists respecting the books of the Old Testament I have given almost invariably from a German work entitled *Der Kanon des Alten Testaments nach den Ueberlie-*

ferungen in Talmud und Midrasch, by Professor Dr. Julius Fürst, the distinguished Jewish rabbinical scholar.

I have taken special pains to secure the very latest critical works on the New Testament, that I might present the most recent views of the German critics, both evangelical and rationalistic. For example: I have used the *Einleitung* (Introduction) of Hilgenfeld, of the Tübingen school, published at the close of 1874, and Mangold's edition of Bleek's *Einleitung*, published in the early part of 1875. This Introduction is, however, based upon that of no other writer, nor have I taken any one as a model.

I am indebted to Drs. Crooks and Hurst, the projectors and editors of the series of which the present volume is one, for the careful revision of the manuscript, and for valuable suggestions, which will, I am sure, add to the practical value of the work. I have had their hearty co-operation during the entire progress of my labors.

Marginal notes on the pages, and two copious indexes, one of topics and the other of the authors quoted, will it is hoped, facilitate reference.

The work is now offered to the public, with the earnest prayer that it may contribute something to the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and to the confirmation of Christianity as a Divine Revelation, without whose light and power all our intellectual progress and civilization will tend only to barbarism

DICKINSON COLLEGE, CARLISLE, PA.

Sept. 9, 1873.

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

IN this edition of the "Introduction" I have examined, and endeavored to show the falsity of, the theory of Graf, Kayser, Wellhausen, Kuenen, and W. Robertson Smith, who hold that the priestly laws of the middle books of the Pentateuch were not recorded until the period of the Babylonian captivity, and that they were completed about the time of Ezra.

When I discussed the genuineness of the Pentateuch, in the first edition, the new critical opinions did not seem important enough to demand a separate refutation. Since that time I have examined them again, and studied nearly the whole Hebrew Bible with special reference to them. As a result, it seems to me perfectly clear that the entire Pentateuch is older than any other part of the Old Testament; I have, therefore, no change of view to announce and no concessions to make to the new critical school.

Large additions have accordingly been made in this edition to the part relating to the Pentateuch. In other portions of the book I have also added new matter and made some abridgments and corrections.

DICKINSON COLLEGE, CARLISLE, PA.,
January 1, 1884.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS..... Page 24

Scope of the investigation—Divine revelation not improbable—Biblical criticism progressive—Difficulties in the Bible no sufficient ground of offence—Two factors the divine and the human, are to be recognised in the Bible—Views of the early Church and of the Reformers respecting the inspiration of the Scriptures—The extent of inspiration in the different books, and the methods by which God communicated himself to the ancient prophets—Proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures derived from the sublimity of their doctrines and the fulfilment of their prophecies—The wonderful plan revealed in the Canon.

CHAPTER II.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT..... 33

The origin of the term Canon—The catalogues of Melito, Origen, Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, and Jerome—The catalogues of Josephus, Philo, Jesus the son of Sirach, and the Talmudists.

CHAPTER III.

THE HEBREW AND ITS COGNATE TONGUES..... 41

The Old Testament written chiefly in Hebrew, but also partly in Chaldee—The origin of the name Hebrew—The regions in which the Hebrew, Punic, Syriac, and Chaldee languages flourished, and the books and inscriptions found therein—The Arabic, Æthiopic, and Himyaritic—Some peculiarities of the Semitic languages—The different periods of the Hebrew language—The means by which the knowledge of Hebrew has been preserved—Some account of great modern Hebraists, and a notice of some of the most important grammars and lexicons of the Semitic languages.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONDITION OF THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT—HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS..... 48

The loss of very ancient Hebrew MSS.—A list of the oldest that have been preserved—The origin of the vowel points—The conscientious labours of the Masorites upon the Hebrew text.

CHAPTER V.

ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT..... 50

1. THE SEPTUAGINT.—Historical sketch of the origin of this version—Character of the Septuagint—The text of the Septuagint—Editions of the Septuagint.

2. THE TARGUMS.—The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel—The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan—The Targum of Jerusalem—Editions of the Targums.

3. THE SYRIAC TRANSLATION.

4. THE LATIN VERSIONS.—The Itala—Jerome's translation of the Old Testament—Revision of this Latin version (Vulgate) by order of the Council of Trent.

5. EGYPTIAN TRANSLATIONS.—The Coptic or Memphitic, the Sahidic or Theban.

6. THE ÆTHIOPIC VERSION. 7. THE ARMENIAN VERSION. 8. THE GEORGIAN VERSION. 9. THE GOTHIC VERSION. 10. THE SLAVONIAN VERSION. 11. THE ARABIC VERSION. 12. THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH AND ITS VERSIONS.

CHAPTER VI.

GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH—HISTORY OF VIEWS RESPECTING IT—
DOCUMENT HYPOTHESIS—VIEWS OF THE NEW CRITICAL SCHOOL. 66

Universally ascribed to Moses by the ancient Jewish and Christian Churches—Its genuineness first questioned by the Gnostics—First seriously attacked about the time of the Reformation—Views of Spiuza, Richard Simon, and Le Clerc—Attack of Bolingbroke—Defended by Michaelis and Eichhorn—Attacked by the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentists—Other attacks upon the Pentateuch—Vater, De Wette—Defence of the Pentateuch by Jahn, Rosenmüller, Sack, Graves, and others—The views of Herbst, Volney, Hartmann, Von Bohlen, Vatke, George, Gesenius, and Stähelin—Astruc's document hypothesis—Von Lengerke's theory—The views of Ewald, Knobel, and Colenso—Green's reply to Colenso—Defence of the Pentateuch by Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil, and others—The theories of Schrader, Davidson, Bleek, and Fürst—The new critical school: Graf, Kayser, Wellhausen, Kuenen, and W. Robertson Smith—Opponents of the new critical school: Nöldeke, Riehm, Curtiss, Klostermann, Dillmann, Watts, Stebbins, and Green—The views of Delitzsch.

CHAPTER VII.

EXAMINATION OF THE DOCUMENT HYPOTHESIS..... 78

A discussion of the use of the divine names in Genesis and the first part of Exodus—Bleek's objection to statements in Exod. vi considered—Various historical inaccuracies alleged by Bleek considered—The numbering of the children of Israel in the first chapter of Numbers considered—The building of the tabernacle—The number of the firstborn males among the children of Israel—Bleek's objection to the chronological order of Num. ix, 12, answered—The alleged contradiction between Num. iv and viii, 24-26, considered.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH..... 95

A unity of plan throughout the whole Pentateuch—The history sacred in character, and generally limited to the chosen people—Genesis an introduction to the other books—Proof of unity from connection of events.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE ART OF ALPHABETICAL WRITING AMONG THE
HEBREWS, AND THE STATE OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES IN GENERAL
IN THE MOSAIC AGE..... 99

Hieroglyphical writing in Egypt—The Hebrew alphabet originated in Palestine—Ancient alphabetical writing among the Phœnicians—Antiquity of the art of writing in Italy and Hindostan—Writing in Palestine before the time of Moses—The Egyptians before the age of Moses possessed a knowledge of those arts referred to in the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER X.

PROOF FROM INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE GREAT ANTIQUITY OF THE
PENTATEUCH..... 103

Internal evidence that no portion of the Pentateuch could have been written either during or after the Babylonian captivity. This is evident from the phraseology that came into use during the captivity, especially the names of months and measures, and the absence in the Pentateuch of Chaldaisms which are found in the books written during and after the captivity—Internal proof that the whole Pentateuch is older than any other part of the Old Testament. This is evident from the archaisms that pervade the entire Pentateuch.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PROBABILITY THAT MOSES, AS LEGISLATOR, WOULD HAVE WRITTEN
HIS LAWS, AND ALSO THE ANNALS OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE.... 114

Ancient testimony of heathen to the existence of Moses and his legislation—The Egyptians had a written code of laws before the time of Moses—Every thing in Egypt in the courts of justice was done in writing—The lawgivers of antiquity wrote their laws—Necessity that Moses should write his laws.

CHAPTER XII.

THE STATEMENT OF THE PENTATEUCH RESPECTING ITS AUTHOR..... 117

It professes to be written by Moses—The use of the third person by Moses has its analogies in the histories of Xenophon, Cæsar, and Josephus—De Wette's objection to the Mosaic authorship—Additions in Deuteronomy to the Mosaic history contained in the other books—Modifications of previous legislation—Concluding reflections.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY..... 122

The charge of its contradicting the other books considered—The impossibility of its being forged at a late age—Bleek's objection considered—Internal evidence of its Mosaic authorship—Additions in Deuteronomy to the Mosaic history contained in the other books—Modifications of previous legislation—Concluding reflections.

CHAPTER XIV.

PROOF FROM INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH 133

The directions respecting the building of the Tabernacle written down at the time—The laws respecting leprosy were enacted in the desert—The regulations respecting the Levites pertain to the desert—Regulations respecting the high priest's dress taken from Egypt—The exact enumeration of the Israelites, and the list of their encampments.

CHAPTER XV.

FALSITY OF THE THEORY THAT THE EARLY LEGISLATION OF THE PENTATEUCH CONSISTED OF ONLY EXODUS XXI-XXIII..... 142

The laws in Exod. xxi-xxiii are too meagre, and in parts too indefinite, to have been put into operation without further legislation—Examples of this—Testimonies in Deuteronomy to Levitical precepts found in the middle books of the Pentateuch—The testimony of Hosea to a large early code of divine laws given to Israel—Discussion of Hosea viii, 12.

CHAPTER XVI.

EXAMINATION OF THE VIEWS OF THE NEW CRITICAL SCHOOL ON THE PRIESTLY AND SACRIFICIAL SYSTEMS IN THE PENTATEUCH..... 148

The new critical school of Kuenen, W. Robertson Smith, and others asserts that in the original Pentateuchal legislation all Levites could be priests, and that the restriction of the priesthood to the sons of Aaron was the work of Ezra—Examination of the Jewish history in the consideration and refutation of this theory—Proof that the sacrificial system of the middle books of the Pentateuch is a part of the original legislation of Moses—A consideration of the assertion of the new critical school that the sacrificial system arose later and was not approved by the prophets—An examination of Jer. vii, 21-23, and Isa. i, 11-14—General reflections upon the subject.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ALLEGED TRACES IN THE PENTATEUCH OF A POST-MOSAIC AGE. 157

General reflections—Examination of the alleged post-Mosaic traces—No clear allusion in Deuteronomy to any thing later than the Mosaic Age except in the last chapter.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH 174

The origin of the Samaritans, and their relation to the Jews—The Samaritan Pentateuch derived from the ten tribes—Its character.

CHAPTER XIX.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE ANTIQUITY, AUTHORITY, AND INTEGRITY OF THE PENTATEUCH FURNISHED BY THE SEPTUAGINT, EZRA, NEHEMIAH, AND THE PROPHETS..... 180

CHAPTER XX.

ALLUSIONS TO THE PENTATEUCH IN THE BOOKS OF PROVERBS AND PSALMS..... 191

CHAPTER XXI.

TESTIMONIES TO THE EXISTENCE AND AUTHORITY OF THE PENTATEUCH FURNISHED BY THE HISTORY IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL AND KINGS	194
--	-----

CHAPTER XXII.

TRACES OF THE PENTATEUCH IN THE BOOKS OF RUTH AND JUDGES....	205
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIII.

PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE AND AUTHORITY OF THE PENTATEUCH IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA	208
--	-----

References in Joshua to Deuteronomy—References in Joshua's acts to the Pentateuch—Historical facts the same in Joshua as in the Pentateuch—The Levitical precepts in full force in the age of Joshua—Proof of the antiquity of the Book of Joshua.

CHAPTER XXIV.

REFLECTIONS ON THE REFERENCES TO THE PENTATEUCH IN THE WRITINGS OF THE ISRAELITES IN THE POST-MOSAIC AGE.....	211
---	-----

Impartiality of the Old Testament historians—Bleek's unfair method of treating the evidence for the early existence and authority of the Pentateuch—His tacit admission of the existence of the first four books in the time of the Judges—Strength of the testimony of the Post-Mosaic books.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE ALLEGED NON-OBSERVANCE OF PORTIONS OF THE MOSAIC LAW FOR SEVERAL CENTURIES AFTER MOSES, CONSIDERED IN ITS BEARING UPON THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH	213
--	-----

Violation of laws no proof of their non-existence—General compliance with the precepts respecting the place of sacrifice—Shiloh a sacred place—No real violation of the precept enjoining the place of sacrifice—Circumstances under which the Israelites could not comply with Deut. xii, 11.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY IN THE PENTATEUCH, AND ITS BEARING ON THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE WORK.....	218
---	-----

The Mosaic cosmogony compared with the cosmogonies of heathen religions—The object of Moses in his account of creation—The Mosaic order of creation in harmony with science—The Etruscan and Babylonian accounts of creation—The comparatively recent origin, unity, and the primitive seat of mankind—The Mosaic account of the primitive condition of man agrees with universal tradition—The tradition of a deluge universal among the great races of mankind—The genealogy of the sons of Noah accordant with modern ethnology—The story of Nimrod illustrated on monuments—Confusion of tongues—The gifts presented to Abraham in Egypt.

CHAPTER XXVII.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY CONTAINED IN THE PENTATEUCH.....	229
--	-----

The time between the Deluge and the building of the great Pyramid—Indirect confirmation of the account of the rebellion of the kings in Genesis xiv, found on Babylonian monuments—The exact knowledge of Egyptian affairs shown in the history of Joseph—The increase of the Israelites in Egypt considered—Length of the sojourn in Egypt.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY CONTAINED IN THE PENTATEUCH—CONCLUSION	243
---	-----

Internal credibility of the history of the institution of the Passover—The route of the Israelites on leaving Egypt, and the exact knowledge of the author of the Pentateuch respecting

the Sinaitic desert—Topography of Moab correctly given in the story of Balaam—Objections of Colenso to various parts of the Mosaic history considered—The opinion of De Wette concerning the miraculous features of the Pentateuch considered—Colenso's general objection to the miracles of the Pentateuch—The author of the Pentateuch possessed of intimate knowledge of the affairs concerning which he wrote.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE COMMAND TO EXTERMINATE THE CANAANITES, AND THE GENERAL SEVERITY OF THE MOSAIC SYSTEM..... 255

A divine order only could justify the extermination of the Canaanites—The act in the divine visitation the important point—Not unusual for the innocent to suffer with the guilty—God frequently uses one nation as his instrument to punish other nations—An even-handed justice shown both toward Israelites and Canaanites—The Mosaic system adapted to the Hebrew people—The comparative purity of the morality and the sublimity of the theology of the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH..... 258

Testimonies from the Gospels and Epistles.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE EARLIER PROPHETS: THE BOOK OF JOSHUA..... 259

Unity of the book—The date and authorship of the book—The historical credibility of Joshua—The history evidently contemporary—The standing still of the sun and moon—Probable reference to this miracle in Habakkuk.

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE BOOK OF JUDGES..... 270

The unity of the book—Date and authorship—Not written later than the middle of the reign of David—Could not have been written before the time of Saul—Conjectural emendation in chap. xviii, 30—Davidson and Bleek on the date of Judges—The character of its history—De Wette's admission respecting the genuineness of its history—The views of Davidson and Schrader.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE BOOK OF RUTH..... 275

Design of the Book—Written to give the ancestry of David—Its date—Written probably in the time of David—Character of the narrative—The history a beautiful picture of Hebrew life—Rabbinical view of the Book of Ruth.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL..... 277

Date and authorship—Written before the revolt of the ten tribes—The Prophet Nathan probably the author—The character of the history—The opinions of modern critics concerning the books—Alleged contradictions—Saul's appointment to meet Samuel in Gilgal—Saul's ignorance of David's family considered—Other alleged contradictions examined.

CHAPTER XXXV.

THE TWO BOOKS OF KINGS..... 286

Sources and time of their composition—Composed from contemporary historical documents—Credibility of the history in the Books of Kings—Confirmation of the Books of Kings from ancient monuments—The inscription on the Moabite stone—Confirmation from Assyrian monuments—Mention of Pul, King of Assyria, by Berosus—Capture of Samaria noted in the annals of Sargon—Confirmation of an important part of Hezekiah's history in the annals of Sennacherib—The destruction of Sennacherib's army—Merodach-Baladan in Assyrian inscriptions—Other confirmations of this history.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES..... 297

The date of their composition and their authorship—Probably written in the time of Ezra—Ezra probably their author—Example of words common to Chronicles and Ezra—The sources of the history—Its credibility.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE BOOK OF EZRA..... 306

The unity of the book—Its author—The objections of modern critics to the unity of Ezra considered—The hypothesis of Kell—The change of person no objection to its unity.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH..... 312

The authorship and unity of the book—Objection to Nehemiah's being the author of the three middle chapters considered—These chapters evidently written by an eye-witness—The whole book, with the possible exception of chap. xii, 11, written by Nehemiah.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER..... 316

Credibility of the history—The date and author—Character of the book—It has been a ground of offence to some Christian scholars.

CHAPTER XL.

THE POETICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT..... 322

The poetry of the Hebrews: its rhythm and other peculiarities.

CHAPTER XLI.

THE BOOK OF JOB..... 326

Composed of three parts: prologue, dialogue, and epilogue—Integrity of the book—Its character and design—Date of the composition and the author—The language post-Mosaic—Not probable that Moses is the author—Probably written in the time of Solomon—The author an inhabitant of Southern Judea—The time in which Job lived uncertain—Concluding reflections.

CHAPTER XLII.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS..... 334

Consists of five divisions—The superscriptions of the Psalms—Opinions of modern critics on the accuracy of the superscriptions—David's authorship of certain Psalms denied by Bleek—The anonymous Psalms—Psalms attributed to Asaph—Psalms attributed to the sons of Korah—Authorship of other Psalms. ORIGIN OF THE COLLECTION OF THE PSALMS—Kell's theory of the origin of the collection—The singing of psalms a part of Hebrew worship—A collection in existence in the time of Hezekiah—On what principle were the Psalms arranged? THE INTEGRITY OF THE PSALMS—No proof that they have been altered. THE IMPRECATIONS IN THE PSALMS—The imperative mode used for the future tense.

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS..... 345

The book divisible into four sections—THE GENUINENESS OF THE PROVERBS WHICH ARE ATTRIBUTED TO SOLOMON—The first and second sections especially considered—Peculiarities of the language of the Proverbs of Solomon—Agur and Lemuel unknown.

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES..... 349

The design of the book—Schrader's explanation of Ecclesiastes—Date and authorship.

CHAPTER XLV.

THE SONG OF SOLOMON..... 353

Delitzsch's analysis of the song—The author—Its design—Its canonicity.

CHAPTER XLVI.

THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH 358

The author generally conceded to be the prophet Jeremiah.

CHAPTER XLVII.

THE PROPHETIC BOOKS 360

HEBREW PROPHECY—Use of the term prophet—The schools of the prophets—Characteristics of the Hebrew prophets—Symbolism of the prophets—Views of the character of the prophecies—Bleek's view—Reflections on the nature of some prophecies—Conclusion respecting the fulfilment of prophecy—A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE HEBREW PROPHETS.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH 364

The character of Isaiah's prophecy—His personal history—Time of his prophetic labours—Subjects of his prophecies—Genuineness of the book considered—Ancient testimonies thereto.

CHAPTER XLIX.

THE PROPHET JEREMIAH 383

His personal history—Kings of Jeremiah's time—The genuineness of the prophecies of Jeremiah, and the date of their deliverance—Their collection and arrangement.

CHAPTER L.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHECY OF EZEKIEL 393

The person of the prophet—The genuineness of the book considered.

CHAPTER LI.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL 396

Written partly in Hebrew and partly in Chaldee, yet the work of one author, as now generally conceded—Objections to its genuineness considered—Proofs of its genuineness—Its author not a mythical character—Ezekiel's references to him—Bleek's hypothesis.

CHAPTER LII.

THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS 423

HOSEA: The period of his prophetic labours—The book may be divided into two parts—Date of composition.

JEREMIAH: The date of his prophecy—Its character.

AMOS: Date of his prophecies—Their character.

OBADIAH: His prophecy—Its character—Its date.

JONAH: Character and design of the book—Probably not written by Jonah—Its language belongs to later Hebrew.

MICAH: His prophetic labours—Date of his prophecy.

NAHUM: His prophecy—Its date—Style of the book.

HABAKKUK: His prophecy—Date of its delivery.

ZEPHANIAH: His prophetic labours and prophecy—Its date and character.

HAGGAI: His prophetic labours and the time of the deliverance of his prophecies.

ZECHARIAH: Genuineness of chapters ix, xiv—Character of the prophecy.

MALACHI: Date of composition—Character of the prophecy.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

- PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS 448
 Connection of the New Testament with the Old—Written records necessary to perpetuate Christianity as a divine revelation.

CHAPTER II.

- THE RAPID DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY, AND THE NUMBER AND LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS, AS BEARING UPON THE GENUINENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY 450
 Testimony of Tacitus and Pliny to the rapid spread of Christianity—Evidence of the same fact from the Acts—The testimonies of Irenæus, Tertullian, Bardesanes, Origen, and others—Conversion of the Empire under Constantine—Literary proficiency of the early Christians—Notice of the most eminent Christian writers of the early centuries.

CHAPTER III.

- DIFFUSION OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT THE CHRISTIAN EPOCH 457
 Diffusion of Greek in the times of Cicero and Juvenal—Means by which it spread.

CHAPTER IV.

- CHARACTER OF THE GREEK OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 459
 Greek Dialects—Characteristics of Hellenistic Greek—New Testament Hebraisms.

CHAPTER V.

- ANCIENT GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 462
 The Codex Sinaiticus, and other leading UNCIAL MSS.—The most important CURSIVE MSS.

CHAPTER VI.

- ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 467
 The Peshito Syriac—The Philoxenian Translation—The Jerusalem Syriac—THE LATIN VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—The Coptic, Memphitic, Thebaic, Bashmuric, Æthiopic, Gothic, and Armenian versions.

CHAPTER VII.

- EDITIONS OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT 481
 Early critical studies—TISCHENDORF—TREGELLES.

CHAPTER VIII.

- THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 488
 The Books of the New Testament Canon—Times and occasions of their composition—References to the books in early writers—Justin Martyr's citations—The Gospels and Epistles.

CHAPTER IX.

- THE TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH RESPECTING THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 490
 Canon of Muratori—Canon of the old Latin version—Tertullian and the Peshito-Syriac version—Canon of Titus Flavius Clemens, Irenæus, and Origen—Eusebius' list of Canonical books—

Canon of Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Didymus, Rufinus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Jerome—The Canon of the Memphitic, Theban, Æthiopic, Armenian, and Gothic versions.

CHAPTER X.

GENUINENESS OF CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 500

The four Gospels—Universal reception of the Gospels in the ancient Church—External evidence of the genuineness of the Gospels.

CHAPTER XI.

THE TESTIMONY OF CELSUS TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS.. 518

Proof that Celsus had before him all four Gospels—Quotations from John in Celsus—Celsus attributes the Gospels to Christ's disciples.

CHAPTER XII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE HERETICS OF THE SECOND CENTURY TO OUR FOUR GOSPELS 521

The Clementine Homilies—The testimony of Marcion—The testimony of Basilides—The Serpent brethren—Reflections on the Gnostic testimony.

CHAPTER XIII.

EVIDENCE OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS FROM THEIR SUPERSCRPTIONS 530

Superscriptions in the Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus—The Gospels had superscriptions in the second century—Valuable testimony derived from Tertullian on this point—Clementine Homilies.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW 533

The person of the evangelist—Statements of the early Church Fathers respecting this Gospel—Reception of Matthew's Gospel by early Jewish Christian sects—Some critics favour a Greek original—Internal evidence that Matthew wrote for Jewish Christians—Hilgenfeld's theory considered—Date of its composition—Testimony of Irenæus, Clement, and Eusebius—The views of modern critics—The assertions of Strauss and Renan respecting interpolations groundless—Genuineness and character of this Gospel—Its apostolic character—The objections of De Wette considered—Bleek's opinion of Matthew considered.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK 553

The person of the evangelist—Character of this Gospel—Contains less matter than Matthew—Its omissions of and additions to what Matthew contains—Mark possessed independent sources—Ewald's theory of Mark's Gospel—Genuineness and date of composition—Place of composition—The integrity of Mark.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE 563

The person of the evangelist—The author of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles evidently the same person—Date of its composition—Contents of Luke compared with those of Matthew—The design of Luke's Gospel—The statement of Luke respecting the taxing under Cyrenius, (chap. ii, 1, 2.)—The statement of Luke respecting Lysanias—The statement confirmed by an inscription recently found near Baalbec.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN 579

The Apostle John—Genuineness of the Gospel according to John—Additional writers in the early Church who received John's Gospel—It was received by all parties in the Council of Nicæa

A. D. 325—It was an authority in the Council of Sardica (A. D. 347); in the Council of Ancyra, in Galatia (A. D. 358); in the Council of Seleucia (A. D. 359); in the Council of Laodicea—Reflections on the foregoing—The unity of authorship of the Gospel and First Epistle of John—Internal evidence that the fourth Gospel proceeded from John—The Logos (Word) in John's Gospel—The term not necessarily from Philo, but rather Jewish—The alleged discrepancy between John and the other evangelists respecting the day of the month on which Christ was crucified—The rejection of John's Gospel by the Alogians—Conclusion—The time and place of its composition—Synopsis of the Contents—Integrity of this Gospel—Opinions respecting chapter xxi—The account of the woman taken in adultery wanting in the most ancient MSS. and versions—The account of the angel troubling the pool (chapter v, 3, 4) wanting in best MSS. and some versions, and doubtless spurious.

CHAPTER XVIII.

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS	627
The Protevangel of James and other apocryphal gospels—Their legendary character.	

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES	630
Sources of this history—Its credibility—Paley's <i>Horæ Paulinæ</i> —Baur's estimate of the Acts—Baur's theory of the purpose of the Acts examined—Reproof of Peter by Paul explained—Paul the same, as exhibited in the Acts and in the Epistles—Falsity of Baur's theory—Other points of agreement in Acts and Epistles respecting Paul's teachings—Luke's accuracy.	

CHAPTER XX.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.....	644
The person of the apostle—Paul's early history—Attainments in knowledge, conversion, and missionary journeys—The account of Paul's preaching and martyrdom given by Clement of Rome—Characteristics of Paul and his writings.	

CHAPTER XXI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.....	649
The persons addressed—Place and time of its composition—Its genuineness—Its integrity.	

CHAPTER XXII.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.....	653
The persons addressed—Place and time of its composition—Its genuineness.	

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS	657
Place and time of its composition—Genuineness of this epistle.	

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS	659
The persons addressed—Time, place, and occasion of the writing of it—Genuineness.	

CHAPTER XXV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS	662
The persons addressed—Place and time of its composition—Its genuineness.	

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS	671
Persons addressed—Place and time of composition—Its genuineness.	

CHAPTER XXVII.

- THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS** 674
Place and time of composition—Written during Paul's first imprisonment—Genuineness of this epistle.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

- THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS** 678
The persons addressed—Place and time of its composition—Its genuineness.

CHAPTER XXIX.

- THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS** 680
Place and time of its composition—Its genuineness.

CHAPTER XXX.

- THE PASTORAL EPISTLES** 683
Objections of Baur and Hilgenfeld to their genuineness—Use of the term "gnosis" in Paul's epistles—References which agree with the practice of the apostolic age—Objections drawn from the style of these epistles—Special objections to the genuineness of First Timothy—Consideration of chap. v, 14—Incidents noted in these epistles proof of their Pauline origin—Paul's travels after his first imprisonment—Bearing of Acts xx, 25—Passages suggestive of the genuineness of these epistles.

CHAPTER XXXI.

- THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY** 691
The person of Timothy—Ancient testimonies to the genuineness of this epistle.

CHAPTER XXXII.

- THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY** 693
Ancient testimonies to its genuineness—It is found in the Peshito-Syriac version and in the Canon of Muratori.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

- THE EPISTLE TO TITUS** 694
Titus mentioned only by Paul—Ancient testimonies to genuineness of this epistle.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

- THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON** 696
The contents of the epistle, and the time of its composition—Its genuineness—Its general reception in the ancient Church—Defended by Hilgenfeld.

CHAPTER XXXV.

- THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS** 697
The persons addressed: The epistle not general, but addressed to some Church—Not addressed to Palestinian Christians—The author—No mention of the author in the epistle itself—Opinions of the fathers upon its authorship—Character of the epistle as bearing upon its authorship—Bleek's objection to the Pauline authorship—Peculiarities of style—Most probably not written by Paul—The time and place of its composition—Written before the destruction of Jerusalem, probably in Italy.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

- THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES** 707
THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES: Writer, James the son of Alpheus—Luke's notice of James—A cousin of Jesus, but called a brother—GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE: Found in all the ancient versions—Views of the Fathers—The opinions of Erasmus and Luther respecting this epistle—The ground of Luther's rejection of it—Agreement between Paul and James—Peculiarities of James' language—No reasonable doubt of its genuineness—Hilgenfeld's objections from internal evidence considered—Probably written between A. D. 50 and 63 at Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE EPISTLES OF PETER 718

Notices of Peter in the New Testament, in Clement of Rome, and other early Fathers—Probable date of Peter's arrival in Rome—His martyrdom there.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER 722

GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE: This epistle universally acknowledged in the ancient Church—Alleged rejection of it by Theodore of Mopsuestia—Modern objections to its genuineness considered—De Wette's objections—Passages in 1 Peter supposed by De Wette to be borrowed from Ephesians—Time of composition—The language used—Suits the time of Nero—Hilgenfeld's date absurd—Written from Babylon, probably about A. D. 64.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER 734

THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE: External evidence of its genuineness meagre—Paul's writings described in it as Scripture—Quotations of Jude's Epistle—Very few notices of the Epistle in the Fathers—Generally recognized as Peter's in the fourth century—Not received by the Syrian Christians—The opinions of the reformers and modern critics respecting its genuineness.

CHAPTER XL.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE 738

GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE: Opinions of the Fathers—Modern opinion—The author's statement respecting himself—Quotation in Jude from apocryphal writings.

CHAPTER XLI.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF JOHN 741

ITS GENUINENESS: Universally received by the ancient Church—Undoubtedly genuine—Spuriousness of chap. v, 7—Wanting in all the ancient MSS. and versions—Its first appearance in the printed text of the Greek Testament.

CHAPTER XLII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN 746

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE: Ancient testimony to it—Doubtless genuine.

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN 747

THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE: Generally acknowledged to be genuine.

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE APOCALYPSE. 749

ITS LINGUISTIC CHARACTER: It abounds in Hebraisms and irregular constructions. THE TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION: The testimony of the Fathers—Probably written before the fall of Jerusalem, and in the time of Nero—The views of modern critics respecting the time of its composition. THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE APOCALYPSE—Statement of the author—Testimony of the early Church respecting its author—Almost universally received in the second century—Not in the Peshito—Dionysius of Alexandria its first great opponent—Writers who used it in the fourth century—Its rejecters—Opinions of modern critics—Rejected as the work of the Apostle John by Neander, Bleek, Lücke, and others—Received as the Apostle John's by Gieseler—No sufficient reason for denying the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse—Points of similarity between the language of John in his Gospel and First Epistle and in the Apocalypse—Nothing in the Apocalypse at variance with the rest of the New Testament. CONTENTS OF THE APOCALYPSE—Its general design—Three views of its meaning.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION—INSPIRATION—SUBLIMITY OF THE DOCTRINES OF SCRIPTURE—THE WONDERFUL PLAN OF THE SACRED CANON.

IT is our purpose, in the present volume, to examine the Genuineness, Credibility, Integrity, Language, Contents, and most important Ancient Versions of the Canonical Books of the Bible. An inquiry of such a nature travels over a long period of human history. We are to consider books extending through a period of more than fifteen hundred years, the earliest of which appeared at the dawn of history, and the last were composed when the Roman Empire and Pagan Civilization were at their zenith of power. In the treatment of such a subject much depends upon the frame of mind with which it is approached. If our speculative system excludes from the universe an ever-living, free, supreme Intelligence, the Creator and Preserver of all that is, and acknowledges nothing but unintelligent physical forces, upon whose play all things depend, we are wholly unfit to deal fairly with the Sacred Canon. For in such a case Revelation, Miracles, and Prophecies are palpable absurdities. But Atheism can never be a positive affirmation; and if the natural phenomena of the world furnished no proof of a personal God, we could yet philosophically admit the evidence which the facts of the Bible give of his existence. No *real Theist* can consistently deny the possibility of revelation, with its accompanying proofs—miracles and prophecies—and hence he is ever ready to listen to the evidence of the genuineness of documents that establish them. Nor will he take offense at a *written* revelation, when he reflects that it is by means of *books*, in the order of Providence, that mankind are instructed in the various affairs of the world.

Scope of investigation.

The Theist is compelled to acknowledge a written revelation.

Biblical Criticism, like all other branches of our knowledge, is progressive. The thorough study of Hebrew and its cognate languages, of Attic and Hellenistic Greek, and of the general principles of philology; the profound investigations into ancient history; the discovery of lost works and of ancient manuscripts of the Bible; the excavation of ancient ruins and the deciphering of ancient monuments; and a more thorough knowledge of the geography, natural history, and customs of Palestine, derived from numerous modern Oriental travelers, have all thrown great light upon the Holy Scriptures, and in many instances have remarkably confirmed them.

The difficulties that frequently meet us in the Holy Scriptures should neither surprise nor offend us. They arise partly from the nature of the subjects treated, partly from the foreign languages in which the Bible is written, and partly from the imperfectly known habits of the people to whom the various parts of Revelation were originally communicated. If the Bible contained nothing that required deep study, it would have but little attraction for us. As it is, all its practical parts are sufficiently clear, while those of a more abstruse character exercise our thoughts, our patience, and our faith. And this holds true of the physical world, in which, while it has pleased God to make plain to us what is most necessary, he has at the same time hidden much from us, and given us a large field in which to develop, through intense study, our intellectual powers, by solving the mysteries of nature and discovering her laws.

Two factors are to be recognised in the Bible—the Divine and the Human—and it may not always be an easy matter to fix the limits of each. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.” (2 Tim. iii, 16.) Admitting this to be the meaning of the original,¹ it leaves undetermined what books constitute the Old Testament, to which it obviously refers; nor does it fix the extent of their inspiration, or fairly include the New Testament. We accordingly find different views held by Christian scholars respecting the exact degree of divine influence granted the sacred writers.

“That the prophets and apostles taught under the influence of the Holy Spirit, was the universal belief of the ancient Church, founded in the testimony of Scripture itself. But this living idea of inspira-

¹ The Greek is, *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος*, etc. As there is an omission of *ἐστὶ*, it has been disputed whether it is to be supplied before or after *θεόπνευστος*. In the latter case the passage would be rendered, “All Scripture given by inspiration of God is also profitable,” etc. This is the rendering of the Peshito Syriac and the Vulgate, and is the view of some eminent critics; but the *καὶ* seems to forbid it.

tion was by no means confined to the written letter. The Jews, indeed, had come to believe in the verbal inspiration of their sacred writings, before the canon of the New Testament was completed, at a time when, with them, the living source of prophecy had ceased to flow. . . . The fathers, however, in their opinions respecting inspiration, wavered between a more and less strict view. . . . All, however, insisted on the practical importance of the Scripture, its richness of divine wisdom clothed in unadorned simplicity, and its fitness to promote the edification of believers."¹

Belief of primitive Church in inspiration of the Scriptures.

Justin Martyr, speaking of the wonderful teachings of the Old Testament, remarks: "The divine *plectrum*, itself descending from heaven, makes use of holy men, as a harp or lyre, to reveal to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things."² He seems, however, to have limited inspiration to what is religious, and necessary to be known in order to salvation; and while he expresses himself strongly on the inspiration of the Old Testament, he believes also in the inspiration of the New, especially of the evangelists. The views of Irenæus on the same subject were strict: "The Scriptures are, indeed, perfect since they were uttered by the word of God and his Spirit."³

Clement of Alexandria, speaking of the law and the prophets, remarks: "Justly could we call the apostles prophets and righteous men, since one and the same Holy Spirit works in all of them."⁴ Irenæus speaks of Paul's frequent use of *hyperbata*. "He attributes this peculiarity of Paul's style," says Neander, "to the crowd of thoughts pressing for utterance from his ardent mind," showing that he made a distinction between the divine and the human element in inspiration.

Testimony of Justin, Clement, Irenæus, and others.

Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, observes: "Respecting the righteousness which the law teaches, both the prophets and the gospels are found to agree, because they all (the writers) spoke inspired by the one Spirit of God."⁵

Origen, the most illustrious scholar of the early post-apostolic

¹ Hagenbach, *Hist. Christian Doctrines*, Smith's ed., vol. i, p. 87.

² 'Ἰν' αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιὸν πληκτρον, ὡσπερ ὄργάνῳ κιθάρᾳ τινὸς ἢ λύρας, τοῖς δικαίαις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἡμῖν καὶ οὐρανίων ἀποκαλύψῃ γυῶσιν.—*Cōhort. ad Græcos*, § 8.

³ *Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt quippe a verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ.*—*A Iver. Hæret.*, ii, cap. xxviii, § 2.

⁴ Προφήτας γὰρ ἅμα καὶ δικαίους εἶναι τοὺς ἀποστόλους λέγοντες εὐ ἂν εἰπομεν, ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνεργούντος διὰ πάντων ἁγίου πνεύματος.—*Strom.*, liber v, cap. vi.

⁵ 'Ἐτι μὴν καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης ἧς ὁ νόμος εἴρηκεν ἀκόλουθα εὑρίσκειται καὶ τὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἐναγγελίων, ἔχειν διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἐνὶ πνεύματι Θεοῦ λελαληκέναι.—*Ad Autolyicum*, liber iii, § 12.

Church, remarks: "Certainly, the Holy Spirit inspired each one of those holy men, whether they were prophets or apostles; and that there was not one spirit in the ancients and another in those who were inspired at the coming of Christ, is most clearly proclaimed in the Churches."¹ He also remarks: "All the Scriptures are inspired by the Holy Spirit."²

Hagenbach remarks: "It appears that Origen, with all his exaggerated views of inspiration, also admitted that there were uninspired passages in the Scripture, and thus distinguished between its divine and human elements."³ "In general," says Gieseler, "Origen appears to understand by inspiration, not the pouring in of foreign thoughts, but an exaltation of the soul, whereby prophets were elevated to the knowledge of the truth; and this *view was held fast* in the school of Origen."

Chrysostom, commenting on the Gospel of John, says: "Let us no longer listen to the fisherman, or to the son of Zebedee, but to the Spirit that knows the deep things of God, and strikes the apostle as a lyre. For he will tell us nothing that is human, but will speak to us of spiritual depths."⁴ Yet when commenting on Matthew, he observes: "The evangelists are shown to disagree in many places; but this circumstance itself is the greatest proof of their truth. For if they had accurately agreed in all things respecting times and places, and in their very words, none of our enemies would have believed that they had not written from human concert. For they would not have supposed that so much harmony grew out of the simple truth. But, as it is, the apparent disagreement in small things frees them from all suspicion, and clearly vindicates the character of the writers."⁵

Augustine compares the apostles to hands, which wrote what

¹ Sane quod iste Spiritus unum quemque sanctorum, vel prophetarum, vel apostolorum inspiravit, et non alius spiritus in veteribus, alius vero in his qui in adventu Christi inspirati sunt, fuerit, manifestissime in ecclesiis prædicatur.—*Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, liber i, § 4.

² In Psalms, 527.

³ Hist. Christ. Doct., vol. i, p. 91.

⁴ Ὡς οὖν οὐκέτι τοῦ ἑλιεύς, οὐδὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, ἀλλὰ τοῦ τὰ βᾶθη τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰδότης, τοῦ Πνεύματος λέγω, ταύτην ἀνακρονομένον τὴν λύραν, ὄντως ακούωμεν. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐνθρόπινον ἡμῖν ἔρει, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἰβύσσω τῶν πνευματικῶν.—*In Joan.*, hom. i, § 2.

⁵ Πολλαχοῦ γὰρ διαφωνοῦντες ἐλέγχονται. Αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο μέγιστος εἶγμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐστίν. Εἰ γὰρ πάντα συνεφώνησαν μετὰ ἀκριβείας, καὶ μέχρι καιροῦ, καὶ μέχρι τόπου, καὶ μέχρι ῥημάτων αὐτῶν, οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐπίστευσε τῶν ἐχθρῶν, ὅτι μὴ συνελθόντες ἐπὶ συνθήκης τινὸς ἀνθρωπίνης ἔγραψαν ἅπερ ἔγραψαν; οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τῆς ἀπλότητος τὴν τοσαύτην συμφωνίαν. Νυνὶ δὲ καὶ ἡ δοκοῦσα ἐν μικροῖς εἶναι διαφωνία πάσης ἀπαλλάττει αὐτοὺς ὑποψίας, καὶ λαμπρῶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τρόπου τῶν γραφάντων ἀπολογεῖται.—*In Mat.*, hom. i, § 2

Christ, the head, dictated.¹ He calls the holy Scriptures the venerable writing of the Holy Spirit, and declares that he most firmly believes that none of their authors has written any thing that is erroneous.²

Jerome, while holding the inspiration of the Scriptures, did not overlook the human element, and in commenting on Gal. v, 12, "I would they were even cut off which trouble you," remarks: "Nor is it strange if the apostle, as a man, and still shut up in a frail vessel, and seeing another law bringing him into captivity, and leading him into the law of sin, once uttered such language, into which we often see holy men fall."³ He also says he finds solecisms and transpositions of words in the Epistles of Paul.⁴ Theodore, the celebrated bishop of Mopsuestia, "assumed," says Hagenbach, "different degrees of inspiration. He ascribed to Solomon, not the gift of prophecy, but only that of wisdom, and judged of the Book of Job and the Song of Solomon only from the human point of view."⁵

Though the Reformers submitted in faith to the authority of Scripture as a divine revelation, they also had an unprejudiced regard to its *human* side, taking a comprehensive view of inspiration, especially in its practical bearing. The Catholic Church in general held firmly to inspiration. Luther's expressions on the inspiration of the Scriptures were very strong. Among other things, he says that we must look upon the Scripture "as if God himself had spoken therein." Yet he seems to have conceded historical contradictions between the Pentateuch and Stephen's speech. Melancthon, too, only claims freedom from error in the apostles as to doctrine, but not in the application of doctrine. Calvin also asserted in the strongest manner the divine authority and inspiration of the holy Scriptures.⁶

The question of the amount of divine inspiration in the Bible is of a grave and important character, and here the words of the poet are especially applicable, "The middle course is the safest."

¹ Quando quidem membra ejus operata sunt, dictante capite.—*Cons. Evang.*, i, 35.

² Soleis eis scripturarum libris qui jam canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam.—*Epis.* 82. cap. i, § 3.

³ Nec mirum esse si Apostolus, ut homo, et adhuc vasculo clausus infirmo, vidensque aliam legem in corpore suo captivantem se, et ducentem in lege peccati, semel fuerit hoc locutus, in quod frequenter sanctos viros cadere perspicimus.

⁴ Nos quoties cumque soloecismos aut tale quid annotavimus, et cetera.—*Commen. Epis. Eph.*, cap. iii.

⁵ *Hist. Christ. Doctrines*, vol. i, 321.

⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 240-243.

The theory of verbal inspiration in every part of the sacred Scriptures would give them more sanctity and authority; but even if we could determine with complete certainty the original reading in every case, the mass of the Christian world who read the Scriptures in translations would not be profited by verbal inspiration. But it is very inconvenient to the biblical interpreter, apart from its being in many cases useless, for it compels him to reconcile every discrepancy, however trifling, and to vindicate the grammatical accuracy of every word and sentence in the sacred canon, which, in not a few instances, is a difficult task, and rarely satisfies the candid reader. On the other hand, lax views of inspiration may strip the Bible of a great deal of its authority as a divine revelation, and resolve much of it into mere human opinion. In considering the inspiration of the historical books of the Bible we must carefully distinguish between the inspiration of the writers and that of the speakers whose discourses are recorded. The book may be inspired but not the speaker, or both speaker and writer may be inspired. This remark applies with special force to the Book of Job; and if we allow this work to be genuine history in all its parts, and that its author was guided by the divine Spirit to write accurately every speech made by Job and his friends, nevertheless all these speeches might contain more or less false doctrine.

REQUIREMENTS OF THE CANONICAL BOOKS.

Respecting the kind and the amount of inspiration in the canonical books, we must consider what the nature of each book requires. In writing the Pentateuch, Moses would need inspiration in narrating the history of the world before his own times. If he had written documents lying before him, or possessed merely the traditions of his ancestors, he still needed a divine guidance to enable him to distinguish true history. The account of creation must have come to Moses or to some one of his ancestors by divine revelation. As the founder of a religious system for the most part new, and as a prophet, he required immediate divine guidance.

Yet there may have been some unimportant points, in which he followed his own judgment or the advice of friends. We find upon a certain occasion that Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, visited him, and, observing him sitting in judgment on small cases as well as on large ones, he remarked, "The thing that thou doest is not good. Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou and this people that is with thee: for this thing is too heavy for thee: thou art not able to

perform it thyself alone " He advised him to appoint judges to decide small controversies, while the most important causes should be brought to Moses himself. This advice Moses followed.¹

The books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, being merely historical in their character, would require at most in their authors merely the divine guidance to enable them to give a correct narrative of events. In history of a merely civil, and, in some cases, of a religious character, specific inspiration is not demanded, and a well-informed man could himself write it with sufficient accuracy. The Psalms being of a doctrinal as well as of a devotional character, and some of them being Messianic and prophetic, require full inspiration.² The Proverbs of Solomon and the Book of Ecclesiastes, also, being doctrinal, require inspiration. The question of the inspiration of the Book of Job and the Song of Solomon will be considered in the introduction to these books.

The prophetic books of the Bible demand the highest degree of inspiration, as their authors are not only teachers of moral truth, but boldly predict the future, which none but the Omniscient God can clearly foresee. Gesenius defines the word נְבִיא,³ *vates, a prophet*, one who, impelled by a divine influence or by the divine Spirit, rebukes kings and nations, and predicts future events. With the conception of a prophet, there was also, primarily, connected the idea that he spoke not his own thoughts, but what he received from God, and that he was the ambassador and interpreter of God; as is evident from Exod. vii, 1, where God says to Moses: "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." Here it is clear that Aaron was to utter faithfully the words of Moses.

The divine communication was often made to the prophets in a vision, which is called in Hebrew by the various names of מְרֵאָה, מְחֻזָּה, חֻזִּין, חֻזִּית, חֻזִּין, and hence the prophet is sometimes called רֵאָה, *a seer, one who sees*. God says: "If there be a prophet among you, *I the LORD will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream.*" Num. xii, 6. Visions of the future condition of the Jewish and Christian Churches, and of the

¹ See Exodus xviii, 13-26.

² And so Peter in the Acts (chap. i, 16) declares, in quoting Psalms lxxix, cix, "The Holy Ghost spake by the mouth of David."

³ This word is derived from נָבֵא, Niphel נִבְא passive, which Gesenius defines, *to speak under divine influence*, the passive form being used because the prophets were moved by a divine power.

different cities and nations standing in a close relation to the Israelites, were presented to the prophets by the divine Spirit. The Apostle John, after quoting a passage from Isaiah, remarks: "These things said Esaias, when he *saw* his glory, and spake of him." Chap. xii, 41. And the Prophet Daniel says: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him." Chap. vii, 13. So also the Apostle John, as recorded in the Apocalypse, saw in visions the overthrow of paganism, the final triumph of Christianity, a general judgment, the punishment of the wicked, and the future glory of the saints. To Moses, also, was exhibited in vision the form of the tabernacle and its furniture. "And look that thou make them after their pattern which was showed thee [which thou wast made to see] in the mount." Exod. xxv, 40. The prophets, we may suppose, would write down these wonderful visions in their own language. Nor need we be surprised if, in these circumstances, their transitions are sometimes sudden, their style abrupt, and their expressions occasionally ungrammatical. It is impossible, in this ecstatic state, not to speak and write in a lofty and symbolic style. The human spirit labours to give utterance to its magnificent conceptions; language is taxed to its utmost; and the mind, excited to the highest degree of tension, seizes upon whatever will express its deep emotions. In this way, perhaps, we may account for the fact that the prophet Ezekiel is careless in his grammatical forms. He had more visions than any other prophet, and was oftener in the ecstatic state. In this way, too, may be explained, in part at least, the irregularity of a part of the Greek of the Apocalypse.

But it was not by vision only that God manifested himself to the prophets of old. He "spoke in divers manners." Heb. i, 1. The spirit of Christ in the prophets predicted the future glory of Messiah's kingdom. 1 Pet. i, 11. In this case the very words may have been inspired; at least, the suggestions were communicated to the mind.

The inspiration of the apostles as evangelists consists principally in **inspiration** of the Holy Spirit's bringing to their minds every thing our the apostles. Saviour spoke to them, according to the promise he had made to his disciples. John xiv, 26. Mark was very probably an eyewitness of the scenes in our Lord's history, and a companion of Peter, as the ancient Church testifies; and Luke, the companion of Paul wrote the history of Christ as it had been delivered to him by the eyewitnesses of Christ's ministry. The inspiration of these two evangelists, who were not apostles, we may suppose extended only so far as to enable them to give a true account of the works and the teachings

of Christ. In the evangelists, seeming discrepancies in minor points may, after all, grow naturally out of the reality of things; but we are not required to make the absolute correctness of the evangelists in the most unimportant matters an article of faith, and to resort to far-fetched explanations to reconcile every apparent discrepancy. The Apostolical Epistles, teaching and discussing Christian doctrine, require inspiration to keep them free from all error. The Apocalypse of John is principally a prophetic book, written at the command of Christ, who revealed its contents to the apostle in visions.

The inspiration of the Bible is evident from its sublime doctrines concerning God, the purity of its moral precepts, and from the wonderful fulfilment of its prophecies. The Bible presents to us a wonderful plan. Abraham, originally an idolater,¹ is called out of Mesopotamia, and God promises him that in his seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. His posterity, after sojourning in Egypt several centuries, are led out by Moses, who becomes their legislator in the Sinaitic desert. Joshua brings the Hebrews into the promised land, and establishes them there. The Almighty, later, sent prophets among them at different periods to instruct and warn them, to enforce the great principles of the Mosaic law, and to announce the fate of the surrounding kingdoms and the coming of the Messiah.

Evidences of the inspiration of the Bible; doctrines, ethics, prophetic fulfillments.

The doctrine of the unity and the holiness of God is the fundamental doctrine proclaimed by Moses and the prophets. It came by divine revelation to Abraham. The ancient world could never have discovered the unity of God; it had not the wide view of the universe that we now have, in which we see everywhere a unity of plan. Nor did Moses derive the doctrine from Egypt, for the ancient Egyptians were polytheists. And so far was the idea of the unity of God from being original with the Hebrew people, that there were times when nearly all of them relapsed into idolatry; and it required the severest chastisements from God, and his continual intervention through prophets, armed with miraculous powers, to keep it alive among them.

The unity and the holiness of God.

Plan in Revelation.

The religions of antiquity were characterized by the foulest superstitions, and generally by the most revolting impurities and most cruel rites, from which the religion of the Old Testament is entirely free. Moses and the prophets inculcate, in the clearest and strong-

¹“Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood [the river Euphrates] in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nahor: and they served other gods.” Josh. xxiv, 2.

est manner, the holiness of God. Indeed, the legislation of Moses is especially directed to this point.

The predictions of the Hebrew prophets, both in respect to a Messiah and to the fate of cities and kingdoms contiguous to the Israelites, and respecting the Hebrew people themselves, have no parallel in history; and the number of these prophecies, and their accuracy, entirely exclude the hypothesis of accident, or mere human foresight.¹ We know that the ancient Jews explained the Hebrew interpretations of the Messianic prophecies. that we do. This is evident from the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel. At the time predicted by the prophets the Messiah appears in the land of Israel, teaching the most sublime doctrines respecting God and his worship, and the noblest precepts, which he beautifully illustrated in his holy, active life, establishing his claims as Messiah by the clearest proofs; and having been crucified as a sacrifice for the sins of mankind, he rises from the dead and commissions his apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, after which he ascends to heaven. About thirty-seven years after he had been crucified, the mass of the Jews still persisting in rejecting him, Jerusalem was destroyed by the Roman army under Titus; the temple was laid in ruins, according to the prediction of Christ; and the Jews were scattered to the four winds of heaven. In the meanwhile the religion of Christ continued to spread rapidly; and, after the fiercest conflict with Paganism, in three centuries it became the religion of the Roman Empire, is now the creed of the noblest part of the human race, and gives strong indications of mastering the world. This great scheme of revelation is without a parallel in the annals of our race.

When we see a plan running through the whole universe, both in time and space, extending to the organization of the meanest insect, it is difficult to believe that there is no plan in the moral world, no provision for the redemption of the race. There must be a plan, and Christianity is that plan, or there is none.

¹ The only passage in the Koran resembling a prophecy is in chap. xxx: "The Greeks have been overcome in the nearest part of the land; but after their defeat they shall overcome within a few years." "That this prophecy was exactly full filled," says Sale, "the [Mohammedan] commentators fail not to observe, though they do not exactly agree in the accounts they give of its accomplishment."

CHAPTER II.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

AS early as the second century we find the phraseology "Old" and "New Testament," employed to designate the Jewish and the Christian revelations,¹ but its application to the *books* of the Old and the New Covenant is first clearly seen in Melito,² Bishop of Sardis, in the last half of the second century, and in Origen³ in the first half of the third century. The term canon,⁴ as applied to the sacred writings of the Old and the New Testament, came into use near the middle of the fourth century.⁵

Names designating the collection of the Sacred Writings.

The earliest known catalogue of the books of the Old Testament is given by Melito. In writing to Onesimus, he states that he had made diligent inquiry to learn accurately the number and the order of the ancient books. "Accordingly," says he, "having gone to the East, and as far as the place where (these things) were preached and done, and having ascertained accurately the books of the Old Testament, I herewith send them to you, of which these are the names: Five Books of Moses—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deu-

¹ New Testament, Justin, Dial. cum Tryp., sec. 11, 12; New Testament and the Old, Irenæus ad Hære., liber iv, cap. 9; Old Testament and New, Clem. Alex. Paed., liber i, cap. 7; Old and New Testament, Tertul., adver. Mar., liber iv, cap. xxii.

² He speaks of a catalogue of the *books* of the Old Testament in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., liber iv, 26.

³ Origen remarks on the manuscripts of the Old Testament, tom. xv, § 14, on Matthew. He also observes that the New Testament gives a Greek form to Hebrew names. On *Johan*, tom. ii, § 27.

⁴ The principal definitions of this Greek word (*κανών*), given by Liddell and Scott, are the following: 1. A *straight rod* or *bar*; 2. A *rule* or *line* used by carpenters or masons. Metaphorically: 1. A *rule* in a moral sense; 2. In the Alexandrian Grammarians, collections of the old Greek authors were called *κανόνες*, as being *models* of excellence, *classics*; 3. In the Church, *κανόνες* were the books received as the rule of faith and practice—*canonical Scriptures*.

⁵ The term canon is applied to the Holy Scriptures by Gregory Nazianzen, § 1105 of his Works. Augustine speaks of the sacred writings as canonical books (*canonici libri*) and canonical Scriptures (*Scripturæ canonicæ*). *Epist.* 82, 14, 22. Athanasius calls the Holy Scriptures, "Books that are *canonical* and believed to be divine."—*Epist.* 39, on the Passover. Jerome in various places speaks of a *canon* of Scripture.

teronomy; Joshua Nave, Judges, Ruth; Four Books of Kings, Two Books of Chronicles, Psalms of David, Proverbs of Solomon (which is also called Wisdom), Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; of the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah; of the Twelve Prophets in one book—Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra.”¹ We miss in this catalogue the Book of Esther. In Ezra, Nehemiah is, no doubt, included, as Jerome informs us that these two books were included in one volume, which was called Ezra.²

In the first half of the third century we have the canonical books of the Old Testament as held by the learned Origen. “There are twenty-two books,” says he, “according to the Hebrews, corresponding to the number of the letters of their alphabet.” He then enumerates the various books, giving both the Hebrew and Greek names: Five Books of Moses; Joshua; Judges and Ruth in one volume among the Hebrews; First and Second Books of Kings in one volume, called Samuel with the Hebrews; Third and Fourth Books of Kings in one volume; Two Books of Chronicles in one volume; First and Second Ezra in one volume, which they call Ezra; Book of Psalms; Proverbs of Solomon; Ecclesiastes; Song of Songs; Isaiah; Jeremiah, with Lamentations and Epistle in one volume, which they call Jeremiah; Daniel; Ezekiel; Job; Esther; besides these, the Books of Maccabees, inscribed Sarbèth Sarbanè *EL.³ This list is preserved by Eusebius (Eccles. Hist., book vi, 25) from Origen’s lost Commentary on the First Psalm. In this catalogue the Twelve Minor Prophets, forming one book, are wanting. This must have been an accidental omission on the part of Origen or Eusebius, or in copying the latter; for Origen wrote a Commentary on the Twelve (Minor) Prophets, of which only twenty-five books were found by Eusebius. (Eccl. Hist., book vi, 36.) The Twelve Minor Prophets, in one book, would make the number of the sacred books twenty-two, and the Maccabees would not be in the canon. We might suppose that the extract of Eusebius does not correctly represent the views of Origen. But, on the other hand, Origen quotes 2 Maccabees vii as Scripture, as follows: “But that we may also, from the authority of the Scriptures, believe that these things are so, hea· how in the books of the Maccabees, where the mother of seven martyrs exhorts one of her sons to endure the torments.”⁴ The books

¹ In Eusebius, Eccles. Hist., liber iv, 26.

² Apud Hebræos Ezræ Neemiæque sermones in unum volumen coarctantur.—Preface to his translation of Ezra and Nehemiah.

³ The name which Origen here gives the Maccabees is for the Hebrew שר ביה אלהים, שר בני אלהים, prince of the temple, prince of the children of God.

⁴ Περὶ Ἀρχων, liber ii, cap. i, from the Latin version of Rufinus.

of Maccabees were regarded with great favour by some of the most eminent of the earlier fathers, doubtless because they encouraged the spirit of martyrdom.

The catalogue of Hilary,¹ Bishop of Poitiers, in France, is the same as that of Origen, except that it includes the Twelve Minor Prophets, and omits the Maccabees altogether; but he remarks, "Some add Tobias and Judith." He gives twenty books in all, excluding every Apocryphal book except the Epistle of Jeremiah. Athanasius († A. D. 373) gives us a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, in which he rejects from the canon the Book of Esther, and adds to it, with the Lamentations, the Book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah.² Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem († A. D. 386), states that the number of the books of the Old Testament is twenty-two. His canonical books are the same as ours, except that he adds to Jeremiah, with the Lamentations, the Book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah.³

Gregory Nazianzen († about A. D. 390) omits from his catalogue the Book of Esther, observing, however, that some add this to the other books of the canon; otherwise his catalogue does not differ from ours, as his First and Second Ezra are doubtless Ezra and Nehemiah; and his Chronicles are, no doubt, our two Books of Chronicles.⁴ Epiphanius, metropolitan Bishop of Cyprus († A. D. 402), one of the most learned men of his age, gives us the catalogue of the books of the Old Testament in the following order: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua the son of Nave (Nun), Job, Judges, Ruth, Psalms, First and Second Chronicles, First Book of Samuel or First of Kings, Second Samuel or Second Kings, Third Book of Kings, Fourth Book of Kings, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, The Twelve (Minor) Prophets, The Prophet Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, First Book of Ezra, Second Book of Ezra, and Esther.⁵ We have given but one name to each book, though wherever the Hebrew name differs from the Greek Epiphanius gives both names. It will be observed that there is no apocryphal book in this list, the Second Ezra being put for Nehemiah. Nor do we miss any of our canonical books.

Of all the fathers of the earlier Church Jerome was the greatest Hebrew scholar, and the best versed in the literature of the Jews.

¹ About A. D. 365. Prologue to the Book of Psalms.

² Epistle 39, on the Feast of the Passover.

³ Catechesis iv, de Decem Dogmatibus, cap. 35.

⁴ Carminum, liber ii.

⁵ Liber de Mensuris et Ponderibus, cap. 23.

His testimony as to the canon of the Old Testament is, therefore, very valuable. In the preface to his translation of the two Books of Samuel and of the two Books of Kings he furnishes a catalogue of books of the Old Testament as arranged in the Hebrew Bible, giving both the Hebrew and the Greek or Latin name of each. He gives, first, the five Books of Moses, which he says are called *TORAH—LAW*. The second division, he says, is that of the *PROPHETS*, and he begins with Joshua the son of Nun. Next comes the Book of Judges, with that of Ruth in the same volume. The third book is that of Samuel, called First and Second of Kings with us. The fourth book is that of Kings, contained in the third and fourth volume of Kings; fifth, Isaiah; sixth, Jeremiah; seventh, Ezekiel. Then come the Twelve (Minor) Prophets. The third division, says he, contains the *Ἁγιογραφα*, (*HAGIOGRAPHA*, *Holy Writings*). The first book is Job; next, Psalms of David, in one volume; three books of Solomon, namely, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs; Daniel; First and Second Chronicles; Ezra; and the ninth, Esther. "Thus the books of the ancient law," says he, "are twenty-two: five of Moses, eight of the Prophets, and nine of the Hagiographa; although some often insert Ruth and the Lamentations in the Hagiographa, . . . and thus the books of the ancient law would be twenty-four."¹ In this catalogue are all the books that we have in our

¹As the passage is of vast importance, we herewith give the full Latin text:—
 "Primus apud eos liber vocatur BRESITH (בראשית), quem nos Genesim dicimus. Secundus ELLE SMOTH (אלה שמות), qui Exodus appellatur. Tertius VAJECRA (ויקרא), id est, Leviticus. Quartus VAJEDABBER (וידבר), quem Numeros vocamus. Quintus ELLE ADDABARIM (אלה הדברים), qui Deuteronomium prænotatur. Hi sunt quinque libri Mosi, quos proprie THORATH (תורה), id est, legem appellant.

"Secundum Prophetarum ordinem faciunt; et incipiunt ab Jesu filio Nave, qui apud eos JOSUE BEN NUN (יהושע בן נון), dicitur. Deinde subtexunt SOPHTIM (שופטים), id est, Judicum librum; et in eundem compingunt RUTH (רות), quia in diebus judicum facta narratur historia. Tertius sequitur SAMUEL (שמואל), quem nos Regnorum primum et secundum dicimus. Quartus MALACHIM (מלכים), id est, Regum, quam MALACHOTH (מלכות), id est, Regnorum dicere. Non enim multarum gentium regna describit; sed unius Israelitici populi, qui tribus duodecim continetur. Quintus ISAIAS (ישעיה). Sextus JEREMIAS (ירמיה). Septimus JEZECIEL (יהזקאל). Octavus liber duodecim Prophetarum, qui apud illos vocatur THARE ASRA (תרי עשרא).

"Tertius ordo *Ἁγιογραφα* possidet; et primus liber incipit ab JOB (איוב). Secundus a David (דוד), quem quinque incisionibus, et uno Psalmore volumine comprehendunt. Tertius est SALAMON (שלמה), tres libros habens: Proverbia, quæ illi Parabolæ, id est, MASALOTH (משלות) appellant; Ecclesiasten, id est, COELETH (קהלת); Canticum canticorum, quem titulo SIR ASSIRIM (שיר השירים) prænotant. Sextus est DANIEL (דניאל). Septimus DABRE AJAMIM (דברי הימים, id est, verba dierum, quod significantius *Χρονικὸν* totius divinæ his-

present canon of the Old Testament, and no others; Nehemiah is included in Ezra, and the Lamentations are included in the prophecy of Jeremiah. Jerome remarks on this catalogue: "Whatever is outside of these must be placed among the Apocrypha. Therefore Wisdom, which is commonly inscribed the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' and the Book of Jesus the Son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobias, are not in the canon. The First Book of Maccabees I have found in Hebrew. The Second Book is in Greek."¹ He observes, in his preface to Jeremiah, that "The Book of Baruch has no existence among the Hebrews, and the spurious Epistle of Jeremiah I have determined should be by no means commented upon."²

Furnished with this definite statement respecting the Hebrew canon (the same as the present Hebrew canon) at the beginning of the fifth century, and having seen the views of the most eminent of the earlier Fathers upon the same subject, we naturally turn to the celebrated Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus, born four years after the ascension of Christ. As his father belonged to the family of the priests, and as he himself was profoundly learned in the antiquities of the Jews, he possessed every facility for making himself master of the history of the Jewish canon. "For we have not," says he, "myriads of books, discordant and conflicting, but only twenty-two books, containing the history of all time, which are justly believed to be divine. Of these, five be-
The Catalogue
of Josephus.
 long to Moses, which contain both the laws and the tra-
 dition of the origin of man until his (Moses') death, a period little short of three thousand years. From the death of Moses until the reign of Artaxerxes, who was king of the Persians after Xerxes, the prophets after Moses wrote in thirteen books the events of their own times; the remaining four books contain hymns to God and practical duties for men. From Artaxerxes down to our own time every thing has been written, but (this history) has not been deemed worthy of

torix̄ possumus appellare. Qui liber apud nos Παραλειπομένων, primus et secundus inscribitur. Octavus EZRAS (עזרא), [Al. Eledras], qui et ipse similiter apud Græcos et Latinos in duos libros divisus est. Nonus ESTHER (אסתר). Atque ita fiunt pariter veteris legis libri viginti duo; id est, Mosi quinque; Prophetarum octo; Hagiographorum novem. Quamquam nonnulli RUTH (רות) et CINOTH (קניות) inter Ἀγύγραφα scriptitent, et libros hos in suo putent numero supputandos: α per hoc esse prisca legis libros viginti quattuor.

¹ Quid extra hos est, inter ἀπόκρυφα esse ponendum. Igitur Sapientia, quæ vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu filii Syrach liber, et Judith et Tobias et Pastor, non sunt in canone. Machabæorum primum librum, Hebraicum reperi, secundus Græcus est.

² Libellum autem Baruch qui vulgo editioni Septuaginta copulatur, nec habetur apud Hebræos, et ψευδεπίγραφον epistolam Jeremiæ nequaquam censui disserendam.

equal confidence with our previous history on account of there not having been an exact succession of prophets."¹

These twenty-two books of Josephus (the number of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet) include, doubtless, after the five books of Moses, the following: The writings of the prophets, in thirteen books, viz.: Joshua; Judges and Ruth in one book; First and Second Samuel in one book; First and Second Kings in one book; First and Second Chronicles in one book; Ezra and Nehemiah in one book; Esther; Isaiah; Jeremiah, with Lamentations, in one book; Ezekiel; Daniel; Twelve Minor Prophets in one book; and Job. The four books of hymns, etc., are: Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs. This list we have determined both from the twenty-two books of the Christian Fathers, and from the character of the list given by Josephus.

It will be observed that Josephus closes the canon of Scripture in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B. C. 465-425), and assigns, as the ground of the close at that period, that, after that time, there was no exact succession of prophets. It would seem, then, that no book, however excellent its doctrines or high its literary merit, was ever admitted into the Jewish canon unless it was written, or at least approved, by a prophet. Hence the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, though an excellent collection of moral precepts, and originally written in Hebrew, never had a place in the canon. That the latest books of the Old Testament canon (Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, and Malachi) were not written later, or at least only a little later, than the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, we shall show in discussing them.

From the statement of Josephus we next turn to Philo, the learned Jew of Alexandria (* about B. C. 20). This distinguished writer attempted a philosophy of religion, in which he blended the doctrines of Moses and the wisdom of the Greeks. It is interesting to inquire what books of the Old Testament he received as of divine authority.

The Catalogue of Philo. We find him speaking of those which Moses wrote.² He characterizes him as king, legislator, and high priest,

¹ Οὐ γὰρ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσι παρ' ἡμῖν, ἀσυνφόρων καὶ μαχομένων· δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τοῖς εἰκοσι βιβλία, τοῦ παντὸς ἔχοντα χρόνον τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, τὰ δικαίως θεῖα πεπιστευμένα. Καὶ τούτων πέντε μὲν ἔστι τὰ Μωϋσέως ἃ τοὺς τε νόμους περιέχει, καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀνθρωπογονίας παράδοσιν, μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ τελευτῆς· οὗτος ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τρισχίλιον ὀλίγον ἔτων. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μωϋσέως τελευτῆς μέχρι τῆς Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μετὰ Ξέρξην Περσῶν βασιλέως ἀρχῆς, οἱ μετὰ Μωϋσῆν προφήται τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς πραχθέντα συνέγραψαν ἐν τρισὶ καὶ δέκα βιβλίοις· αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ τέσσαρες ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. Ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀρταξέρξου μέχρι τοῦ κατ' ἡμῶς χρόνου γέγραπται μὲν ἕκαστα· πίστεως δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίας ἤξιώται τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ μὴ γένεσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ακριβῆ διαδοχὴν.—*Contra Arium*, liber i, 8.

² Μωϋσῆς . . . ταῖς ἑρπαις βιβλοῖς . . . συνέγραψεν.—ii, 136.

and attributes to him prophetic powers and divine inspiration.¹ In quoting a passage from Joshua, he calls it “the oracle of the merciful God.”² He quotes Isaiah as one of the ancient prophets;³ likewise Jeremiah, with the remark, “as God, by the mouth of the prophet, said.”⁴ In the same style he quotes Hosea.⁵ Besides these sacred writers, he cites passages from Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, 1 Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and Zechariah. From the books of Moses he has from eight hundred to a thousand quotations. He also speaks of “laws and oracles uttered by inspiration through the prophets, and hymns and the other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are increased and perfected.”⁶ Here we have the threefold division of the Old Testament, so common among the Hebrews. There is no reason for supposing that Philo’s canon differed from that of Josephus.

The next reference, in point of antiquity, to the canon of the Old Testament, occurs in the prologue to the Greek translation of the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach, of Jerusalem. In this prologue the translator states that his grandfather, Jesus, having devoted himself to the “reading of the LAW, and the prophets, and the other books of the fathers,”⁷ was led to write something of his own pertaining to discipline and wisdom. In this statement we recognise the threefold division of the canon.

The translator says that he himself went into Egypt in the (*my*) thirty-eighth year, in the time of (Ptolemy) Euergetes (B. C. 246–221), and having acquired no small amount of knowledge, he translated the work of his grandfather, Jesus the son of Sirach, from the Hebrew language.⁸ And the imitations of the Hebrew language found in the Greek translation show that the original was in Hebrew. The grandfather probably wrote forty or fifty years before the translation was made. We cannot refer the original work to a period much later than B. C. 290, for Sirach praises most extravagantly the

¹ Διὰ τῆς προφητείας ὅσα μὴ λογισμῶ καταλαμβάνεται θεοσπίζη . . . Μωσῆς επιθειάσαντος.—ii, 163. These numbers are according to Mangey’s edition.

² Λόγιον τοῦ Ἰλεω θεοῦ.—i, 430.

³ i, 681.

⁴ i, 576.

⁵ i, 350.

⁶ Νόμους καὶ λόγια θεοσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ὕμνους καὶ τα ἄλλα οἷς ἐπιστήμη καὶ ἐνσέβεια συναύξονται καὶ τελειοῦνται.—*De Vit. Cont.*, ii, 475, according to Mangey’s edition.

⁷ Τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσιν.

⁸ Many suppose that Euergetes II. is referred to by the translator (B. C. 145–116), and that the second Simon also, the son of Onias, is the high-priest praised by the son of Sirach—neither of which suppositions is probable, since, if a second Euergetes and a second Simon had been meant, the author would so have designated them. The second Simon died about 195 B. C. The passage in Sirach has sometimes been translated, “In the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes,” which can hardly be correct. It should rather be, “In *my* thirty-eighth year.”

high-priest, Simon, the son of Onias, who died at that time;¹ the language he uses shows that Simon was already dead, and the eulogy is that of an acquaintance and friend with whom he had been contemporary.

The Old Testament canon, as it existed among the Jews in the early ages of Christianity, and the traditions respecting the various books that compose it, are found in the Talmuds. The Rabbies of the Talmuds divided the canon into twenty-four books, instead of twenty-two, as given by Josephus and several of the most learned Christian Fathers, as we have already seen, though Jerome also alludes to the division into twenty-four books. "Whoever," says the Talmud, "brings more than twenty-four Holy Writings into the house (that is, into the canon), brings confusion into it."² These twenty-four books are the same as the present Hebrew canon. The first division, the תורה, (TORAH, LAW,) consisting of five books, is ascribed to Moses, with the exception of the last eight verses, which, it is said, Joshua wrote.³ Next follow the writings of the EARLIER PROPHETS: The Book of Joshua, The Book of Judges, The Book of Samuel, and The Book of Kings.⁴ In the third division we have the three Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets, in one book, beginning with Hosea and ending with Malachi.⁵ The fourth division was called KETHUBIM by the Hebrews (a word meaning simply *writings*), and *Hagiographa* (Holy Writings) by the Fathers, and also by the Talmud, on the supposition that all the Kethubim were composed under the influence of the Holy Spirit.⁶ The tradition of the Talmud gives the following books in this division: Ruth, Book of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra-Nehe-miah, and Chronicles.⁷

According to an ancient Jewish tradition, found in the Talmud, a great council, consisting of one hundred and twenty members, was established at Jerusalem after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B. C. 444, and continued a period of about two hundred and fifty years, until the death of the high-priest Simon, B. C. 196.⁸ This

¹ Chap. 50.

² San., Shemot rabba, c. 41, quoted by Dr. Julius Fürst, p. 3, *Der Kanon des Alt. Test.*

³ Joshua wrote his book and eight verses which are in the Law Baba Batra.—*Fürst*, page 9.

⁴ Fürst, pp. 10-14.

⁵ See Fürst on the Canon nach den überlef. in Talmud and Midrasch.

⁶ See Fürst, p. 55.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁸ See in Talmud Baba Batra, and Fürst, pp. 21-23.

great council had charge of the sacred books of the Old Testament, and the introduction of new ones into the canon when prophecy had ceased would have been a matter of great difficulty. In 2 Maccabees it is stated "that Nehemiah, having founded a library, collected together those things pertaining to the kings and the prophets, and those concerning David and the epistles of the kings concerning offerings."¹

CHAPTER III.

THE HEBREW AND ITS COGNATE TONGUES.

THE Old Testament is written in Hebrew, with the exception of about three fifths of the book of Daniel and one third of the book of Ezra, which are written in Chaldee. Also in Jeremiah we have a single verse in Chaldee (x, 11). Hebrew was the language of the Canaanites when Abraham sojourned among them, from whom he learned it. His vernacular in Mesopotamia was Aramæan.² His descendants carried the Hebrew with them into Egypt, and brought it back to Palestine with them. It was their vernacular until some centuries after the Babylonian captivity, when it was wholly supplanted by the Chaldee, which came gradually into use from the time of the captivity. It is impossible to tell exactly how long before the advent of Christ the Chaldee, in use in his time, had become the prevailing tongue.

It is evident that the people of Canaan spoke the Hebrew language, from the names of several places; for example, קְרִיית סֵפֶר, *city of books*; מְלִכֵי צְדָקָה, *king of righteousness*. It is called (Isaiah xix, 18) *the language of Canaan*; and after the ten tribes were carried away captive by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, it is called יְהוּדִית, *Jews' language*. The name Hebrew (עִבְרִי) is given to Abraham (Gen. xiv, 13), and Hebrews (עִבְרִים) to his descendants through Jacob (Exod. ix, 1). Some regard this name as derived from עֵבֶר, *beyond the river* (Euphrates), *the man from beyond the river*, ὁ περὰ τῆς

¹ Καταβαλλόμενος βιβλιοθήκην, επισυνήγαγε τὰ περὶ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ προφητῶν, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Δαυὶδ, καὶ ἐπιστολὰς βασιλέων, περὶ ἀναθεμάτων.—ii, 13.

² This is evident from Gen. xxxi, 47, where the name of the heap of stones called גַּלְעָד (*Galeed*) by Jacob, is named יְגֵר קְהֵלֵי יְהוּדָה (*Yegar Sahadutha*) by Laban the Syrian, which is Aramæan.

Septuagint.¹ But in the Bible the name seems to be derived from עֵבֶר (*Eber*), one of the ancestors of Abraham. Gen. x, 21; Num xxiv, 24. From the Hebrew people the name of the language itself is derived.

The Hebrew is a branch of a family of languages generally called *Semitic*, from Shem, the ancestor of the peoples using them. This family embraces, besides the Hebrew, the Punic, spoken by the Phœnicians and their colonies; the Aramæan, spoken in Aram of the Semitic (Syria and Assyria, Mesopotamia and Babylonia) in two languages. dialects, the Syriac in the north and the Chaldee in the south; the Arabic, spoken originally in Northern Arabia, and the Himyaritic in the south; and the Æthiopic in Abyssinia. To these branches of the Semitic family must be added the cuneiform inscriptions on the monuments of Assyria and Babylon.

The Punic language, which differs but little from the Hebrew—as might be expected from Phœnicia lying on the borders of Canaan—exists, with the exception of a few passages in Plautus, only on monuments. Nearly all these inscriptions were made between B. C. 100 and about A. D. 200.² The inscription on the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar, king of Sidon, discovered near Sidon in 1855, is the oldest known Phœnician writing, and is referred by Wuttke to about the year 1000 B. C.³ Others, however, make it three or four centuries later.

Northern Aramæan, or Syriac, first becomes known to us in the Aramæan Syriac translation of the Bible in the second century, and in the various writings of the Christians extending from the second century to the thirteenth. Its most flourishing period was from the fourth to the tenth century, during which time the Syriac literature, embracing nearly all departments of knowledge, was especially rich in works on theology, and particularly in Oriental and ecclesiastical history. The works of Aristotle and other Greek authors were translated into it.⁴ It was spoken through the whole country bounded on the west by the Mediterranean sea, on the north and north-west by the Taurus mountains, on the east by the river Tigris, and on the south by Palestine and Arabia. Its most flourishing seat was Edessa. A corrupt form of Syriac is still spoken by the Nestorian Christians of Oroomiah, Persia, and Koordistan.⁵

¹ Ewald (Ausf. Lehrbuch der Heb. Sprache, 8te ausg., p. 20) regards this view as altogether uncertain.

² Gesenius, *Monumenta Phœnicia*, liber primus.

³ Die Entstehung der Schrift, u. s. w., 1 band. Leipzig, 1872.

⁴ Uhlemann, Introduction to his Syriac Grammar.

⁵ See A Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language as spoken in Oroomiah, Persia, and Koordistan, by Rev. D. T. Stoddard, New Haven, Conn., 1855.

The southern Aramæan, or Chaldee, is first found in the Books of Daniel and Ezra, and is the language of the Targums. It was spoken by the Jews in Palestine in the time of Christ. The Arabic is the richest, the most flexible, the most difficult, and the most widely diffused of all the Semitic tongues. It was first spoken in northern Arabia, but does not appear as a written language until four or five centuries after Christ. The Koran, written in the Koreis' dialect, spread the Arabic language far and wide with the conquests of Mohammed in the seventh century, and with the subsequent progress of his system. The Arabic is the spoken or sacred language of a population of over sixty millions in northern, and a portion of middle Africa, and in western, and a part of southern, Asia. The Himyaritic language was spoken in southern Arabia before the time of Christ, and even in the fourteenth century it had not died out in Yemen. The Ethiopic, a branch of the Himyaritic, simpler in its structure than the Arabic, and more closely allied to the Hebrew, continued in general use in Abyssinia as a written language until the end of the sixteenth century, when it was supplanted by the Tigre and Amharic dialects. Besides the translation of the Bible in Ethiopic, there are found, in this language, in European libraries (especially in London), the Book of Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the fourth Book of Ezra, besides many other unprinted works, as the spoils of the expedition against King Theodore.

The Semitic languages have several peculiar features. The verb stems almost invariably consist of three consonants with their vowels, as: קָטַל (*qatal*), *he killed*. The modification of this primitive form, by prefixing *nun* (נ), gives it a reflexive, reciprocal, or passive sense, as: נִקְטַל (*niqtal*), *to kill one's self*, etc.; by doubling the middle consonant and making certain vowel changes, the verb acquires intensive force, as: קָטַל (*qittēl*), *to massacre, to kill many*; by prefixing *hē* (ה) and modifying the stem, we obtain a causative meaning; as: הִקְטִיל (*hiqtīl*), *to cause to kill*; by prefixing *hith* (הִ), with vowel changes, we have a reflexive sense; as: הִתְקַטַּל (*hithqattēl*), *to kill one's self*, etc.

Some peculiarities of the Semitic languages.

These languages have only two tense forms, a preterit and a future, sometimes called an imperfect. The future tense is sometimes used for the subjunctive, the optative, and the imperative moods, and also to express past time. Pronouns in the oblique cases are affixed to the nouns, and in the accusative to verbs. Nouns placed before other nouns that limit their meaning are said to be in the *construct* state, and very often undergo change; as: דְּבַר יְהוָה, *dēvār Yehovah*, (*word of Jehovah*), *dēvār*, construct from דָּבָר, *dāvār*. There are

no words compounded in part of prepositions, as in the European languages.

The Semitic languages were originally written without vowel points. In the Ethiopic, however, vowels are indicated by the modification of the consonant forms. It has been estimated that the Hebrew language, as found in the Bible, has about six thousand words, which, of course, are but a portion of its entire ancient treasures. The Arabic language contains about sixty thousand words; but the greater part of its roots are the same as those of the Hebrew, and the language often furnishes valuable aid in understanding the Hebrew. The Aramæan is more closely allied to the Hebrew than is the Arabic.

Gesenius acknowledges but *two* distinct periods in the biblical Hebrew: the first, its *golden age*, extending to the end of the Babylonian exile; and the second, the *silver age*, from the close of the

The biblical
Hebrew lan-
guage.

exile to the times of the Maccabees, about B. C. 160.¹

On the other hand, Ewald, the late distinguished Orientalist, remarks, that "the Hebrew language, until the end of the Old Testament, lived through *three* periods, into which the whole history of Israel is divided."² His divisions are as follows:

1. The period extending from some time previous to Moses to the age of the kings. 2. The period from the kings to the sixth or seventh century before Christ. 3. From the Babylonian captivity to the times of the Maccabees,³ when it was completely supplanted by the Chaldee.

The Hebrew language, Ewald holds, seems to have suffered few changes from the time of Moses until about six hundred years before Christ, because the structure of the Semitic languages is somewhat more simple, and therefore less liable to change, than that of languages of a greater development. The Hebrews were never long subjected to peoples of a foreign tongue; they lived under their own free constitution, mostly separated from other nations. Many changes in the language, however, are not perceptible to us, because it was punctuated according to a later standard.⁴ The language, as it is exhibited to us in the Pentateuch, is completely formed, and subsequent ages could make but little improvement in it. The square character, in which it is now written and printed, came gradually into use, it would seem, some time after the Babylonian captivity, and was brought home by the Jews returning from exile

¹ Roediger's Gesenius' Heb. Gram., pp. 9, 10.

² Ausf. Lehrbuch der Heb. Sprach., eighth edition, p. 23.

³ See Ewald's Ausf. Lehrbuch der Heb. Sprach., pp. 23-25.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

along with the Chaldee;¹ so that about the time of Christ it had already supplanted the ancient Phœnician character. The latter, however, is found on Maccabean coins of about B. C. 143. The Samaritan characters were very similar to the Phœnician, but the present Samaritans use characters in many respects different from Phœnician.

A thorough acquaintance with the Hebrew language is very valuable to the theologian, and to the biblical critic indispensable. The knowledge of the tongue has been preserved to us in several ways: First, by tradition, handed down from generation to generation by learned Jews, who established schools of learning, and wrote lexicons, grammars, and commentaries on their language; second, by the early translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, namely: the Septuagint, Targums or Chaldee translations, the Syriac, Vulgate, and other versions; and third, by the Arabic, one of the sister tongues of the Hebrew, a living language, which confirms and illustrates our traditional knowledge of the Hebrew. Besides these sources, the analogy of languages and the study of the context often throw great light upon difficult passages.

The necessity of a knowledge of Hebrew. How the language has been preserved.

In the Middle Ages the Jews were almost exclusively the cultivators of Hebrew literature, and a Hebraist among the Christians was rare. The revival of learning in Christendom, and the powerful impulse given to the study of the Holy Scriptures by the Reformation, was felt in Hebrew philology.

John Reuchlin, Professor of Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt († 1522), was the father of Hebrew philology among Christians. In the first part of the seventeenth century the labours of the two Buxtorfs, father and son, Professors of Hebrew in Basel, in Hebrew grammar, lexicography, and cognate subjects, form an epoch in the history of the cultivation of the language. In the same century we have in England the great Hebraists, Lightfoot, Walton, Castell, Pococke, and Hyde. In the first half of the eighteenth century Albert Schultens employed his profound knowledge of Arabic in illustrating the Hebrew; and since his time Hebrew lexicographers and grammarians, in discussing the principles of the language, avail themselves of the light afforded by the sister tongues. In the same century we have, in Hebrew philology, the distinguished names of John Henry Michaelis and John David Michaelis, Simonis, and Dathe. In the present century the study of Hebrew has re-

¹ Origen, Jerome, and the Talmudists affirm this.

² The author brought home from Nablûs the present Samaritan alphabet.

ceived a new impulse through the labours of Gesenius, Ewald, Fürst, Hupfeld, Rosenmüller, Winer, Roediger, Lee, and others. In the United States the language has been especially cultivated by Stuart, Bush, Nordheimer, and Green. Nearly all the men who have been distinguished as Hebrew scholars were skilled in most of its cognate tongues. For acquiring a knowledge of Hebrew the grammars of Gesenius (edited by Roediger, and translated into English by Conant), Nordheimer, Ewald, and Green, and the lexicons of Gesenius (translated by Robinson) and Fürst (translated into English by Davidson) are the best. Gesenius, as a lexicographer, has no superior. "He had," says Dr. Robinson, "the persevering industry of the Germans and the common sense of the English."

In Fürst's lexicon the accented syllable is marked, and such frequent references are made to the explanations of the ancient Rabbies as might be expected from one who was a Rabbi himself. The Concordance of the Hebrew and the Chaldee words of the Books of the Old Testament by Julius Fürst,¹ is of great value to the student of Hebrew, and is not only a Concordance, but, to a great extent, a lexicon also.

For the study of Chaldee, Winer's Grammar of the Chaldee Language contained in the Bible and in the Targums, translated into English by Professor Hackett, is the best. The Hebrew lexicons contain the biblical Chaldee; and for the Targums, the lexicon of Rabbi J. Levy is preferable to any other.² The definitions are given in German, and the words are arranged alphabetically. Also, for the biblical Chaldee, and for the dialect of the Babylonian Talmud, the work of Samuel David Luzzatto, of Trieste, is valuable.

The Chaldee, Talmudical, and Rabbinical Lexicon of John Buxtorf extends over the Targums, the Talmuds, and the writings of the ancient Rabbies in general. It was the product of thirty years' labor, and contains two thousand six hundred and seventy-eight columns, (two columns to the folio page,) and was published at Basel in 1640. The definitions are in Latin. It is a great storehouse of Hebrew learning, and is indispensable to the student of the ancient Jewish writings. With all its great merits, however, it has some serious defects. The words are not arranged alphabetically, but placed under the roots from which they are supposed to be derived. The

¹ The Latin title is, *Librorum Sacrorum Veteris Testamenti Concordantiæ Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ*, etc. It is printed on fine paper with clear type. Leipzig, 1840.

² Its title is, *Chaldaisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grosser Theil des Rabbinischen Schrifthums*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1867, 1868.

proper names are wanting. A reprint of the work was undertaken at Leipzig in 1866 by the Jew Fisher, and published, with additions, in 1875, in 2 vols., 4to.

For the students of Syriac, the grammar of Uhlemann, translated from the German by Enoch Hutchinson, with exercises in Syriac grammar, a chrestomathy, and brief lexicon, will be found to be all that is desired. Helps for the study of Syriac and Arabic. The lexicon of Edmund Castell, with additions by Michaelis, in two parts, quarto. Göttingen, 1788, is the best general Syriac lexicon. For the Peshito New Testament, Schaaf's Lexicon, published at Leyden in 1709, quarto, is the best. A small lexicon to the Peshito New Testament is published by Samuel Bagster, London. To meet a felt want, the preparation of a "Thesaurus Syriacus" has been undertaken by Bernstein and others, the first volume of which, folio, was published at Oxford in 1879, edited by R. P. Smith.

For the acquisition of Arabic, one of the best grammars is Caspari's, translated into English, with additions, by W. Wright. Ewald has also published a valuable Arabic grammar in Latin. The Arabic grammar of Silvestre de Sacy, Paris, second edition, 1831, stands very high. The Arabic-English lexicon of E. W. Lane, when completed, will be the best lexicon, at least for English students. Freitag's Arabic-Latin lexicon, in four volumes (of which there is an abridgment in one volume), is the best yet published. The Arabic-English and English-Arabic lexicon of Joseph Catafago, bound in one volume, is too meagre in the Arabic-English part to meet the wants of students.

For the Ethiopic language we have the grammar and the lexicon of Job Ludolf, first published in 1661, and the recently published grammar, chrestomathy, and lexicon of August Dillmann.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONDITION OF THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
—HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS.

IT may seem strange that while we have Greek manuscripts of the New Testament fifteen hundred years old,¹ the most ancient manuscripts of the Old Testament extant are scarcely a thousand years old, and are few in number. The following causes may be assigned for this disparity:—

1. As the Christians made but little use of the Hebrew Bible, the number of Hebrew manuscripts in existence from the third to the tenth century was not one tenth, perhaps not one twentieth, of the number of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament; consequently the probability of their destruction was proportionately greater than that of the New Testament manuscripts.

2. The Jews have had no permanent places of abode, but have been wanderers upon the earth. This unsettled life has been unfavourable to the preservation of their sacred writings, while the convents of the Christians, existing from the early centuries of the Church to the present day, have been safe depositories of the Christian Scriptures. The convent has proved the ark for the transmission of the ancient manuscripts to us.²

3. After the pointed Hebrew text had been established by the Masorites, the Jewish rabbies destroyed those manuscripts which were not conformable to this standard. This cause has been assigned by Walton, and is not without justification.

4. The custom that existed among the Jews of burying, with distinguished teachers, their worn manuscripts.

The most ancient and valuable of the Hebrew manuscripts are the following:—

1. The manuscript that takes its name from Rabbi Aaron ben-Mose ben-Asher, who lived at Tiberias in the tenth century. This is the best and most celebrated of all the codices of the Old Testament, and is regarded both by the Karaites and

¹Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus were written about the middle of the fourth century.

²It will be remembered that Tischendorf found his famous Codex Sinaiticus in the convent of Saint Catharine.

the rabbies as a model codex of the Old Testament Scriptures, from which the usual Masoretic text is printed. This manuscript is preserved at Berœa.

2. Codex of the Prophets, written A. D. 895, by Moses ben-Asher, an inhabitant of Tiberias, a Karaite, is preserved in the synagogue of the Karaites in Cairo.

3. Codex of the Later Prophets, of uncertain age, probably written between the seventh and the eleventh century. It wants the Masora. This manuscript is preserved in the British Museum.

4. Two very ancient manuscripts are said to exist in Syria, one in Damascus, and the other in a neighboring town, Gobar.

5. Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus, containing the later prophets, edited by Hermann Strack, Leipzig. Written, A. D. 916.

6. Several manuscripts in the collection of Kennicott, from eight hundred to a thousand years old.

7. In De Rossi's collection of manuscripts are four that probably belong to the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries.

8. Manuscripts preserved at Odessa. In this fine collection of Hebrew codices are some a thousand years old, and one of the whole Bible written about A. D. 1010.

Several valuable manuscripts, now lost, were once quoted by rabbies; of these the most celebrated was that of Hillel, written probably not earlier than the seventh century, as it seems to have been furnished with the Masora.¹ Sixteen manuscripts of the Hebrew-Samaritan Pentateuch, the oldest not later than the tenth century, are described by Blaney in his Oxford edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch, 1790. These manuscripts have no vowel points.

A variety of readings is found in the Hebrew manuscripts, but there is substantial agreement. Those prepared for the use of the synagogue are the most correct.

In the time of Jerome (about A. D. 400) the Hebrew text was still without vowels² and critical remarks, and this was also the case at the time of the completion of the Babylonian Talmud, in the beginning of the sixth century. The text was punctuated, and critical remarks were made on the margin by the Masorites (traditionists, from מְסוֹרָה, *tradition*), learned Jews, principally of the school of Tiberias,

¹ See Dr. Strack's Proleg. Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, Leipzig 1873, of which we have made great use.

² The Phœnician, Syriac, and Arabic languages were anciently written *without vowels*. The Koran originally had no vowels. Even the English language has no complete vowel system, but the same vowel is differently pronounced in different words.

after the beginning of the sixth century, and completed in the seventh. The vowel system is, accordingly, that which was in use in Palestine, and is, no doubt, very accurate. So scrupulous were the Masorites that they did not venture to change the text when they had the best reason for believing it faulty, but they wrote without vowels on the margin the word that should be read, and the vowels belonging to it they gave to the word in the text. The marginal reading is called *Qeri, read*, while the text is *Kethib, written*.

The Masorites spent a great deal of labour upon the text. They computed the number of letters in each book, and gave the middle letter, the number of verses of each book, and many other particulars. The Talmudists give definite rules for the writing of manuscripts, and the most strenuous care was taken to secure the greatest accuracy in transmitting to posterity the sacred books of the Old Testament.¹

But in modern times we have had no such continued labours on the text of the Old Testament as we have had on the New in the critical editions of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and, above all, of Tischendorf and Tregelles. Accordingly, the text of the Old Testament is not so definitely fixed as that of the New.



CHAPTER V.

ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

I. THE SEPTUAGINT.

NEXT in importance to the ancient Hebrew manuscripts for settling the original text are ancient versions; and when they were executed at a period far earlier than that of the oldest existing manuscript of the original they are of the highest value, for they show, in not a few cases, how the original read at the time when they were made, and they prove, by their agreement with the Hebrew, that there has been no corruption of the sacred writings. The most ancient version of the Old Testament is the *Alexandrian*, generally called the *Septuagint*, from its being claimed to be the work of seventy or seventy-two men, who, it is said, translated the Hebrew into Greek. A great deal of uncertainty rests upon the history of this version; for the oldest account respecting it appears in a document professing to be written by a Greek at the court

The Septuagint version.

¹ The *Textus Receptus* is printed from the text of the Masorites, hence it is called the Masoretic Text.

of Ptolemy Philadelphus (B. C. 285-247) in Alexandria, and addressed to Philocrates. It is generally rejected as spurious.¹

According to the statement of this writing, the celebrated Athenian Demetrius Phalereus induced the Egyptian king, Ptolemy Philadelphus, to have a Greek version made of the Jewish law books. The king, first having secured the favour of the Jews by emancipating their countrymen who were slaves in Egypt, sent to Jerusalem an embassy, in which Aristeas took a part, to request the high priest to send him suitable men, acquainted with both Hebrew and Greek, to make the translation. The high priest sent him the required men, seventy-two, six from each tribe, with a Hebrew manuscript written in letters of gold. They completed the translation in seventy-two days, on the island of Pharos. Thereupon, Demetrius called together the multitude of the Jews, and read the version in their presence and in that of the translators. The translation met with universal favour. Such is the substance of the statement of Pseudo-Aristeas, and, if the writing were not a forgery, would be satisfactory. Yet the principal points in the story are possibly true.

The next statement respecting the Septuagint is from Aristobulus, an Alexandrian Jew of the second century before Christ, preserved in Eusebius.² He states that the whole law was translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and that Demetrius Phalereus especially interested himself in the matter. Some, indeed, have called in question the authority of Aristobulus, but probably without sufficient ground.

The testimony of Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, is important, on account of his locality and his learning.³ He states that Ptolemy Philadelphus sent ambassadors to the high priest and king of Judea—one man holding both offices—requesting him to send to him interpreters of the law. The Jewish high priest being delighted by the request, sent to the Egyptian king men of the highest repute among the Hebrews, who, in addition to their Hebrew learning, had received a Greek training. The translators executed their work on the isle of Pharos. Philo also states, that “even to the present time, every year, a feast and an assembly of the people are held on the island of Pharos, not of Jews only, but of great multitudes of other people, who sail thither, honouring the place where the translation was made.”⁴

The opinions of Philo, Josephus, and others on the Septuagint.

Josephus⁵ gives a long account of the manner in which the version

¹ Since the time of Hody, who showed the grounds of its spuriousness. He died in 1706.

² Præp. Evan., xiii, 12.

³ Vita Mosis, liber ii, 5-7.

⁴ He was born about 20 B. C.

⁵ Born A. D. 37.

was made, agreeing in the main facts with the preceding statements.¹ This translation was of only the Five Books of Moses; and Josephus expressly states, that "those who were sent to Alexandria as interpreters gave him (the king) only the Books of the Law."² From a statement of Aristobolus, it would appear that some part of the law had been previously translated. It is to be regretted that what professes to be a contemporary account of the origin of the Greek version of the law has no good claim to genuineness; yet the very fact that Philo and Josephus follow it, shows that the writing of Aristeas must contain the principal facts; nor could a forged writing have changed the existing tradition. Its object was to give it definiteness and authority.

That the work was executed by seventy-two Jews may be correct, though it seems improbable that such a large number should be found either in Palestine or Egypt well skilled both in Hebrew and Greek. The translators may have been Egyptian Jews, but we have no proof that they really were; for, though they were Palestinians, they might have consulted their brethren of Egypt, who would be supposed to be better acquainted with Greek; and in this way it may be explained that they translated thummim (תִּמְמִים) by ἀλήθεια, *truth*, the name given by the Egyptians to the image worn by the Egyptian high priest. De Wette³ rejects the account of the translation having been made through the efforts of Ptolemy, and attributes it to the Jews of Egypt, who wished to meet their own wants—a view which, though probable enough in itself, we cannot accept, because it lacks historical evidence.

The translation of the Five Books of Moses was made, it would seem, about B. C. 285, and the other books followed in the next century and a half. The whole was completed, most probably, before B. C. 130, as the grandson of Jesus Sirach, in the Prologue to his translation of the Wisdom of Sirach, apologizes for any defects that his version of the Hebrew into Greek may contain, by remarking "that the law itself, and the prophecies, and the rest of the books, have no little difference when read in their own language."

A. CHARACTER OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

The Greek of this version is the *Common Dialect* that prevailed from the time of Alexander the Great. Executed at different times, and by various authors, it exhibits different degrees of fidelity to the

¹ See *Antiq.*, liber xii, cap. 2.

² See the preface to his *Antiquities*.

³ *Einleitung*, p. 94.

original.¹ The Pentateuch is the most faithfully translated, especial care being devoted to it on account of the importance of the books. The translation of Isaiah and of the Psalms is but indifferently done, while that of Daniel was so bad that the early Church substituted the translation of Theodotion for it. At the end of the Books of Daniel Esther, Job, and Psalms, additions are made to the Hebrew text.

The Septuagint had great authority in the early Christian Church, and some of the Fathers regarded it as inspired. Among the Jews, too, its authority about the beginning of the Christian era was great. Philo uses it alone, and Josephus makes more use of it than he does of the Hebrew text. "In the synagogues of the Alexandrian, and especially of the Hellenistic, Jews," says Bleek, "the sacred books were read almost exclusively for a very long time in this translation, and explained according to it."²

The Septuagint version in the early Church.

Its authority and use at the time of Christ are shown from the frequent quoting of it by the New Testament writers.³ But few of the Fathers were acquainted with Hebrew, and great use was made of the Septuagint, upon which they mainly depended for their knowledge of the Old Testament. To this version they appealed in their controversies with the Jews; and on this ground it gradually lost authority with the latter, and began to be suspected as early as the second century.⁴

The Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament are bound up with this version, which fact led some of the early fathers to quote some of them as Canonical Scripture.

B. THE TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

It is to be regretted that the text of the Septuagint is still in an unsettled state. We have had no very critical edition of it—a work greatly needed. Different Greek versions made subsequently have

¹For difference of authors compare $\text{בְּחֻשְׁבֵּי־הַיָּדַיִם}$, preserved as *φυσιοσιελμ* in the Pentateuch and in the Book of Joshua with *ἀλλόφυλοι* as translated in the other books. פָּרֹצֵי translated *φασέκ* throughout Chronicles; in the other books *πάσχα*.

Einleitung, p. 772.

²It is well known that the apostles and evangelists do not always quote exactly from the Old Testament, but often write according to the sense of the Hebrew or of the Septuagint. In 1 Peter iv, 18, "If the righteous scarcely be saved," etc., we have in the Septuagint the exact language of Prov. xi, 31.

⁴See Justin's Dial. cum Tryphone, c. 68, 71. In Megillath Taanith it is said that darkness came over the world for three days when the version was made.

been more or less mixed with it. Of these versions, the most important are the following:—

1. That of Aquila, who, according to Irenæus¹ and others, was a
Other Greek versions. Jewish proselyte (that is, a convert from Heathenism to Judaism), born in Pontus, most probably in the first part of the second century. This version, made for the Jews, who preferred it to the Septuagint, was remarkably literal,² so that it not unfrequently gave an obscure rendering.

2. The version of Theodotion, who, according to Irenæus, was a Jewish proselyte of Ephesus, living about the middle of the second century. It appears to have been a revised edition of the Septuagint, as it took a middle course between the Septuagint and the version of Aquila. The Greek version of Daniel used by the early Christians was that of Theodotion.

3. The version of Symmachus, who was a Jew, possibly an Ebionite, living about A. D. 200. This version was not so literal as those of Aquila and Theodotion, on account of which it was praised by Jerome.

Besides these versions, fragments of three other Greek translations were used by Origen in his work on the Scriptures, and marked fifth, sixth, and seventh, according to their position, the work of unknown authors.

As the Septuagint had become greatly corrupted, either through the carelessness of copyists or the daring spirit of those who either added to, or took from, the text, to correct it according to their fancies,³ Origen, the greatest scholar of his age, undertook the task of comparing the different Greek versions with the original Hebrew, in columns, by the following method. He placed in the first column the original text in Hebrew characters; in the second, the Hebrew text with Greek letters, giving the pronunciation of the Hebrew; in the third, the text of Aquila, as being next to the Hebrew in accuracy; in the fourth, that of Symmachus; in the fifth, the text of the Septuagint; and in the sixth, that of Theodotion. The work being arranged, for the most part, in six columns, it was called Hexapla (*ἑξαπλῆ*). In some parts the fragments of three other versions were used, when, properly speaking, nine columns were formed.
 The Hexapla. Origen corrected the text of the Septuagint by means of the other versions, principally, however, by means of Theodotion,

¹Ως Θεοδοτίων ἠρμήνευσεν ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλας ὁ Ποντικὸς, ἀμφότεροι Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι.—*Adver. Hæreses*, iii, 21.

² Take this as an example: ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἐκτισεν ὁ θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τῇ γῆν.—Gen. i, 1.

³ See Com. in Matt., tom. xv, 14, opp. iii.

inserting from this version what was wanting, marking the insertion with an asterisk and the name of the source, and allowing what was not in the Hebrew to stand, but designating it with an obelus. This great work was, most likely, never completed. Fifty years after the death of Origen it was brought by Eusebius and Pamphilus from its obscurity into the library of Pamphilus, at Cæsarea in Palestine, where Jerome found it and made use of it. Afterwards it is not mentioned, and it has been supposed that it perished when the Arabs captured and destroyed Cæsarea, A. D. 653. Of this great work we have only some fragments remaining, which are printed in the editions of Origen. It has been disputed whether the *Hexapla* and the *Tetrapla* are different names for the same work. But, according to Eusebius and Epiphanius, the *Tetrapla* contained simply the four principal versions—Septuagint, Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus—in four columns; and, according to some, Origen had executed it as a special work, a synoptical edition of the four translations.¹

As the course pursued by Origen in supplementing the defects of the Greek text by passages from the version of Theodotion had led to new corruptions, through a careless use of his work, we find that at the close of the third century Lucian, presbyter at Antioch, and Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, undertook the revision of the Septuagint. Each made a special recension, which circulated in his own territory. Thus, as Jerome informs us,² there were three conflicting texts of the Septuagint—that of Hesychius, in Egypt; that of Lucian, in use from Constantinople to Antioch; and the Palestinian Codices, elaborated by Origen, circulating in the intermediate province. Our existing manuscripts of the Septuagint exhibit this confusion, and it is difficult to say to which of the texts or recensions existing in the time of Jerome our two oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Alexandrinus, are to be referred.³ Under these circumstances the criticism of the Septuagint is a difficult task. Bleek, however, believes that the form of the two different texts presented by the Vatican and Alexandrian Codices extends back beyond the time of Origen into the apostolic age.⁴

¹ See Jerome's Preface to Chronicles.

² Preface to Chronicles.

³ The Codex Vaticanus belongs to the middle of the fourth century, and the Codex Alexandrinus to the last part of the fifth century. The Codex Sinaiticus, belonging to the middle of the fourth century, contains only about twenty books of the Old Testament.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 787.

C. EDITIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

The following are the most important editions of the Septuagint:—

I. The Roman edition, published in 1587, folio, under the authority of Pope Sixtus V. It was the joint work of several learned men, who were engaged upon it nine years. It was based upon the text of the Vatican Codex, the chasms in which were filled up from two other manuscripts of less ancient date. The Vatican text is not, indeed, always followed, but its orthography is changed into the usual Greek forms, and the editors have sought to improve what they regarded as faulty in the manuscript without always indicating their deviation from it. Besides the text, the most remarkable readings have been introduced from many other manuscripts, especially from the Medicean, at Florence.¹

Upon this edition the following are based:—

1. The London Polyglott, 1657, with various readings from the Alexandrian Codex and from other manuscripts.

2. The edition of Lambert Bos, Franeker, 1709, with prolegomena concerning the history and criticism of the Septuagint. Under the text stand Greek scholia from the Roman edition, and various readings from the London Polyglott. The text is not everywhere that of the Roman edition, although Bos assures us that it is.

3. The edition of John Reineccius, Leipzig, 1730, second edition, 1757. The Roman text is accompanied by the most important variations of the Alexandrian and other manuscripts.

4. The edition of Leander Van Ess, Leipzig, 1824, a copy of the Roman text.

5. That of Constantine Tischendorf, two volumes. Leipzig, 1850, fourth edition, 1869. This is a copy of the Vatican text, with the various readings of the Alexandrian Codex, as well as those of Ephraem, and of Frederico-Augustus. This favorite edition contains rich prolegomena, and at the end the Book of Daniel, according to the Septuagint.

II. The edition of the Septuagint, by John Ernst Grabe, Oxford, 1707-1720, four volumes, folio. This generally follows the Alexandrian Codex. Grabe himself, who died in 1711, published only the first and fourth volumes. The two intermediate volumes did not appear until after his death. The second was published by Francis Lee, and the third by an unknown editor, from the materials left by Grabe. The editor does not follow the Alexandrian text exclu-

¹ Bleek. Einleitung, p. 788.

sively, but adopts the readings of other manuscripts of the Septuagint where he regards them as more correct, and, like Origen, he generally supplies the omissions of the Septuagint from other translations. The text of Grabe was printed by John J. Breitinger, (Professor at Zürich,) 1730-1732, in four volumes, folio, with the removal, however, of the typographical errors, and with the introduction into the text of the changes considered necessary by Grabe in his prolegomena. In all these editions the translation of the canonical Book of Daniel is given according to Theodotus; of the Alexandrian translation of the book but a single codex is known, namely, that in the library of Cardinal Chigi, at Rome.

For the criticism of the text of the Septuagint, rich materials are contained in an edition of this version which was published in five volumes, folio, in single parts, at Oxford, 1798-1827. The work was undertaken by Robert Holmes, Professor of Theology in Oxford, who, at the time of his death, in 1805, had published only the first part, containing the Pentateuch. The four remaining Septuagint—
edit. of Holmes
and Parsons. volumes were published after the death of Holmes by James Parsons. The fourth volume contained the book of Daniel both according to Theodotus and the LXX. The text of the work is the Sixtine. Under the text stand readings from many manuscripts, collated from ancient writers and from the ancient translations of the Septuagint.

The remainder of the ancient Greek translations, excluding the Septuagint, preserved to us, partly in the citations of the Church Fathers, partly in the ancient manuscripts of the LXX, and partly in the translations of some of the books, especially the Syrian, which flowed from the Hexapla, have been published at different times. We may especially mention Montfaucon's edition, *Hexaplorum Origenis Quae Supersunt*, etc., two vols., folio, Paris, 1713. Frederick Field has also undertaken a new edition of Origen's Hexapla. The work is entitled, *Otium Norvicense, sive tentamen de reliquiis Aquilæ, Symmachî, Theodotionis, e lingua Syriaca in Græcam convertendis*, Oxford, 1864. There also appeared at Oxford, in 1867, *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt; sive veterum interpretum Græcorum in totum Vet. Test. fragmenta*. This work is not yet completed. The remainder of the Hexapla is also found in the edition of Origen's works, by Migne, Paris.

Of the Greek translations of the Old Testament there are several Concordances and Lexicons.

1. The oldest is that of Conrad Kircher: *Concordantiæ V. T. Græcæ Ebraeis vocibus respondentēs πολύχρηστοι*. Frankfort, 1607, folio. This work is properly a Hebrew-Greek Concordance. The Hebrew words are arranged alphabetically, Concordances

and under them are placed the words employed by the Septuagint to express them. At the end is an alphabetical index. The passages are also indicated where each of the Greek words is found in the Apocrypha.

2. The work of Abraham Trommius: *Concordantiæ Græcæ versionis LXX*, etc. Utrecht, 1718. Two vols. folio.

3. That of John Chr. Biel: *Nov. Thesaur. Phil. Sive Lexicon in LXX, et alios interpretes et Scriptores Apoc. V. T.* Haag, 1779-1780. Three vols., edited by Mutzenbrecher.

4. The Concordance of John Fried. Schleusner: *Nov. Thesaur. Phil. Crit. Sive Lexicon in LXX.* Leipzig, 1820-1821. Five vols. This work, though the best, has great defects, and in no way meets the wants of our times.

5. Böckel, who died in 1854, commenced: *Nova Clavis in Græcos V. T., Interpretes*, etc.¹

6. On the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament there appeared at Leipzig, in 1853, a work by Christ. Abr. Wahl, entitled: *Clavis librorum Vet. Test. apocryphorum philologica.*

2. THE TARGUMS.

1. TARGUMS OF ONKELOS AND JONATHAN BEN UZZIEL.—Next to the Septuagint, in point of antiquity, are the Targums² (Chaldee translations) on the Pentateuch and on the Prophets; that on the former by Onkelos, and that on the latter by Jonathan Ben Uzziel. It is to be regretted that our information respecting the authors of these translations is so meagre and uncertain.

According to the Talmud,³ Onkelos was a proselyte, a contemporary of the elder Gamaliel, the instructor of St. Paul. The ancient book of Sohar makes him a disciple of Hillel and Schammai.⁴ He lived, accordingly, about the time of Christ or a little before. There is no good reason for questioning the antiquity of this Targum. It is reasonable to suppose that the books of Moses would first be translated into Chaldee, the language that prevailed in Palestine at the time of Christ. Mention is made of a written (Chaldee) translation of the book of Job, belonging to the middle of the first century,⁵ and also of far older Targums, which would imply the greater antiquity

¹ Bleek, *Einleitung*, pp. 787-792.

² תַּרְגְּמוֹת, from תַּרְגָּמוֹת, *translations*, from which we have *dragoman*, an *interpreter*.

³ *Megilla*, f. 3, c. 1. *Tosiphta Schabb.*, c. 8.

⁴ *Ad Levit.*, xviii, 4.

⁵ *Tosefta Sabb.*, c. 14, etc., in Dr. Zunz's *Gottesd. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 62

of Onkelos. The Targum of Onkelos is a plain, intelligible, and generally very faithful translation; in various passages, however, to avoid anthropomorphisms, he uses "Memra," *Word*, instead of Jehovah himself. Two passages he refers to the Messiah: Gen. xlix, 10, and Num. xxiv, 17.

Jonathan Ben Uzziel, the translator of the prophets,¹ appears to have been contemporary with Onkelos, or to have lived a little later. The rabbies relate that he was a disciple of the elder Hillel.² In another Talmudic passage,³ it is said that Jonathan, the son of Uzziel, wrote his paraphrase from the mouth of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan. The Targum of Jonathan differs from that of Onkelos in dialect and style, and in a freer translation of the text. The passages which he translates as Messianic are numerous, and the most orthodox Christian commentator could scarcely refer more positively to the Messiah. He has been supposed, in several places, to quote Onkelos.⁴ That Jonathan explains so many passages as Messianic which were differently interpreted by the Jews of the third⁵ and subsequent centuries is a proof that his translation could not have been made as late as the third century. For the same reason it could not have been made in the second, nor, perhaps, in the latter half of the first; for the continual appeal made by the early Christians to the Messianic prophecies must have led the Jews, so far as possible, to give a different explanation of them.

The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, made at so early a period, when the Hebrew language was well understood, are of great value in explaining the Pentateuch and Prophets.

2. THE TARGUM OF PSEUDO-JONATHAN ON THE PENTATEUCH. —This Targum has been wrongly ascribed to the Jonathan who translated the prophets. Antiquity knows nothing of a Targum on the Pentateuch by Jonathan. The authors of the Jerusalem Talmud⁶ know nothing of a *Targum of Jerusalem*, but they speak of a *Targum of Palestine*. Writers until the end of the fourteenth century, however, very often mention the Targum of Jerusalem; and it is evident, from their quotations and the The Targum of Jerusalem.

¹ This includes Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings.

² Baba Bathra, f. 134, c. 1.

³ Megilla, f. 3, c. 1.

⁴ Targ. Judg. v, 26, quotes unchanged Targ. Deut. xxii, 5; Targ. 2 Kings xiv, 6, almost unchanged, Targ. Deut. xxiv, 16; Targ. Jer. xlvi, 45, 46 is similar to Targ. Num. xxi, 28, 29.

⁵ Jonathan refers Isaiah lii, 13–liii to the Messiah, which the Jews of Origen's time referred to themselves.

⁶ The Jerusalem Talmud was composed in the latter part of the fourth century

clear testimony of several writers, that it embraced the whole Pentateuch.¹ Nor does it appear to have been confined to the Pentateuch; for Dr. Zunz observes that the Targum of Jerusalem is quoted by the rabbies of the Middle Ages as containing paraphrases on the Judges, Samuel, and various prophets, from which he infers that the Jerusalem Targum contained translations of all the Books of the Old Testament.² He concludes that Pseudo-Jonathan is no other than the *Targum of Palestine* or *Targum of Jerusalem*, of which our existing Targum of Jerusalem is only a recension or abridgment. He infers, on various grounds, that it was written in the second half of the seventh century. Its language is a Palestinian dialect of Aramæan, and it must have originated in Syria or Palestine, perhaps in Cæsarea, (on account of Num. xxiv, 19.) Its most ancient title justifies this view. Its linguistic character differs widely from that of Onkelos, but it is very similar in expressions, style, and grammar to the Talmud of Jerusalem and the Targums on the Hagiographa.³

3. THE TARGUM OF JERUSALEM.—This Targum, as we have already seen, is an abridgment or recension of Pseudo-Jonathan. It consists merely of fragments of the Pentateuch.

4. TARGUMS ON THE HAGIOGRAPHA.—Targums or paraphrases exist on all the books of the Hagiographa, with the exception of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The ground of this exception lies in the books themselves, as they were in part originally written in Chaldee.

The paraphrases of the Psalms, of Job, and of the Proverbs, which we now possess, have the same linguistic character, and must, therefore, have been written at nearly the same time and in the same country, perhaps Syria. The Targum on the Proverbs adheres quite closely to the text, while that of the other two books is more periphrastic. The Targum on Job is mentioned quite early, but that on Proverbs bears traces of a later period.

The Targum on the books of Ruth, Esther, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, departs widely from the method of a translation, and indulges in a free rhetorical style. The work was executed by one author, and belongs to a period, very probably long after that of the Talmuds. The erroneous opinion that Rabbi Joseph, the blind, who died A. D. 325, was the author of the Targums on the Hagiographa, was already refuted by authors of the thirteenth century. On Esther there are two Targums. A Targum on the Chronicles exists in two editions.

¹Dr. Zunz, Gottesd. Vorträge, p. 66.

²*Ibid.*, p. 79. ³Dr. Zunz, p. 73.

The Targum of Onkelos was first published, with the Hebrew text, in Jarchi's Commentary, at Bologna, in 1482. Other editions followed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and in the Bomberg Bibles, published at Venice.

In the great Rabbinical Bibles published at Basel, by Buxtorf, in 1618, 3 vols. folio, republished in 1718, the Targums of Onkelos, Jerusalem, Jonathan Ben Uzziel, and Targums on the Hagiographa, are inserted. The Targum of Onkelos was published in the Paris and London Polyglotts in 1657. A critical dissertation on the Targum of Onkelos was published in 1830 at Vienna by Sam. Dav. Luzatto. Winer published a work—*De Jonathanis in Pent. Parap. Chal. spec. I. Erl.*—in 1823. Jonathan was published with the Hebrew text, Onkel., Targ. Jerus., and Rashi's Commentary, by Asher Phorins, Venice, in 1590–1594. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan have been translated by Etheridge.

Later editions
of Onkelos and
others.

3. THE SYRIAC TRANSLATION.

This version of the Old Testament and the New, called the Peshito—*plain, literal*, on account of its fidelity to the Hebrew and Greek texts—was made, most probably, in the second century. Ephraem, the learned Syrian, who died A. D. 378, calls it "our version,"¹ and long before his time it had gained universal reception in the Syrian Church. The New Testament, it seems, was translated into Syriac about the same time as the Old. The version was already old in the time of Ephraem, for some of its expressions were obscure to him.²

The Syriac version of the Old Testament was made from the Hebrew text. Of this there is the strongest internal evidence. The Targum of Onkelos seems to have been consulted in the translation of the Pentateuch. Certainly there is a striking resemblance between much of the Syrian Pentateuch and Onkelos. The Peshito version generally adheres closely to the Hebrew, and gives an excellent rendering of the original. Occasionally, however, it favours some of the readings of the Septuagint. It was, in all probability, executed by several Jewish Christians. It extends over the canonical books alone, and contains none of the additions to the Hebrew text found in the Septuagint. The version was first published in the Paris, and then in the London, Polyglott. The British Bible Society had an edition of the Peshito Bible published for the use of the Christians of Malabar, by Prof. Lee, who collated several manuscripts for the purpose. It appeared in London, 1823, in 4to.

¹ Comment on 1 Sam. xxiv, 4.

² Wiseman's *Horæ Syriacæ*, p. 121.

4. THE LATIN VERSIONS.

As Christianity spread throughout portions of Italy in the first century, and in Northern Africa, where Latin was used, certainly as early as the second, it was to be expected that the Bible would at a very early period be translated into Latin. We accordingly find that a version in that language, called the Itala, was made about the middle of the second century.¹ It was a translation of the Old Testament from the Septuagint. In the time of Augustine many translations of the Old Testament existed, but he preferred the Itala to all others on account of both its close adherence to the letter and the perspicuity of its language.² It was made from the common text of the Septuagint, unaffected by the Hexapla of Origen. The great number of Latin versions producing confusion, Jerome, after revising the text of the New Testament, undertook the revision of the Latin text of the Old Testament. His revision extended to nearly all the Old Testament books. Of this work we have only the Psalter and the book of Job. The greater part of the revision perished during his life.

While Jerome abode at Bethlehem he made a Latin translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew text during the years 392-405, a work of great merit. His profound knowledge of Hebrew, derived from the rabbies, his acquaintance with previous versions, and his critical judgment and carefulness, admirably fitted him for his task. He did not translate the Bible in the order of the books that compose it, but commenced with "Kings," for the reason, perhaps, that he regarded these books as the less difficult to translate. At first his work met with great opposition, as might have been expected from its many departures from the existing Latin versions; but it gradually came into use, so that in the seventh century its authority was recognized by the Western Church,³ and, under the name of Vulgata, (Vulgate,) it is still considered by the Church of Rome as a standard authority.

In the course of a few centuries, however, the version of Jerome was greatly corrupted by introducing into it passages from the Septuagint, and from the Latin translations which were in use before his

¹ Tertullian, about A. D. 220, speaks of the Latin version.

² Qui scripturas ex Hebræa lingua in Græcam verterunt, numerari possunt: Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. . . . In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala cæteris preferatur: nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.—*De Doc Christ.*, liber ii, cap. xi, xv. Of the Itala some portions are extant.

³ The Septuagint is the authority in the Greek Church.

time. Various attempts were made to improve the Vulgate. At the beginning of the ninth century Alcuin, at the command of Charlemagne, made a revision of it. Also in the eleventh century Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Cardinal Nicolaus, in the twelfth century, undertook new revisions.

In 1546 the Council of Trent made the Vulgate the standard text of the Bible, and declared that "in public lectures, disputations, in preaching, and in expositions, it shall be held as authentic, and that no one shall dare or presume, on any pretext whatever, to reject it."¹ As the Council had de- Recognition of the Vulgate by the Tridentine Council.clared the Vulgate to be authoritative, it was necessary that the Council itself, or the Pope, should select one edition, or order a new edition to be prepared, which should be the standard. The Pope ordered a new revision, and in the preface to the Vulgate it is stated that Pius IV. commissioned some of the most eminent cardinals and distinguished linguists to prepare an accurate edition of the Latin Vulgate, by using the most ancient manuscripts, examining the Hebrew and Greek originals, and consulting the commentaries of the Fathers. Pius V. continued the work, but left it unfinished. Sixtus V. ordered the work, at length finished, to be printed, and when it came forth from the press it contained so many typographical errors that he determined to subject it to a new revision, but was prevented by death from executing his design. Succeeding pontiffs, on account of the shortness of their reigns, accomplished nothing, and it was reserved to Clement VIII. to complete it, in the beginning of his pontificate, in 1592.² The subsequent editions were reprints of this. The Old Testament Canon contains Baruch, Judith, Tobias, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 1 and 2 Maccabees, in addition to the Hebrew Canon, as determined by the Council of Trent. The Vulgate of the Old Testament, in its present form, is not a very faithful translation of the Hebrew text.

5. EGYPTIAN TRANSLATIONS.

About A. D. 200 two Egyptian versions of the Bible, which are partly still extant, were made. They were the Coptic or Memphitic, in the dialect of Lower Egypt, and the Sahidic, in the dialect of Upper Egypt. It is not certain which of these versions is the older. The Old Testament of both is based on the Septuagint.

¹In publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur, et ut nemo inquam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.—Sess. iv, Dec. 2.

²We have translated and abridged a part of the Latin preface.

6. THE ÆTHIOPIC VERSION.

The Æthiopians, or Abyssinians, have in their sacred language (the Geez) a version of the whole Bible, made not later than the year 400. The author is unknown.¹ The Old Testament appears to have been translated chiefly from the Septuagint.

7. THE ARMENIAN VERSION.

Although Christianity was introduced into Armenia as early as the second century, the Armenians had no version of their own until Miesrob gave them an alphabet, and translated the Bible into their language in the earlier part of the fifth century. He was assisted in the work of translation by two of his disciples, Joannes Ekelensis and Josephus Palnensis, who were sent to Alexandria to acquire a better knowledge of Greek. Before this time "the Syrian version of the Bible, the authority of which was recognized in the Persian Church, had been used in Armenia, and hence an interpreter was always needed to translate into the vernacular tongue the portions of Scripture read in public worship."²

The version of the Old Testament closely follows the Septuagint, with the exception of the book of Daniel, the translation of which was made from Theodotion. The text followed is a mixed one, agreeing with none of our chief recensions. The charge that it has been interpolated from the Peshito-Syriac is unfounded; nor is it certain that it was interpolated from the Vulgate in the thirteenth century.³

8. THE GEORGIAN VERSION.

In the sixth century the Georgians, after the example of the Armenians, from whom they obtained the Scriptures, procured for themselves a translation of the Bible. The New Testament was translated from the original Greek, and the Old from the Septuagint. The authors are not known.⁴

9. THE GOTHIC VERSION.

Ulphilas, Bishop of the Goths, invented for them an alphabet, and translated the Bible⁵ into their language soon after the middle of

¹ De Wette, p. 118.

² Neander, Hist. Christian Religion and Church, vol. ii, pp. 113, 114.

³ De Wette, p. 120.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁵ Fragments of this version are still extant.

the fourth century. "He is said, however, to have omitted the books of the Kings, to which the books of Samuel, also, were then reckoned, that nothing might be presented to foster the warlike spirit of the Goths."¹

10. THE SLAVONIAN VERSION.

In the latter half of the ninth century Cyril translated the Holy Scriptures into the tongue of the Slavonians.

11. ARABIC VERSIONS.

From R. Saadias Gaon, who lived in the first half of the tenth century, we have an Arabic translation of the Pentateuch and of Isaiah, of an explanatory, paraphrastic character, in harmony with the Targums and the Rabbinical expositions.

There was a translation of the Pentateuch made by an African Jew of the thirteenth century, published by Erpenius.

12. THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH, AND ITS VERSIONS.

The Samaritan Pentateuch, differing but little from that of the Jews, and being at least twenty-three or four hundred years old, is an independent witness to the integrity of the Hebrew text. Of the Hebrew-Samaritan Pentateuch there are two versions. The one which the Samaritans call *Tarjûm*, a species of Chaldee, differing, as we find, from both the Chaldee of Onkelos and the Peshito-Syriac. The high priest of the Samaritans informed me that it was made about eighteen hundred years ago.² This statement seems probable, the time coinciding very nearly with the age of the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel. The spread of the Chaldee language through Palestine made all these versions necessary. The Targum of the Samaritans follows closely their Pentateuch. Onkelos may have been consulted in the translation, but it does not always agree with him.

The Samaritans have also a version of their Pentateuch in *Arabic*, made, as the high priest informed me, in the thirteenth century. It is the opinion of some that the Samaritans had a Greek version of their Pentateuch, as quotations of it, under the name τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν, in Greek, are found in some of the Fathers of the Church. But it is doubtful that such a version ever existed, and the extracts may have been simply the Samaritan readings translated into Greek.

¹ Neander's Hist. Christian Religion and Church, vol. ii, p. 126.

² See my Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land in 1869, 1870, pp. 183-185.

CHAPTER VI.

GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH—HISTORY OF VIEWS RESPECTING IT—DOCUMENT HYPOTHESIS—VIEWS OF THE NEW CRITICAL SCHOOL.

THE Founder of Christianity and his disciples, in common with the Jews of that period, assume the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.¹ Philo² of Alexandria speaks of Moses as the writer of sacred books; and Josephus³ attributes to him five books, and remarks: "He (Moses) gives them (the Hebrews) the laws⁴ in a book." "All things have been written as he left them: we have added nothing to them for embellishment." The Talmudists,⁵ also, speak of Moses as the author of the Pentateuch, with the exception of the last chapter. And this has been the unanimous judgment of the Jewish Church. The Fathers of the Christian Church attributed the Pentateuch to Moses. Nor does the language of Jerome imply any doubt upon this point: "Whether you regard Moses as the author of the Pentateuch, or Ezra as the restorer of the same work, I do not object."⁶ Here Jerome, like many of the other Fathers of the early Church, supposes that the books of Moses were lost in the Babylonian captivity, and restored by Ezra. He intends to express no doubt about Moses having been their original author. Occasionally the voice of a Gnostic heretic was raised against the credibility of the Pentateuch, or its Mosaic authorship.

In the eleventh century Isaac ben Salomo, a Jewish scholar, asserted that the passage in Gen. xxxvi, 31, concerning the dukes of

¹ From *πέντε*, *five*, and *τεῦχος*, *a book*, ἡ πεντάτευχος. The term is as old as the first part of the third century, being used by Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem*, i, 10), and by Origen (*In Joannem*, tom. xiii, cap. 26). The names by which the different books of the Pentateuch are called in English are taken from the Septuagint. The following are Hebrew names, with the corresponding English ones: בְּרֵאשִׁית *Berēshith* (In the beginning), Genesis; וַאֲלֵהֶם שְׁמוֹת, *Ve'alleh shemoth* (And these are the names), Exodus; וַיִּקְרָא, *Vayyikra* (And he called), Leviticus; בְּמִדְבָּר, *Bemidh-bar* (In the desert), Numbers; אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים, *Elleh haddebarim* (These are the words), Deuteronomy. The English names from the Greek are expressive, but the Hebrew are not, being generally the first words of the book.

² *Vita Mosis*, ii, 136.

³ *Contra Ap.*, i, 442.

⁴ *Liber iv* 3, 3, 4.

⁵ *Baba Batra* in Fürst, *Über den Kanon*, etc., pp. 8, 9.

⁶ Sive Moysen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi sive Ezram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso.—*De Perpet. Virgin. Beat. Mariæ liber*, 212.

Edom and kings of Israel, was not written until the time of Jehoshaphat. In the next century we find Aben Ezra, a learned rabbi, doubting the Mosaic authorship of a few passages in the Pentateuch, which he seemed to regard as later additions to the original; but he expresses no doubt of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. He attributed Deut. xxxiv to Joshua. At the beginning of the Reformation Carlstadt thought the proposition that Moses was not the author of five books could be maintained; and he assigned as a reason that nobody but a fool could believe that Moses wrote the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which gives an account of his own death. In the last half of the sixteenth century, Masius, a Roman Catholic lawyer, in his Commentary on Joshua, denied that the Pentateuch in its present form could have proceeded from Moses; but he claimed that it is the work of Ezra, or some other inspired man. Thomas Hobbes, an English deist, about 1650, remarks, in his "Leviathan," that "the Pentateuch seems to have been written concerning Moses rather than by Moses." About the same time Isaac Peyrère asserted, on various grounds, that the Pentateuch could not be the work of Moses. He supposed that Moses kept a journal of the Exodus, of the journeyings in the desert, and of his legislation, to which journal he prefixed a history of former times, and even of the time before Adam. According to Peyrère these autographs of Moses perished, and our books are extracts made at a far later period, and not immediately from them in any case.

Doubts in relation to the Pentateuch.

Spinoza, a Dutch Jew, in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, A. D. 1670, endeavoured to show that the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses. He adduced, in support of his view, several single passages, and the phenomena that pervade the whole work, especially the fact that Moses is spoken of in the third person. He suspects that our Pentateuch, as well as the other historical writings of the Old Testament, in their present form, were composed by Ezra, who first wrote Deuteronomy, and then the other four books, to which he attached the former. In 1678 Richard Simon, a French critic of great learning and acuteness, published a *Critical History of the Old Testament*, in which he attributes the written composition of the laws to Moses himself. The history of his times, he supposes, Moses had written down by public annalists whom he appointed, after the custom of the Egyptians. Out of the different writings of these annalists, who worked without mutual connexion, and out of the Mosaic Law Book, our present Pentateuch was composed. In 1685 John Le Clerc attributed the Pentateuch to an Israelitish priest, who was sent back from Babylon by the Assyrian king, after the captivity of the ten tribes, to instruct the colonists in the service of Jehovah.

But in his Commentary on Genesis, published in 1693, he retracted his former view, and sought to vindicate for Moses the whole Pentateuch, with the exception of a few interpolations, and to refute the objections that had been made against its genuineness. He maintained the opinion that Moses composed Genesis from written documents, in which the patriarchs themselves had written the events of their lives. Not long after this Anton Van Dale, a Dutch scholar, again expressed the opinion that Ezra compiled the Pentateuch from the Law Book of Moses, and from other historical and prophetic writings.

In England, in the first half of the eighteenth century, Lord Bolingbroke attacked the whole Mosaic system with great virulence, and intimated that the Pentateuch was forged in the time of the Judges,¹ and lost during the Babylonian captivity. There were, however, but a very few genuine scholars who doubted or disputed the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Carpzov, who lived in the first half of the eighteenth century, in his Introduction, made a vigorous defence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. John Gottfried Hasse, in a work published in 1785, took the ground that the Pentateuch had been compiled, at the time of the exile, from ancient monuments, partly Mosaic, which, however, were very much enlarged and altered. He afterward changed this view, and held the Pentateuch to be the work of Moses, which, in the lapse of time, had received only single glosses, additions, and supplements, until Ezra finally gave it the finishing touch.

John David Michaelis, professor in Göttingen, one of the ablest men and greatest scholars of his age, was of rationalistic tendencies; nevertheless, in his Introduction, in 1787, he defended the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch († in 1791). Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, Professor at Göttingen (* in 1752, † in 1827), a man of vast erudition and great genius, was likewise a rationalist; but he defended the genuineness of the Pentateuch in his Introduction, which appeared in 1782. He repeated this defence in the second and third editions. "He rather turns the opponents," says Hävernick, "into contempt and scorn, than refutes them." In his fourth edition, in 1823, he modified his views respecting the Pentateuch, but still held that the greatest part of it was written by Moses himself, especially the laws, the whole of Leviticus, and the whole of Deuteronomy to the end of chap. xxxii; that the history of the march of the Israelites was composed by contemporaries of Moses; that Genesis was compiled from old documents

Rationalistic
defense of the
Pentateuch.

¹Leland, View of Deist. Writers, vol. ii, p. 375.

written before the time of Moses; and that the whole Pentateuch was collected and arranged in the interval between Joshua and Samuel, and that afterward only single glosses were added.

The deism of England and France was propagated to a large extent in Germany in the latter part of the eighteenth century, and found a powerful support in the Wolfenbüttel Fragments. Wolfenbüttel Fragments, written by Reimarus, and published by Lessing in 1773 and 1777. In these writings the genuineness of the Pentateuch was violently assailed,¹ and the truth of divine revelation positively denied. These writings threw Germany into a ferment, and the attacks on the genuineness of the Pentateuch were renewed with great vigour, and, indeed, are still kept up.

With the denial of divine revelation and its accompaniments, miracles and prophecies, the genuineness of the Pentateuch could not be long admitted, for the concession would draw after it a miraculous history which no ingenuity or acuteness could explain on natural principles.² There are, however, some exceptional cases, in which the genuineness of the Pentateuch is not fully acknowledged on the part of those who have no such abhorrence of the supernatural. Fulda in 1791, Corrodi in 1792, and Nachtigal somewhat later, while denying the genuineness of the Pentateuch, attributed some portion of it to Moses.

But the most elaborate attack on the genuineness of the Pentateuch was made by Vater in 1805. He sought to show Vater and De Wette. that it could not have been written either by Moses or Wette. in the Mosaic age: that if any thing was written by Moses or in the Mosaic age—possibly only a few fragments at most—it is not preserved in its original form. De Wette († in 1849) followed Vater in point of time, though he wrote quite independently of him, and published the first part of his Introduction in 1806. He here wholly denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and allows no portion of it to be older than the age of David.³

In the first part of the present century the genuineness of the

¹ See Hengstenberg, Genuineness of Pentateuch.

² Hence Strauss, to make way for his mythical treatment of the gospel history, denied that any one of the Gospels was written by an eyewitness of Christ's life. In his third edition of the Life of Jesus, he seemed disposed to abandon his objections to the genuineness of the Gospel of John, but resumed them again in his fourth edition, principally, as he confesses, because "without them one could not escape from believing the miracles of Christ." A great admission.

³ As De Wette may be considered a representative of extreme negative criticism, we shall consider his views more at large in the discussion of the genuineness of the Pentateuch.

Pentateuch was vigorously defended by Kelle, Fritzsche, Jahn, Rosenmüller, Hug, Sack, Graves, Meyer, and others.

Herbst, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, published after his death, places the final revision of the Pentateuch, from the writings of Moses and other ancient monuments, in the age of David. Bertholdt, in his Biblical Introduction, in 1813, holds that there is much in the Pentateuch which is really from Moses, and that the whole of it was collected and brought into its present form between the beginning of the reign of Saul and the end of the reign of Solomon. Volney, in 1814, published the view that the Pentateuch, in its present form, was composed of genuine Mosaic documents, and writings of a later date, by the high priest Hilkiyah, in the time of King Josiah. The four following writers have carried their doubts of, and hostility to, the Pentateuch to an extreme point: Hartmann, in his work on the Pentateuch, published in 1831, denies the existence of the art of writing in the Mosaic age, and places the beginning of written composition in the age of Samuel. Von Bohlen, in 1835, published the view that Deuteronomy is the oldest part of the Pentateuch, but that this did not appear until the time of King Josiah, and the entire Pentateuch not before the Babylonian exile. In the same year Vatke and George published their opinions of the Pentateuch, in which they both deny that Moses had any share in the composition of the work.

Gesenius, the celebrated Hebrew lexicographer and grammarian, was, during the most of his life, an advocate of the late origin of the Pentateuch; yet he seems to have finally modified his opinion, for he expresses himself thus doubtfully in the thirteenth edition of his Hebrew Grammar: "It is still a subject of critical controversy whether the Pentateuch proceeded, entire or in part, from Moses."¹ J. J. Stähelin, in his work published in 1843, refers the arrangement of the Pentateuch, in its present form, to the age of Saul, and thinks it may be the work of Samuel or of one of his disciples.

J. Astruc, a French physician and professor belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, in his anonymous work published in 1753 (Original Memoirs, which it appears that Moses used in composing the Book of Genesis), first called attention to the divine names in different portions of the book, as furnishing proof of different sources employed in its construction. Astruc supposed that there were two principal sources—an Elohim (God) document and a Jehovah (Lord) document—the elements

¹ Leipzig, 1842.

of which run through the whole. He supposed, that besides these there were ten other documents, of which single fragments were introduced. Astruc held that from these twelve documents Moses composed the whole of Genesis by copying them into twelve separate columns, but that through the fault of copyists some of the passages were afterward misplaced.

The views of Astruc at first attracted little notice, but the seed sown yielded, in due time, a rich harvest of hypotheses. Eichhorn conjectured, that at the basis of the Book of Genesis there lay two principal ante-Mosaic documents, an Elohist and a Jehovistic—the Elohist document embracing also the first two chapters of Exodus. He supposed that in some few instances other documents were also used. Ilgen († in 1834) asserted that Genesis is composed of seventeen independent documents, which proceeded from three different authors, a Jehovist, and a first and second Elohist.

Von Lengerke, in his investigations concerning the Pentateuch, published in 1844, recognizes as the sources of the Pentateuch: 1. A fundamental document written in the age of Solomon; 2. A later writing, that of the supple-
Views of Lengerke, Ewald, Knobel, Graf, and Nöldeke.

menter, composed in the first period of the Assyrian age, perhaps under Hezekiah; 3. The Deuteronomist, in the time of Josiah. Henry Ewald, the great Orientalist, in his *History of the Children of Israel until the Time of Christ* (1843–1853), gives in full his opinion of the Pentateuch. He grants the existence of writing in Egypt before the time of Moses, but attributes to Moses only a few fragments of the Pentateuch, such as the Decalogue and some short legal decisions, with a few songs, but no lengthy laws and series of laws. Knobel, in his work on the Pentateuch and Joshua, published in 1861, supposes that Moses taught his laws orally only, and left to his successors the work of developing and recording them. John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal, published, in 1862, his estimate of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua.¹ In this work the author assails, principally from an arithmetical point of view, the credibility of the history in the Pentateuch, and denies its Mosaic authorship. Its publication produced a great sensation in England and in the United States, principally on account of its author's rank as bishop in the Church of England. Professor Green, of Princeton, wrote an able and scholarly reply to Colenso. In 1873 Colenso published his *Lectures on the Pentateuch and the Moabite Stone*, in which he further develops his opinions. What he calls the Elohist narrative, or the original story of the exodus, embracing about one fourth or one fifth of Genesis, about one third

¹ Republished in New York in 1863.

of Exodus, no part of Leviticus, about one fourth of Numbers, and only six verses of Deuteronomy, he thinks was written by Samuel. He contends that the whole of Deuteronomy, with the exception of six verses, was written by Jeremiah, and that the "priestly legislation," embracing one half of the Pentateuch, was written during the Babylonian captivity and later.

Very able vindications of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch have been put forth by Hengstenberg, Hävernick,¹ Ranke, Drechsler, M. Baumgarten, Keil, and others.

Schrader, in his edition of De Wette's Introduction, distributes the Pentateuch among four successive writers: "the annalist," who composed his work from written sources during the first seven years of the reign of David; "the theocratic narrator," who wrote between B. C. 975 and 950; "the prophetic narrator," who combined and retouched these, B. C. 825-800; and the Deuteronomist, a man inspired of God, who wrote the last book of the Pentateuch not long before the eighteenth year of King Josiah, and edited the whole Pentateuch.

Dr. Samuel Davidson holds that the Pentateuch bears marks of having originated from an elder Elohist (who wrote in the time of Saul), a junior Elohist (about B. C. 880), and a Jehovist (in the first half of the eighth century before Christ). Besides these, there was an editor of the whole work. The Pentateuch was completed in the time of Manasseh, and the book found in the temple in the time of King Josiah (2 Kings xxii) was our Pentateuch. Dr. Davidson believes that whole chapters in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers were written by Moses. The theory of Dr. Davidson is substantially the same as that of Hupfeld.

Frederick Bleek, in his Introduction to the Old Testament,² holds that the Pentateuch in its present form is not the work of Moses, although it contains a considerable number of chapters written by him; but that it is based upon an Elohist history which extended from the creation to the conquest of Canaan, written probably in the reign of Saul. The writer used the term *Elohim* exclusively until the time that God revealed himself to Moses as Jehovah (Exod. vi, 3), after which he employed the term Jehovah. Documents, some of which were written during the sojourn in Egypt, were used in the composition of the work. The author of the first four books of the Pentateuch, nearly in their present form, a Jehovist of the first part of the reign of David, made the Elohist history the basis of his own work. He did not

¹ The Pentateuch Vindicated, etc., New York, 1863.

² Edited by Kamphausen, Berlin, 1870.

always follow it, however, but incorporated into it new matter, partly from written sources and partly from tradition. This recension included only a few verses of Deuteronomy, which arose in the time of Manasseh, so that it formed a part of the Pentateuch found in the temple in the time of Josiah. The author of Deuteronomy was also the editor of the whole Pentateuch.

Fürst¹ believes the Pentateuch to be composed of various documents, some of which were ante-Mosaic, but that the most were composed in the Mosaic age, in great part by the law-giver himself; and that the *last* revision of the whole Pentateuch and Joshua was made at the end of the period of the Judges. Two writers figure in Fürst's scheme: the "narrator" and the "supplementer." He attaches but little importance to the use of the divine names in different portions of Genesis. Fürst's theory.

In 1866, Prof. K. H. Graf, of Meissen, in his discussion of The Historical Books of the Old Testament, put forth the hypothesis that the Pentateuch and the earlier prophets (Genesis—2 Kings), form one book. He supposes² that a writer, the Jehovist, about B. C. 750, revised an older historical work (the Elohist), which had been composed partly from oral and partly from written sources. This revised work of the Jehovist was an historical work rather than a law book. It contained the most of Genesis, but lacked Exodus xii, 1-28, 43-51; xxv-xxx1; xxxv-xl, the whole of Leviticus, about one half of Numbers, and Deuteronomy i-xxx.³ Toward B. C. 600, this work was revised and continued by the Deuteronomist. About B. C. 450 the Pentateuch received its present form by the introduction of the laws collected and arranged by Ezra; or, rather, it received its complete form immediately after Ezra.⁴ He thinks that Ezekiel wrote Leviticus xviii-xxiii, xxv, xxvi. He thus divides the Elohist document (Grundschrift) of the Pentateuch. After his attention had been called to the inconsistency of this proceeding, he reconsidered the matter, and adopted the view that "The Elohist parts of Genesis are later than the Jehovistic parts."⁵

Prof. Kayser, of Strassburg, in his *Prae-Exilic Book of the Primitive History of Israel and its Enlargements*, finds, as the result of his investigations, that there was a Pentateuchal document, the Jehovist, written before the time of Amos, Hosea, and Micah, who refer to it, but know nothing of the Elohist. Nor does the Deuteronomist, who lived in the time of King Manasseh or Josiah, know any thing of the Elohist; he is acquainted with the Jehovist

¹ See his *Geschichte der Biblischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1867. ² Pp. 111, 112.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁵ Wellhausen's *Bleek*, p. 161.

only. "The Deuteronomist," he says, "was also acquainted with the Jehovistic law, Exodus xx-xxiii, xxxiv. The Elohim book arose in the time of Ezra."¹ The Jehovistic and Elohist books were united after the exile.²

Prof. J. Wellhausen, in his additions to Bleek's *Einleitung*,³ gives his views of the composition of the Pentateuch, and refers to previous discussions, in which he sets forth his views more at large. His first document is the Jehovistic Book of History (J E), formed from two sources, one of which (J) used the name Jehovah, the other (E) Elohim. This book contained only very short laws (Exodus xx-xxiii). To it was afterward united Deuteronomy, which was originally only a law book. At the same time the whole Hexateuch (which altogether lacked Leviticus) was revised from the standpoint of the Deuteronomist, least in Genesis, more in Exodus and Numbers, and most in Joshua. Beside this combination there stands independently also another historical and legal work, the Codex of the Priests. Its foundation—which appears almost pure in Genesis, but elsewhere is enlarged in the most comprehensive manner through the labour of a whole school—is the book of the four covenants (Q), a work which presents the laws in a strictly historical framework. The last editor of the Hexateuch (R) combined the previous work with the Codex of the Priests. This Codex is later than Deuteronomy.⁴ Wellhausen manifestly considers it largely the work of Ezra.

Abram Kuenen, Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden, has, in different treatises, set forth his views of the Pentateuch. The work of Bishop Colenso, according to his confession, seems to have influenced him. He observed that those portions of the Pentateuch in which Colenso found the greatest difficulties had been considered the oldest portions of the Pentateuch. He "gradually reached the conviction that our criticism of the fundamental document (*Grundschrift* of the Pentateuch) has stopped half way."⁵

In 1869-1870, Kuenen published in Dutch his *Religion of Israel*.⁶ His standpoint is naturalistic. "For us," says he, "the Israelitish is one of those [principal] religions, nothing more, but also nothing less."⁷ "Even though it be admitted that God may now and then have suspended natural laws, no one has a right to assume for that reason that this really took place among the Israelites."⁸

¹ Strassburg, 1874, p. 196.

² *Ibid.*, p. 143.

³ Berlin, 1878.

⁴ Wellhausen's Bleek, pp. 177, 178.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

⁶ Translated into English by Alfred Heath May, and published in London and Edinburgh, in 3 vols., 1874-1875. Republished without change in 1882-1883.

⁷ Vol. i, p. 5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

Kuenen, with all his skepticism, admits some facts in the Pentateuchal history. "We may not doubt," says he, "that the Exodus is an historical fact. Independently of the authority of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, it is proved by the testimony of the prophets."¹ He grants that Moses was the leader of the Israelites in Egypt and subsequently, and that he established the worship of Jehovah in Israel.

Respecting the ten commandments, Kuenen remarks: "There is no real obstacle to the supposition that they are derived from Moses: on the contrary, their contents and arrangement are entirely in accordance with the theory of their Mosaic origin."² "The tradition which ascribes them to Moses is worthy of respect on account of its undisputed antiquity." "We acknowledge as a fact that Moses in the name of Jahveh prescribed to the Israelitish tribes such a law as is contained in the ten words."³ "We are led," says he, "to place the institution of the Sabbath in the Mosaic time."⁴ He also remarks: "From the Mosaic time downward there always existed in Israel a worship of Jahveh without an image. Scarcely any tradition of Hebrew antiquity is better guaranteed than that which derives *the ark of Jahveh* from the lawgiver himself."⁵ In Kuenen's view, "Moses bequeathed no book of the law to the tribe of Israel."⁶ "It is quite certain that nearly all the laws of the Pentateuch date from much later times."⁷ "In the eighth century B. C. but few laws—and those, as we shall see further on, not even universally or in the same sense—were ascribed to Moses, and carried back to the sojourn in the desert of Sinai."⁸ "I have been led to the conviction that the priestly legislation in Exodus and Numbers was not brought to its present form until after the exile, and therefore in its entirety is younger than Deuteronomy. . . . The decrees of the priestly laws were not *made* and *invented* during or after the exile, but *drawn up*. Prior to the exile the priests had already delivered verbally what, with the modifications that had become necessary in the meantime, they afterward committed to writing."⁹ After the ten commandments, Kuenen seems to consider Exodus xxi-xxiii, which he calls the Book of the Covenant, as standing next in point of antiquity.

Kuenen divides the priestly laws of the middle books of the Pentateuch into *three* groups. The first embraces Leviticus xviii-xxiii, xxv, xxvi. To the second group belong in great part the laws in Exodus xii, xxv-xxxi, in Leviticus i-xvii, xxiv, xxvii, and most of

¹ Vol. i, p. 117.² Ibid., p. 284.³ Ibid., p. 285.⁴ Ibid., p. 286.⁵ Ibid., p. 289.⁶ Vol. ii, p. 7.⁷ Vol. i, p. 272.⁸ Ibid., p. 139.⁹ Vol. ii, p. 96.

the priestly documents in Numbers, both the purely legislative and the semi-historical. His third group is "usually closely united with the older documents in three central books of the Pentateuch, and cannot be separated from them without difficulty."¹ "The laws," says he, "of the first and second groups, and the historical narratives belonging to them, were written in Babylonia between the years 538 and 458 B. C."² The author of the first group of priestly laws wrote also the book of Elohistic History, the Book of Origins. Genesis i, 1-ii, 3, was, accordingly, written about the time of Ezra! It is clear that Kuenen considered the author of the Elohistic narrative the inventor of the historical incidents. Deuteronomy, he holds, is a forgery of the seventh century before Christ.³

Prof. Smend, of Basel, asserts that the priestly laws of the Pentateuch were unknown to Ezekiel, and, therefore, had no existence at the time.⁴ Prof. W. Robertson Smith, in lectures on *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*,⁵ puts into a popular form the views of Graf, Wellhausen, and Kuenen on the Pentateuch. But, at the same time, he widely differs from the naturalistic views of these men in admitting a divine revelation as the basis of the Mosaic system. In short, he endeavours to breathe into the deathly results of a rationalistic criticism the living spirit of divine revelation. After the ten commandments, Prof. Smith recognizes as most ancient Exod. xxi-xxiii, which he calls "the first legislation."⁶ But he does not seem to think that these laws were written by Moses, for he says: "Till we come to the book of Deuteronomy, we find no statement that Moses wrote down more than the ten commandments."⁷ He contends that "Deuteronomy was unknown until long after the days of Moses." "It was not known to Isaiah."⁸ But he does not believe in "the idea of some critics, that the Deuteronomic Code was a forgery of the temple priests, or of their head, the high priest Hilkiah."⁹ "It was of no consequence to Josiah—it is of equally little consequence to us—to know the exact date and authorship of the book. Its prophetic doctrine and the practical character of the scheme which it set forth—in which the new teaching and the old Torah were fused into an intelligible unity—were enough to commend it."¹⁰ He regards "the Levitical law as later than Ezekiel."¹¹ "The development of the details of the [Levitical] system falls, therefore, between the time of Ezekiel and the work of Ezra."¹² "It is for the historian to

¹ Vol. ii, p. 150.² *Ibid.*, p. 152.³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.⁴ *Com. on Ezekiel.*⁵ D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1883.⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 316.⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 331.⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 354.⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 362.¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 363.¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 375.¹² *Ibid.*, p. 384.

determine how far the Levitical law is mere law, of which we can say no more than that it was law for the Second Temple, and how far it is also history which can be used in describing the original sanctuary of the ark in the days of Moses."¹

The new theory has been decidedly opposed by Nöldeke, who in his work published in 1868 thinks that the laws in Leviticus and the chapter on the tabernacle were written in the ninth or tenth century before Christ; and that the principal portion of the Pentateuch belongs to the earlier kings. Riehm, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1868 and 1872, strongly opposes the new theory. Prof. Curtiss in his valuable work on *The Levitical Priests*² tests the new theory, and finds it wanting respecting the priesthood. Klostermann, in *Delitzsch's Journal of Lutheran Theology*, 1877, refutes the theory that Ezekiel wrote Leviticus xviii-xxvi. Prof. August Dillmann, of the University of Berlin, in his *Commentary on Exodus and Leviticus*, takes strong ground against the new theory, and remarks: "That the priests of the central sanctuary in ancient time wrote their laws is the most reasonable supposition in the world. . . . That the laws relating to the priesthood and divine service were not written down, or even made, until the Babylonian Captivity, is absurd (*Widersinnig*)."³ It is also opposed by Bredekamp,⁴ of Erlangen. Prof. Watts, of Belfast, in his *New Criticism*,⁵ has replied to Prof. W. Robertson Smith. Dr. Stebbins, in *A Study of the Pentateuch*, reviews and decidedly condemns Kuenen's views in his *Religion of Israel*.⁶

Prof. W. H. Green, of the Princeton Theological Seminary, published in the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review* a masterly refutation of Prof. W. Robertson Smith, which he enlarged and republished in book form, with other kindred articles.⁷ Prof. Delitzsch has written against the new theory, but makes so many concessions to it that he rather seems to favor it.⁸ "He admits that 'the Mosaic legislation had its history, and that the codification of its parts was executed successively'—yea, that the process extended over a thousand years."⁹

¹ The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 384.

² Edinburg, 1877. ³ Vorwort, Leipzig, 1880.

⁴ Gesetz und Propheten, 1881. ⁵ Second ed., 1882. ⁶ Boston, 1881.

⁷ New York, 1883.

⁸ His views are given by Joseph Cook in the *N. Y. Independent*, Sept. 15, 1881.

⁹ Prof. F. A. Gast, D.D., in the *Reformed Quarterly Review* for July, 1882. This article and the one in the previous number of the *Review* by the same author are very valuable, and give a comprehensive view of the theories respecting the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER VII.

EXAMINATION OF THE DOCUMENT HYPOTHESIS.

IT is thus seen that the impugnors of the Pentateuch regard it not as the work of Moses, but as a patchwork, a *mosaic*, of various documents, written at different periods by various authors. Respecting the document hypothesis, we may remark, first of all, that there is very little agreement, as we have already seen, among the opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch in regard to the *number* of the original documents, *when* they were composed, by *whom* and from *what* sources, and *when* the *final* revision of the whole was made. This want of unity in view is a strong proof that their theories rest upon no solid basis of facts. One feature, however, stands out prominently in nearly all their theories: they deprive Moses, as much as possible, of all connexion with the composition of the Pentateuch.

That part of the Pentateuch which the critical school, prior to Graf, with great unanimity, called *the fundamental document* (Grund-schrift)—consisting of the Elohist history in Genesis, and a large part of the history and most of the laws in the middle books—is now pronounced by Graf and his school to be the latest of all. In short, what former critics considered the foundation of the Pentateuchal edifice the new school declares to be the top. The new school, therefore, throws every thing into confusion. It affirms that, prior to Ezra, the first chapter of Genesis and the first three verses of the second had no existence, and that the history of creation began with Gen. ii, 4. In this way, there is not a single hint in Genesis that God created every thing in six days, in spite of the fact that this is affirmed in the fourth commandment, Exodus xx, 8-11, and that the Sabbath was ordained to commemorate the divine rest after the six days' work of creation. If one can believe that no Jewish historian until Ezra, a thousand years after Moses, would write an account of the six days' work of creation, and that previous to that time the account of creation begun in the following manner: "And every plant of the field before it was in the earth," etc., we do not envy him his judgment. Jeremiah quotes Gen. i, 2: "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void" (iv, 23). The Hebrew is exactly that of Genesis (תהו וָבֶהוּ). So also in Deut-

eronomy and the earlier prophets, there are references to the Elohist history in Genesis, as we shall see.

The different names for the Divine Being—*Elohim*, *God*, *Jehovah* (properly *Jahveh*), and *Jehovah Elohim* (LORD God, Eng. Ver.)—found in different portions of the Book of Genesis furnish the original ground for the decomposition of the Mosaic writings. In the other books of the Pentateuch (with the exception of the first few chapters of Exodus) the use of the divine names furnishes no support at all for the document hypothesis. But it must be borne in mind that the hypothesis that one document, or more, entered into the composition of the Book of Genesis and into the first two chapters of Exodus, by no means militates against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. That the traditions of the Hebrew people would be written down during their sojourn in Egypt, where they came in contact with a people who were accustomed to write the annals of their kings, and to compose works on science and religion, is highly probable. Joseph, who married the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On, might have compiled the annals of the Hebrews and the traditions respecting the deluge and the antediluvian world. But those annals might have been very defective, and have contained no account, or a very imperfect one, of the work of creation, the order of which none but God could know. The original document lying before Moses—for we can scarcely believe it at all probable that the Hebrews had two different documents which related the history of the world from the creation to the time of Moses—may have been used by him in the composition of Genesis. In this way we might find in Genesis a narrator (*the Elohist*), and an editor or reviser, the Jehovist (*Moses*). How far this is probably true must be determined from the phenomena exhibited in the book.

In the account of creation, ending with the third verse of the second chapter of Genesis, the Creator is called *Elohim* (God). After this we have an enlarged account of the creation of the first pair of the human race, the condition of the earth, the planting of Eden, the fall of man and his expulsion from Paradise, ending with the fourth chapter. In this historical sketch (with the exception of the address of the serpent to Eve, and her reply, where *Elohim* (God) is used) the name of the divine Being is *Jehovah Elohim* (LORD God, Eng. Ver.). Such phraseology is found nowhere else, either in Genesis or in any other book of the Bible.¹ At the end of the first account of creation, and immediately preceding the more special

¹ Everywhere else, if *Jehovah God* is used, it is in such form as this: *Jehovah, God of heaven.*

Argument
against the
document hy-
pothesis.

narrative of a part of the divine work, we have the statement: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that Jehovah God made the earth

Jehovah and
Elohim con-
sidered.

and the heavens" (Gen. ii, 4). Now the question arises, whether this verse belongs to the first narrative of creation or to the description that follows. To refer it to the latter would be unsuitable, for in this there is no consecutive account of creation, no mention at all of the making of the heavens and of the earth. There appears, therefore, a good reason for referring it to the preceding account, to which it is altogether applicable. But why was this verse (ii, 4) not placed at the very beginning of Genesis? For a very good reason; since in that case it would take away the sublimity and prominence of the declaration: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." How comparatively feeble, and almost awkward, would be such an arrangement as this: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, when they were created, in the day that Jehovah God made the heavens and the earth. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Fürst refers verse ii, 4, to the preceding account of creation.¹ Further, the "and" (ו) that follows the verse forbids the reference to what follows: "And every plant of the field," etc., ver. 5.

The next question is: Why does the narrator use, in the second description, the combined names Jehovah Elohim? Evidently to show that Elohim, the general name for the divine Being, is the same Jehovah² who manifested himself to the Hebrews in Egypt, and who was in a special sense their God. We have already observed that this form of blending the two names occurs nowhere else; but very frequently we find both names used in passages which obviously were written by one author. Take as an example the Eighteenth Psalm of David, in which several divine names—Elohim, Eloah, El (God), and Jehovah (Lord)—occur without our being able to determine in most instances why one name should be preferred to the other. In some cases there is a special fitness in using one in preference to another; while in others no good reason can be assigned for discriminating between them. We ourselves often use them promiscuously.

¹Geschichte der Bib. Liter., vol. i, p. 69, note. I refer to Fürst especially on account of his great knowledge of the Hebrew Bible, and from the fact that he is a Rationalist, and treats the Hebrew Scriptures with great freedom, and cannot be supposed to be biased in favour of any thing that may be considered orthodox.

²The name יהוה, *Jehovah*, should be written with different vowels, and pronounced *Jahveh*, the future of the verb הָוָה, (*Havah*), *to be, the Being who will be, who will always exist, the Absolute Being*. The Hebrews use the future tense to indicate what is *customary, permanent*. אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהֵינוּ, אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ, (God), are terms indicative of *might, power*.

In the very midst of the narrative of the creation and fall of man, in which *Jehovah Elohim* (Lord God) is used, we find both the serpent and the woman using *Elohim*. It would be unsuitable to put the word Jehovah into the mouth of the serpent, and *Elohim* is taken up from the serpent by Eve. This narrative most properly belongs to Moses, the theologian and lawgiver, and stands most intimately connected with his whole system. Nor do we think that any historian of the creation, subsequently to the time in which God revealed himself to Moses as Jehovah, would have omitted the use of the latter august name. Nor is there any thing strange in supposing that Moses should first give us a general con-
 Probability of
 Moses using
 the word Je-
 hovah.

secutive history of creation, and then a more particular description of the important parts of it, especially when the more particular account was so closely connected with the history that was to follow.

In the fourth chapter Jehovah (Lord) is everywhere used, except in the twenty-fifth verse, where Eve says, on the birth of Seth, "God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew." When Abel was born she said: "I have gotten a man [through the aid of] Jehovah." We cannot assert, with any degree of probability, why she used the one term for the divine Being instead of the other. In the fifth chapter Elohim (God) is used, with but one exception, where Jehovah occurs; and in the sixth chapter Elohim occurs eight times and Jehovah four times. In verses five, six, and seven, Elohim and Jehovah stand in the closest connexion.

The statement in chap. vi, 2, "that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose," has no reference, as some have imagined, and even Gesenius among the number, to the intercourse of angels with women. Such an idea would have been abhorrent to all the religious views of the Old Testament writers, and would require the clearest language to establish it. Nor is the phrase בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, *sons of God*, ever used in the Pentateuch for angels. It occurs a few times, probably in this sense, in the poetic book of Job (i, 6; ii, 1; xxxviii, 7),¹ and in a very similar form and in a similar sense in Psalm lxxxix, 6. The passages in Job are referred to the angels by the LXX. On the contrary, in Genesis xxviii, 12, where Jacob beheld in a dream the *angels of God* ascending and descending upon the ladder extending from earth to heaven, they are called by a different expression, מַלְאֲכֵי אֱלֹהִים, *messengers of God*.² But the phrase "*sons*

¹ In this passage the article is omitted before *Elohim*.

² Also in Gen. xxxii, 1: "The angels of God met him."

of God" in Genesis vi, 2, must refer to the holy people of God upon the earth. The Targums of Onkelos, Midrash, and Symmachus, whom Fürst follows, have *sons of princes*, or *companions of distinguished ones*. The LXX adheres closely to the Hebrew—"sons of God." In Exodus iv, 22, God calls Israel his son; and in Hosea i, 10, it is said, "Ye are the sons of the living God."

In the next two chapters (vii, viii), in which we have a description of the deluge, its subsidence, Noah's leaving the ark, and his sacrifice to Jehovah, both Elohim and Jehovah are employed. In some sections of the description of the deluge only one of the divine names is found; in others, both occur: in one short section *Elohim* alone occurs, and but once; while both names are found in the sixteenth verse of chapter vii.

There are, it is true, some apparent indications of two separate accounts of the deluge, not in the use of the divine names merely, but also in the matter of the narrative itself: for we find that when *Elohim* (God) commanded Noah to build the ark, he ordered him to take into it *two* living things of each kind, the male and the female; but after the ark is built, Jehovah commands Noah to take living things into the ark, the unclean by twos, the male and his female, and the clean by *sevens*, the male and his female. And it is said of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that creepeth upon the earth, there went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, the male and the female, as God had commanded Noah (verses 8, 9). Again, after enumerating different kinds of living beings, without discriminating between clean and unclean, it is added: "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life. And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him; and Jehovah shut him in" (vii, 15, 16). We cannot suppose that the author of the Elohist portion knew nothing of the distinction between clean and unclean—though that has been asserted—for this distinction is recognised in the Elohist portion (vii, 7-9). Respecting the apparent discrepancy between the number of living things (by twos) that were ordered to be taken into the ark when the command was given to build it, and the *larger* number of clean animals (by sevens) that were directed to be taken into the ark after it was completed, it may be observed that the first command was in *general* terms, but when the ark was completed the numbers were more specifically stated. And when it is said that the living things went into the ark two and two, even in the section which closes with the name of Jehovah, it is difficult to think that there can be a real contradiction;

rather, the expression "two and two" indicates that they came in pairs, without fixing the number of pairs of each kind, or discriminating between the clean and the unclean.

There is considerable repetition in the account of the deluge, and, indeed, in other parts of the Pentateuch, which is not strange in a work of so great antiquity. In fact, repetition is characteristic of the poetry of the Hebrews, as well as of that of the ancient Egyptians, whose poetry would naturally affect a prose writer like Moses, skilled in their learning. Respecting the Egyptians, Wuttke remarks: "In poetical productions they loved the repetition of the same thought in a different form, either to make it clearer or to give it more emphasis."¹

In the subsequent parts of Genesis, Elohim is used in some sections, Jehovah in others, while in some instances the two names are inseparably connected. Some sections contain no divine name. In the last chapters of Genesis, Elohim is almost universally used. It was extremely natural, indeed, that Joseph, in his intercourse with the Egyptians, should use Elohim, as they knew not Jehovah. In some cases it is possible to assign a reason for the preference of one divine name to the other; but in other cases it is impossible.

In the first two chapters of Exodus Elohim alone is used. In the following chapter the Angel of Jehovah appears unto Moses in a burning bush, proclaims himself as "I AM THAT I AM," and commissions him to bring the Israelites out of Egypt. Here, and in the subsequent chapters, the use of Elohim and Jehovah are so interwoven in the narrative that it is absolutely impossible to separate them and assign them to different documents; and in the sixth chapter the Almighty reveals himself to Moses as JEHOVAH.

It would seem that the sacred historian, in the last chapters of Genesis and in the first two chapters of Exodus, purposely kept the name Jehovah in the background, that he might bring it forward with more power and splendour in the divine manifestations to Moses and the other Israelites, in the merciful and powerful deliverance of the chosen people from Egyptian bondage, and in the establishment of a sacred covenant with them.

When God revealed himself to Moses as JEHOVAH he said, "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as *El Shadday* (God Almighty), but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them" (Exod. vi, 3). It is not to be supposed from this declaration that the name was *absolutely* unknown, but that its full import in redeeming power and mercy had not been known to the patriarchs, but was now about to be revealed gloriously in the redemption of Israel and in the es-

God's revelation of himself as Jehovah.

¹Geschichte der Schrift, p. 571.

tablishment of a new covenant. The Abrahamic covenant was the revelation of *El Shadday*, not the fulness of divine mercy and goodness as exhibited in the import of the name Jehovah.¹ To the Hebrews names were of the deepest significance, and were sometimes employed to express all that existed in the object to which they are applied; especially is this the case with the Divine Names. Thus we find the Almighty declaring to the Israelites that he will send his Angel before them. "He will not pardon your transgressions, for my *name* is in him," that is, my *Godhead, Deity* (and so Gesenius), Exod. xxiii, 21. In Psalm liv, 1, we have the following: "Save me, O God, by thy *name*," that is, by the power and goodness that pertain to thy name. And we have a similar analogy in the New Testament (1 Cor. i, 21), where St. Paul says, "The world by wisdom knew not God" (Θεός). But nothing among the Greeks was more common than the name Θεός (God), yet its deep import, in the Christian sense—the attributes of the Deity, his relations to the human race, and experimental religion—were not known to the pagan world.

It is true that if the previous history of the Hebrews showed that the name Jehovah was *absolutely* unknown to the patriarchs, the revelation of it made to Moses would shine forth with more splendor, as the orb of day without a preceding twilight. But we have positive proof that the word Jehovah existed among the Hebrews previously to the Mosaic period, and analogy is against the hypothesis of its being absolutely new, for when God communicates himself to men in revelation he employs terms already in use, and gives to them a new and deeper meaning.

We are not to suppose, however, that the word Jehovah was much used before the Almighty revealed himself to Moses. But few names are found previously to this in which this one occurs. We may mention *Jochebed* (whose glory is Jehovah), the mother of Moses, and *Rephaiah* (whom Jehovah healed), the grandson of Issachar. Subsequently to the Mosaic age the word is very often found in proper names.

In the history of the Mosaic legislation the name Jehovah almost everywhere prevails, and Elohim retires into the background. In the history of Balaam, however, Elohim is frequently used, as being more suitable in describing the acts of a prophet without the pale of Israel; yet to show that it was the true God with whom Balaam had relations, Jehovah is occasionally used.

¹ We have already remarked that this name, יהוה, was in all probability pronounced *Jahveh*, the future of the verb יהה, *to be, The Absolute Being, The Eternal Divine Essence*. It is evidently a Hebrew word.

After leaving the second chapter of Exodus we can find no support whatever for the document hypothesis in the use of the Divine Names. And if unity of authorship is to be denied to the subsequent part of the Pentateuch, it must be done on wholly different grounds. So far as pertains to the Book of Genesis, the document hypothesis by no means disproves the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, since Moses in the composition of Genesis might have made use of previously written memorials of his ancestors. How far he may have done so we have no means of determining. The argument drawn from the divine names in favour of the use of documents by Moses is by no means conclusive, and, at most, would only prove that the memorials of but *one* annalist had been incorporated into the book of Genesis. But if such an ante-Mosaic history existed, what it embraced, and what its primitive form was, cannot be determined. The whole Pentateuch is uniform in its language; the archaisms are found in Deuteronomy as well as in Genesis; and in Genesis itself we can find no parts of which the phraseology belongs to an ante-Mosaic age.

It is no objection to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch that the laws of Moses are not arranged as methodically as are those of a well-digested code of a highly civilized modern State. Moses had to legislate for a people sojourning in the desert, and for them when they should enter the land of Canaan and live under altered circumstances. The laws were delivered in different parts of their journeyings, and sometimes to meet the exigencies of particular cases. History and legislation are combined; and this is what might have been expected in a work originating with Moses. Had the Pentateuch arisen subsequently to the Mosaic age, its form would have been different—the legislation pertaining to Israel in the desert would naturally have been passed over as entirely belonging to the past, or as being altogether unknown; the laws would, probably, have had a different form, resembling a well-digested code. Many incidents are recorded which would otherwise have faded away in the lapse of time.

The opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch endeavour to point out contradictions in the history, and inconsistencies in some parts of the Mosaic legislation, together with repetitions and anachronisms, as affording proof that it could not have been written by Moses. But great caution is necessary in considerations of such a nature, lest we find contradictions and inconsistencies where none exist. Nor do we see how a repetition of the same precept militates against the genuineness of the

Unmethodical arrangement of the laws no objection to Mosaic authorship.

Supposed contradictions and inconsistencies.

Pentateuch; for it is less likely that a subsequent collector or editor of the Mosaic laws would repeat a precept than that Moses himself would. And if in a few instances Moses does not observe the exact order of time in his history and legislation, how can that be inconsistent with the genuineness of the Pentateuch? We would not judge after this manner in respect to the genuineness of any other book.

Bleek thinks that Exodus vi, 2-12, in which Jehovah appears unto Moses, makes the impression that then for the *first time* God had revealed himself to Moses, when in fact he had already commissioned him to go to Pharaoh, and to bring Israel out of Egypt (Exod. iii, iv). He also holds that Exod. vi, 28-vii, 7, which describes a revelation of God to Moses, has no indication that Moses had already appeared before Pharaoh. He thinks that in the original narrative of the appearance of God to Moses, Exod. vi, 1-13 was immediately joined to Exod. ii; that Exod. vii, 1-7 perhaps immediately followed it, and that the rest was added at a later period from oral tradition or from a written document. But portions of these supposed later chapters (iii, iv, v), in which God reveals himself to Moses, and in which the Hebrew legislator appears before Pharaoh, are referred to in the subsequent history. In Exodus vii, 16, God commands Moses to say unto Pharaoh: "The Lord God of the Hebrews hath sent me unto thee, saying, Let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness; and, behold, hitherto thou wouldst not hear." In ch. iii, 18, God commands Moses and the elders of Israel to go unto the king of Egypt, and to "say unto him, The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met with us: and now let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God." Again, in ch. v, 1, it is stated that Moses and Aaron went in and told Pharaoh, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness." It is clear that chs. iii, 18, and v, 1, are referred to in ch. vii, 16. For if we reject iii, iv, and v, there is no instance in which Moses requested Pharaoh to let Israel go to sacrifice to the Lord in the wilderness; and the clause in ch. vii, 16, "and behold, hitherto thou wouldst not hear," shows that this request had before been made. And it suits the language much better to suppose that Pharaoh had already considered the subject for some days, than that it had been presented to him only on the previous day.

Also the language, "And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment: . . . and they spoiled the Egyptians" (xii, 35, 36), seems to refer to iii, 22. Certainly, it is the same phraseology.

If Exodus iii, iv, and v are rejected from the original narrative, then it contained no account of the calling of Moses to his great work. Such a narrative is inconceivable, for this was a great epoch in the history of Moses. These chapters contain an account of the proofs which God gave Moses and the children of Israel that he had sent him, and also of his arrival in Egypt from Midian. They are necessary parts of the history. When Moses and Aaron visited the children of Israel, and Aaron performed the signs before them, they believed; and when they learned that God was about to deliver them, they worshipped him (iv, 30, 31). This statement seems natural, for the Israelites, in their misery, would gladly lay hold of whatever promised them any ground of hope. But, on the contrary, when the demand made upon Pharaoh to let them go had caused their burdens to be increased (ch. v), and Moses a *second* time spoke to them of deliverance by the Lord, "they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of spirit and cruel bondage" (vi, 9). And this is what might have been expected. Disappointed in their first hope, in the increase of their miseries they gave themselves up to despair. The whole history is consistent; and the silence in chapter vi about a previous appearance of Moses before Pharaoh can by no means negative such an appearance.

The genealogy of Moses and Aaron (Exodus vi, 14-27) has furnished ground of objection to the genuineness of the Pentateuch.¹ And it must be acknowledged that the genealogy, in its form and position, is rather peculiar.

It is true, there is nothing strange in giving the names of the ancestors of Moses and Aaron, and also of those of the chief families of Levi, but especially of the sons of Aaron, whose names afterward appear in the Mosaic history in connexion with the priesthood. Nor would a catalogue of the chief Israelites be out of place in the history of the Exodus. The most peculiar and most unsuitable part of the list is found in the verses (14 and 15) beginning with the words, "These be the heads of their fathers' houses," and followed with the names of the sons of Reuben and the sons of Simeon. After this the families of Levi are given, ending with the remark: "These are that Moses and Aaron."

The sons of Reuben and Simeon stand without any additions, just as they are given in the list of the sons of Jacob who came down into Egypt (Gen. xlvii, 9, 10). Not even the ages of Reuben and Simeon when they died are stated; while in the list of the ancestors of Moses and Aaron, and their relatives, and the sons of Aaron and his grandson, the ages of Levi, Kohath, and Amram, at the time of

¹ Bleek, among others, objects to the genealogy, p. 222.

their death, are given. The sons of Moses, on account of their being of little importance in the history, are not named. This list contains no one born later than the Mosaic period, and the fact that it gives the ages of several at their death shows that it must have been written down in the Mosaic time, or soon afterward. It seems not improbable that Reuben and Simeon, and their sons (in vi, 14, 15), have been interpolated from Gen. xlvi, 9, 10, just as we have in Matt. xxvii, 35, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots," interpolated from Psalm xxii, 18, or from John xix, 24. On this hypothesis, "These be the heads of their fathers' houses" (Exod. vi, 14) will refer to Moses and Aaron.

In Exod. xix, 22, it is said: "And let the *priests* also, which come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves;" and also in verse 24: "Let not the *priests* and the people break through." As Aaron and his sons had not yet been consecrated to the priesthood, some have thought that those passages in which priests are mentioned are anachronisms. But are we to suppose that the Israelites had no priests before Aaron and his sons? Did they live several centuries in Egypt, among a people who had a powerful priesthood, without ever having any priests themselves? Were they wholly without religion in Egypt, no one sacrificing to Jehovah, nor making intercession for the people? Such an idea is preposterous. It has been objected that Exod. xxxiv, 23-26 is a repetition of Exod. xxiii, 17-19,¹ for each of these sections contains the command that all male Israelites should appear before Jehovah three times a year, and that the blood of the Lord's sacrifice should not be offered with leaven, "neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left unto the morning. The first of the firstfruits of thy land thou shalt bring unto the house of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk." But the precepts of the thirty-fourth chapter of Exodus were delivered when Moses went up to God in Mount Sinai a *second* time, to have renewed the tables of stone which he had broken; and under these circumstances some of the precepts found in Exod. xxiii—which God delivered to Moses when he *first* went up to Mount Sinai—are repeated for emphasis.

In Exod. xxiii, 9, the precept, "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt," is a repetition of Exod. xxii, 21. But in both cases this precept stands connected with other benevolent precepts of a different character; and its being twice given shows the stress that

¹ By Bleek, pp. 218, 219.

was laid upon it. The twentieth chapter of Leviticus has been regarded as scarcely anything more than a repetition of the eighteenth of Leviticus; but there is this important difference, that, while the latter chapter merely sets forth the things prohibited, the former contains *the penalties* annexed to the crimes.

In Numbers chapter xi there is an account of the sending of quails to the Israelites, which were to last them a whole month. As no mention is made that they were before sent, Bleek¹ thinks that the sending of these birds as stated in Exodus xvi never occurred, but that the real event in Numbers xi had been erroneously supposed to have occurred at the same time that manna was first given. But the argument from silence is very delusive. Nor is there any thing in the language to indicate that quails had never been sent before. What excited the incredulity of Moses was, that God had promised to feed all the people of Israel with flesh for a *whole month*. We have no indication in Exodus xvi whether the quails were sent once or several times. But how could the historian have made such a blunder as Bleek thinks he did, when the history, whether we suppose it written by Moses or not, shows such a minute knowledge of events? The lusting of the Israelites after flesh, the sending them immense quantities of quails, the plague that broke out in consequence of the murmuring against God, and the naming of the place where they were encamped *Kibroth hattaavah (the graves of lust)*—all combine to make the narrative in Numbers xi salient and memorable in the history of the exodus. The natural tendency, so far from producing the account of the quails in Exodus xvi, would have been to blot it out altogether.

Nor is there any good reason for supposing,² in the account of Moses bringing water out of the rock, and calling the place *Massah (temptation, trial)*, and also *Meribah (strife, Exodus xvii, 1-7)*, that two different occurrences are here blended into one, because in Numbers xx, 1-13, on another occasion, when the people murmured for the want of water, Moses smote the rock, and the waters gushed forth, and the fountain was called the water of *Meribah*. In each case there was *Meribah* or *strife*. But the fountain *first* named was called *Massah*, and the other name, *Meribah*, was also given it at the time of the occurrence. But when the *second* fountain, called *Meribah*, was opened at *Kadesh*, the *first* named fountain, in Exod. xvii, 7, was called by no other name than *Massah*, as is evident from Deut. vi, 16; ix, 22; xxxiii, 8, where the fountain is so styled. How could it be otherwise, if confusion was to be avoided?

In Numbers ix, 15-23, we have, in the particular account of the

¹ Page 219.

² Against Bleek, pp. 219, 220.

cloud, and the appearance of fire that rested upon the tabernacle in connexion with the journeyings of the Israelites, an amplification of the statement in Exodus xl, 34-38, made when the tabernacle was set up. The account in Num. ix was written at least a year after that in Exod. xl; for in the former it is stated, "whether it were two days, a month, or *a year*, that the cloud tarried upon the tabernacle." In these statements there is nothing inconsistent with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

The different names by which Moses's father-in-law seems to be called create a difficulty, though not of a serious nature. It seems best to regard Raguel as the father-in-law of Moses, and to suppose Jethro and Hobab to be his brothers-in-law. The Septuagint renders the Hebrew אֲבִי (translated *father-in-law* in our version) by γαμβρός; which means *brother-in-law* and *father-in-law*. With this rendering—brother-in-law—all is easy. Moses marries the daughter of Raguel, priest of Midian. About forty years after this, when, we may suppose, Raguel was dead, Jethro his son succeeded him as priest, and Moses, his brother-in-law, was keeping his flocks (Exod. iii, 1). Hobab, another brother-in-law of Moses, visits him on his journey, as we find in Numbers x, 29. The visit of Hobab to Moses mentioned in this last verse is evidently a different one from that described in Exod. xviii as having been made by Jethro, in company with the wife and the two sons of Moses. The position of the account of this visit of Jethro to Moses has given offense to some. It is stated (Exod. xviii, 5) that Moses was encamped at *the mount of God*, which is the name given in Exodus iii, 1, to Horeb; while in the beginning of the next chapter (xix) we have an account of the arrival of the children of Israel in the desert of Sinai, and of their encamping "before the mount," that is, Mount Sinai. But it is by no means certain that the visit of Jethro is misplaced, since it is not stated that Moses had already arrived at Mount Sinai. In Exod. xvii, 6, while the Israelites were still at Rephidim, God says unto Moses, "Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel." We have already remarked that Horeb is called *the mount*, or *mountain of God* (Exod. iii, 1); and it is evident here that the Mount Sinai from which the law was proclaimed is not intended, for it is stated that Moses led his flock to Horeb. At Rephidim Moses was encamped near a mountain or hill, for he says, "To-morrow I will stand upon the top of the hill." Horeb was a range of which Sinai was a peak.

Bleek thinks that references are made, in the account of Jethro's

visit, to the tabernacle, which was not yet built.¹ His Bleek's sharp criticism. critical powers must here be sharp indeed! It is stated that Jethro "took a burnt offering and sacrifices for God: and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God." *Wherever sacrifice was offered, it was before God.* Already, in Exod. xvi, 9, Moses commands Aaron to say to the whole congregation of the children of Israel, "Come near before the Lord." Even in reference to Nimrod it is said, "He was a mighty hunter before the Lord" (Gen. x, 9). We, as Christians, in private and public, speak of coming unto or before the Lord. Nor is there any necessary reference to the tabernacle in the language of Moses, "The people come unto me to inquire of God." But even if Moses had already arrived at Mount Sinai when Jethro visited him it would create no difficulty, since Moses might prefer to record it just before describing the arrival at Sinai, that he might not interrupt the thread of events connected with that arrival.

In Exodus xxxiii, 7-11, it is said that "Moses took the tent (not tabernacle, as in English version) and pitched it without the camp, afar off from the camp, and called it the Tent of the Congregation. And it came to pass that every one that sought the Lord went out unto the tent of the congregation." It is evident that the tent here spoken of was a different structure from the tabernacle which Moses was commanded to have built. There can be no reasonable doubt that it was the tent which Moses had brought up with him out of Egypt, in which he had been living, and to which the people resorted on important occasions to consult him, and from which orders were issued. On the occasion referred to the people had committed a great sin in worshipping the golden calf which Aaron had made; and, on account of this sin, Moses removes his tent from among them, and God talks with him at the door of the tent, far away from the sinful people.² God had very recently delivered to Moses the *ten commandments*, with various other precepts, and he now appears to Moses in his tent, thus showing to all Israel that, while they have sinned, with Moses he talks face to face. At the same time this tent was to serve as a temporary arrangement until the great tabernacle, of which it was a type, should be built.

The enumeration of the children of Israel in Numbers i, in connexion with the statement of the amount of money received and appropriated to the building of the tabernacle (Exod. xxxviii, 25, 26), creates a difficulty. Numbers and contributions of Israel. Ac-

¹ Page 223.

² It is plain that the tent itself was no new contrivance, which removes Bleek's objection that its institution appears too late. Pp. 223, 224.

According to Exod. xl, 17, the tabernacle was set up on the *first day* of the *first month* of the *second year* after the children of Israel had left Egypt; while the command to Moses "to take the sum of all the congregation of Israel" was given on the *first day* of the *second month* of the *second year* after they had left Egypt (Num. i, 1), just *one month*, therefore, after the tabernacle was set up. Yet it is stated in Exod. xxxviii, 25, 26: "The silver of them that were numbered of the congregation was a hundred talents, and a thousand seven hundred and threescore and fifteen shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary: a bekah for every man, that is, half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for every one that went to be numbered, from twenty years old and upward, for six hundred thousand and three thousand and five hundred and fifty men." The largest portion of this silver was employed in making sockets for the sanctuary and the vail (Exod. xxxviii, 27, 28). The number of the Israelites here given is precisely the same as that in Num. i, 46, and there can be no doubt that both accounts refer to *one* enumeration; the first giving merely the result, and the second the particulars. For, apart from the fact that the totals in both Exod. xxxviii, 26 and Num. i, 46 are the same, it is exceedingly improbable that the children of Israel should be numbered *twice* in a *few months*.¹ The *first* enumeration was made to ascertain the numbers in reference to the poll tax for the tabernacle and the marshalling of the armies: the *second* was made about thirty-eight years after the first (Num. xxvi, 2-51)—a short time before the Israelites entered Canaan—that the land might be divided in proportion to the number of each tribe (Num. xxvi, 53-56). These *two* were the only enumerations from the time the Israelites left Egypt until they reached Canaan.

J. D. Michaelis seems to give the best solution of the difficulty under consideration. "An exact enumeration," says he, "of six hundred thousand men demands quite a long time, if all the names are to be written down. It had proceeded so far before the building of the tabernacle that every male over twenty years of age was compelled to report himself and pay his poll tax; but in the second month of the second year all these names were reduced to order, and entered into a kind of register by Moses, Aaron, and the heads of the twelve tribes; and whoever in the former year had paid his poll tax was regarded as living, though he had since died; and whoever at that time was under twenty years of age, and had paid no poll tax, was still considered under twenty. It is necessary to read only Num. i, 2, 3, to see that the Israelites here are not simply numbered, but enrolled by name, and to each one a position is to be as-

¹ Colenso absurdly supposes that here we have two separate enumerations.

signed in the army, which had not been done when the poll tax was paid."¹ The Levites and the firstborn of the other tribes were numbered afterward.

Bleek thinks that the tabernacle could not have been built in so short a time as eight or nine months, and that the date in Exodus (xl, 17), where it is said that the tabernacle was set up on the first day of the first month of the second year, is placed too early.² But we see no good reason for this opinion. The people contributed so liberally of their means that Moses commanded that no more work should be made "for the offering of the sanctuary" (Exod. xxxvi, 5, 6). The material was worked up by "Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every wise-hearted man in whose heart the Lord had put wisdom, even every one whose heart stirred him up to come unto the work to do it" (Exod. xxxvi, 2). In the ardour of their first love, they laboured with very great zeal and cheerfulness.

Further, the history of the building of the tabernacle, the numbering of the children of Israel, and the position of their camps, are narrated with such circumstantiality, and so many marks of truth, that an error in the date of the erection of the tabernacle is inadmissible.

The number of the firstborn males among the children of Israel from a month old and upward, omitting those of the Levites, is put at twenty-two thousand two hundred and seventy-three (Num. iii, 43). Michaelis computes that this gives one firstborn to every forty-two males, which he regards as a proof that polygamy must have been extensively practised by the Israelites in Egypt. For, however many wives a man might have, and whatever number of sons, but one of these could be his firstborn. Perhaps the edict of Pharaoh to drown all the male children of the Israelites diminished greatly the number of the firstborn males, and on account of the great loss among the firstborn of Israel God may have smitten the firstborn of the Egyptians as a penalty.

In the enumeration of the males of the tribe of Levi, from a month old and upward, the whole number is stated to be twenty-two thousand (Num. iii, 39), while the sum of the three numbers (Num. iii, 22, 28, 34) is three hundred more. But it has been supposed that the three hundred in excess were themselves firstborn. As the whole number of the firstborn males of the children of Israel belonged to Jehovah, those of Levi as well as the rest, the actual substitute for the firstborn of Israel was the sons of Levi diminished by the number of the firstborn. This left

Question of the firstborn males.

¹ From his German Annotations on Numbers, I. Göttingen und Gotha, 1771.

² Pp. 224, 225.

the number of the firstborn of Israel in excess of the Levites diminished by the firstborn, two hundred and seventy-three, redeemed by paying five shekels apiece to Aaron and his sons (Num. iii, 46-48).

In Numbers ix, 12, it is said that the Lord spake unto Moses, and gave him directions respecting the passover, in the first month of the second year after they were come out of the land of Egypt; while in Numbers i, 1, 2, the command to take the sum of the Israelites is given on the first of the following month. Bleek¹ makes this want of exact chronological order an argument against the genuineness of the Pentateuch, though it is not easy to see its force. But Moses had a good reason for his chronological arrangement. He tells us that Jehovah had given directions—in the first month of the second year—respecting the observance of the passover on the fourteenth day of the month according to its rites. Here Moses evidently refers to the precepts already given in Leviticus xxiii, 5-8, and to the fact that the people kept the passover on the fourteenth of the first month. But there were certain men who had been defiled by the dead body of a man, so that they could not keep the passover, and who made application to Moses and Aaron to have their seemingly hard case considered. Moses made known their case to Jehovah, who directed that all persons who were unable to eat the passover on the fourteenth day of the *first* month, on account of uncleanness or being on a journey afar off, should keep it on the fourteenth day of the *second* month. It is evident, then, that these unclean persons kept the passover on the *fourteenth* of this *second* month, and this *ninth* chapter is the very place in which to insert the events of that part of the second month. And, in order to describe what was to be done on that *fourteenth* day, the historian goes back to relate the incidents that led to the observance of the passover by some on that day. In the very next chapter (x, 11) he states that on the *twentieth* day of the *second* month of the *second* year the Israelites left the wilderness of Sinai; that is, a few days after the unclean persons had eaten the passover. What can be more natural than this chronological arrangement?

The statements made in respect to the service of the Levites in the tabernacle (Numbers iv, viii, 24-26) have been represented as contradictory. In the former chapter they are to serve from thirty years of age until they are fifty; while in the latter passage their time of service is from twenty-five until fifty. But the kind of service in each case is different. In Numbers iv, the *Levites who bore the various parts of the tabernacle during the sojourn in the desert* are assigned to this work. They were between the ages of thirty and fifty,

¹ Page 225.

in the vigour of life, and were still to wander many years in the desert. This was a special service which would terminate when the tabernacle had obtained a fixed locality after the conquest of Canaan. But in Numbers viii, 24-26, those who are to serve from twenty-five until they are fifty are said to "go in to wait upon the service of the tabernacle of the congregation." Here the precept has no special reference to time or place, but is in its highest sense general.

But, further, it is evident that the first of these precepts had its origin in the desert; and the second one, if originating in a period subsequent to Moses, would have repealed the first, which would, in all probability, have still been in existence. Can it be supposed for a moment that a later law, for no assignable reason, and contradicting the Mosaic regulation, was invented and attributed to Moses?

CHAPTER VIII.

THE UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

THERE is a unity of plan pervading the whole Pentateuch, which shows that it is the work of one mind.

A collection of independent documents brought together would have no unity nor coherence. The book of Genesis begins with the creation of the world in six days, and contains a brief history of man's fall, his expulsion from the garden of Eden, the subsequent history of the antediluvian world, the deluge, the preservation of Noah and his family, the peopling of the earth by the sons of Noah, the calling of Abraham, the principal incidents in his life and in the lives of Isaac and Jacob and Esau, the selling of Joseph into Egypt, and his exaltation there, which prepares the way for the removal to Egypt of Jacob and his family.

The book of Exodus opens with a reference to Jacob's descent into Egypt, and a sketch of the history of the oppression of the Israelites, their deliverance from the Egyptians through Moses, the divinely commissioned leader and lawgiver; the wanderings in the Desert, the giving of the law from Mount Sinai, the directions for building the altars of sacrifice and the tabernacle, and various precepts.

The contents of
the Books of
Moses.

The book of Leviticus is devoted to the services of the priests, their duties, the law of sacrifices, and many other matters. The book of Numbers opens with the enumeration of the children of Israel, and contains both historical events and precepts.

In Deuteronomy, when the Israelites have arrived in the land of

Moab, near the close of the forty years wandering, Moses rehearses their history from the time they left Horeb, and also repeats and enforces, and in some cases slightly modifies, precepts before delivered. He also inculcates new precepts, some of which have especial reference to the Israelites when they shall have entered the land of Canaan—for example, the directions concerning war. He appoints cities of refuge, gives directions respecting the setting up of stones on Mount Ebal upon which all the words of the law are to be written, pronounces the blessings that shall come upon the people if obedient, and the curses that will overtake them if they are disobedient. He at the same time predicts their disobedience. In conclusion, he teaches them a song, and pronounces a blessing upon the different tribes of Israel. Nothing could be more suitable to the position of Moses than this whole book, and it is throughout exceedingly natural. A chapter by a later hand, containing the death of the great lawgiver, closes it. Without Deuteronomy the Mosaic legislation would be incomplete. There is nothing in the ending of the book of Numbers to indicate that it is the conclusion of the laws of Moses. The whole spirit of Deuteronomy is Mosaic.

If we examine the Pentateuch more closely we shall find that it is bound together by indissoluble connexions, and permeated with the spirit of unity.

In the book of Genesis we have a connected history, in which the genealogies are carefully given, the age of the antediluvians when the eldest son was born, and the length of their lives. The same method is generally pursued in narrating the history after the flood, down to the close of the book. Nowhere in Genesis is the age of the father given when any of the daughters were born, and the names of the latter are rarely mentioned. The history is evidently of a sacred character, written from a theocratic standpoint. A standard of moral right, with which the actions of men are compared, and approved or condemned, is everywhere recognised in Genesis. The growing wickedness of the antediluvian world, culminating in bringing down the wrath of Jehovah upon it, and the pious exceptions, are prominently set forth by the sacred writer.

With the exception of the peopling of the earth by the sons of Noah, the history generally limits itself to the line of the chosen people; and other nations are noticed only in connexion with the patriarchs, as we see in the account of the battle of the kings and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, with which Abraham and Lot are historically related.

It is easy to see that *the whole of Genesis is an introduction and*

preparation for the Mosaic Covenant contained in the following books. The sanctification of the seventh day at the end of creation is intimately connected with the Jewish Sabbath. The sacrifices of Abel, Noah, and Abraham, and the distinction made between clean and unclean animals in the account of the preservation of living beings in the ark during the deluge, are intimately related to the Mosaic institutions. The history of Joseph in Egypt, though it seems to break the thread of patriarchal history, is, in fact, a necessary part of that history, as it prepares the way for the descent of Israel into Egypt.

Genesis an introduction.

Between Genesis and Exodus there is a close connexion. God makes a covenant with Abraham, and promises him that his posterity shall inherit the land of Canaan, and that in his seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. In Genesis, also, God declares to Abraham that before his descendants shall come into possession of that land, they shall be strangers in another, in which they shall serve and be afflicted, and that the "nation whom they shall serve will I judge, and afterward shall come out with great substance. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." Chap. xv, 13-16. Compare this with the afflictions of the Israelites detailed in the first chapters of Exodus, and with xii, 40, where it is said that the sojourning of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt was four hundred and thirty years. The declaration made to Abraham, being prophecy, was expressed in round numbers, while the history gives the exact number. In Exodus xiii, 19, it is stated that "Moses took the bones of Joseph with him; for he had straitly sworn the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you; and ye shall carry up my bones away hence with you." This refers to Gen. l, 25.

Connexion between Genesis and Exodus.

In the third month after leaving Egypt the Israelites come to Mount Sinai (Exod. xix, 1, 2). There the Mosaic legislation properly begins with the delivery of *the decalogue, the moral law*, under the most solemn and awe-inspiring circumstances. Then follow four chapters of precepts; after which instructions are given respecting the making of the ark of the covenant, and the building of the tabernacle. These could not be made while the Israelites were travelling, and as they were necessary in divine worship, the building of them in this stage of the wandering is very appropriate. In the latter part of the same book we have a description of the dress of the high priest, his consecration, and matters pertaining to his service. All of this seems to be in the proper place.

When the tabernacle had been built, and Aaron and his sons were ready for the consecration to the divine service, Moses delivered precepts respecting the offerings to be made to Jehovah, and prescribed

the duties of the priests—which occupy the most of the Book of Leviticus. In the first part of Numbers we have an enumeration of the people, to ascertain who are liable to military duties and to other services. The remainder of the book is occupied with history and precepts. That Moses, at the close of the forty years' wandering, should have rehearsed the most important events in the history of the Israelites, as we find in Deuteronomy, is quite natural. The additional precepts which he inculcates—for example, the directions for carrying on war when they are about to enter the land of Canaan, where they would have many wars to wage—seem suitable to this stage of the history; and the earnest exhortation, and the deep solicitude of the lawgiver for the happiness of his people, are a fitting close of his wonderful life.

But the connexion of the events of the Pentateuch is not the only proof of its unity. A stronger evidence is furnished by the uniformity of language that pervades the whole five books, especially the archaisms which disappear in the subsequent books, even in those so ancient as Joshua and Judges.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE ART OF ALPHABETICAL WRITING AMONG THE HEBREWS, AND THE STATE OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES IN GENERAL IN EGYPT IN THE MOSAIC AGE.

AS a preliminary to the discussion of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, there arises the question of the antiquity of the art of alphabetical writing among the Hebrews: for if it can be shown that the art was well known among that people in the Mosaic age, the probability that their great lawgiver *wrote* his laws will be very great.

Writing in hieroglyphics, which preceded alphabetical writing, was known and practised in Egypt at a very remote period. The sacred books of Thoth, the Egyptian Mercury or Hermes, were written, in part at least, as early as the time of Suphis, (Cheops,) to whom the books were attributed.¹ This Memphitic king, according to Wilkinson, reigned about B. C. 2450. Numerous commentaries were written on these sacred books of Thoth. "Papyri are of the most remote Pharaonic periods, and the same mode of *writing* on them is shown from the sculptures to have been common in the age of Suphis, or Cheops, the builder of the Great Pyramid."² "Every thing was done in writing."³ They had decimal as well as duodecimal calculation, and the reckoning by units, tens, hundreds, and thousands, before the pyramids were built.⁴ Alphabetical writing came into use several centuries later. "From the Pal-
Alphabetical
writing in
Palestine.
 estinians, the people near the Mediterranean Sea received their alphabet. The sounds of the alphabet itself, as it is known to us, suit well the general lingual characteristics of the Semitics. It corresponds to their peculiarity, for it expresses their inclination to gutturals, and the variety of their hissing or aspirated sounds. We can, therefore, assert with high probability that *its inventor was a Semitic*."⁵ That the Israelites possessed alphabetical writing when they went down into Egypt is quite evident, otherwise they would have adopted the hieroglyphic system of the

¹ See Wuttke, *Geschichte der Schrift*, u. s. w., vol. i, p. 557.

² Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, vol. ii, p. 98.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

⁵ Wuttke, *Geschichte der Schrift*, u. s. w., vol. i, p. 720.

Egyptians.¹ The Phœnicians, who lived on the borders of Canaan, and whose language was nearly the same as the Hebrew, possessed writing at a very remote period. They attributed the invention of their alphabet to Taut, their world-god. The sacred writings of the Phœnicians, in which their cosmogony, the history of their gods and heroes, natural events, and astronomical, astrological, and psychological doctrines were contained, were called Taut-writings. Antiquity mentions seven such writings.²

Among the ancient Phœnician writers, Mochus, mentioned by Josephus³ as a writer of Phœnician history, may be named. Strabo states, on the authority of the very learned Posidonius, that Mochus lived before the Trojan war.⁴ There was a very ancient tradition among the Greeks that Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, brought sixteen letters of the Phœnician alphabet into Greece.⁵ On this point we have the testimony of Herodotus, who states that "the Phœnicians who came with Cadmus brought among the Greeks learning and letters." "I myself," says he, "saw the letters of Cadmus in the temple of the Ismenian Apollo, in Bœotian Thebes, engraved upon three tripods."⁶ The age of Cadmus was more ancient than that of Moses. At all events it is certain that the Greek alphabet was derived from the Phœnician. The letters speak for themselves.

Another proof of the great antiquity of the Phœnician, or Hebrew, alphabet is furnished by the linguistic researches in the monuments of ancient Italy. Dr. Mommsen remarks :
Antiquity of the art of writing in Italy. "We must, both as regards Etruria and Latium, carry back the commencement of the art of writing to an epoch which more closely approximates to the first incidence of the Egyptian dog-star period within historical times, the year 1322 B. C., than to the year 776, with which the chronology of the Olympiads began in Greece. The high antiquity of the art of writing in Rome is evinced otherwise by numerous and plain indications."⁷ The alphabet came from the Phœnicians through the Greeks. Writing in Hindoostan furnishes another proof of the antiquity of the Semitic alphabet. According to Max Müller,⁸ the Vedas were written B. C. 1200 or 1500. And it has been shown, upon the firm ground of palæog-

¹ Wuttke, *Geschichte der Schrift*, u. s. w., vol. i, p. 723.

² Fürst, *Geschichte Bib. Lit.*, vol. i, p. 43. ³ *Antiq.*, i, 18. ⁴ *Lib.* xvii, 757.

⁵ So ancient was alphabetical writing considered to be, that it is attributed by Æschylus (B. C. 450) to the god Prometheus (*Prom. Desm.*, 460).

⁶ *Lib.* v, cap. 58. He also states that one of the tripods contained the inscription: "Amphitryon, returning from the Teleboans, dedicated me." This would be in the time of Laius, the fourth in descent from Cadmus.

⁷ *History of Rome* (translated by Dickson), vol. i, p. 224.

⁸ *Lectures on the Vedas*, vol. i, p. 13.

raphy, by A. Weber, of Berlin, that the ancient Hindoo alphabet was derived from the Semitic or Phœnician.

A proof of the existence of writing among the Canaanites, and consequently among the Hebrews before the Mosaic Age, is the fact that when Joshua subdued the land of Canaan he found a city there called קִרְיַת סֵפֶר (Kirjath-sepher), *city of the book or books*.¹ That the Israelites made use of writing in Egypt is shown by their officers being called שְׂטָרִים (shoterim), *scribes* (Exod. v, 6-19), from שָׂטַר (shatar), *to write*. And in various places in the Pentateuch writing is mentioned as practised by the Hebrews in the Mosaic age.

We may further remark that it is now generally conceded that writing among the Semitics dates as far back as B. C. 2000.

Writing material was abundant in Egypt in the Mosaic age. When the pyramid of Cheops was built papyri were used as writing material;² they were made from a plant that grew in lower Egypt. The papyrus employed for sacred writings was about thirteen inches wide; the length was from a few inches to twenty, thirty, and even sixty feet. One piece in the Museum of Turin is fifty-seven feet long, and another measures one hundred and forty-four feet.³ Skins of animals were also used for writing at a very early period in Egypt.⁴ "Records kept in the temple," written upon skins, are mentioned in the time of the eighteenth dynasty, the age of Moses.

As numerous allusions are made in the Pentateuch to embroidery, engraving on stone, and working in brass, silver, and gold, it is a matter of great importance to ascertain from other sources what was the condition of the sciences and arts in Egypt before and during the time of Moses.

Astronomy and mathematics were cultivated by the Egyptians at a very remote period. The Egyptian priests devoted themselves ardently to astronomy, and computed the length of the solar year with approximate correctness. According to Biot's investigations, they made, upon accurate examination, a reform of their calendar about B. C. 1780. Moiris, or Mares, a king of the twelfth dynasty (about B. C. 2000), is said to have been the founder of geometry. The mathematical knowledge of the ancient Egyptians was transferred to the Greeks through Thales, Pythagoras, and Democritus, who were disciples of Egyptian priests.⁵ Even when the pyramid of Cheops was built, the decimal system was in use.

¹ Josh. xv, 15, 16.

² Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, vol. ii, p. 98.

³ Wuttke, vol. i, p. 533. ⁴ Wilkinson, vol. ii, p. 99. ⁵ Wuttke, vol. i, pp. 568, 569.

Gold wire was employed B. C. 2000, and silver wire probably at the same time, certainly not more than five hundred years later. The ornaments in gold found in Egypt consist of rings, bracelets, armlets, necklaces, earrings, and numerous trinkets belonging to the toilet, many of which are of the time of Osirtasen I. and Thothmes III., who lived about B. C. 2080 and 1460. Gold and silver vases, statues, and other objects of gold and silver, of silver inlaid with gold, and of bronze inlaid with the precious metals, were also common at the same time.¹ Signet rings were worn as early as the Mosaic age, and even earlier.

Substances of various kinds were overlaid with fine gold leaf at a very early period, even in the time of Osirtasen I., about B. C. 2000. In the early age of Thothmes III. (about B. C. 1460) the people were already acquainted with various methods of overlaying with gold leaf, gilding, inlaying, and beating gold into other metals, previously tooled with devices to receive it.² The art of cutting glass was known to the Egyptians of the most remote periods, hieroglyphics and various devices being frequently engraved upon vases and beads. The art of grinding glass was known and practised. For engraving stone, emery powder and the lapidary's wheel were used.³ The Egyptians manufactured fine linen at a very early period. Striped cloths were woven in Egypt in the age of the Pharaohs of the twelfth (B. C. 2000) and the eighteenth (about B. C. 1460) dynasties. The hieroglyphics on obelisks and on other granitic monuments are sculptured with a minuteness and finish which are surprising, even if steel as highly tempered as our own had been used. The hieroglyphics on the obelisks are rather engraved than sculptured; and, judging from the minute manner in which they are executed, we may suppose the Egyptians adopted the same process as modern engravers, and that they even, in some instances, employed the wheel and drill.⁴ Mirrors of metal, chiefly copper, were used by them.

It is not necessary to pursue this part of our subject any further. Enough has already been said to show that the statements of the Pentateuch respecting the arts employed by the Israelites in building the tabernacle, in making its utensils, and in adorning the priests, together with the allusions made to gold and other ornaments, are natural and credible, unless one can suppose that the Israelites, although dwelling in close proximity to the Egyptians for centuries, never learned any of their arts, and that no Egyptian artist ever appeared among them.

¹ Wilkinson, vol. ii, p. 140. ² Ibid., p. 145. ³ Ibid., p. 67. ⁴ Ibid., pp. 156, 157.

CHAPTER X.

PROOF OF THE GREAT ANTIQUITY OF THE PENTATEUCH
FROM INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE THAT NO PART OF THE PENTATEUCH COULD
HAVE BEEN WRITTEN DURING OR AFTER THE BABYLONIAN
CAPTIVITY.

THAT the Hebrew language would undergo no change in its vocabulary and syntax in nine or ten centuries, from the age of Moses to the Babylonian captivity, is very improbable, and unless we ignore all the teachings of history in similar cases it is certain on *a priori* grounds that the Hebrew language would be affected by coming into contact with the Chaldee during the Babylonian captivity. We accordingly find that in many instances the later Hebrew differs from the earlier, that the language of *all* the writers who lived during or after the Babylonian captivity is colored to a greater or less extent by the Chaldee; and that the writers themselves give unmistakable evidence of the age to which they belong. In proof and illustration of these statements we cite the following words: אָבִיב, *Abib*, is used in Exod. ix, 31, and in Lev. ii, 14, for *green ears*. Four times in Exodus and twice in Deuteronomy it takes the article with הָרֵשׁ, *hhodēsh* (month) prefixed, הָרֵשׁ הָאָבִיב, *hhoaesh haabib*, month of *Abib* or *greenness*. The fact that *Abib* takes the article is a proof that it is not a proper noun. It occurs nowhere except in the passages named, and everywhere else in the Pentateuch the Hebrew months are indicated simply as *first, second*, etc. But this *Abib*, the first month of the Hebrew year, is called נִסָּן, *Nisan*, in Neh. ii, 1; Esth. iii, 7; and in other books composed about the time of the Babylonian captivity, we have the proper names of some of the months. Thus, in 1 Kings vi, 1, we have "the month Ziv, which is the second month," and Ziv in verse 31. In 1 Kings vi, 38, mention is made of "the month Bul, which is the eighth month." In Ezra vi, 15, and in several passages in Esther, the twelfth month is called *Adar*. In Zech. i, 7, the eleventh month is called *Shebat*; and in vii, 1, the ninth month is

Probability of
change in the
Hebrew lan-
guage.

Later lan-
guage not
found in the
Pentateuch.

named *Chisleu*; and in Neh. vi, 15, the sixth month is called simply *Elul*. The most of these proper names came from the Chaldee.

אַזַּר, *azar*, to bind, and אֵזוֹר, *ēzōr*, a girdle, are found in later books of the Bible, but nowhere in the Pentateuch.

אֲרָרְבָּנִים and דָּרְבָּכֹון, *darics*, the name of a Persian coin that came into use after the Babylonian captivity, is found in several places in Ezra and Nehemiah. Why is it not found in the middle books of the Pentateuch if they were written after the captivity?

בְּאַחַד, with כ prefixed, בְּאַחַד, *kēhhadh*, as one, together, occurs three times in Ezra, and once in each of the books of 2 Chronicles, Nehemiah, Isaiah, and Ecclesiastes, and nowhere else.

אֶלְגַּבִּישׁ, *elgabish*, hail, occurs three times in Ezekiel, and nowhere else. A different word is used in the Pentateuch and other biblical books.

The phrase לָקַח אִשָּׁה, *laqahh ishshah*, to take a wife, is found in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and most of the books of the Bible, but in several passages in Ezra, Nehemiah, and 2 Chronicles the phrase נָשָׂא אִשָּׁה, *nasah ishshah*, is used. It is, however, not used in the Pentateuch. It is difficult to think that if Leviticus had been written in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah it would not have contained this latter phrase.

בָּרַר, *barar*, to separate, to select, to choose, and to be pure, occurs thirty-four times in the Old Testament, generally in the later books, but never in the Pentateuch.

בֵּירָה, *birah*, fortress, palace, or temple, is not found in the Pentateuch, but occurs in some of the books written after the Babylonian captivity.

בַּת, *bath*, liquid measure, one tenth of a homer, and equal to the ephah in dry measure, is nowhere found in the Pentateuch, and appears to be of late origin. It occurs once in Isaiah, several times in Kings and Chronicles, seven times in Ezekiel, and twice in the Chaldee of Ezra. עֹמֶר, *omer*, the tenth of an ephah, occurs ten times in the Pentateuch, and nowhere else. חֹמֶר, *homer*, a measure containing ten baths, occurs in the Pentateuch, Hosea, and Ezekiel, while כֹּר, *kōr*, the same measure, is never used in the Pentateuch, but occurs several times in 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles, and once in Ezekiel. Had the middle books of the Pentateuch been written in the time of Ezekiel or Ezra, it is in the highest degree probable that the word *bath*, and very likely also the word *kōr*, would have been found in them.

נָאֵל, *to be defiled, to be polluted*, occurs in Isaiah, Zephaniah, Lamentations, Malachi, Ezra, and Nehemiah, but nowhere in the Pentateuch. It is evidently late Hebrew.

גִּיל, *to exult*, occurs forty-four times in the late books of the Old Testament, but never in the Pentateuch. דָּאָג, *to fear*, and דָּאָגָה, *fear*, are not found in the Pentateuch, but in 1 Samuel, Joshua, Psalms, Jeremiah, Proverbs, and three times in Ezekiel.

דְּבִיר is used *fifteen* times in the books of Kings, Chronicles, and once in the Psalms for the *holy of holies* of the Jewish temple. Now, it is very probable that if the middle books of the Pentateuch had been written during, or after, the Babylonian captivity, they would have contained this word, applied to the most holy place of the tabernacle.

דִּיק, *watch tower*, is used in 2 Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and nowhere else.

הִנָּה, *to murmur*, and its derivatives are used thirty-five times in the later books of the Old Testament, but never in the Pentateuch.

זָמַן, *to appoint*, is used twice in Nehemiah and once in the Hebrew portion of Ezra; and זְמַן, *time*, occurs once in Nehemiah, and in Ecclesiastes and Esther. They are not found until the Babylonian captivity, and doubtless came from the Chaldee.

זָכַר, *to play, to sing*, is used more than forty times, but not in the Pentateuch. זָנַח, *to be rancid*, occurs nineteen times, but is never used in the Pentateuch.

חָן, *palate*, occurs eighteen times in various books, including Ezekiel.

חָמַס, *to do violence*, is found in several late books, but neither word is found in the Pentateuch.

יְהוָה הַצְּבָאוֹת, *Jehovah of hosts*, or *Jehovah God of hosts*, is not found in the Pentateuch, though it occurs in Jeremiah, Zechariah, Malachi, and especially in Isaiah.

הַתִּילָךְ, *to be in a genealogical table*, is found only in Num. i, 18. Instead of this word, הַתִּיחֵשׁ is used twenty times in Ezra, Nehemiah, and in 1 and 2 Chronicles.

כְּתָב, *a writing, or book, or prescript*, is not found in the Pentateuch, but occurs as Hebrew three times in Chronicles, four times in Ezra, once in Nehemiah, and once in Ezekiel. It evidently, at the captivity, came from the Chaldee, which has a very similar form (כְּתָב).

כַּפּוֹר, *a cup* occurs in several places in Ezra and in 1 Chronicles, but not in the Pentateuch.

כַּפִּיר, *a young lion*, is found thirty-one times in the Old Testament, but in no case in the Pentateuch.

לְהַטִּים, *secret arts, magic arts* (Exod. vii, 22; viii, 3, 14), and מַגִּים, *magic arts* (Exod. vii, 11), are found nowhere else in the Bible in this sense, except in the Pentateuch, but in the later books different words are used.

לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים, *show bread*, is employed in Exod. xxxv, 13; xxxix, 36, and without the article in xxv, 30. The same name also is found in other books. But this bread is called twice in Chronicles and once in Nehemiah לֶחֶם הָעֵרֶכֶת, *bread of the row, row bread*.

מִגִּלָּה, *a roll of a book*, occurs twenty-one times in the Old Testament, including four times in Ezekiel, but not in the Pentateuch.

מִצְנֶפֶת, *turban, mitre*, is found eleven times in Exodus and once in Ezekiel, but nowhere else in the Old Testament. In some of the later books צִנִּיף is used in the same sense.

כְּרוֹם, *high place*, occurs more than *fifty times* in the Old Testament, but nowhere in the Pentateuch. It seems to have come into use first when the Israelites occupied Jerusalem and other high places.

נָגִיד, *prince, leader, etc.*, is not in the Pentateuch, but occurs *forty-two times* elsewhere, being found in Samuel, Kings, Job, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and Daniel.

נָגַע, in Ezra iii, 1; Neh. vii, 73; Hiphil in Ezek. vii, 12, has the singular meaning, *to come*.

נְתִינִים, *servants of the tabernacle, or temple, given to the Levites to aid them*, occurs eight times in Ezra, nine times in Nehemiah, and once in 1 Chronicles. If the middle books of the Pentateuch had been written in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is in the highest degree probable, if not certain, that this word would have been used to designate the servants of the Levites.

סְבִלָה, found only in the following form construct plural:

סְבִלֹת, *burdens, a bearing of burdens, six times* in Exodus, and nowhere else. Outside of the Pentateuch different words are used for burdens, סָבַל and סָבְלוּ.

סֵנַן, or סָנַן, *prefect, ruler, governor*, is not in the Pentateuch, but in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, and Ezra, it is used for chief officers among the Hebrews, just as נָשִׂיא, *prince*, is used in the middle books of the Pentateuch. Why, then, does not this late word occur in the Pentateuch, if it belongs, in large part, to the time of Ezra?

הַכֵּלֶע, or סֵלַע, *Sela Petra* (the Rock), is found in Judges i, 36; 2 Kings xiv, 17; Isaiah xvi, 1, and perhaps xlii, 11, for the well known Idumean city Petra, but it is not found in the Pentateuch. Is not this because the city had no existence when the Pentateuch was written?

סָעַר, *to scatter and to shake*, and its noun, סְעָרָה and סַעַר, *storm*, are not found in the Pentateuch, but some of its forms occur in Kings, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Psalms, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Jonah.

כֹּפֵּר, *king's scribe or secretary*, also military tribune, and in Chronicles, Jeremiah, Ezra, and Nehemiah, it has the meaning of *scribe, one skilled in the law of Moses*; but this participle does not occur in the Pentateuch, which has the word שֹׁטֵר (from שָׁטַר, *to write*), *officer, leader, magistrate, thirteen times*.

עִוַר, *to gird*, occurs *eighty-two times* in the Hebrew Bible, but in the Pentateuch only twice, in the poetical chapters, Gen. xlix and Deut. xxxii.

עֶזְרָא, *omer, the tenth part of an ephah*, occurs *ten times* in the Pentateuch, and nowhere else.

עֲרַב, *Arabia*, and עֲרַבִי, *an Arabian*, are not found in the Pentateuch. But the name of the country occurs in Isaiah, Ezekiel, and 2 Chronicles, while the name of the people occurs also in Isaiah, 2 Chronicles, and in Jeremiah and Nehemiah. Now, as the history in the Pentateuch deals in genealogies and Gentile names, and as the largest portion of its history is transacted in Arabia, it is highly probable that if any large historical part of the work had been written near the period of the captivity it would have contained both the names for Arabia and Arab.

פָּאֵשׁ, *to act proudly, to scatter*, does not occur in the Pentateuch, but in Jeremiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Malachi.

פָּזָה, *pure gold*, is found in several late books, but not in the Pentateuch.

פָּחָה, *governor*, is found eleven times in Nehemiah, seven times in Ezra, and also in Kings, Malachi, Ezekiel, Chronicles, Daniel, and Esther. If any considerable portion of the Pentateuch had been written about the time of the Babylonian captivity, is it not likely that this word would have been found in it?

פָּרָה, *a male mule*, is found *fifteen times* in the books of 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Isaiah, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Psalms. פָּרָהָה, *a she mule*, is found three times in 1 Kings. But neither of these words occurs in the Pentateuch. Is it not, then, in

the highest degree probable that this hybrid had no existence when the Pentateuch was written, or, at least, was not known in the regions of Egypt¹ and Palestine?

צָבִי, *beauty, splendor*, is not found in the Pentateuch, but occurs in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, 2 Samuel, and Daniel.

צַחַק, *tsahhaq, to laugh, to make sport of*, occurs twelve times in Genesis, once in Exodus, once in Judges, and once in Ezekiel, but nowhere else. Instead of this the later writers use a word easier to pronounce, שַׁחַק, *sahhaq*, the צ (*ts*) being exchanged for ש (*s*).

צִעַק, *tsa'aq, to cry out*, is found seventy-two times in the Old Testament. Of these instances twenty-six are in the Pentateuch; the other form, זִעַק, *za'aq* (the initial letter of which is more easily pronounced), is used instead of צִעַק in the Pentateuch only twice, but in the later books eighty-nine times.

צִפּוֹרִי, *a he goat*, is used in the Hebrew portion of Ezra as well as in the Chaldee, in 2 Chron. xxix, 21, and in Daniel. It is found nowhere else. But in the Pentateuch עֲהוֹר and שְׁעִיר are used for *he goat*; the latter word for the goat of the sin offering in Lev. ix, 3, etc., in the same sense that Ezra uses צִפּוֹרִי. If Ezra wrote the middle books of the Pentateuch, how is it that he did not insert for *he goat* the word which he uses in his own book?

קָבַל, *to receive*, is found in Ezra, Proverbs, Job, Chronicles, and Esther, but not in the Pentateuch. It is evidently from the Chaldee.

קָהָה *to be dull, to be blunted*, is found only in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Ecclesiastes.

קִיַּן, *to lament*, and קִינָה, *lamentation*, is found several times in Ezekiel and in some other books, but nowhere in the Pentateuch.

קָלַע, *a curtain*, occurs eleven times in Exodus, and twice in Numbers, but nowhere else.

קָשַׁב, *to listen*, in Kal conjugation, Isaiah xxxii, 3, and Hiphil, *to attend, to hearken*, occurs seven times in Isaiah, seven times in Jeremiah, once in Hosea, once in Micah, twice in Zechariah, six times in the Psalms, eight times in Proverbs, twice in Chronicles, once in Malachi, once in Nehemiah, twice in Job, once in 1 Samuel, once in Canticles, and once in Daniel. Now, as the precept *to hearken, to give heed*, occurs often in the Pentateuch, it is in the highest degree probable that if any considerable portion of the Pentateuch had been written in the period B. C. 700-400, it would have contained this

¹ A painting on an Egyptian tomb in the time of the eighteenth dynasty represents two white mules. Wilkinson's Egypt, by Birch, vol. i, p. 237.

word. Clearly, the word came into use after the Pentateuch was written.

רְגָלִים, plural of רֶגֶל, *foot*, signifies *times* in Exod. xxiii, 14; Num. xxii, 28, 32, and nowhere else. The word in general use to express *times*, is פְּעָמִים, (*beats*).

שָׂאֵן, and שָׂאֲנָן, *to be secure, careless*, are not in the Pentateuch, but are found in eight of the later books.

שָׂאֵר, *to gape after*, is not in the Pentateuch, but in several of the later books.

שָׂרָה, *leaven*, is found only in the Pentateuch.

שִׁכְבָּה, *effusion*, occurs in the Pentateuch alone.

שָׂוֵא is used six times in Exodus and Deuteronomy, in the sense of falsehood—the only books of the Pentateuch in which it occurs; but in the later books it also occurs in the sense of *vanity*.

שֹׁמֵר, in the sense *diamond*, occurs in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, but not in the Pentateuch.

שֵׁשׁ, *fine cotton*, the Egyptian *shensh*, is found twenty-two times in the Pentateuch, and elsewhere but seven times. For this material, בּוּץ, *byssus*, is used in Ezek. xxvii, 16, four times in the Book of Chronicles, and twice in Esther, but never in the Pentateuch. The word is of Aramæan and late origin. Had the middle books of the Pentateuch been written after the captivity, it would certainly have contained this word.

תַּחֲרוֹת, *a coat of mail*, occurs only in Exod. xxviii, 32; xxxix, 23. In the later books a different word, שָׂרְיוֹן, or שָׂרִיָּן, occurring eight times, is used, and שָׂרִיָּה in the Book of Job.

On the use of ל, with nouns after verbs, Gesenius remarks: "Sometimes Hebrew writers, especially the later ones, who inclined to Chaldaism, employ ל (the sign of the dative) incorrectly after active verbs *for the accusative*, as in Chaldee, Syriac, and Ethiopic; for example, לִקְחָ לְ, Jer. xl, 20; אֲכַל לְ, Lam. iv, 5; הָרַג לְ, Job v, 2; compare 1 Chron. xvi, 37; xxv, 1; Psa. cxxxv, 11, etc. [where the same construction occurs]. Of such construction we know nothing in the Pentateuch.

מֵאָה, *a hundred*, in its regular position stands before the noun in the singular, as, מֵאָה שָׁנָה, *a hundred year* (for years). "Rarely, and only in the later books, is מֵאָה put after a noun plural, as רְפוּגִים מֵאָה, 2 Chron. iii, 16; compare iv, 8; Ezra ii, 69; viii, 26," [in which the same construction is found].

אֵיָה, *a cubit*, is placed after numbers above ten in the earlier Hebrew, but in the later we have also the plural *cubits* after large numbers, as Ezek. xlii, 2; 2 Chron. iii, 4.¹

In Ezekiel we find Chaldee plurals, חֲטָיִם, *wheat* (iv, 9), יְאִיִּם, *islands* (xxvi, 18); Chaldee infinitives, as מְשֹׁאֵי כִנְרֹשׁ (xxxvi, 5; xvii, 9).

In Jeremiah there is one verse in Chaldee, and in Ezra there are whole sections in the same language.

Taking into consideration all the peculiarities that distinguish the Pentateuch from the books of the Bible written during or after the Babylonian captivity, it seems to us clearly impossible that any part of the Pentateuch could have been written during either of those periods.

In this view we have the support of the great Hebrew lexicographer, Gesenius, who belonged to the rationalistic school. In the last edition² of his Hebrew Grammar, published a short time before his death, he remarks: "The Old Testament writings which belong to this second period, B. C. 536-160, and in all of which this Chaldee coloring appears, although in different degrees, are, the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther; the prophetic books of Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; of the poetic books, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and the later Psalms."³ "In the Book of Job, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are found decided approaches to the Chaldaizing language of the [this] second period."⁴ He places the Pentateuch in the first period of Hebrew literature.⁵

INTERNAL EVIDENCE THAT THE PENTATEUCH IS OLDER THAN ANY OTHER PART OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In the preceding discussion a considerable part of the linguistic arguments that we adduced indicated not only that no portion of the Pentateuch could be of as late origin as the Babylonian captivity, but also that the Pentateuch is older than any other part of the Old Testament. That this is really the case can be made clear from the *archaisms* that pervade the whole Pentateuch.

The pronoun הוּא, *hu* (*he*), throughout the Pentateuch is used as common gender, and occurs one hundred and ninety-seven times as feminine, *she* or *it*. It is used for the feminine fifty-seven times in Genesis, eleven times in Exodus, sixty-six times in Leviticus, twenty-seven times in Num-

¹ See Gesenius, sub voc., אֵיָה.

² Thirteenth, published at Leipzig, 1842.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 9, German edition.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 7. We shall give his views on the Pentateuch more fully hereafter.

bers, and thirty-six times in Deuteronomy.¹ The feminine pronoun for *she* is הִיא, *hī*. This latter form is everywhere used in the Hebrew Bible for the feminine,² except in the Pentateuch, where it occurs only eleven times, its place being supplied, as we have already stated, by the masculine הוּא, *hu*. The feminine form, הִיא, *hi*, occurs three times in Genesis, in Exodus not at all, six times in Leviticus, twice in numbers, and not once in Deuteronomy. The feminine form, הִיא, *hī*, occurs twenty-nine times in Joshua, but הוּא, *hu*, never as feminine. In the Book of Judges, הִיא, *hi*, feminine, occurs twenty-two times, but הוּא, *hu*, never as feminine. The Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic have distinct forms.³ אֵל, *these*, occurs at least eight times in the Pentateuch, but nowhere else except in 1 Chron. xx, 8, taken, doubtless, from the Pentateuch. הַלְלוּהָ, *this*, occurs *twice* in Genesis only.

The Hebrew word for *boy* is נֶעַר, *naar*; feminine נַעֲרָה, *naarah*, girl. The masculine, נֶעַר, *naar*, is used for the feminine twenty-one times in the Pentateuch, eight times of them being in Genesis, and thirteen in Deuteronomy. The feminine form, נַעֲרָה, *naarah*, occurs but once in the whole Pentateuch, and that in Deuteronomy. Outside of the Pentateuch, the masculine singular is never used for the feminine. The masculine plural, נַעֲרִים, is thought to be used for the feminine in Ruth ii, 21 (Gesenius and Fürst); and to include young men and maidens, in Job i, 19.

שָׁרַץ, as a verb, *to creep*, or, as a noun, שָׂרָץ, *a creeping thing*, occurs twenty-six times in the Pentateuch, and is distributed through all the books, except Numbers. Elsewhere it occurs but twice, once in Psalm cv, 30, as an indirect quotation, in speaking of the plagues

¹ We have carefully counted these instances from personal inspection. The number is greater than we made it in first edition.

² Gesenius (Heb. Lex.) remarks that הוּא, *hu*, is used for the feminine in three passages outside of the Pentateuch, namely, 1 Kings xvii, 15; Job xxxi, 11; Isa. xxx, 33. But these passages do not really form an exception to our statement, since in the first passage the Hebrew is evidently transposed: וְהָאֵל הוּא וְהִיא, *she and he did eat*. The Massora has corrected this by putting the feminine form first and the masculine second in the margin to be read. The passage in Job is הוּא וְהִיא הִיא הוּא. Here the masculine pronoun is used with a feminine noun, and a feminine pronoun with a masculine noun. The Massora has corrected this in the margin, and properly arranged the words. The Massora regards the passage in Isaiah as an error, and has corrected it in the margin.

³ The same as in Chaldee הוּא, *hu*, הִיא, *hi*; Syriac, הוּא, *hu*, הִיא, *hi*; Arabic, هُوَ

of Egypt, and once in Ezek. xlvi, 9, which seems to be taken from Genesis. *אֵשָׁה*, *burnt offering, sacrifice*, is found nearly fifty times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, but nowhere else. Its plural is used sixteen times, and almost entirely in Leviticus and Numbers. Out of the Pentateuch it occurs but twice. *כֶּבֶשׂ*, for *כַּבֵּשׂ*, *a lamb*, occurs thirteen times in all the books of the Pentateuch except Numbers. Elsewhere it does not occur. The feminine form, *כֶּשֶׁבָה*, is found once in Leviticus. *גִּזְלָה*, *a young bird*, occurs nowhere in the Bible, except once in Genesis and once in Deuteronomy. *זָכָר*, for *male*, occurs only in Exod. xxiii, 17; xxxiv, 23, and Deut. xvi, 16; xx, 13. In the first three passages the word occurs in the command that all the males should appear three times a year before Jehovah, but in the last passage the subject is entirely different, and shows that the Deuteronomist was not using the word, though antiquated, merely because he was repeating the words of an old law. *חַיִּים*, *a living thing*, is found twice in Genesis and once in Deuteronomy, and nowhere else. *נְקִיבָה*, *female*, is found twenty-one times in all the books of the Pentateuch, except Exodus. Elsewhere it is met with but once, in Jeremiah. *סִנְיָה*, *thorn bush*, occurs four times in Exodus and once in Deuteronomy, and nowhere else. *נֶאֱסַף אֶל עַמּוּיוֹ*, *to be gathered to one's people*, occurs in Genesis, Numbers, and in Deuteronomy. Elsewhere it is not found.¹

Some of the most important of these archaisms occur in those parts of the Pentateuch regarded by the impugners of its genuineness as the most recent, as well as in those portions acknowledged to be primitive.

“The Pentateuch,” says Gesenius, “certainly contains some linguistic peculiarities which have the appearance of archaisms. The words *הוּא*, *he*, and *נֶעַר*, *young man*, are still common gender, and stand also for *she, young woman* (about as the old [German] *Gemahl* (husband) for *Gemahlin* (wife); and certain harder forms,”²) etc.

Now, it may be asked, In what way do those who deny the unity and genuineness of the Pentateuch dispose of its archaisms? Bleek admits them, but thinks that other considerations outweigh them.³ But we regard such archaisms as we find in the Pentateuch to be an irresistible proof that the entire Pentateuch is older than any other

¹ A very similar phrase occurs in Judg. ii, 10, and 2 Kings xxii, 20: “*to gather one to his fathers.*”

² Thirteenth edition of his Hebrew Grammar. Leipzig, 1842, pp. 7, 8.

³ Einleitung, pp. 341, 342.

portion of the Old Testament, and also a probable proof of the unity of the whole of it. Schrader, in his additions to De Wette's Introduction,¹ attributes them to "*a revision of the text for the sake of producing uniformity.*" This view is wholly untenable. A revision that changes usual and modern forms into antiquated ones for the sake of uniformity would be unnatural. For the natural tendency of a revision is to change the most ancient forms into modern ones, which was done in the Samaritan Pentateuch, where the most important archaisms were changed into modern forms; for example, אֵל into אֱלֹהִים; נָעַר in every instance into נַעֲרָה; הוּא into הִיא, when the feminine gender² was to be indicated.

Nor can we believe that the author of Deuteronomy, on the supposition that he was not Moses, but belonged to a quite late age, would have inserted archaisms in order to make the work uniform with the preceding books of the Pentateuch. For Deuteronomy is written in a spirit so free and independent that its author has been charged with contradicting the statements of the other books; certainly he does not slavishly follow them by giving historical events exactly as the preceding books do; and some of the laws of the other books are modified in this. If the author of Deuteronomy did not conform to the other parts of the Pentateuch in important matters, why should he have accommodated himself to them in minor ones, that is, those of verbal form?

The archaisms of the Pentateuch not only furnish confirmatory proof of its unity, but give the strongest evidence of its high antiquity, showing it to be the oldest writing of the Old Testament—older than even the Book of Joshua. For הוּא, *hu*, is common gender all through the Pentateuch, meaning *he* or *she*; but in the Book of Joshua the distinct feminine form, הִיא, *hi*, *she*, is invariably used for the feminine, occurring twenty-nine times.³ This is important, for it separates the authorship of the Book of Joshua from that of the Pentateuch, which some deniers of the genuineness of the latter refuse to do, and so get rid of the important independent testimony furnished by the Book of Joshua to the Pentateuch. But the Book of Joshua contains internal evidence of

¹ P. 87, Berlin, 1869.

² We have found *one* instance in which the old form, הוּא, is allowed to stand for the feminine; but this is in all probability a mistake of some transcriber.

³ נָעַר, *boy* or *girl*, in the Pentateuch, occurs but once in the Book of Joshua, and as masculine. Joshua had but little need of it, nor does the feminine form, נַעֲרָה, occur in it.

having been written before the reign of David, for it is stated (Josh. xv, 63) that the children of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem, "but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day;" that is, when the book was written. But David drove them out (2 Sam. v, 6, 7). The archaisms of the Pentateuch prove something more than its high antiquity. They furnish the most striking proof that the volume of Moses has come down to us in its original form.

The two propositions on the antiquity of the Pentateuch which we have discussed are entirely independent of its use and authority. Had it been buried or forgotten from the time of Moses until Ezra, the argument for its antiquity would not be affected.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PROBABILITY THAT MOSES, AS LEGISLATOR, WOULD HAVE WRITTEN HIS LAWS, AND ALSO THE ANNALS OF THE HEBREWS.

IT may be taken for granted that Moses was the great legislator of the Hebrews, since the proof is so strong that it may be said to have hardly ever been questioned. All the writings of the Jews, and their oldest traditions, agree that Moses was their lawgiver; and the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans held the same view. Manetho, an Egyptian priest of Sebennytus, a man of great erudition, who wrote in Greek, about B. C. 300, the Egyptian History from their sacred writings, states that the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Amenophis, and that their leader, a priest of Heliopolis, by name Osarsiphus—whose name was changed to *Moses* after he went over to the Israelites—*gave them laws*, for the most part contrary to the customs of Egypt, enjoining upon them not to worship the gods, nor to abstain from those animals held sacred in Egypt, but to sacrifice and slaughter them all.¹ King Amenophis (Amunoph) is placed by Wilkinson at B. C. 1498–1478. Manetho's History of the Dynasties has been remarkably confirmed by the monuments of Egypt. Strabo, the great Greek geographer (*about B. C. 65), in speaking of the Jews, remarks: "Moses, one of the Egyptian priests, possessing a part of Lower Egypt, left there, being disgusted with the existing institutions, and many, honouring

Independent
testimony con-
cerning Moses.

¹ In Josephus against Apion, liber i, 460, 461.

the Divinity, left with him. For he said and taught that the Egyptians have not just conceptions of the Divine nature in representing it by beasts and cattle; nor have the Lybians; nor have the Greeks who represent it by human forms. For that only is God which embraces us all, both land and sea."¹

The Roman satirist Juvenal (about A. D. 100) speaks of "the law, all which Moses delivered in the sacred volume."² "Moses," says Tacitus,³ "gave the Jewish nation new rites contrary to those of other men."

Writing, as we have already seen, was extensively practised in Egypt long before the age of Moses. The oldest of the sacred books of Thoth were composed at least as early as the building of the great pyramid.⁴ These books were partly of a religious and partly of a scientific character; or, rather, they constituted a system of natural and revealed theology. They passed as a revelation. The Egyptians "had a grand code of laws and jurisprudence, known as the celebrated Eight Books of Hermes (Thoth), which it was incumbent on those high priests

Laws and other records among the Egyptians.

called 'prophets' to be thoroughly versed in, and which the king, who held that office, was also required and entitled to know."⁵ The great conqueror, Sesostris, published laws respecting the army. The ancient Mnevis is said to have published laws which he pretended were the commands of Thoth. The proceedings in the courts were conducted in writing. Near the judge lay the eight books of law; the plaintiff was compelled to present his demand in writing, with an exact statement of the attendant facts.⁶ Contracts were made in writing; also terms of sale and service, where with us an oral agreement would be sufficient. This was the custom in the time of the eighteenth dynasty, B. C. 1500. The priests wrote down the succession of their kings, and engraved on stone the pious and memorable deeds of their ancestors. They also wrote annals of the achievements of their kings, and preserved them in the archives of the temples. Instructive histories from their annals were read to their kings. The priests of On (Heliopolis) enjoyed the reputation of having the greatest knowledge of history.⁷ The number of books possessed by the ancient Egyptians was great. Books were gathered and piled up in the temples and in the graves of their kings. In Memphis there was a book temple in the sanctuary of Pthah. In Karnak, on the

¹ Liber xvi, 760, 761.

² Jus tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses.—Liber xiv, 101, 102.

³ Hist., liber v, 4.

⁴ Wuttke, 557.

⁵ Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of Ancient Egyptians, etc., vol. ii, p. 226.

⁶ Wuttke, 574, 575.

⁷ Wuttke, Geschichte der Schrift, u. s. w., p. 570.

monument of Osymandoa, the great King Rameses I. (who, according to Seyffarth, was born B. C. 1730), there is found at Tepe a consecrated collection of books with the superscription, "Institute for the Cure of Souls." Champollion discovered a library hall, the origin of which he places in the sixteenth century before Christ.

The preserved remains of the written monuments of Egypt are so numerous that they surpass in number those of the Greeks and Romans. They consist of many thousands of rolls of papyrus and of inscriptions on stone. The Arabian physician and historian, Abdallatif, who wrote about A. D. 1200, assures us in his Memorials of Egypt, that if one could translate into a book merely the writings found on the two largest pyramids, the translation would fill about ten thousand leaves.¹

With the foregoing facts before us, the probability is strong that Moses must have written his laws for the Hebrews; and the supposition is reasonable that he wrote the annals of the Hebrews of his own age, and of the age of his ancestors. There is no ground for the theory of those rationalists who hold that Moses wrote little or nothing. We have already seen that, according to Manetho, the Egyptian priest and historian, Moses was originally a priest of Heliopolis, a town already in existence about B. C. 2000, as the single obelisk standing in the center of the ruins of the ancient city, bearing the name of Osirtasen I., clearly shows. "It may be regarded as the university of the land of Misraim: its priests from the most remote epochs were the great depositaries of theological and historical learning; and it was of sufficient political importance to furnish ten deputies, or one third of the whole number, to the great council which assisted the Pharaohs in the administration of justice." Herodotus remarks that the inhabitants of Heliopolis were regarded as the most learned of the Egyptians;² and Strabo informs us that they pointed out to him the residences of Plato and Eudoxus, who remained thirteen years with the priests.³

Accustomed to law books in Egypt, and being educated in the most learned city, whose priests were especially devoted to historical investigations, and where he had often seen the annals of Egyptian kings, it would be strange, indeed, if, as a lawgiver, Moses should write no laws, and if with all his learning he should not do for his ancestors and contemporaries what the Egyptian priests had done for their countrymen, namely, give written history. During a period of forty years he had ample opportunity to write his laws and the annals of the Hebrew people. If Julius Cæsar could write seven books of Commentaries on the Gallic Wars, half the size of the Pen-

¹ Wuttke, *Geschichte der Schrift*, u. s. w., p. 573. ² Liber ii, 3. ³ Liber xvii, 29.

tateuch, in the midst of his campaigns, which lasted nine years, surely Moses, notwithstanding his numerous official duties, might write twice as much in forty years.

Mohammed, too, the great Arabic legislator, wrote down his system in the Koran, which is about the size of the Pentateuch, during the period of twenty-three years, the last half of which was spent in numerous wars. Moreover, writing was but little used in Arabia before Mohammed's time.

Zaleucus, the celebrated Locrian lawgiver, *wrote* his laws (B. C. 660); and so did the distinguished Athenian lawgivers, Draco (B. C. 621) and Solon (B. C. 594).

But, further, a legislator in the position of Moses would have had the strongest reasons for writing his laws. For many of his institutions were entirely new, and others were modifications of previously existing customs. A theology was to be inculcated wholly different from that of the idolatrous nations in close contact with the Hebrews, and the entire system was to be maintained in opposition to the public sentiment that everywhere prevailed. Without a written revelation, to which they could refer as a standard, and which would be a perpetual check to their idolatrous tendencies, there

would have been the greatest danger of the corruption of the system. What would have become of Christian-

Probability of
Moses writing
his laws.

ity itself if it had been handed down, for some centuries, by oral tradition only, instead of having been committed to writing in the first century?

CHAPTER XII.

THE STATEMENT OF THE PENTATEUCH RESPECTING ITS AUTHOR.

THAT Moses kept a record of his laws, and of the most important events of the journey through the Desert, appears from various passages in the Pentateuch. In Exodus xvii, 14 it is said, in reference to Amalek, "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in *the book* (not in a book, as in the English version), and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: For (that) I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." The inference to be drawn is, not that this writing was something unusual and exceptional, but that the statement might seem to be so unim-

portant that Moses would not think it necessary to write it in his book; for no one will pretend that Moses wrote every event of the Exodus. He was to write it in the book of laws and records for permanency and emphasis. In Exodus xxiv, 3, 4, it is stated: "And Moses came and told the people all the words of Jehovah and all the judgments, . . . and Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah, . . . And he took (the) book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people." The book here referred to contained, evidently, *all* the laws and precepts hitherto given to the people. Again, in Numbers xxxiii, 2, we read: "And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the command of Jehovah."

The following commandment we find in Deuteronomy xvii, 18, 19: "And it shall be when he (the king) sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear Jehovah his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them."

Reference is also made to the book of the law in Deuteronomy xxviii, 61: "Also every sickness and every plague which is not written in *the book of this law*;" also in chap. xxix, 20, 21, 27: "All the curses that are written in this book;" "All the curses of the covenant that are written in this book of the law;" "To bring upon it all the curses that are written in this book."

Again: "If thou shalt hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in *this book*" (Deut. xxx, 10). "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee" (Deut. xxxi, 24-26).

There is nothing strange in the mention of the book of the law in the book itself; the fact has its analogy in other writings. Thus, in the Korân of Mohammed we have the Korân named: "They to whom we have given the book (of the Korân);" "Teach them the book (of the Korân);" "The month of Ramadân (shall ye fast), in which the Korân was sent down;" "This Korân could not have been composed by any except God;"¹ "Verily if men and genii were purposely assembled that they might produce a book like this Korân, they could not produce one like unto it. . . .

The Korân.

¹ Sale's Korân, chap. ii, chap. x.

And we have variously propounded unto men in this Korân every kind of figurative argument ;” and, “ We send down of the Korân that which is a medicine and a mercy unto the true believers.” In other passages are similar allusions.¹ Jesus the son of Sirach, the author of one of the books of the Apocrypha, inserts his own name, near the end of the last chapter but one of his work : “ I, Jesus, the son of Sirach of Jerusalem, have inscribed in this book instruction in wisdom and knowledge.”

The statements in the Pentateuch respecting its authorship are in every way worthy of credit. If the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, it is a forgery. The most of the declarations respecting the Mosaic authorship are found in Deuteronomy.² If Moses did not write that book, then it is a wicked fraud, and not “ an innocent fiction,” as it has been called. The unity of the Pentateuch has been pointed out, and in another place we will show that it belongs to the Mosaic age, so that the declarations in the book itself respecting its authorship apply to the *whole* book.

It is objected that Moses, throughout the Pentateuch, is spoken of in the *third* person : “ Jehovah said unto Moses.” But this usage is no real objection to the Mosaic authorship, as can be shown from many analogies. Julius Cæsar, in his Commentaries on the Gallic Wars, always speaks of himself in the third person, and it is impossible to ascertain from the phraseology whether he wrote the work or not. Xenophon, in the Anabasis, speaks of himself in the third person : “ There was in the army a certain Athenian, Xenophon, who accompanied the army neither as a general nor a captain nor a private soldier ; but Proxenos, an old acquaintance, had sent for him.” (Book iii, cap. i.) The same form of speaking occurs in numerous other places. Likewise in the Memorabilia (i, cap. iii, § 9) he speaks of himself in the third person : “ Tell me, Xenophon, he said,” etc. “ And Xenophon replied.” Josephus, in his Jewish Wars, speaks of himself invariably³ in the third person, as for example : “ Josephus, the son of Matthias, is appointed governor of the two Galilees,”⁴ and “ it was reported that Josephus died at the capture⁵ (of the town).”

In Cæsar’s Commentaries, Xenophon’s Anabasis, and in the Jewish Wars of Josephus, the authors were prominent actors in the history they were writing, and they viewed themselves as a part of

¹ Sale’s Korân, chap. xvii.

² Bleek admits that Deut. xxxi, 9, probably attributes the whole of our Pentateuch to Moses. Einleitung, p. 308.

³ I have used the word “ invariably,” for I find no passage in the Wars in which he speaks of himself in the first person.

⁴ Liber ii, cap. xx, 4.

⁵ Liber iii, cap. ix, 5.

that history of which they were both the historians and spectators. In the same way Moses, as the lawgiver and leader of the Jewish people, is the principal character in the whole history, and as a historian he considers himself to be an objective part of the story he is narrating, and, consequently, speaks of himself in the third person.

It has been thought by some that the passage, "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth" (Num. xii, 3), is not such language as a writer would use in reference to himself. But the Hebrew word מֵיָדָוּ, rendered here "meek" by our translators, is thus defined by Gesenius: "*oppressed, afflicted, wretched*, but every-where with the accessory idea of humility, meekness; i. e., *the humble, the meek*, who prefer to suffer wrong rather than do wrong." (Heb. Lex.) Miriam and Aaron had spoken against Moses on account of the Ethiopian woman [Cushite, Midianite] whom he had married; and they said, Hath the LORD spoken only by Moses? hath he not also spoken by us? And the LORD heard it, and his anger was kindled against them, and Miriam became leprous. The object of the statement respecting Moses' meekness is, apparently, to show that no one was farther removed

Meekness of from a revengeful spirit than himself, and that the punishment inflicted upon Miriam was not through any resentment on his part. Perhaps an additional object was to show that Miriam and Aaron presumed to speak against Moses *because he would not avenge an insult*. There are times when men of the greatest modesty and humility can speak in the strongest terms in self-vindication and self-commendation: it is when they feel that gross injustice has been done them, and that their very virtues have furnished the occasion for their bad treatment. Under such circumstances there is a tendency to use language stronger than calm reason would justify, and stronger than even personal friends would employ. Was there ever a more egotistical speech made than that of Demosthenes De Corona? The occasion required it. St. Paul was unquestionably a man of profound humility. He styles himself "less than the least of all saints." (Eph. iii, 8.) But in spite of this utterance he declares on another occasion: "For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles," (2 Cor. xi, 5). Could

Apparent inconsistencies in Paul's statements. we believe, if we had not the facts before us, that such apparently contradictory statements could proceed from the same man? But the strong language of self-commendation was called forth in vindication of his apostolic character when that was assailed. How absurd is Dr. Davidson's exposition of this passage, that *false* apostles are here referred to!

In cases like the present, criticism should be careful not to go beyond proper bounds in determining from the critic's own subjective feelings, which vary in different individuals, what a man would say—in seeking utterances at variance with its standard of propriety, and in denying that they were ever spoken at all. This is, in the language of Merivale on another subject, “the last resource of the morbid skepticism which cannot suffer any author to say more or less than harmonizes with its own gratuitous canons of historical criticism.”¹

In the first verse of the thirty-third chapter of Deuteronomy we have the following statement: “And this is the blessing wherewith Moses, the man of God, blessed the children of Israel.” There is no more necessity of referring this to Moses than there is of attributing to him the superscription of the ninetieth Psalm: “A prayer of Moses, the man of God.” The thirty-second chapter closes with the command of God to Moses to get up unto Mount Nebo and die there, which properly finishes the book and the career of Moses. The superscription to the thirty-third chapter is given to mark definitely that it belongs to him, and to distinguish it from the next chapter, the last, which records his death, and belongs to a later hand.

Against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch it is urged by De Wette that “it is nonsense to suppose that one man should have created the epic-historical, rhetorical, and poetic styles of writing in their whole extent, the three departments of Hebrew literature in substance and spirit, and have left succeeding writers nothing to do but to follow him.”² In this statement there is a want of historical accuracy, and a narrow view of the possible powers of the human mind. Moses was not the creator of poetry, nor of his-
Answer to the charges of De Wette.

torical writing. Poetry³ was in use among the ancient Egyptians; and the ancient priests of Heliopolis,⁴ where Moses was educated, were distinguished for their historical investigations. Poetical compositions are generally the first literary productions of a people, as we see among the Hindoos and Greeks. In the Pentateuch reference is made to those who speak in proverbs, הַכֹּזְבִיבִים, (*the poets*), Num. xxi, 27; “Israel sang this song,” xxi, 17. Thus it is evident that it was not Moses alone who possessed the poetic spirit. All the poetry attributed to him in the Pentateuch amounts to only three or four chapters, and it is not of that lofty style which characterizes Isaiah, nor has it all the fullness of the Psalms. The historical portions of the Pentateuch are marked by great simplicity,

¹ Remarks on the Genuineness of Cæsar's Commentaries on the Civil Wars.—History of the Romans under the Empire, vol. ii, p. 209, note.

² Einleitung, p. 268. ³ Wuttke, Geschichte der Schrift, p. 571. ⁴ Ibid., 570.

by an entire want of art, and abound in repetitions. Thus it is far from being true that Moses "left succeeding writers nothing to do but to follow him."

Moses was certainly a man of great intellectual power, and the variety of his gifts can be determined only by history. Nor is history deficient in parallels to Moses, so far as the gifts of genius are concerned. Julius Cæsar was a truly wonderful man. "He was at one and the same time a general, a statesman, a lawgiver, a jurist, an orator, a poet, an historian, a philologist, a mathematician, and an architect. He was equally fitted to excel in all, and has given proofs that he would have surpassed almost all other men in any subject to which he devoted the energies of his extraordinary mind."¹

The *natural* endowments of Cæsar seem to have been greater than those of Moses. Will the narrow criticism of De Wette reject the history of Cæsar as unhistoric, and banish it to the regions of the mythical?

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

THE Fifth Book of Moses is placed by some of the opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch as late as King Manasseh or Josiah, and it is sometimes represented as contradicting parts of the previous history and legislation. The book is undoubtedly written in a free and independent spirit, not with a slavish adherence to what precedes. This, however, is by no means an argument against its Mosaic authorship, but rather in favour of it; for who would be bold enough to deviate in any degree in such a work from the Mosaic history and laws? But this does not go to the root of the matter, for Deuteronomy professes to be written by Moses; and if it is not his work it is an impious fraud, and must have been executed under circumstances of peculiar difficulty. For a Mosaic code of laws had (on this hypothesis)

¹Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, art. Cæsar.

been already long in existence, and been recognised as his, and used by David and quoted by the Prophets. Can we, for a moment, suppose that a newly written book, attributed to Moses, could have so deceived the whole Jewish people as to be regarded as his real production, his final legislation, and his farewell address? Of all forged writings, codes of laws are the most difficult to execute with success, for they are matters of the greatest notoriety and of public interest; while writings of a private character, but little known and of little public interest, may be greatly enlarged by forgery. But the addition of Deuteronomy to the long well known code of the law of Moses was clearly impossible. No one in his senses could believe that such a document, originating with Moses, had been buried for five or eight centuries, especially when it is ordered that when "he [the king] sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites" (xvii, 18); and "when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing" (xxxi, 11). Further: "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi" (xxxi, 9). Can it be supposed that a book thus submitted to the Levites by Moses, and ordered to be read at one of the great festivals at the end of every seven years, and of which the king was to obtain a copy for his guidance, should be absolutely unknown for so many centuries? For if this was incredible to the ancient Hebrews, they could never have believed that the newly-forged book was written by Moses. Imagine the effect that would have been produced in the Christian Church if a fifth gospel, bearing the name of Peter or James, had been forged five or eight centuries after Christ! With what contempt it would have been treated! And it is expressly enjoined in this book: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it" (iv, 2). A similar prohibition is made in xii, 32.

The Book of Deuteronomy bears the stamp of Moses in both its narrative and legislative parts; and its exhortations also suit Moses in a striking manner. In a brief recapitulation of the history of the Israelites Moses moves with great ease and freedom, supplying incidents not found in the previous history. A forger would not have ventured upon this, but would have made up his sketch from known incidents; nor would he have dared to depart in any degree from the Mosaic legislation lying before him.

Respecting this book, Bleek remarks: "It cannot escape the attentive reader that the legislation in Deuteronomy differs greatly

from the earlier books, in language, representation, in its entire tone, in the hortative, warning, and threatening character pervading the whole book, and leads to the supposition of a different author from the editor of the other books."¹ This is an exaggerated statement; but that it should be partially true is natural. Is not Washington's Farewell Address different from his messages to Congress? Is not a pastor's farewell discourse different from his ordinary sermons? Are we so well acquainted with Moses as to be able to know accurately the style and language he would employ, what he would say, and what he would not? So far is this from being true that we do not know in most cases what we ourselves would say under given circumstances. It is a narrow and overweening criticism that undertakes to determine what a writer or speaker should express on any given occasion, and, finding the style and expressions different from what was to be expected, declares the utterances spurious. In different circumstances and on different subjects the style of the same speaker or writer is often found to vary. Sometimes is this so much the case that the address or writing would, on internal grounds, be pronounced spurious if its genuineness were not established by undoubted external evidence.

The blessings which Moses declares shall come upon the Israelites if they are obedient, and the curses that are to overtake them if they shall prove to be disobedient, are detailed at length in Deuteronomy chap. xxviii. In Leviticus xxvi, 3-45, we have similar prophecies of the blessings and curses which may fall upon the Israelites, so that in this respect there is not the slightest pretext for pretending that Deuteronomy is different from Leviticus. The resemblance is so strong between the two chapters that Bleek² declares that the author of Deuteronomy wrote the chapter in Leviticus.³ This is, no doubt, true, but not in Bleek's sense.

In regard to the language of Deuteronomy, we have already remarked that the archaisms peculiar to the first four books of the Pentateuch run through this book. In Deuteronomy, as well as in Numbers, Jericho everywhere has the form יִרְחוֹ; but in Joshua it is always יְרִיחוֹ, and in 1 Kings xvi, 34, the form יְרִיחָהּ is found. Horeb is used in several places in Deuteronomy, and Sinai but once (xxxiii, 2); but Horeb is also used in Exod. iii, 1, xvii, 6, xxxiii, 6; and it seems that the whole mountain was called Horeb, and a particular summit Sinai (so Robinson and Fürst); hence we have the expression פְּהָרֵי הֹרֵב in Horeb. Deut. i, 6

¹ Einleitung, p. 299.

² Einleitung, p. 312.

³ Dr. Davidson does not attribute Lev. xxvi, 3-45 to the author of Deuteronomy but thinks the chapter in Deuteronomy an echo of that in Leviticus.

Psalm cvi, 19. And the different meanings of the two words suit this view: Horeb, *waste, desert*; Sinai, *rocky, jagged*. In the nineteenth of Exodus Mount Sinai is spoken of as if it were a single summit. But when Moses had reached the plains of Moab the single summit had receded, and the general range and name presented themselves to his view.

The stand-point of the author of Deuteronomy is evidently that of one in the position of Moses on the plains of Moab. In chap. xi, 30, it is stated respecting mountains Gerizim and Ebal: "Are they not on the other side Jordan, *by the way where the sun goeth down*, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains [Heb. *oaks*] of Moreh?" This language would be wholly unsuitable and false to one living in Palestine. According to Dr. Tristram, Ebal and Gerizim and the opening of the vale of Shechem¹ can be seen from the top of Nebo. And we have no doubt that from other high points beyond the Jordan, where Moses and the Israelites had been sojourning, the sun had been often seen to sink behind Ebal and Gerizim. To a writer living after the conquest of Canaan it was not at all necessary to state where Ebal and Gerizim are situated, for they are conspicuous mountains. The whole passage is decidedly Mosaic. The cities of refuge east of the Jordan are said to be toward the sunrising, which suits the position of Moses, but would suit Palestine equally well.

Moses, in Deuteronomy i, 7, 19, 20, speaks of the mountain of the Amorites (the central range of Palestine). Reference is made to this in Num. xiii, 29: "The Amorites dwell in the mountains." But in the Book of Joshua the range is already called "the mountain of Israel" (xi, 16). In Deut. iii, 11, mention is made of Og, king of Bashan, the remnant of the giants; "Behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man." This passage belongs most suitably to the Mosaic age, and could not have been written after the time of David, for we find in 2 Samuel xii, 26-31, that David took Rabbath of the children of Ammon, and destroyed the inhabitants, and got great spoil. Such an incident as this respecting the bedstead of Og would, in all probability, have faded away had it not been written down in the Mosaic age.

The declaration that a Moabite shall never enter the congregation of Jehovah (Deut. xxiii, 3) could not have been invented and attributed to Moses in the age of David, or subsequently, as King

¹ Land of Moab, p. 338.

David was the great-grandson of a Moabitess (Ruth iv). The prohibition that the future king should "not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses, forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way" (xvii, 16), was quite natural to Moses, who might fear that the Israelites would be tempted to return to Egypt. But centuries afterward, when the people had come to Canaan, there was no ground for this fear.

The precept not to abhor an Egyptian, "because thou wast a stranger in his land" (Deut. xxiii, 7), differs from similar precepts in the other books from its being special,—“an Egyptian,”—but it is very natural for Moses, who had left Egypt, to use it. In subsequent ages, however, other strangers had relations with Israel.

In Deut. xxviii, 68, it is said, "The Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships." From this Dr. Davidson infers that the passage was written after the Egyptians had become a highly commercial people, and, of course, long after Moses. But waiving the prophetic character of the passage, it does not say, in *Egyptian ships*. In the Mosaic age the Phœnicians, living on the borders of Palestine, were the great traders of the world. In chap. xxv, 17-19, special directions are given to blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven, when Jehovah shall have given Israel rest from their enemies, on the ground that he had smitten the hindmost of the Israelites when they were faint and weary. The charge is ended with the command: "Thou shalt not forget it." Both Saul and David gained victories over the Amalekites, and in the time of Hezekiah we find that five hundred men, sons of Simeon, went to Mount Seir, and "smote the rest of the Amalekites that were escaped, and dwelt there unto this day" (1 Chron. iv, 41-43). After this nothing more is heard of the Amalekites. How unnatural it would be for a writer, after they had been annihilated, to represent Jehovah as commanding the Israelites "to blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it."

In the blessings pronounced upon the tribes of Israel (ch. xxxiii) there is no indication that the prophetic utterances were made up at a later period from the history of the tribes and put into the mouth of Moses. The language is too indefinite. The blessing pronounced upon Benjamin can have no allusion to the extension of his border to Zion: "The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety by him; and the Lord shall cover him all the day long, and he shall dwell between his shoulders" (xxxiii, 12). But little is said respecting Judah; and this would be inexplicable in a prophecy

made up of Judah in the days of her kings. In Deut. xviii, 18, God promises to raise up a prophet (נָבִיא), the singular. If the passage had been written in the time of the prophets with reference to them, it strikes us that the plural, נְבִיאִים, would have been used.

The mention of the Zamzummin (Deut. ii, 20) indicates that the book was written at an early period, as they must soon have faded out of the minds of the Israelites.

The language in xi, 10, is extremely natural for one in the position of Moses: "For the land, whither thou goest in to possess it, is not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs." Respecting some of the details of the Israelitish history not found in the preceding books, from what source could the author of Deuteronomy have obtained them if he had written seven or eight hundred years after Moses? Are we to suppose that *minute* incidents in the Mosaic history, not incorporated into the first four books of the Pentateuch, had been floating about like sibylline leaves for centuries? It is incredible that there were historical sources for the Mosaic history outside of the first four books, on which the author of Deuteronomy could have drawn in the age of Josiah, or even in that of David. When Luke wrote his gospel many writings on the history of Christ had already appeared, but not a vestige of them is found in the second century. Two or three hundred years after Christ there was nothing authentic respecting him except what had been written in the apostolic age. And that age, too, was one of great literary activity, and the highest interest was felt in every thing pertaining to the Saviour. In the prophets, psalms, and historians of the Old Testament subsequently to the Mosaic age, the historical references to that period are taken from the Pentateuch, and from no other source.

If the historical additions to the Mosaic history that are given in Deuteronomy are not from Moses, they are pure inventions. The additions are the following: The repentance of the Israelites after they had been defeated by the Amorites, "And ye returned and wept before the Lord" (i, 45); the stay of the Israelites in Kadesh, "Ye abode in Kadesh many days" (i, 46); the command, "Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle: for I will not give thee of their land for a possession" (ii, 9); the divine command to cross the Arnon and to begin to possess the territory of King Sihon (ii, 24); and, what is more important, "the space in which we came from Kadesh-barnea, until we were come over the brook Zered, was thirty and eight

No floating traditions out of which Deuteronomy could be written.

Additions in Deuteronomy to Mosaic history.

years; until all the generation of the men of war were wasted away from among the host" (ii, 14). In ch. i, 44 it is stated that the Amorites chased the Israelites; while in Num. xiv, 45, the Amalekites and the Canaanites are said to have smitten them; but the Amorites are doubtless included in the Canaanites. In x, 1, 2, we have two separate commands (Exod. xxv, 10, 16; xxxiv, 1) blended into one: "At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest, and thou shalt put them into the ark." In the first-named passage in Exodus the Israelites were directed to make an ark, in which "thou shalt put the testimony which I shall give thee;" while in the second, Moses is directed to hew two tables of stone like the first. These passages were evidently brought together by Moses for brevity's sake.

The statement made by Moses respecting the appointment of judges (Deut. i, 9-18) occurs between the command to leave Horeb and the actual departure; and he speaks of their having been constituted "at that time." But in referring to Exod. xviii, it seems that Jethro advised their appointment when Moses was at the mount of God; yet they may not have been appointed immediately. Again, in Deut. x, 8, Moses states: "At that time Jehovah separated the tribe of Levi;" but the stations of the Israelites, named in the verses immediately preceding these words, had not been reached when the tribe of Levi was consecrated to God. But Moses adds: "And I stayed in the mount, according to the first time, forty days and forty nights; and Jehovah hearkened unto me at that time also, and Jehovah would not destroy thee. And Jehovah said unto me, Arise, take thy journey before the people, that they may go in and possess the land." It appears, then, that Deut. x, 6, 7, has no connexion with what follows.

In reciting the principal events of the history of the Israelites after they left Egypt, it is not to be expected that Moses should state the exact time of the incidents on which nothing depended; it is sufficient that he does not contradict the previous history. But it must be observed that thirty-eight years had elapsed since the events narrated in Exodus and in a considerable portion of Numbers. Under these circumstances considerable latitude must be given to the phrase "at that time," which seems to be used to indicate the comparatively short period intervening between the departure from Egypt and the arrival in Kadesh-barnea. For after thirty-eight years the incidents of

Exact time of incidents not to be expected in Deuteronomy.

the early wanderings in the desert seemed to Moses to have occurred, as it were, in a unit, or in one period of time.

Respecting the deviations between Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch, Dr. Davidson remarks: "We admit that there is no positive contradiction between them. This has been successfully made out by Stähelin and Von Lengerke."¹

Davidson—"No positive contradiction" can be shown.

Respecting the legislation in Deuteronomy, it is to be observed that it is partly affirmatory and partly supplementary; but hardly any part is revocatory. The ten commandments delivered by God from Mount Sinai (Exod. xx) are repeated substantially in Deut. v, 6-21, with a reference to their original delivery, "As Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee;" "And therefore, Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." The legislation in Deuteronomy evidently presupposes that of the preceding books. The supplementary legislation became necessary in some cases from the changes that were about to occur in the condition of the Israelites, in their transition from wandering in the desert to the possession of the land of Canaan. Of such a character are the directions for carrying on war (Deut. xx), and the command to set up stones on Mount Ebal and to write on them the words of the law, and to bless the people from Mount Gerizim and to pronounce curses from Mount Ebal.

Legislation in Deuteronomy.

The modifications of the preceding laws are few. In Leviticus xvii, 4-9, the children of Israel are commanded to offer sacrifice only at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. But in Deut. xii, and in other passages, they are ordered, when they shall have entered the land of Canaan, to offer sacrifice only in the place "which Jehovah shall choose in one of thy tribes."

The prohibition against lending to poor Israelites upon usury (Exod. xxii, 25, Lev. xxv, 36, 37) is expressed in general terms: "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother: usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of any thing that is lent upon usury." And it is added: "Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury" (Deut. xxiii, 19, 20). It does not appear that this precept not to lend on usury to the Israelites is a revocation of the similar ones in Exodus and Leviticus not to lend to the *poor* Israelite upon usury. For it would be the poor who would most likely borrow, as corporations, and large business establishments requiring capital, were unknown. Indeed the precept is based upon the principle of benevolence, and no one would feel himself bound to lend to the rich. In Lev. xxv, 35-37, it is said: "If thy brother be waxen poor,

¹ Introduction, vol. i, p. 367.

and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him, or increase: . . . Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase." This is evidently a command to lend to the poor Israelite without interest; but in Deuteronomy there is no command to lend at all.

In Deut. xvi, 16, it is enjoined that "three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose." This command, with the exception of the last clause, is a repetition of that in Exodus xxiii, 14, 17, and xxxiv, 23. The children of Israel are directed to bring their sacrifices to the place which Jehovah shall choose out of all the tribes to put his name there, and in that place only to offer their burnt offerings (Deut. xii). It is given with special reference to their abode in Canaan (chap. xii, 1), while that in Lev. xvii, 3-5, to offer the sacrifices only at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, refers to the sojourn in the desert.

Dr. Davidson thinks, that by the expression in Deuteronomy, "the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there," Jerusalem, and not the place where the tabernacle should happen to be, is designated.¹ Of course, it is to him a proof of the late origin of Deuteronomy. Even upon the supposition that Jerusalem is referred to in Deuteronomy, the proof of its Mosaic authorship would not be invalidated, except in the opinion of those who deny that Moses was endowed with a prophetic spirit. But the supposition that the reference is to Jerusalem is destitute of all proof. For when the land was subdued by Joshua the tabernacle of the congregation was pitched at Shiloh (Josh. xviii, 1), and to this place the people went up to worship during the period of the Judges. "The house of God was in Shiloh" (Judg. xviii, 31); "there is a feast of the Lord in Shiloh yearly" (Judg. xxi, 19); "and this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts in Shiloh" (1 Sam. i, 3); "and brought him unto the house of the Lord in Shiloh" (1 Sam. i, 24); and "so the people sent to Shiloh, that they might bring from thence the ark of the covenant of the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth between the cherubim" (1 Sam. iv, 4). But Jeremiah furnishes the clearest proof that Shiloh was the place chosen of the Lord before Jerusalem: "But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I set my name at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people

Groundless
supposition of
Davidson.

¹ Page 363.

Israel" (vii, 12).¹ Here is a clear reference to Deut. xii, 11: "a place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there."

The language of Deuteronomy, from its indefiniteness, suits any place, and contains nothing inconsistent with a Mosaic origin; moreover, it is referred to in several instances in the subsequent history of Israel. For example, Joshua "made them hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, and for the altar of the Lord, even unto this day, *in the place which he should choose*" (Josh. ix, 27). In Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple we find an undoubted reference to Deut. xii, 5: "Toward the place of which thou hast said, My name shall be there" (1 Kings viii, 29).

Language of Deuteronomy proves a Mosaic origin.

In connexion with the command to offer sacrifice only in the place which the Lord should choose, it is said: "Ye shall not do after all that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes" (Deut. xii, 8). Here Dr. Davidson supposes that the author of Deuteronomy has transferred the existing state of things at a late period to the Mosaic age.² But this is an unfounded supposition. If, however, it is to be referred to a period later than the Mosaic age, the period of the Judges, when "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judg. xvii, 6; xxi, 25), and not that of King Josiah, more than eight centuries after Moses, would seem more suitable. But there is no necessity to refer it to a post-Mosaic period at all. The disorderly state of things grew out of the unsettled life of the Israelites before they entered Canaan: "For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you" (Deut. xii, 9).

In Lev. xvii, 3-7, the children of Israel are charged in the following language: "What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord . . . to the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, even that they may bring them unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them for peace offerings unto the Lord." In Deut. xii it is said, in respect to the place which Jehovah should choose: "Thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and heave offer-

¹ "So that he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent which he placed among men; . . . but chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved." Psa. lxxviii, 60, 68.

² Page 368.

ings of your hand, and your vows, and your freewill offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and of your flocks: and there ye shall eat before the Lord your God." Then follows the command not to do as at present, "every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes." In Lev. xvii the command has reference to the *sacrifice of animals* only, while not a word is said in reference to tithes, heave offerings, vows, freewill offerings, and the firstlings of herds and flocks, respecting which Deut. xii gives directions after the people shall have entered the land of Canaan.

Respecting the legislation in Deuteronomy, we may ask, Who would venture to annul or modify any of the laws of Moses contained in the preceding books? Such abrogations or modifications could come only from the lawgiver himself. All additions to, or explanations of, the Mosaic legislation would have assumed the form of tradition, and would not have been incorporated into the written code. This has been actually the case with the oral tradition of the Jews, which they pretend was handed down from Moses. They have never been bold enough to incorporate it into the Pentateuch, but wrote it down in a separate work, The Mishna, more than sixteen centuries after Moses.¹ The Roman Catholic Church has numerous traditions, but it has never gone so far as to incorporate them into the New Testament. Nor have the Mohammedans inserted their numerous traditional precepts into the Koran.

Had the Pentateuch been revised by a late author, the supposed Deuteronomist, for example, it must have presented a different aspect, and all the precepts bearing upon one subject would, in all probability, have been brought together, and would not lie scattered, as at present, in an undigested form, as they were delivered at different times.

Deuteronomy properly ends with chapter xxxii, 49-52, "Get thee up into this mountain Abarim," etc. The blessing of Moses (xxxiii) has the addition, "the man of God," which is foreign to the rest of the Pentateuch. Chapter xxxiv shows itself to be quite a late appendix, from another hand, after the tribes of Israel had settled in Canaan. For it says the Lord showed Moses "all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah" (verse 2). This is very different from all the preceding part of the book. The same may be said of the phrase, "And not yet has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses" (verse 10), which points to quite a late period.

¹The Mishna was written in its present form A. D. 219.

CHAPTER XIV.

PROOF OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH FROM INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

AS we find no sufficient ground for separating Deuteronomy from the other books of the Pentateuch, and as all the five stand closely connected, the question arises, Do we find, in any of the books, portions bearing the strongest internal evidence of their having been written by Moses? For if it can be shown that Moses actually wrote a considerable portion of the Pentateuch, the genuineness of the whole will easily follow.

The instructions respecting the building of the ark, and especially of the tabernacle, and the history of the execution of the work, contain every mark of having been written during the sojourn in the desert, at the very time of the occurrences. First, we have in Exodus (xxv-xxxi) minute directions given to Moses from God respecting the construction of the ark, the table of showbread, the garments of Aaron and his consecration, and especially the tabernacle; and he is charged: "And look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount" (Exod. xxv, 40). In the next place we have, in Exodus xxxvi-xl, a detailed account of the work itself. All this would be unnatural in a post-Mosaic age. A laboured description of the way the tabernacle is to be built, and a tedious account of the execution of the work, are not to be thought of in the ages later than Moses. The directions respecting its construction seem to have been written before the tabernacle was erected, and it appears that it was built in accordance with the written plan. In this way it may be explained why we have both the directions respecting the building and the history of its execution.¹

Instructions concerning the building of the tabernacle and ark belong to time of Moses.

The laws relating to the leprosy (Lev. xiii, xiv, 1-32) were evidently enacted and recorded in the desert, for we find special reference to the encampment of the Israelites: "He [the leper] shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be" (chap. xiii, 46); "and the priest shall go forth out of the camp" (xiv, 3); "and after that he shall come into the camp" (xiv, 8). That these

¹We have already shown the high state of art that existed in Egypt in the Mosaic age, thus refuting De Wette's objection to the Mosaic origin of the tabernacle.

laws have special reference to the desert appears also from their being followed by laws upon the same subject that assume the living of the people in houses in Canaan: "When ye come into the land of Canaan, which I give to you for a possession, and I put the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession" (xiv, 34). Also in Lev. xvi, 10, 21, 22, where it is stated that the scapegoat is sent into the wilderness (desert): "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat¹ in the wilderness" (desert); ver. 22. Mention is also made of the camp: "And afterward come into the camp;" and "afterward he shall come into the camp." The incident related in Lev. xxiv, 10-16, concerning the blasphemy of the son of the Israelitish woman whose father was an Egyptian, and the proceedings in his case, bear the stamp of historical truth.

The Book of Numbers opens with an enumeration of the children of Israel, in which we find the exact number of each of the ten tribes and of the half tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, with the omission of Levi (chap. i). We have in the following chapter the position assigned the most of the tribes in the line of march. All this, in its circumstantiality, bears marks of having been written in the desert. In chapter iii an enumeration is made of the Levites, and a statement is given of their respective charges. Chapter iv gives specific directions concerning the parts of the tabernacle to be borne by the men between the ages of thirty and fifty in the families of the three sons of Levi. This regulation pertained to the Levites only during the wanderings in the desert and their entrance into Canaan. After the tabernacle had been pitched in Shiloh, and the Levites settled in forty-eight cities, this temporary arrangement certainly ceased.

The Levites, with the exception of those who bore the tabernacle, entered the divine service when twenty-five years of age (Lev. viii, 24). Such an arrangement as this, with all the attendant circumstances, could not have originated in an age subsequent to Moses, but bears every mark of having been adopted on the journey through the desert. The minute details of the offerings brought before the Lord (chap. vii) must have been recorded at the time they were made. The incident

¹ אֲזָזֵל , *Azazel*, rendered *scapegoat* in the English version, is most probably Satan, as Hengstenberg understands it. Both Gesenius and Fürst give it as *an evil demon*. It may be Typhon, the evil being of the Egyptian mythology, equivalent to Satan. The goat upon which were confessed the sins of the people was sent away to אֲזָזֵל , *Azazel*, in the desert, not so much as a sacrifice to this evil being as an indication to whom evil belongs, and to give Satan his due.

in Numbers ix, 6, 7, where certain men, defiled by a dead body, are kept back from observing the passover, and apply to Moses for redress, bears every mark of being a genuine event recorded at the time of its occurrence.

The law relating to the blowing of the trumpets in Numbers x must also have been written in the desert, as the following language shows: "When ye blow an alarm, then the camps that lie on the east parts shall go forward. When ye blow an alarm the second time, then the camps that lie on the south side shall take their journey; they shall blow an alarm for their journeys." The remaining part of the chapter abounds in details indicative of contemporary history. The narrative respecting the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath day, and who was kept confined until the will of God respecting him was known, bears the stamp of truth. Nor does the prefatory remark, "*And the children of Israel were in the desert, and found,*" etc., imply that the passage was written after the Israelites had entered Canaan. It could certainly have been written when they reached the land of Moab.

In Numbers xvii, 2, we have the following: "Speak unto the children of Israel, and take of every one of them a rod according to the house of their fathers, of all their princes according to the house of their fathers, twelve rods: write thou every man's name upon his rod." Here we have reference to an Egyptian custom, familiar to Moses and to the other Israelites who had lived in Egypt. Wilkinson remarks: "When walking from home Egyptian gentlemen frequently carried sticks, varying from three or four to about six feet in length, occasionally surmounted with a knob imitating a flower. . . . *The name of each person was frequently written on his stick.*"¹

In Numbers xix we have an ordinance evidently written in the desert: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, . . . and ye shall give her unto Eleazar the priest, that he may bring her forth without the camp;" "afterward he shall *come into the camp*;" and "a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up *without the camp* in a clean place." The reference here to the encampment of the Israelites in the desert is obvious. The song sung by Israel, Num. xxi, 17, 18, "Spring up, O well," etc., evidently originated in the desert, and was perhaps written at the time.²

The customs and usages of ancient Egypt, as represented upon her monuments belonging to the Mosaic age, show by their frequent correspondence with the institutions of the Pentateuch that the

¹ Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, vol. ii, 346-348.

² Also the song in xxi, 27-30, was most probably written at the time of the events.

author of that work was not only thoroughly acquainted with ancient Egypt, but that in all probability he had been educated in that country.

The Abbé Victor Ancessi, in his treatise on L'Égypte et Moïse, shows so many points of correspondence between the mitre, the robe, and the breastplate of the

Jewish high priest, the material of the dress of the priests, the garments of the Levites, and the sacrifice of doves¹ as described

in the middle books of the Pentateuch, and the arrangements of a similar nature found on the monuments of Egypt, that it is impossible to doubt that this legislation originated in the desert during the Mosaic age. "It is impossible that these pages [the pages of the Pentateuch that describe the garments of the Hebrew

priests and the sacrifice of doves], which are bound by bonds so close and strong to the entire work of Moses, were not written immediately after (*au lendemain, on the morrow*) the Exodus and for a people still full of the memory of Egypt. Moreover, these pages were evidently dictated by a man who knew thoroughly the Egyptian rites and customs, and who had been initiated into the ideas, tastes, and arts of the most original civilization of antiquity. Now, in all the history of Israel, only one considerable and influential man is found in these conditions—that is Moses. The only time when the organization of worship could take place was in crossing the desert. It is useless to insist upon these two points. No one is allowed to call them in question. It was, then, by Moses, and during the sojourn of the Hebrews in the Peninsula of Sinai, that these pages were written."² We may add that the pictures of the Egyptian arks on the monuments sufficiently correspond with the description of the Hebrew ark of the covenant (Exod. xxv, 10–22; xxxvii, 1–9) to show the pattern after which it was largely modeled.³

The foregoing facts prove conclusively that the priestly legislation in the Pentateuch was largely affected by Egypt, and there is not a vestige of Babylonian influence visible in its composition; thus the theory of Graf, Wellhausen, and W. Robertson Smith that the priestly legislation was the work of Ezra, and possibly others during or after the Babylonian captivity, carries its own refutation upon its very face.

¹ The sacrifice of doves is mentioned in Lev. i, 14–17; v, 8. The English translation is partly erroneous. The dove's neck is to be wrung, but not separated from the head. There are pictures on the Egyptian monuments in which the priests are wringing the necks of the doves, but not separating them from the head.

² L'Égypte et Moïse, par L'Abbé Victor Ancessi, Paris, 1875.

³ See pictures of the Egyptian arks in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, and in M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopædia.

The remark on the daughters of Zelophehad, and their inheritance, found in Num. xxvii, 1-7, has all the marks of genuine history, and was recorded, no doubt, at the time of the event. Chapter xxxiii contains the journeys of the Israelites from the time they left Succoth until they arrived in the plains of Moab; and, from the nature of the case, the narrative must have been written in the Mosaic age. Besides, it is expressly stated: "Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys."

Even of those who deny the genuineness of the Pentateuch, there are found some who admit that large portions of it were written by Moses. Bleek thinks that large sections were written either by Moses, or by some one in his age.

Bleek's concession of large sections of Mosaic origin.

"Of this nature," he says, "are many laws which contain clear traces of the Mosaic age, found especially in Leviticus, and also in Numbers and Exodus, which refer to relations and circumstances that existed only in the Mosaic age, when the people wandered in the desert and were closely pressed together in camps or under tents—a condition of things which was entirely changed after the people took possession of the land of Canaan, and had settled in the towns and in the open country."¹ Under this head he places the *first seven chapters* of Leviticus, chapters xi-xvi, xvii, and Numbers xix. He evidently regards Exodus xxv-xxxi, which contains the account of the building of the tabernacle and kindred matters, as having been written in the Mosaic age. He also supposes three songs in Numbers xxi, 14, 15, 17, 18, 27-30, to have been written in the same period.²

Bleek draws the following conclusions from the laws which he acknowledges to have been written by Moses himself, or, at least, in the Mosaic age: "1. Although it may be supposed that the Pentateuch in its present form was not composed by Moses, and that many single laws in it are the product of a later age, yet the legislation contained in the Pentateuch, in its entire spirit and character, is genuinely Mosaic. 2. Already in the Mosaic age writing must have been in use among the Hebrew people; for, without it, such laws in such fulness would not have been written down at that time. 3. In the Pentateuch (at least so far as the three middle books are especially concerned) we stand in general upon *historical* ground. As, indeed, in these laws the same relations of the Israelitish people are presupposed which the historical part of the Pentateuch brings before us, so do they serve to establish the historical character of the Pentateuch in general."³

Dr. Samuel Davidson also acknowledges that considerable portions of the Pentateuch were written by Moses, or a contemporary.

¹ Einleitung, p. 202.

² Ibid., pp. 202-209.

³ Ibid., p. 206.

He makes Moses the author in substance of Exod. xx, 2-14, and xxi-xxiii, 19. Chapters xxv-xxxi, relating to the building of the tabernacle, he looks upon "as originating with Moses, and as probably written down by him in its present state."¹ "Probably," says he, "these are not the only legal prescriptions in Exodus which Moses wrote." "Another portion," continues the same author, "which seems to be Mosaic in its origin, and probably, too, in its composition, is Lev. i-vii." Chapters xi-xvi, and xvii with a slight exception, he also refers to Moses, and thinks that xxiv, 1-9, was probably written by him.

In Numbers he refers chapters i, ii, iv, x, 1-8, xix, to the Mosaic age, and regards vi, 22-27, as probably belonging to the same period. Also in Numbers xxi "three poems are referred to, or given, which belong likewise to the Mosaic age." "These," says he, "are not the only parts of the three middle books of the Pentateuch written by Moses; but they are the most probable and perceptible ones. Doubtless, single prescriptions are scattered here and there throughout the present books which also came from Moses' pen. . . . The *germ* and *nucleus* of the entire legislation contained in these three books [Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers] is Mosaic. Some parts he wrote himself; others were probably written by a contemporary under his direction, or with his sanction."²

The concessions of Bleek and Davidson are valuable, as coming from able critics who are not disposed to attribute to Moses more than they can well avoid conceding. And we remark that the former has evidently more confidence in the Mosaic history than the latter.

In fact, no fair-minded critic can deny that large portions of the Pentateuch came from Moses. With this solid foundation on which to stand, we can fairly claim the whole Pentateuch to be his work, a few passages possibly excepted, which we shall subsequently consider. For we have already seen that there is a *unity* of plan running through the whole of it, and that from Genesis to Deuteronomy it is pervaded by the same archaisms. There is no possibility of evading the genuineness of the Pentateuch, except by adopting the document hypothesis. Now this can be applied with any show of reason to the book of Genesis only, and breaks down altogether when applied to the entire five books.

When we find in various parts of an ancient author such strong internal evidence as fixes the *age* of those parts, we naturally attribute the *whole* work to the same age, even where we do not discern the same internal evidence. For all parts of

¹ Introduction, p. 109.

² *Ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 109-112.

a work do not furnish us with criteria by which to determine the age and the author. And if passages are discovered which might be referred to a later age than that clearly indicated by other parts, we still refer them to the age otherwise established. But if in a work of such a character we find words, or even sentences, of a later period, we regard them as interpolations, especially if they do not constitute an integral and inseparable part of the whole.

These principles of criticism, we think, are just, and they should be applied in the examination of the Pentateuch.

When it is once established that Moses wrote a portion of the laws in the Pentateuch, it becomes probable that he wrote others also which were of equal importance. In fact, during the period of forty years, there was ample time to develop the whole legislative system of the Hebrews; and being familiar with the comprehensive legislation of the Egyptians, it was not to be expected that he would leave a code of laws very imperfect,—which would be the case if we deny his authorship of any considerable part of the legislation in the Pentateuch.

It would be unreasonable to suppose that a small body of laws written down by Moses as having been delivered by God to him—the great legislator who was believed to be commissioned from heaven—would have received so many large additions. Whatever laws Moses wrote would have had the greatest authority with the Hebrew nation, and would have been safely kept, and guarded as a sacred treasure, separate and distinct from all other laws. Customs and regulations lying outside of the written code would be preserved as oral tradition. This is precisely analogous to what has actually occurred with Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans, as we have already shown. The history in the three middle books of the Pentateuch is so interwoven with a great deal of the legislation that it is impossible to separate them; so that whatever establishes the Mosaic authorship of the laws, at the same time establishes that of the history. And independently of this consideration, there are, as we have seen, portions of the history that bear internal marks of having been written in the Mosaic age. At all events, we are authorized to conclude that the Pentateuch originated with Moses. And to this view that distinguished orientalist and liberal biblical critic, Roediger, accedes: “The point of commencement for this period, and in general of the literature of the Hebrews, must certainly be fixed as early as the time of Moses, even though we should regard the Pentateuch, in its present structure and form, as modeled by a later hand.”¹

Concession of
Roediger.

¹ Roediger's Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, translated by Conant, p. 9.

It has been objected to the genuineness of the Pentateuch that its language does not differ as much from that of the later books of the Old Testament as might have been expected. Dr. Davidson says, there is no important difference between it and that of the books written shortly before the return of the Israelites from the Babylonian captivity;¹ and he makes this a ground of objection to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But there is a glaring, palpable inconsistency in his reasoning, for he acknowledges that whole chapters in the Pentateuch were written by Moses. The language of these chapters does not differ from that of the rest of the Pentateuch, nor does Davidson attempt to show that it does. The argument drawn from the want of greater difference between the language of the Pentateuch and that of the later books is utterly worthless, so long as it is acknowledged that any portion of the Pentateuch was written in the Mosaic age.

But analogies are not wanting. The Syriac language changed but little from the second to the twelfth century of our era. Nor has the written Arabic changed from the time of the composition of the Koran, in the seventh century, to the present time. Upon this point Ewald is certainly a competent judge. In speaking of the Arabic language having been cultivated and used by a great number of writers of all kinds, he remarks: "So that *for nearly a thousand years* it has preserved in writings its purity and peculiar character intact."²

Between the Mosaic age and the time of David and Solomon, of whom we have some undoubted writings in many of the Psalms and in the book of Proverbs, only four or five centuries intervened. The Pentateuch should be compared with these writings, and the difference, we admit, is not great. But we must bear in mind that the Oriental tongues possess more stability than the western, and that, as the books of Moses contained the civil and religious code of the Israelites, they moulded and fixed in a great degree the whole language, which was not, until a late period, disturbed by foreign influence. It must also be remembered that Moses wrote the Pentateuch without vowel points. These points, and those indicating the doubling of the consonants, were not written until about two thousand years after his time. Accordingly, the changes that occurred in the vowels, and in the doubling of the consonants, fail to be seen on account of the language being punctuated according to a later standard.

¹ Vol. i, p. 103.

² Ut per mille fere annos puritatem suam et indolem peculiarem integram in scriptis conservavit.—Proleg. to his Arabic Grammar.

It has been urged against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch that it gives but few incidents that occurred during a period of nearly thirty-eight years,¹ the time intervening between the first arrival of the Israelites in Ka-
Reason given
for slight treat-
ment.
desh-barnea (Num. xiii, 26), and their crossing the brook Zered (Num. xxi, 12, 13; Deut. ii, 14). But this can afford no valid objection to the genuineness of these books. These thirty-eight years are passed over slightly because little or nothing of a theocratic character intervened, and scarcely any laws were given during this period. For the same reason several centuries—from the death of Joseph in Egypt until the birth of Moses—are disposed of in a single chapter, because there was nothing of a sacred character to relate. In the same way Matthew, having given an account of the birth of Christ (i, ii), in the very next chapter begins with the preaching of John the Baptist, passing over a period of twenty-eight or twenty-nine years in the life of the Saviour, evidently because there was nothing of an official character to disclose. No one, so far as we know, has ever objected to the genuineness of the Gospel of Matthew on this ground; it is, indeed, rather an argument in favour of its genuineness. It is only apocryphal gospels that have attempted to fill up the chasm left by Matthew and the other evangelists. Is not the silence of the Pentateuch in reference to the history of the Israelites during so many years an argument in favour of its Mosaic origin, or, at least, of its genuine historical character? Two years had not passed away, after leaving Egypt, when spies were sent to explore Canaan. Upon their return and the giving of their report, the people murmured against Moses and Aaron. The Israelites, on account of their unbelief, were not allowed to enter the land of Canaan, but were thrown back into the desert, and were compelled to wander about for thirty-eight years, as if forsaken of Jehovah. But if any thing of importance had occurred during the time thus passed over in comparative silence, it would have found its way into the history of the exodus in the same way as the other events, whether the history were written down by Moses, or by some one subsequently from tradition, or from documents belonging to the Mosaic age. It cannot reasonably be supposed that this period was passed over by the author of the Pentateuch from his ignorance of its history; for only on the supposition of ignorance can this omission be an argument against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The knowledge which the author displays of minute events in other places forbids it. In Num. xxx we have a list of the encampments of the Israelites from the departure from

¹ Bleek lays great stress on this, pp. 226, 227.

Egypt until their arrival in the plains of Moab. And in Deut. ii, 14, the number of years passed over from Kadesh-barnea—from their arrival there it would seem—until they came to the brook Zered, is stated to be thirty-eight years. It is difficult to believe that a writer acquainted with the exact time spent between these two points—the last of which is of little importance—should know but little of the history itself. The most of this period seems to have been spent at Kadesh-barnea, for Moses says, “Ye abode in Kadesh many days.” Deut. i, 46.

The Pentateuch was, very probably, revised by Moses a short time before his death, and some passages were, perhaps, added to what he originally wrote.



CHAPTER XV.

THE FALSITY OF THE THEORY THAT THE EARLY LEGISLATION OF THE PENTATEUCH CONSISTED ONLY OF EXODUS XXI-XXIII.

OUR new school of skeptical critics contends that the early legislation of the Pentateuch consisted only of Exodus xxi-xxiii; but an examination of these chapters shows that such a view is wholly untenable. The injunctions in these chapters are of too indefinite a nature, and too meagre, to have comprised all the early legislation of the Pentateuch.

The law concerning involuntary homicide is of an indefinite and obscure character, and needs further legislation: “He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death. And if a man lie not in wait, but God deliver him into his hand; then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee” (xxi, 12, 13). A specific description of what is to be decided as involuntary homicide is given in Num. xxxv, 22, 23, and Deut. xix, 4, 5. These passages supplement the passage in Exodus, while Num. xxxv, 13, 14, and Deut. xix, 7, 9, fix the number of the cities of refuge to be appointed on each side of the Jordan.

In the command to keep three feasts a year to the Lord, there is an indefiniteness respecting them, and the paschal lamb is not mentioned, while the feast of the passover is called simply the feast of unleavened bread. The language employed, “as I commanded you,” implies previous instruction, as we find it in Exod. xii, 15-27. In

Lev. xxiii, 4-42, particular injunctions are given concerning all these feasts, but most especially respecting the feast of Pentecost and the feast of tabernacles.

In the three chapters of Exodus under consideration (xxi-xxiii) the word priest does not occur, and there is no mention made of the ark and of the tabernacle. In short, there is scarcely any provision at all for religious services. Is it likely that the system of Moses, who was learned in the lore of Egypt and acquainted with its priestly system, would be so meagre and have nothing in it of a priestly nature? Such a scanty legislation seems to be clearly contradicted by the history of the Israelites immediately subsequent to Moses. For, to say nothing of the history of the Book of Joshua, which clearly establishes the authority of the Pentateuch, we find in Judg. xx, 27, 28, the following statement: "The children of Israel inquired of the LORD, (for the ark of the covenant of God was there [at Bethel] in those days, and Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, stood before it in those days)." Likewise in 1 Sam. i, 3, 9; ii, 13-16, 27-30, we find a tabernacle, a priesthood, and sacrifices—the two latter declared to be of divine appointment. Had Moses nothing to do with these arrangements? Kuenen acknowledges that the ark of Jehovah came from Moses¹ himself. Did he make no regulations respecting it? If he did, why should he not have recorded them?

Meagre legis-
lation in relig-
ious services
in Exod. xxi-
xxiii.

THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY BEARS WITNESS TO A MORE EXTENSIVE LEGISLATION THAN EXODUS XXI-XXIII.

The entire skeptical school of critics, though they deny the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, grant that it was written before the Babylonian captivity, in the reign of Manasseh or Josiah. In Deut. iv, 5, it is declared: "Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments even as the LORD thy God commanded me," etc. And after referring to the ten commandments, Moses adds: "And the LORD commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments, that you might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it" (verse 14). It is possible that this verse might refer only to Exod. xxi-xxiii. In x, 9, Moses refers to the tribe of Levi having been set apart by Jehovah for his service: "The Lord is his inheritance, according as the LORD thy God promised him." Here it is evident that, at the time of the composition of Deuteronomy, there were regulations respecting the tribe of Levi and their service, and that well known promises had been made to the

¹ Religion of Israel, vol. i, p. 289.

tribe. It is most natural to suppose that these regulations and promises were written just as we find them now in the middle books of the Pentateuch. Again, respecting the priests and the Levites, "The LORD is their inheritance, as he hath said unto them" (xviii, 2). Where is this said except in Num. xviii, 20? In Deut. xxiv, 8, it is enjoined, "Take heed in the plague of leprosy, that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the priests the Levites shall teach you: as I have commanded them, so ye shall observe to do." These regulations respecting the leprosy are contained in Leviticus, embracing chapters xiii and xiv. It is clear that when Deuteronomy was composed these chapters had already been written, and ascribed to Moses. In Deut. v, 2; xxix, 1, reference is made to the covenant God established with Israel at Horeb. At the end of Lev. xxvi it is said: "These are the statutes and judgments and laws which the Lord made between him and the children of Israel in mount Sinai, by the hand of Moses." Also the closing verse of the last chapter of Leviticus has a shorter but similar statement. The Mosaic legislation as far as Num. x, 12, was made in the wilderness of Sinai, a prominent mountain in the range of Horeb. In Deut. xi, 6, allusion is made to the destruction of Dathan and Abiram, whom the earth swallowed up, "their households and their tents," etc. Here we find reference to the rebellion against Moses and Aaron in connection with the priesthood of Aaron, as described in Num. xvi. In the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram were conspicuous characters, who became a sign (Num. xxvi, 9, 10).

Korah is omitted in Deuteronomy, possibly because his children perished not (Num. xxvi, 11), while the families of Dathan and Abiram did. Kayser says: "The Deuteronomist had manifestly read nothing of Korah (in Num. xvi), otherwise he would not have omitted him."¹ Yet he acknowledges that the author of Psalm cvi, in which the same omission occurs, was acquainted with Korah's rebellion.²

In Deut. xx, 6: "And what man is he that planted a vineyard, and hath not yet eaten of it" (Heb., וְלֹא אָכַל מִיָּדָוּ, *hath profaned it*)? we have a reference to Lévi. xix, 23, in which the children of Israel are forbidden to eat of the fruit of any tree which they may plant until the fourth year.

Our new critics grant that the Deuteronomist was acquainted with what they call the Jehovistic legislation and history, but deny his knowledge of the Elohist. Yet in Deut. x, 22, it

¹ Vor-Exilische Buch, p. 132.

² Ibid., p. 174.

is said: "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons." Now this refers to Gen. xlvi, 27, and Exod. i, 5, both of which are Elohist.¹ Here, again, we have a refutation of the theory that the Elohist history in Genesis was written about the time of Ezra.

Refutation in Deuteronomy that the Elohist history was written in Ezra's time.

THE TESTIMONY OF HOSEA TO A LARGE WRITTEN CODE OF LAWS THAT IN HIS AGE HAD BEEN ALREADY GIVEN TO ISRAEL.

This prophet, who flourished B. C. 785-725, bears witness to a *large written* code of laws in the following language:

אֲכַתְּבֶלְךָ רַבִּי הַזֹּרֶתִי כְּמִזְרֹר נְחֹשֶׁבֶת, *I wrote for him (Ephraim) multitudes (numerous precepts) of my law; what a strange thing were they counted!* (viii, 12). The verb *to write* (כָּתַבְתִּי) is in the future tense (אֲכַתְּבֶ), and "*were counted*" is in the perfect. But the future tense is often used for the past,² of which we have undoubted examples in this prophet. "I will visit upon her the days of Baalim, wherein she burned incense to them and decked herself with earrings," etc. (ii, 13). In this passage "burned incense" is in the *future hiphil*, and "decked" is the *future vav* conversive. "And I have redeemed them and they have spoken falsehood against me" (vii, 13). Here "have redeemed" in the Hebrew is the *future* tense. "They have sacrificed flesh for the sacrifices of mine offerings, and have eaten them" (viii, 13). "Have sacrificed" is the *future* in the Hebrew. "They sacrificed unto Baalim and burnt incense to graven images" (xi, 2). "Sacrificed and burnt incense" are both in the *future*³ in the original. "I drew them with cords of a man" (xi, 4). "Drew" is in the *future* in the original. In other passages in this prophet the *future* tense in the Hebrew is used for the *present*.

Professor W. Robertson Smith translates the passage in Hosea as follows: "Though I wrote to him my Torah in ten thousand precepts, they would be esteemed as a strange thing."⁴ But this translation is inadmissible, for there is no particle of condition or contingency in the Hebrew text—nothing to indicate a supposition. Such a method of translating the biblical Hebrew has no parallel in any other instance, and

W. Robertson Smith's incorrect translation of passage in Hosea.

¹ Professor Smend acknowledges the reference to a former Elohist, Moses apud Prophetas, p. 74.

² This is a common construction in Arabic as well as in Hebrew, and abounds in the Qoran.

³ The tense we call "future" is by some Hebrew grammarians called the "imperfect."

⁴ The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 297.

nothing but the requirement of a preconceived theory could induce any one to think of such a version. If the prophet had expressed a mere supposition he would have employed the particle אֲנִי , *im, if, although*, before the verb "wrote," just as in Isa. i, 18: "Though (אֲנִי , *im*) your sins be as scarlet . . . though (אֲנִי , *im*) they be red like crimson," etc.; and in Isa. x, 22. Or, possibly, the prophet might have used אֲנִי אֲפִלּוּ , *even if*.

Nor do we see how the latter part of the passage can be rendered, "They would be esteemed as a strange thing;" for the tense "counted," or "esteemed," is *perfect* in the Hebrew, and there is no connective particle that can give it a *future* meaning. Professor Smith renders רַבּוֹת "ten thousand precepts,"¹ taking it for רַבּוֹתַי , which is found in hardly a single instance in the books written before the captivity and never as a construct "ten thousand of"—in this instance "ten thousand of my law." The Masorites have put the vowels to the text, and given the reading on the margin which makes the word read רַבּוֹתַי , *multitudes of my law*. And it is thus that Gesenius defines it. The singular is thus used in Lev. xxv, 16, "multitude of years." The Septuagint, the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, the Peshito Syriac, and the Vulgate have either "multitude" or "multitudes" of my law.

Professor Smith's version of the passage does not make good sense. For, in the first place, the prophet Hosea assumes that Ephraim is a transgressor of the divine laws with which the tribe was acquainted. Why, then, should he say, If I were to write for him ten thousand precepts (or any great number) they would be counted strange? Is it more likely that a large body of laws would be obeyed, rather than a small one? Would not a law of "*ten thousand precepts*" really have astonished, and quite confounded, Ephraim?

In the next place, even according to Prof. Smith's translation, the divine law consists of *numerous* precepts, and not simply of the three chapters of Exodus which Prof. Smith recognizes as a written code existing in Judah.

The translation, "I wrote," is the rendering of both the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel and the Peshito Syriac. De Wette translates the passage: "I am writing out for him many of my laws; how strange they have been considered." But, at the foot of the page, he give also another way of translating it, namely, "I wrote." Pusey in his "Commentary on the Minor Prophets," renders "I

¹ He has evidently thus translated the word to show that "ten thousand precepts" would not be applicable to the Mosaic law, as being too large a number.

write" in the sense that the law was written in the past, but is still in force in the present.

In the verse immediately preceding the one under discussion, Hosea says: "Because Ephraim has multiplied altars to sin, they have become altars to sin." Then follows our text: "I wrote for him the numerous precepts of my law [Torah], what a strange thing were they counted!"

That Hosea refers, in this passage, to the Mosaic law, is clear from his using the word *Torah*, and from the fact that we know of no other divine law that had been given to Israel. To this law Hosea also refers in the following passages: "Because thou [Israel, the ten tribes] hast forgotten¹ the law [Torah] of thy God" (iv, 6). "They [Israel] have transgressed my covenant and trespassed against my law [Torah]" (viii, 1).

Prof. Smend remarks on the passage: "The words of Hosea in the eighth century [B. C.] prove that there were many written laws among the Ephraimites, which were contained in one book or more, and, although neglected, they were known to every body, and in the judgment of the prophet they could claim obedience from all, as they seemed to possess as much divine authority as if they had been written by Jehovah himself."² Hosea thus refutes Kuenen, who says: "In the eighth century B. C. but few laws. . . were ascribed to Moses and carried back to the sojourn in the desert of Sinai."³ For we may ask, Who but Moses gave these laws to the Ephraimites?

¹ Prof. Smith infers, from the fact that the law was forgotten, that it was not written, but was merely the oral law; just as if a *written* law could not be forgotten! God says in Ezek. xxiii, 35: "Because thou hast forgotten me." Similar is Hos. viii, 14, and elsewhere. If Israel could forget his Maker, why could he not forget a *written* law?

² Moses apud Prophetas, pp. 13, 14, Halis, 1875.

³ Religion of Israel, vol. i, p. 139.

CHAPTER XVI.

EXAMINATION OF THE VIEWS OF THE NEW CRITICAL SCHOOL
ON THE PRIESTLY AND SACRIFICIAL SYSTEMS IN THE PEN-
TATEUCH.THE THEORY OF THE NEW CRITICAL SCHOOL CONCERNING THE
JEWISH PRIESTHOOD REFUTED BY FACTS.

ACCORDING to the new critical school, in the original legisla-
tion of the Pentateuch, all the Levites were capable of becom-
ing priests, and "before the exile the high priest was looked upon
as the first among his equals."¹ But we find in Ezra i, 5; ii, 70,
the distinction between priests and Levites already existing when
Zerubbabel went up to Jerusalem, in accordance with the
decrees of Cyrus, about eighty years before Ezra went
up to Jerusalem. At that time it is stated that certain
sons of the priests were unable to show their genealogy, that they
were put out of the priesthood as polluted, and that the governor
had forbidden them to eat of the most holy things until there stood
up a priest with Urim and Thummim. Here we have a refer-
ence to the regulation in Lev. xxii forbidding any one but the
priests to eat of holy things; also to Num. iii, 10, respecting the
Aaronic priesthood; and, finally, to the high priest with Urim and
Thummim, Aaron as named in Exod. xxviii, 30, and Eleazar in
Num. xxvii, 21.

Many of the priests and Levites who went up with Zerubbabel
are stated to be old men, and to have seen the first house (Ezra
iii, 12). Hence it is clear that it would have been impossible to
impose on them regulations that had not existed under the first
temple.

The number of the priests who went up with Zerubbabel to
Jerusalem is stated to be over four thousand (Ezra ii, 36-39). This
number of priests may seem to be too great for the whole number of
returning captives—forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty.
But it must be remembered that many of the priests in the kingdom
of Israel in the time of Jeroboam left it for the kingdom of Judah.
Besides this, it is natural to infer that the priests would be espec-

¹ Kuenen.

ially anxious to return to their own country, to resume their sacred functions.

In the sixth year of Darius (B. C. 515)—about sixty years before Ezra came up to Jerusalem—when the new temple was dedicated, it is said, “They set the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of God which is at Jerusalem; as it is written in the book of Moses” (Ezra vi, 18).

Artaxerxes, in his decree in favour of Ezra, giving the Jews permission to return to Jerusalem, speaks in two places of “priests and Levites.” Hence these two classes were already discriminated before Ezra went up to Jerusalem.

Nehemiah, governor of Judah, in his book (chap. xii) gives an account of “priests and Levites” who went up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel. It seems perfectly plain, then, that at least eighty years before Ezra the distinction between priests and Levites was clearly recognized. Nowhere does there appear a single trace of dispute respecting priests and Levites; their status appears already fixed. No dissatisfaction on the part of the Levites appears. They join heartily in the services and offer up prayers.

But how could the Levites who were not descendants of Aaron be deprived of the priesthood without provoking the bitterest opposition? Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah gives us the slightest hint of it; nor does Jewish tradition know any thing of it. In 2 Chron. xxiii, 18; xxx, 27; and Neh. xi, 20, the priests are called “the priests the Levites.” In 2 Chron. xi, 14, it is said: “Jeroboam and his sons had cast them [the Levites] off from executing the priest’s office.” In 2 Chron. xxix, 5, the priests and Levites are addressed as “Levites.” From the first of these passages, if not from the second, it could be easily inferred that *all* Levites are priests. In Joshua the phrase “the priests the Levites” occurs twice in iii, 3, and viii, 33, but never yet “priests and Levites.” Both Chronicles and Joshua discriminate clearly the priests from the Levites in other passages. Joshua assigns the priests, the sons of Aaron, thirteen cities (xxi, 4, 19). The account of the assignment of these cities must antedate the Babylonian captivity. For, apart from the arguments that may be advanced from the language of the book, which no unprejudiced Hebraist can assign to the period of the captivity, or later, some of the cities assigned by Joshua to the Levites among the tribes of Israel, already in the time of Jeremiah, no longer belonged to Israel. Jahazah (Josh. xxi, 36) is given to the Levites, but in Jer. xlvi, 21, it belongs to Moab. Mephaath (Josh. xxi, 37) and Heshbon (Josh. xxi, 39) are also assigned to them. But in the time of Jeremiah the first of these two cities belonged to

Moab (Jer. xlviii, 21), and the other also to Moab (xlviii, 3), and already in the time of Isaiah (xv, 4). In Josh. xxi, 18, Anathoth is assigned to the priests. This is confirmed by the statement of Jer. i, 1, that he was among the priests of that town. In the description of the dedication of Solomon's temple mention is made of "the priests and the Levites" (1 Kings viii, 4), the only passage in this book where they are named together.

That the priesthood, in the original Mosaic law, was restricted to the sons of Aaron is clear from 1 Sam. ii, 27, 28, where a man of God says to Eli the priest: "Thus saith the LORD, Did I plainly appear unto the house of thy father, when they were in Egypt in Pharaoh's house? And did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest, to offer upon mine altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before me? and did I give unto the house of thy father all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel?" That Eli was a descendant of Aaron through Ithamar appears from a comparison of 1 Chron. xxiv, 3; 1 Sam. xxii, 20; and 1 Kings ii, 27. By "the house of thy father" the descendants of Aaron alone can be intended. For there exists not a vestige of proof that God appeared to Levi and gave him the priesthood several centuries before the Exodus and the Mosaic legislation. Nor could "the house of thy father" be one of the descendants of Aaron, for, in that case, the LORD could not have spoken to him in "the house of Pharaoh." The passage in Samuel under consideration clearly refers to Exod. xxviii, 1, 4; Num. xvi, 5; xviii, 1, 7; Lev. ii, 3, 10, etc. Also in 1 Sam. ii, 30, the declaration, "I said indeed that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me forever," evidently refers to Exod. xxix, 9: "And the priest's office shall be theirs [Aaron and his sons] for a perpetual statute."

In the Book of Deuteronomy the phrase "the priests the Levites" occurs four times, and the phrase "the priests the sons of Levi" twice. In Deut. xxvii, 9, it is said: "Moses and the priests the Levites spoke unto all Israel, saying, Take heed and hearken, O Israel; this day thou art become the people of the LORD thy God." It is very improbable that, by this language, "the priests the Levites" means the whole tribe of Levi united with Moses in speaking to "all Israel," of which the tribe of Levi was a part. "The priests the Levites" is equivalent to *Levitical* priests. In similar language Korah and his company are called "sons of Levi" (Num. xvi, 6-8). They are named after the tribal head. When first appointed the priests are often called "Aaron and his sons" (Numbers) for identification.

In Deut. xxxiii, 8-10, in the blessing pronounced by Moses upon Levi, it is said: "Thy Urim and thy Thummim belong to thy pious one [literally, to the man thy pious one] (Aaron), whom thou didst tempt in Massah, with whom thou didst strive at Meribah; who said to his father and to his mother, I have not seen him [them]; and his brethren he did not recognize, and his sons he did not know; for they shall observe thy word and keep thy covenant. They shall teach thy judgments to Jacob, and thy law to Israel: they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt offerings upon thy altar." If we refer these priestly acts to the sons of Aaron, the last noun before "they shall observe," etc., the passage is in perfect harmony with the Aaronic priesthood as laid down in the Pentateuch. But it is contended that these priestly offices are attributed to the tribe of Levi, and not simply to the descendants of Aaron. To this we reply, that what belongs to a part (Aaron and his sons) may be ascribed to the tribe of which they form a part. Thus in Psalm lx, 7, it is said, "Judah is my lawgiver" (sceptre—Gesenius); that is, the king is of that tribe. In the same way, "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah" (Gen. xlix, 10) naturally means that the sceptre, the emblem of kingly power, belongs to some individual or family of that tribe, and not to the *whole* tribe. In the Athenian Senate the tribe out of which the presiding officer was taken was called the "presiding tribe," not because the whole tribe presided, but for the simple reason that the president was of that tribe. Hence the language of Socrates: "I was Senator and our tribe happened to be the *presiding* (πρωτανεύουσα) tribe."¹

In a similar manner, Malachi—seventeen years after Ezra came up to Jerusalem, when the distinction between priests and Levites is acknowledged to have existed—declares: "My covenant was with him" (Levi). But "Ye [the priests] have corrupted the covenant with Levi, saith the LORD of hosts" (ii, 5, 8). Here the covenant with Aaron is called the covenant with the tribal head.

In Deut. x, 8, Moses says: At that time "the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and to bless in his name, unto this day." Here the offices of priests and Levites are blended. To bless the people in the name of the Lord seems to have been the prerogatives of the priests only.²

In Deut. xviii, 1, it is said: "The priests the Levites, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel: they

¹ Απολογία Σωκράτους, cap. xx.

² Prof. Curtiss, in his scholarly work on the Levitical Priests, clearly shows that this was the office of the priests only.

shall eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and his inheritance" (that is, what is offered to God). This language is applicable to the priests only, who had a share of what was offered as sacrifice. Besides this, the addition made to the words "the priests the Levites," of "all the tribe of Levi," indicates that the priests do not comprehend the whole tribe. Verse 3 describes the part of the sacrificed animal which the priest shall receive.

In various passages in Deuteronomy the Levite is spoken of in such a way as to show that he could not be a priest. The Levite is to have a share of the tithes brought to the place which *the* LORD should choose (Deut. xii, 12). Of the tithes laid up within the gates of the Israelites at the end of every three years the Levite is to have a share. In Deut. xxvi, 12, it is said: "When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger," etc. According to Num. xviii, 21, 24, the tithes are given to the Levites. No such provision is made for the priests.

The Levite is set forth in Deuteronomy as a proper subject of charity, but the priests are never thus described. Besides, it is very unlikely that, if all the Levites were priests, they would be called by their tribal name, and not by their official name. Furthermore, Deuteronomy requires the Israelites to offer sacrifice only in that place which Jehovah should choose from among all the tribes (xii, 5, 11, 14). In the same spirit Leviticus commands that the sacrifices shall be offered only at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation (xvii, 3-7). In Num. iv, 46-48, the number of the Levites from thirty years of age to fifty who entered into the service of the tabernacle is eight thousand five hundred and eighty. Now, it is in the highest degree improbable that Moses, or any one else, would appoint all these Levites to be priests, to officiate at one sanctuary alone. But if we are not to rely upon this large number, it is still incredible, or, at least, highly improbable, that all the middleaged male Levites would be made priests, to offer sacrifice at one tabernacle.

In Deut. x, 6, it is stated: "There Aaron died, and there he was buried; and Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his stead." This accords with the other books of the Pentateuch. Aaron and Eleazar are the only priests definitely named in Deuteronomy, and the language certainly favors the view that Aaron had been chief priest and head of the family of priests. In deciding difficult matters of controversy, it is directed that they shall be taken up to the place which Jehovah shall choose, to be decided by the priests and the judge who shall be there. And it is added:

“That the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the LORD thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die” (Deut. xvii, 8-12). The naming of a single authoritative priest in the last verse indicates that he is the high priest.

In the history of the Israelites subsequent to Moses we find several references to a high priest. In Josh. xx, 6, we have reference to “the high priest” that shall be in those days. In Judg. xx, 27, 28, we find Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron standing before the ark of the covenant. He was evidently high priest. In 2 Kings xii, 10, in the time of King Jehoash (B. C. 856), mention is made of the high priest. In the time of Josiah (B. C. 624), it is stated that the king commanded Hilkiah the high priest and *the priests of the second order*, etc. (2 Kings xxiii, 4); and in chap. xxv, 18, and in Jer. lii, 24, Seraiah is chief priest and Zephaniah the second priest. In the time of the prophet Haggai (B. C. 520), we find that Joshua the son of Josedech is high priest (i, 1, 12, 14; ii, 2, 4). About the same time this Joshua is called high priest in Zech. iii, 1, 8; vi, 11; that is, about sixty years before Ezra came up to Jerusalem from Babylon. It is evident, then, that the office of high priest was no invention of Ezra.

According to 1 Chron. xxiv, the distinction of priests and Levites evidently existed in the time of David, and is recognized in various other passages in the two books of Chronicles. Ezekiel, in his vision of the land of Israel, declares that “the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my sanctuary, when the children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister unto me” (xliv, 15). Now, Zadok was a descendant of Aaron through Eleazar (1 Chron. vi, 3-8; Ezra vii, 1-5).

PROOF THAT THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE MIDDLE BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH IS A PART OF THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF MOSES.

It has been asserted by the new critical school that the sacrificial system of the middle books of the Pentateuch formed no part of the original Mosaic code. The leading proof text in support of this position is Jer. vii, 21-23: “Thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel; Put your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you,

that it may be well unto you." It can be clearly shown that this language does not necessarily mean that God absolutely said nothing, and gave no commandment about burnt offerings and sacrifices. In Gen. xlv, 8, Joseph in Egypt tells his brethren: "Ye did not send me hither, but God." But according to Gen. xxxvii, 28, Joseph's brethren sold him to the Ishmaelites who were going into Egypt. Of course, the meaning is that Divine providence had arranged his coming into Egypt. In the same manner, in Exod. xvi, 8, Moses says to the Israelites: "Your murmurings are not against us, but against the LORD." Yet in the second verse of this very chapter it is said: "The whole congregation murmured against Moses and Aaron." Their murmurings against these leaders was nothing in comparison with their murmurings against God. Similar is the language of 1 Sam. viii, 7, where God says to Samuel, when the Israelites demanded a king: "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me that I should not reign over them." But, in fact, they had rejected Samuel. Again, in 2 Chron. xx, 15, Jehoshaphat is told by the Lord: "For the battle is not yours, but God's;" that is, it pertained more to God than to him.

There is one passage in the New Testament which is a striking illustration of the language in Jeremiah. The apostle Paul declares that "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel" (1 Cor. i, 17). We might infer from this, not only that Paul never baptized, but also that in his judgment baptism was not a Christian ordinance, and from this we might conclude that between him and the other apostles there was on this subject a radical difference. But the epistles of Paul refute such an inference. He clearly means that the chief part of his mission was preaching.

The passage in chap. vii of Jeremiah, under discussion, shows in the most striking language the superiority of obedience to the Divine commands to sacrifices and offerings, and the utter worthlessness, and even hatefulness, of these forms, when those who offer are polluted by crime. In the ninth verse of this chapter the prophet asks: "Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before me in this house?" Also in vi, 20, it is said: "Your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifice sweet unto me." In the same spirit Samuel reproves Saul: "Hath the LORD delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (1 Sam. xv, 22). Furthermore, it is difficult

Refutation of
sceptical ob-
jection to mid-
dle books of
Pentateuch.

Superiority of
obedience to
sacrifice.

to believe that Jeremiah did not recognize as Mosaic the sacrificial and priestly system of the Pentateuch. The following passages seem to make this matter clear: "For thus saith the LORD . . . neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually" (Jer. xxxiii, 17, 18); and, "Thus saith the LORD; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; *and with the Levites the priests, my ministers*" (xxxiii, 20, 21).

That the Book of Deuteronomy at least was recognized by Jeremiah as proceeding from Moses is evident from the use he makes of it. Nor is its existence in the time of Jeremiah denied by the sceptical critics,¹ who identify it with the Book of the Law found in the temple in the time of King Josiah. Now, sacrifices and offerings are clearly enjoined in Deuteronomy.

As a further proof that God was not pleased with the sacrificial system of the Israelites, the new school of critics appeal to Isa. i, 11-14: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the LORD: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to trample [*to profane*—Gesenius] my courts? Bring no more vain oblations [*a lying sacrifice*]; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them." Now, in this list of observances which are declared an abomination and not to be endured, are the "sabbaths." But even the new sceptical school admits that the sabbath is a part of the Mosaic system, it being one of the ten commandments. And if the passages on the feasts and sacrifices of the Jews quoted from Isaiah prove that these institutions were not of divine authority, it is at the same time proved that the sabbath is not a divine institution. But this logic proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. The verse following the passages quoted adds: "When ye make many prayers, I will not hear." This might be quoted to prove that God does not approve of prayer. But the explanation of the whole passage is easy: "Your hands are full of blood" (verse 15). The lan-

¹ Colenso holds that Jeremiah wrote Deuteronomy.

guage of Isaiah creates no difficulty. It merely asserts strongly the futility and hatefulness of rites and ceremonies when hypocrisy and crimes pollute the observers of them.

The superiority of morality and piety to sacrifice, and the comparative insignificance of the latter, is emphasized by the prophet Micah: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" (vi, 8). But if we press upon this language closely the feast of the passover, and even the sabbath, may be excluded from the list of requirements.

The Lord, in Isaiah, speaking of the sons of the stranger who join themselves to him, says: "Their burnt offering and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon my altar" (lvi, 7); and in lx, 7, he declares of the rams of Nebaioth: "They shall come up with acceptance upon my altar."

That sacrifices were acceptable to God appears from Mal. iii, 4: "Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, *as in the days of old, and as in former years.*"

In 1 Sam. ii, 29, a man of God reproves Eli for the violation of the law of sacrifice, declaring: "Thus saith Jehovah, . . . Wherefore kick ye at my sacrifice which I have commanded in my habitation?" The divine authority of sacrifice is here recognized.

In Exod. xx, 24, standing in close connection with the ten commandments, it is enjoined: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in every place where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee;" that is, in whatever place I shall appoint for worship and sacrifice. In Exod. xxii, 20, it is declared: "He that shall sacrifice to any god save to the LORD only, he shall be utterly destroyed," which shows that sacrifices are to be offered unto Jehovah. In Exod. xxiii, 18, it is ordered: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread; neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning." Here we have regulations respecting sacrifice. Now our new sceptical critics admit that Exod. xxi-xxiii was the first legislation.

In concluding this subject we may remark, that as Moses found the custom of offering sacrifices already in existence, it would be in the highest degree improbable that he should make no regulations respecting the kind of sacrifices to be offered, the persons by whom they were to be offered, and the time and place of their offering.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ALLEGED TRACES OF A POST-MOSAIC AGE IN THE
PENTATEUCH.

THAT the Pentateuch, though composed by Moses, should have suffered no interpolation whatever in the course of more than three thousand years, is not very probable. We know that the New Testament itself, though only eighteen centuries old, and very widely spread by numerous manuscripts and several important versions—having, in this respect, the advantage of the Pentateuch—has not wholly escaped interpolation.¹ Interpolations as glosses most generally occur in the historical portions of a work, and mostly at an early period of its existence, when more is known respecting a subject than is recorded. But they rarely ever occur in the midst of laws or general discussions. Frequent interpolations, of course, weaken the authority of a document.

We can easily imagine that in a few instances explanatory remarks, and new names for obsolete ones, might have been written on the margin of the Mosaic Pentateuch, and afterward have been incorporated into the text, and yet that they might be of such a nature as not to affect the general integrity of the text, or weaken in the least its authority.

Minor and accidental interpolations do not weaken authority.

In the Septuagint we have two remarkable interpolations in the Book of Joshua. When this leader of the Hebrews razed Jericho, he pronounced a curse upon its rebuilder (Josh. vi, 26). The Septuagint adds to the Hebrew text the following: "And thus did Hozan of Bethel. In Abiron his firstborn he laid its foundations, and in his youngest surviving son he set up its gates." This is substantially taken from 1 Kings xvi, 34. Again, in Josh. xvi, 10, we find it stated that the children of Israel "drove not out the Canaanites that dwell in Gezer: but the Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites unto this day, and serve under tribute." But the Greek version adds to the Hebrew text: "Until Pharaoh king of Egypt came up and took it, and burnt it with fire, and killed the Canaanites and Perizzites, and those who dwelt in Gezer, and Pharaoh

¹ See Tischendorf's eighth critical edition of Greek Testament. The instances, however, are few. John v, 4; vii, 53-viii, 11, are instances.

gave it as a dowry to his daughter." This is manifestly taken from 1 Kings ix, 16.

The alleged post-Mosaic passages of the Pentateuch, if real, do not bring down the work in its present form—if we except one or two passages—later than the age of Joshua. But in determining what might have been written by Moses, and what could not much depends upon our preconceptions. If we regard miracles and prophecies as impossibilities, or violent improbabilities, in connexion with the Mosaic history, and consider Moses as nothing more than a human legislator, we shall be unable to form a correct judgment respecting the Pentateuch. Under such misapprehensions, wherever we meet with the record of miracles, we will conclude that this cannot be contemporary history, but only legend; and wherever we meet with prophecy, we will immediately infer that the prophecies were written after the predicted events. To one holding these views, the genuineness of the Pentateuch will be quite impossible. But the credibility of the miraculous, as belonging to a different department of Christian theology, we do not here discuss.

We have already seen, in the sketch which we have given of the opinions respecting the Pentateuch, that it is a favourite idea with the opponents of its genuineness that the whole five books passed under the revision of some *rédacteur*, or editor, who lived seven or eight centuries after Moses.

But there seems to us a remarkable want of candour in those who hold such an idea. For if they find some traces of a post-Mosaic age in the Pentateuch, why can they not adopt the following hypothesis:

"We believe that the Pentateuch was substantially written by Moses, but that it passed under the hands of a *rédacteur* some centuries after his time." Or could they not even allow that it was revised by Joshua or Samuel?

Instead of some such hypothesis as this, there seems to be a studied effort on the part of not a few critics to avoid, as far as possible, conceding the Mosaic authorship, from a fear, it would seem, of the evangelical consequence of such a concession.

But the question, whether there are any interpolations or post-Mosaic passages in the Pentateuch, must be determined from the examination of the alleged instances. The first among these is Gen. xii, 6: "And the Canaanite was then in the land." There is a similar statement in Gen. xiii, 7: "And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt then in the land." In reference to both of these passages the inquiry arises, whether the language indicates that in the time of Abram the Canaanites were living in the land, but were afterward

Want of candour in the opponents of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

driven out; or that they were already in the land, having arrived there before Abram? The latter seems to be the meaning; for was it necessary for the historian to inform the Israelites that the Canaanites once lived in Canaan, when everybody knew it? But it was not known, independently of the statements in Genesis, that already, in the time of Abram, the Canaanite and the Perizzite were in the land. The first of these passages stands in close connexion with the promise made to Abram, "Unto thy seed will I give this land," which at that time was held by the Canaanite. The second passage seems to assign a reason why there was a strife between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle; because the Canaanite and the Perizzite being in the land, there was not room enough for the herds of both Abram and Lot. The context would seem to indicate this.

In Gen. xiv, 14 it is stated that Abram pursued the kings unto Dan. As there was in the northern part of Palestine a city (Laish) to which the Danites gave the name Dan some time after the conquest of Canaan (Josh. xix, 47, Judg. xviii, 29), it has been thought by many that the passage in Genesis must have been written after that event. But it is very probable that the Dan in Genesis ^{The location of Dan.} is a different place from that called Laish in Joshua and Judges. In 2 Sam. xxiv, 6, mention is made of Dan-jaan, which would show that this place was different from that called simply Dan. Jerome remarks on the passage, "he pursued them unto Dan," "to a town of the Phœnicians now called Paneas."¹ And in his *Onomasticon* he says, "Dan is a small village four miles from Paneas as you go to Tyre, which is so called to-day." From this it appears that he believed in the existence of *two* Dans. Yet in another place he says, that the Laish which the Danites took is to-day called Paneas; and in still another, that it is situated near Paneas. Dan existed in his time, as he tells us, and it is now called *Tell Kadi* (*hill of a Judge, or hill of Dan*), and he clearly distinguishes Paneas from this. The two places have been clearly identified in modern times, and are two or three miles apart.

Fürst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, under the word דָּן gives *Judge, ruler*, a Phœnician name of *Eshmûn*, or Pan, otherwise called [on the coins of פַּעַל יַעַן, i. e., Paneas] Bal-inas, i. e., Ba'al Ya'an) n. p. of a Sidonian-Phœnician city, situated on one of the sources of the Jordan, in the valley בֵּית־רְחוֹב, at a short distance from Paneas, called in Hebrew דָּן יַעַן [*Dan-jaan*], in Phœnician פַּעַל יַעַן [Ba'al-ja'an], as the deity worshipped there (Gen. xiv, 14). He defines דָּן יַעַן, *Dan-jaan*,

¹ Questions in Genesis.

Dan playing the pipe, as the proper name of *Paneas*, where *דָּן* *עַל*, i. e., Pan, was worshipped in a grotto (2 Sam. xxiv, 6).

It is, therefore, in the highest degree probable that the Dan mentioned in Gen. xiv, 14 was a Phœnician town already existing in the time of Abraham, or at least in the Mosaic age.

But the narrative in which Dan occurs bears every mark of antiquity and accuracy, and such a blunder as making Abraham pursue the kings to a Dan that was not so called until five or eight centuries later is not to be thought of in such a connexion. In this part of the history we have the name that Zoar bore previous to the overthrow of Sodom: "And the king of Bela (the same is Zoar)." The valley above the Dead Sea is called "The Vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea" (ch. xiv, 3), a name found nowhere else, and apparently the more ancient one. Mention is also made of Hazezon-tamar, which in Joshua is called simply En-gedi, which is shown in 2 Chron. xx, 2, to be the same. The description of the meeting of Melchizedek with Abram is likewise highly indicative of early times. Had the passage under discussion been written after the Danites had captured Laish, and had the reference been to that town, we should have expected to find the following: "Unto Laish, the same is Dan."

In Gen. xxviii, 19, it is said that Jacob "called the name of that place Bethel: but the name of that city was called Luz at the first." But it is stated in Judges i, 23: "And the house of Joseph sent to descry Bethel: now the name of the city before was Luz." Here

No inconsistency between the Bethel of Genesis and Judges. there is no difficulty at all, for, although Jacob in passing through the place called it Bethel, yet the Canaanites would still continue to call it Luz, the old name, even if they knew that Jacob called it Bethel. When the Israelites captured it, they simply gave it the name by which Jacob had called it several centuries previously.

In Gen. xxxvi, 31, there occurs the following passage, which many have regarded as having been written after Israel had kings: "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." But in Gen. xxxv, 11 God promises Jacob kings shall come out of his loins. God had also said unto Abraham respecting Sarah (Gen. xvii, 16): "She shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her." The prophecy respecting Judah was: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come" (Gen. xlix, 10), and this conveys the same idea of kingly power to be possessed. At the birth of Jacob and Esau it was predicted, "The elder shall serve the younger" (Gen. xxv, 23). Yet in the time of

Moses Israel had not yet had a king, but had been in servitude in Egypt; while Esau, the younger, had kings among his descendants.

It does not follow from the language of the passage that Israel already had kings: this would be the inference if kings had not been promised: but Moses, being well acquainted with the promises made the patriarchs, confidently expected kings, and viewed them as a future reality. These considerations, of course, will have no weight with one who believes that such promises were never made to the patriarchs; but he may still believe in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and regard the passage under consideration as a later addition.

But the enumeration of the kings and the dukes of Edom (Gen. xxxvi, 31-43) may be made to yield a positive testimony to the genuineness of the Pentateuch. The list contains *eight* kings and *eleven* dukes, and the government appears to have been an elective monarchy, as in no instance does the son succeed the father. In the days of Moses Edom had a king; for it is stated (Num. xx, 14) that Moses sent messengers from Kadesh unto the king of Edom. And it had also dukes, for in the song which Moses and the children of Israel sang at the Red Sea, after the overthrow of Pharaoh, it is said: "Then the dukes of Edom shall be amazed" (Exod. xv, 15); that is, when they hear what Jehovah has done to Pharaoh. These dukes, at least a great part of them, were contemporary with Moses, and lived at the same time with one or more of the kings of Edom, and none of them can well belong to a post-Mosaic period. Certainly, they could not reach far beyond Moses, for they are too few.

Enumeration of kings a testimony to the genuineness of Pentateuch.

In Gen. xxxvi, 9-19, there is given a list of the dukes of Esau—his grandchildren. This is followed by a list of important Horites, the sons of Seir, whom the Edomites drove out, as is stated in Deut. i 12. Then follow the names of the kings who reigned in Edom before any king reigned over Israel; and then come eleven dukes. The Horites seem to have been driven out by the grandsons of Esau, probably one hundred and fifty or two hundred years before Israel entered Canaan.

Eight elected kings, beginning with the subjugation of the Horites, would extend to about the same period. There is a strong probability, if not a certainty, that Hadar, the eighth king, was a contemporary of the author of the Pentateuch, as no mention is made of his death; while of the other kings it is said that they died, and, what is remarkable, the name of not only Hadar's wife, but of her mother and grandfather, is given. This last is not done in the case of any other of these kings, and it

Hadar and Moses contemporary.

shows a more intimate acquaintance with the last of the eight; and such accurate knowledge Moses, being a contemporary, and in close proximity with him, could have easily obtained. We know that Hadar¹ was not the last king of Edom, for mention is made of a king of Edom in the time of Jehoshaphat (2 Kings iii), and of the king's seed (1 Kings xi, 14) in the time of Solomon.

The monarchy of the Edomites at the time of the composition of the Pentateuch was elective,² certainly not hereditary; but in the time of David and Solomon it was hereditary: for when Joab slew all the male Edomites, Hadad, of the king's seed, was raised up to be an adversary of Solomon, doubtless by attempting to cause a revolt of Edom from Solomon in favour of himself, the heir of the throne of Edom. As Hadar belonged to an elective monarchy—a strong proof of his great antiquity—and was evidently a contemporary of the author of the Pentateuch, we have another proof of the very early composition of this work. Certainly, all the kings of Edom in Gen. xxxvi, 31–39, lived before the time of Saul, and this fact itself carries back the Pentateuch at least to the days of the judges. But if the Pentateuch existed at that time, it must have been written in the Mosaic age, for it could not have been composed in such an age as that of the Judges.

The incident mentioned in chap. xxxvi, 24, in naming the Ho-
 rrites, "This was that Anah that found *the warm springs*
 (English version erroneously, *mules*) in the desert, as he
 fed the asses of Zibeon his father," indicates such an
 intimate knowledge of these early times as a late writer could not
 have possessed.

The language employed by Joseph in his request to the chief butler has been thought to indicate a post-Mosaic age: "For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews" (Gen.

¹ It has been suggested against the genuineness of the Pentateuch that this Hadar (called Hadad in 1 Chron. i, 50, 51) is the same that is mentioned as the adversary of Solomon (1 Kings xi, 14). But in Gen. xxxvi, 31, it is stated that the kings there named reigned before there was any king in Israel; therefore, before the time of Saul. When Joab, in the time of David, slew all the males of Edom, Hadad, being yet a little child, fled with others into Egypt about forty years before he became the adversary of Solomon, Edom, in the meanwhile, being subject to the Jewish kings. The Hadar in Genesis reigned instead of Baal-hanan, while the Hadad in 1 Kings seems never to have reigned at all, as Edom continued subject to the Jewish monarchs; and if he had, in whose stead would it have been? The whole history of the Edomites in the time of David and Solomon, as compared with the statement, in Genesis xxxvi, 31–39, completely refutes the idea that the Hadar of Genesis is the same as the Hadad of 1 Kings.

² This clearly appears from the list of the kings, Gen. xxxvi, 31–39.

xl, 15). To object to this language on the ground that it supposes that the children of Israel had already taken possession of Canaan, is at least hypercritical. For "the land of the Hebrews" is equivalent to "the land where the Hebrews dwell," as they were then dwelling in the land of Canaan. Perhaps this appears more clearly from the use of the article "*the* Hebrews." If we were to call Frankfort-on-the-Main "the city of the Rothschilds," that would simply mean that they were born or live there, not that the *whole* city belongs to them, and that nobody else lives there. And we may illustrate this usage from Scripture. God says to Abraham, "Get thee out of *thy* country" (Gen. xii, 1), that is, out of Mesopotamia, though he owned little or none of it. And Jacob says to Laban, "Send me away . . . that I may go to *my* country," that is, Canaan (Gen. xxx, 25).

It has been contended by some that the passage, "And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan" (Exod. xvi. 35), could not have been written by Moses, since the manna did not cease until the children of Israel had crossed the Jordan and encamped in Gilgal (Josh. v, 12). But it must be observed that the Hebrew *עַד*, *until*, does not always mark a final limit, but occasionally a first limit. We may say in English, "*Farewell until we meet again*;" or in German, "*Auf wiedersehen*;" or in French, "*Au revoir*." But this does not imply that we have no concern afterward about the person addressed. The passage in Exodus says not a word about the *cessation of the manna*; nor does it state *definitely* how long it continued. But in Joshua v, 11, 12, we have a very definite statement: "And they did eat of the old corn of the land on the morrow after the passover. . . . And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn of the land; neither had the children of Israel manna any more; but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year." If the passage in the Pentateuch respecting the continuance of the manna had been written after the Mosaic age, it is natural to suppose that it would have stated definitely where the manna ceased to fall. When Moses was about to die, on the borders of the land of Canaan, the Israelites had been fed with manna forty years, and he must have known that the manna would cease upon their entering Canaan, so that he made an indefinite statement respecting it, simply asserting that it continued to fall until the Israelites reached the borders of Canaan. The Jordan could be called the border (*קצה*) of Canaan, just as the Arnon, forming the boundary between the Moabites and the Amo-

Objection
based on time
of cessation of
the manna.

rites, is called *the border*¹ of Moab (Num. xxi, 13). The seashore is also called קְצֵה, *border of the sea* (Josh. xv, 2). In the close of the book of Numbers it is said: "These are the commandments and the judgments, which the Lord commanded, by the hand of Moses, unto the children of Israel in the plains of Moab *by Jordan near Jericho.*"

In close connexion with the preceding statement respecting the manna, it is said: "Now an omer is the tenth of an ephah." This has been thought to indicate a post-Mosaic age, inasmuch as it is an explanation. Some critics have regarded the *omer* (Heb. עֹמֶר, Sept. *gomor*) to be the name of a vessel, the same as the Arabic *gomer*, a *cup*. Both Gesenius and Fürst define the word to mean both a *measure* and a *sheaf*. This is a strange combination of meanings. The statement respecting the size of the omer may have been made on one of two grounds—either because it was a measure previously unknown, or but little known, to the Israelites; and, therefore, Moses, in giving the Israelites a command respecting the quantity of manna each one is to gather, defines its capacity; or because, being generally unknown in the post-Mosaic age, it was added to the original account as an explanation. No mention is made of the *omer* until the giving of the manna; and, except in Exodus xvi, 16, 18, 22, 32, 33, 36, it is nowhere found in the Bible in the sense of a measure.² But the *ephah*, of which the *omer* is a tenth, occurs in various places from Exodus to Ezekiel. Gesenius regards the word *ephah* (אֵיפָה) as of Egyptian origin. Then, of course, it was already known to the Israelites, who had come out of Egypt. And this seems to have been the standard measure of reference in the Mosaic legislation, for we have numerous passages⁴ in which the *tenth of an ephah* is expressed simply by עֲשָׂרֹן, *a tenth*, and the *omer* is left entirely out of sight. This may be illustrated by an analogous case. *The shekel of the sanctuary*, or *the holy shekel*, seems to have been unknown previously to the exodus, for Moses defines its weight: "Twenty gerahs (*beans*, kernels) shall be the shekel" (Lev. xxvii, 25); and the number of *gerahs* to the shekel cannot be regarded as the addition of a later age, for it seems to occur nowhere out of the Pentateuch except in Ezekiel xlv, 12.

¹ עֲבֹרָה is here used for *border*.

² In the account of the manna, it is stated that it resembled coriander seed. This comparison was very natural, for, according to Pliny, the coriander was a noted production of Egypt, and the Israelites who had come out of Egypt must have been familiar with it.

³ In Leviticus xxiii, and in a few other passages, it has the sense of *sheaf*, or *handful* of grain.

⁴ Especially in Leviticus. See chaps. xiv, xxiii, *et al.*

which is evidently based on passages in the Pentateuch. There is no serious difficulty in supposing that the statement respecting the size of the omer was really written by Moses. But if the explanatory remark was made in a post-Mosaic age, when the size of the omer was generally unknown, it shows the antiquity of the account of the manna.

The pot into which the omer of manna was to be put for a memorial is called ^{פִּינְקָה}פִּינְקָה, which is found nowhere else in the Bible—certainly a proof of the antiquity of the record.

The occurrence in the Pentateuch of the name *Hebron*, a celebrated city in Southern Palestine, has been thought by many to be post-Mosaic, since it is stated both in Josh. ^{Difficulty concerning Hebron.} xiv, 15, and in Judg. i, 10, that, before the town was captured by the Israelites, its name was Kirjath-arba. But it is evident that Kirjath-arba was not the most ancient name of the town; for it is stated immediately in connexion with this name *Kirjath-arba* (city of Arba), "which Arba was a great man among the Anakim" (Joshua xiv, 15). Now, in the days of Abram, there were no Anakim in Hebron; but Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol and of Aner, dwelt there, with whom Abram was confederate (Gen. xiv, 13). In Gen. xiii, 18, it is called the "plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron." Hence it is impossible that the town could have had the name of Kirjath-arba in the time of Abram. But when Moses sent spies to search out the land of Canaan they found the Anakim already in Hebron. Consequently the name Kirjath-arba was given the city some time between the age of Abraham and the exodus. Although Abraham called the city Hebron (*Alliance*) in commemoration of his *alliance* with Mamre, Aner, and Eshcol, and it was called Mamre by others, yet the Anakim naturally changed the name to Kirjath-arba; (city of Arba) after the name of a great man among them. But Hebron being the name by which Abraham and his descendants in Egypt probably called it, the Israelites, after conquering it, very naturally restored to it the old name, as in the case of Bethel. That Hebron was already a town in the time of Abraham is evident; for it is stated in Num. xiii, 22, that Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt, and we have proof that Zoan existed as far back as the time of Abraham. In speaking of the great temple of Zoan, Wilkinson¹ remarks: "The temple not only bears the names of kings of the twelfth and thirteenth dynasty [B. C. 2000]; it existed, according to M. Mariette, in the time of the sixth" [B. C. 2200]. What accurate knowledge is here displayed by the author of the Pentateuch in the notice of the building of Hebron

¹ Hand-book of Egypt, pp. 219, 220.

and Zoan—the latter of which was one of the capitals of Egypt in the days of Moses, and situated on the borders of Goshen! And who was so likely to possess this accurate knowledge as Moses, skilled in all the wisdom of the Egyptians? And in giving this exact statement the place is called Hebron. Besides, the following is very natural language if written by one outside of the Promised Land: “Abraham buried Sarah his wife in the cave of the field of Machpelah¹ before Mamre: the same is Hebron in *the land of Canaan*” (Gen. xxiii, 19). Also we have: “Kirjath-arba: the same is Hebron in *the land of Canaan*” (ch. xxiii, 2). Outside of the Pentateuch it is nowhere stated that Hebron is in *the land of Canaan*, for to writers in Palestine the language would be unnatural, as everybody knew where it was; but it is called simply Hebron. In Num. xiii, 22, no addition is made to define its locality, for that is clear from the context.

In Numbers xxi, 14, mention is made of “*the book of the wars of Jehovah*,” which some think to be post-Mosaic. But surely there was ample time before the death of Moses for the composing and writing of a poem which would give a sketch of the wars of Israel. The events to which allusion is made in Numbers xxi, 14, 15, occurred six months or more before the death of Moses, and they could easily have been added to the book of the wars of Jehovah, and have been referred to by Moses. The song sung by Moses and the Israelites on the drowning of Pharaoh was incorporated into the Pentateuch (Exod. xv, 1-19). We have also in Num. xxi, 27-30, a quotation from one of the songs current in the last part of the Exodus, prefaced with the following remark: “Wherefore the poets say, Come into Heshbon, let the city of Sihon be built and established.”

The reference to what is contained in the *book of the wars of Jehovah* is obscure, and the English translation of the passage is erroneous. The Hebrew may be rendered thus:—

Vaheb (He took) in a storm
And the streams of the Arnon.
And the outpouring of the streams
Which turn to the dwelling of Ar;
And lie near the border of Moab.

The preceding quotations of poems in the Pentateuch, celebrating the events of the exodus, give a strong confirmation to the Mosaic history.

¹ The cave of Machpelah, now covered by a mosque, is on the extreme east of Hebron, which lies below in the valley, “before Mamre,” or Hebron. See the author’s *Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land*, p. 134.

Portions of the prophecy of Balaam (Num. xxiv) have been thought by some to contain internal evidence of a post-Mosaic age. In predicting the future power of Israel he says: "His king shall be greater than Agag." This has been referred by a certain class of critics, and even Bleek among them, to the Agag mentioned in 1 Sam. xv, who was captured by Saul and slain by Samuel; and consequently the prophecy was composed not earlier than the reign of Saul. But there is strong probability that Agag was the common title of the kings of Amalek, and Gesenius gives the word as the name of several of them. Fürst remarks, under אגג, *Agag*, "This name of the Amalekite kings may have existed before the time of Samuel;" and Josephus and Jewish tradition explain *Agagite* in Esther iii, 1, as *an Amalekite by birth*. There is nothing in the language to require a reference to the Agag of Samuel. When the prophecy was delivered Amalek was called the first of the nations. This was not true of the time of Samuel; nor would there be much force in the declaration that the king of Israel would be greater than Agag, if the king of that name destroyed by Samuel be referred to. But there are portions of the prophecy which carry us down to the Assyrian, Greek, and Roman periods. For example: "The Kenite shall be destroyed until Asshur [Assyria] shall carry thee away captive." Here we have a reference to the times of Shalmaneser and Sennacherib: "And ships shall come from the coast of Chittim [the regions of Greece] and afflict Assyria, and shall afflict Eber" [the Hebrews]. Here we have reference to the overthrow of the great Asiatic power by Alexander the Great (about B. C. 330), and the subversion of the Jewish State by the Romans (A. D. 70). Was the prophecy of Balaam written after all these events? No one will assert that. The passages are found in the Samaritan text, which cannot be later than B. C. 400, and in the Septuagint B. C. 280, as well as in the common Hebrew text.

"These are the words which Moses spake unto all Israel *beyond* (בְּעֵבֶר) Jordan in the wilderness" (Deut. i, 1). Also in Objection to the expression "beyond Jordan." verse 5: "*Beyond* Jordan, in the land of Moab." The opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch regard this language as that of a writer whose standpoint is *west* of the Jordan in the land of Canaan; for to such a writer only, they contend, could the tract east of the river be called *beyond* Jordan. The real question here is, Was the tract east of the river called by the Israelites already, in the Mosaic age, *beyond* Jordan? This is in the highest degree probable, for the inhabitants of Canaan, even before the time of Abraham, in all probability, called the region east of the Jordan, *beyond* Jordan. Abraham, in adopting the language of the Ca-

naanites, would use the same phraseology. At all events, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had sojourned long enough in Canaan to give the territory east of the Jordan the name *beyond* Jordan, and this phraseology they would naturally carry with them into Egypt, and bring back with them. Josephus calls the country beyond Jordan, *Peræa* ¹ (from *πέραν*, *beyond*). And it is well known that Cæsar ² calls that part of Gaul between Rome and the Alps "Hither Gaul," and the part beyond the Alps "Farther Gaul," although to him, now waging war in Farther Gaul, this latter region was really Hither Gaul.

But, after all, it is clear from various passages that the country between the Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea was also called *beyond* Jordan. In Deut. iii, 20, 25; xi, 30, *בְּעֵבֶר* has this meaning; and in Num. xxxii, 19, we have *בְּעֵבֶר*, *from beyond*, applied to *both sides* of the *Jordan*: "For we will not inherit with them *beyond* Jordan and farther, because our inheritance is fallen to us *beyond* Jordan eastward." Here the last word is added to distinguish the country east from that west of the river. We also find the country *west* of the Jordan called *beyond* Jordan in Josh. v, i; xii, 7; xxii, 7. With good reason, then, does Fürst explain the phrase, *עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן*, *beyond* *Jordan*, as used for *both sides of the Jordan*. He defines *עֵבֶר* as *bank-land*. In view of these facts there is scarcely the shadow of an argument against the genuineness of the Pentateuch from the use of the phrase, "beyond Jordan."

In Deut. ii, 12, in reference to the children of Esau having dis-
Passages supposed to indicate a post-Mosaic age. possessed the Horites, it is said: They "*dwelt in their stead; as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them.*" This passage has been supposed by some to have been written after the children of Israel had driven out the Canaanites. But it must be borne in mind that when this language was attributed to Moses, the country east of the Jordan had already been subdued, and given to Reuben, Gad, and to the half tribe of Manasseh (Num. xxxii, 33), and Moses knew that the Canaanites would also be dispossessed. But such language could be used without any reference to the Canaanites, even if the conquests and inheritance of the Israelites had been limited by the Jordan. But, further, there is no necessity for rendering the passage in the absolutely past tense, for the preterite of the Hebrew is used also for the present and the future.³ The preterite and the future

¹ Antiq., 636, *et al.* This was the common name of the trans-Jordanic territory.

² In his Commentaries.

³ See Roediger's Gesenius, Heb. Gram., p. 224.

being the only tenses in the language, are used in a wider sense than the same tenses are in the western languages. Hence we can render the passage, without doing violence to the original, thus: "As Israel *does* to the land of his possession, which the Lord *gives* unto them."

The following passage, also, has been thought to indicate a post-Mosaic age: "Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi; and called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day" (Deut. iii, 14). In Judges x, 3, 4, mention is made of a Jair who judged Israel twenty-two years, and who "had thirty sons that rode on thirty ass colts, and they had thirty cities, which are called Havoth-jair unto this day, which are in the land of Gilead." Some have supposed that this Jair is the one mentioned in Deuteronomy, transferred by mistake to the Mosaic age. So far as the genuineness of the Pentateuch is concerned, all that is necessary here is to show that the statements respecting Jair in Deuteronomy are historical facts, belonging to the Mosaic age.

In Numbers xxxii, 40, 41, we find a confirmation of the passage in Deuteronomy: "And Moses gave Gilead unto Machir the son of Manasseh; and he dwelt therein. And Jair the son of Manasseh went and took the small towns thereof, and called them Havoth-jair" (villages of Jair). In Joshua xiii, 30, after speaking of the inheritance which Moses gave to the half tribe of Manasseh, it is added: "All the towns of Jair, which are in Bashan, threescore cities." We also find in 1 Chron, ii, 21-23, a confirmation of the passage in Deuteronomy, where it is stated that Segub, a brother of Caleb, "begat Jair, who had three and twenty cities in the land of Gilead. And he took Geshur, and Aram, with the towns of Jair, from them, with Kenath, and the towns thereof, even threescore cities." The Jair named in Judges x, 3-5, who governed Israel, is evidently a different one from that mentioned in the Pentateuch; and there is nothing strange in there being a second Jair, a descendant of the first mentioned, and bearing his name. The villages possessed by Jair's sons (Judg. x, 4) are called Havoth-jair; but it is not stated that they are so called for the first time.

It is stated in Deut. iii, 14, that the villages are called "Bashan-havoth-jair *unto this day*." This expression, in several places in Deuteronomy, is regarded by some as indicating quite a long period intervening between the events and the time of the writer. But in every instance in Deuteronomy in which "unto this day" is used, except the one relating to *Havoth-jair*,

The Jairs in Judges and in Joshua con-founded by false criticism.

Objection to the term "unto this day."

twenty-eight years, at least, had elapsed. In the middle books of the Pentateuch the phrase nowhere occurs. It is impossible for us to fix the minimum interval to which the language can be applied. In Joshua xxii, 17, it is used to express an interval of, apparently, about eight years.

The only instance in which the use of the expression *unto this day* can create any difficulty, is the passage to which we have already alluded in Deut. iii, 14, that Jair called the villages "after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day." In Numbers xxxii, 41, it is simply stated that he "called them Havoth-jair." It could not have been more than a year, perhaps was less, after the conquest and naming of these villages that the discourse in Deuteronomy was delivered, so that less than a year, in all probability, intervened respecting which it is said that he called them "Bashan-havoth-jair *unto this day*." But the passage simply means that Jair gave these villages his own name, by which they are now called, the name having permanently adhered to them. The improbability of this meaning cannot be shown.

There is something apparently singular in the use of "unto this day" in Gen. xix, 37, where it is said, "the same is the father of the Moabites unto this day;" and especially in Deut. xi, 3, 4, in which, after an enumeration of the mighty acts of God in punishing the Egyptians, it is added, "how the Lord hath destroyed them *unto this day*." The events to which reference is here made occurred in the space of a month or two, and forty years before the address of Moses was delivered; and the phrase *unto this day* must mean simply in *time past*, or in *the time preceding this day*. As Moses was about to leave the Israelites, he takes a survey of the affairs of his people, describes the *present* condition of things, and is thus led to use the expression "*unto this day*" in various places.

The directions respecting the future king of Israel (Deut. xvii, 14-20) have been regarded by some¹ as written after the people had a king, since it was contrary to the divine will that they should have one, and according to 1 Sam. viii, 7, there was a rejection of Jehovah himself in asking for one. But this argument is utterly unsound. For it was foreseen of God, and even promised, that kings should spring from the posterity of Jacob; and Deuteronomy prescribes certain regulations for the king that they might set over them. It may, however, be objected that Deuteronomy, to be consistent with 1 Sam. viii, 7, ought absolutely to have prohibited the Israelites from having a king. But in this objection there would be no force,

¹ Among others, by Bleek, p. 216.

for God *does* allow them to have a king (1 Sam. viii, 22). Is it not the part of wisdom to make regulations for events that are certain to arise? And though it had been better had they never occurred, yet, under the circumstances, the absolute prohibition would work a greater evil.

But, further, the demand of the Israelites to have a king was a rejection of Samuel, and also a rejection of Jehovah, who had appointed Samuel to be their judge. It was not inconsistent with the Mosaic economy, and with the theocracy, to have a king subordinate to God. For, had that been the case, God would not have granted their request at all. The people sinned in rebelling against the existing arrangement and the appointed ruler, instead of waiting to be directed by the Almighty. The Israelites, in Deuteronomy xvii, 15, are charged: "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose." We find this law complied with by Samuel; and God chose Saul (1 Sam. x, 24). Samuel also "told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord." In this there seems to be a reference to the regulations in Deut. xvii, 14-20, respecting the future king, and the language of the elders of Israel to Samuel, "Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations," is very similar to 1 Sam. viii, 5.

Directions concerning kings based on certainty of future facts.

In Deut. xvii, 18, the future king is directed to "write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites." Now, at whatever time this part¹ of Deuteronomy may be supposed to have been forged, it must have been immediately detected as spurious, since no former king would have known anything of it, nor would it in former times have been in the ark.

But the legislation in this seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy presupposes that the *shophet, judge*, is the highest officer of the people in the land of Canaan: "And thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the *judges* that shall be in those days, and inquire" (ver. 9). In the regulations respecting the king it is enjoined that "he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses." The ground of this prohibition is given: "Forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way." This language is natural enough in Moses, for he might fear a return to Egypt of the people who had just left it; but in the ages of the kings such a fear could not be entertained. In 1 Kings iv, 26, we find that "Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for

¹ It is generally conceded that the Book of Deuteronomy is from one author.

his chariots." As he had no intention of conducting the people back to Egypt, he, perhaps, considered himself justified; and there would be some ground for this view. In a similar manner we violate the *letter* of the second commandment, which prohibits the making of any image. But we take it in connexion with what follows, and interpret accordingly: "Thou shalt not bow down to them nor worship them." Whence we infer that the making the image with no idolatrous purpose is not sinful. He is further enjoined: "Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away; neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold." The reason for the last prohibition doubtless was, that in such a case he would impoverish the people; but the obtaining of gold for the enriching of his people might not be forbidden the king.

That Solomon departed from the Mosaic regulations in some things is not to be wondered at; and, indeed, we are informed that he built "a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, . . . and for Moloch, the abomination of the children of Ammon" (1 Kings xi, 7). But these departures from Deuteronomy, and in part from the very fundamental principle of the Mosaic religion, do not prove that Deuteronomy had no existence in the age of Solomon. On the same principle, by comparing the lives of some professed Christians with the New Testament, we might infer its non-existence. But Solomon alludes to Deuteronomy in his prayer at the dedication of the temple. (Compare 1 Kings viii, 29 with Deut. xii, 11).

But would any Israelite have forged the laws respecting the king hundreds of years after Solomon, to condemn what he had done? The supposition is preposterous.

The objection from the prohibition against the removal of landmarks considered. In Deut. xix, 14, it is enjoined, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it." Some have considered this as having been written after the Israelites had fully settled in Canaan. But the word רֵאשִׁימִים, rendered "they of old time," can be well translated "*former ones*." Is there any inconsistency in Moses giving a precept of this kind to be observed by the Israelites in Canaan? And if given, what form should it have? Reference must be made to a boundary already fixed, for the sin would lie in removing what had formerly been established as a landmark. And it is expressly stated in the passage, "In thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it." Is it possible that a writer should contradict himself in the same passage,

in one part using language indicating that Israel had long been in Canaan, and in the other representing them as having not yet entered the land, and giving directions how they should act when they should enter it? No writer, much less the author of Deuteronomy, could be guilty of such stupidity.

The regulations respecting war in Deut. xx refer to the future of Israel, when they shall have entered the land of Canaan; and there is nothing in them that could not have been written by Moses.¹

In concluding this part of our subject we may remark, that if the Pentateuch, comprising about one fourth of the Hebrew Bible, and extending over a period of more than twenty-five hundred years, had been composed centuries after Moses, it would have contained numerous palpable references to post-Mosaic times. On the contrary, however, we find no clear allusion to anything of an age later than that of Moses; and the supposed allusions of that nature, upon examination, disappear in every, or in almost every, case. It is not inconsistent with the genuineness of the Pentateuch to suppose, as we have before stated, that a few interpolations have found their way into it, but of this we have proof in hardly a single instance. The whole colouring and spirit of the book is Mosaic.

¹ Because in the Pentateuch יָמָה, *seaward*, is used for *westward*, and נִנְבָה, *toward the dry region*, especially *the southern part of Judah*, for *south*, Robertson Smith affirms that the Pentateuch was written in Canaan (p. 323). But suppose Moses wrote or revised it in the land of Moab, what then? The Mediterranean Sea was west of him, and the south country of Judah was south of him. But how often are words used in a sense different from their primitive force! We can say of a Philadelphia merchant, he *ships* his goods from Philadelphia to Pittsburg, just as if a sea lay between the two cities. Herodotus (viii, 60) speaks of *yoking up ships* (ἀναζεύγνυμι), that is, removing them. Did he think that *ships* were a species of oxen?

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

THE Samaritans at Nablûs,¹ a remnant of the ancient sect of that name, have the Pentateuch in Hebrew, written in very ancient irregular characters, and differing but little from the Pentateuch of the Jews. In determining the value of the Samaritan Codex, and its bearing on the genuineness of the Jewish Pentateuch, it is necessary, first of all, to inquire, *Who were the Samaritans?* The most ancient origin of the account of the origin of this people is found in 2 Kings Samaritans. xvii, where it is stated that Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, carried away Israel captive into Assyria (B. C. 721), "and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes;" and that "the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof." But it is not likely that the king of Assyria carried off *all* the inhabitants. The remnant of the ten tribes was incorporated with the colonists of the Assyrian king, and thus the Samaritans became a mixed people. At first they knew not the God of Israel, and lions were sent among them, which slew some of them (chap. xvii, 25). Upon this the king of Assyria gave directions: "Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence; and let them go and dwell there, and let him teach them the manner of the God of the land" (ver. 27). "Then one of the priests whom they had carried away from Samaria came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear the Lord" (ver. 28). "They feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations" from which they had been taken. And when the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity, and were engaged in rebuilding the temple, the Samaritans wished to take a part in it, coming to Zerubbabel and to the chief of the fathers, saying: "Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon [about B. C. 709] king of Assur, which

¹In January, 1870, the author had an interview with the high-priest of the sect at Nablûs, and was told that they numbered one hundred and fifty. See the author's *Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land*, pp. 183-186.

brought us up hither" (Ezra iv, 2). This request was promptly refused, as the Samaritans were for the most part pure heathen¹ and worshipped false gods along with Jehovah. This rejection of their offer seems to have been the source of their hatred of the Jews. During the reign of Alexander the Great, Sanballat, whose son-in-law, Manasseh, was a brother of Jaddus, high priest at Jerusalem, obtained permission from the king, while engaged in the siege of Tyre (B. C. 332), to build a temple for Samaritan worship on Mount Gerizim.² This Sanballat executed with zeal. Afterward the Jews, who had become obnoxious to their brethren in Jerusalem on account of their violations of law, took refuge among the Samaritans.³ Josephus informs us that in the reign of Ptolemy Philometer (B. C. 181-146) the Samaritans, who revered the temple built on Mount Gerizim in the time of Alexander the Great, and the Jews had a disputation in the presence of the Egyptian sovereign concerning the claims of their respective temples, the Samaritans affirming that the temple on Gerizim was built according to the Mosaic law. The Jews denied this, establishing from the law the priority of their own temple in Jerusalem, and the succession of the high priests who had the charge of it; and showing, also, that the kings of Asia had honoured the Jewish temple when that on Gerizim had no existence. The king decided the dispute in favour of the Jews, and put to death the Samaritan disputants.⁴

Samaritans in time of Ptolemy Philometer.

Jesus son of Sirach (about B. C. 180, or even earlier) expresses the feelings of the Jews of that period toward the Samaritans: "There are two nations with which my soul is vexed, and the third is no nation—those who dwell in the mountain of Samaria, the Philistines, and the foolish people who dwell in Shechem"⁵ (Samaritans).

Testimony of Jesus son of Sirach.

Josephus⁶ observes that when the Jews were in prosperity the Samaritans claimed relationship, affirming that they were of the family of Joseph; but that when the Jews were in adversity the Samaritans denied any affinity with them, declaring themselves to be foreigners who had migrated to Samaria. And we accordingly find, that when the Jews were severely persecuted on account of their religion by Antiochus Epiphanes

Testimony of Josephus.

¹The heathen element predominated most strongly in the Samaritans. Hengstenberg and others have regarded them as *purely* heathen. In our visit to the Samaritans we failed to distinguish any thing Jewish in their features.

²Josephus, Antiq., book xi, 8, 4.

³Antiq., xi, 8, 7.

⁴Antiq., xiii, cap. iii, 4.

⁵Cap. I, 25, 26.

⁶Antiq., ix, cap. xiv, 3.

(B. C. 167), the Samaritans, to avoid similar treatment, informed Antiochus, that although they kept the Jewish sabbath, and had been offering sacrifices in the temple built on Mount Gerizim, this edifice was nevertheless not sacred to the supreme God, but was nameless, and that they were ready to dedicate it to the Grecian Zeus.¹ The feeling of hostility on the part of the Jews toward the Samaritans still existed in the time of our Saviour, as appears from the New Testament, and in turn was resented by the Samaritans, who still looked upon the Jews as heretics. In an interview with the high priest of the Samaritans at Nablûs, I asked him his opinion respecting Judaism. He replied, that the "Hebrew prophets were learned men, but not inspired; that Solomon was the predicted Shiloh, with whom the sceptre had left Judah, as that monarch had ruined every thing by his course; and that in many things the Jews

The author's
interview with
the Samaritan
high priest
Amram.

act contrary to the divine law, and are a species of heretics." He also stated that he expected a Messiah, and based his expectation principally upon Deut. xviii, 15.²

It is evident, then, that the Samaritans regard themselves as the theocratic people, the regular successors to the ten tribes of Israel. Thus they exclude the Jews, from the days of Solomon, with whom the sceptre left Judah. It appears that they have never received as canonical any part of the Old Testament except the five books of Moses, which at present they hold as alone of divine authority. Hippolytus remarks of the Samaritans: "They pay no attention to the prophets, but only to the law given by Moses."³ Origen observes, that they receive nothing more than the Pentateuch of Moses.⁴ Jerome had a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch in his own hands, for he has given us a reading which he found in it.⁵

Now the question arises. From what source did the Samaritans derive their Pentateuch? Did the priest appointed by the Assyrian king to instruct the new colonies in Samaria in the knowledge of the God of Israel (2 Kings xvii, 27) make use of a copy of the Pentateuch which had been in use among the ten tribes before they were carried away captive by Shalmaneser? There is proof from the prophets that the Pentateuch was known among the ten tribes, and the most natural supposition is, that it was received from them by the Samaritans. The priest must have had a book of the law out of which to instruct the colonists,

Origin of the
Samaritan
Pentateuch.

Did the priest appointed by the
Assyrian king to instruct the new colonies in Samaria in
the knowledge of the God of Israel (2 Kings xvii, 27)

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.*, xii, 5, 5.

² See the author's *Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land*, pp. 183-186.

³ *Contra Hæreses*, liber ix, 30.

⁴ *Com. on Joan*, tom. xiii, 26.

⁵ *Samaritanorum Hebræa volumina relegens inveni Chol. Com. on Galatians*, liber ii, cap. iii.

and the language of 2 Kings xvii evidently presupposes written laws and statutes among them (ver. 34). Also in Ezra, chap. iv, 2, the Samaritans assert that they have been sacrificing to the God of Israel since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Assur (about B. C. 700). They must have had a Pentateuch by which to make this sacrifice. There is, accordingly, probability that their Pentateuch is considerably older than the date of the Babylonian captivity. The irregular characters in which the Samaritans write their Pentateuch is a proof of its antiquity, as the square Hebrew characters were introduced after the return of the Jews from Babylon, though it appears that the irregular characters in use previously to that event were continued to some extent down to the time of the Maccabees. But the Samaritan characters differ much from those old Hebrew characters on the coins of the times of the Maccabees, and from those of the Phœnicians. It is probable that the Samaritan characters are older than any Semitic characters found on monuments. The changes in the Semitic alphabet going on in all directions made no change in the Samaritan. We may conclude that the ancient Pentateuch, their oldest literature, fixed their alphabetical forms.

Antiquity of the Samaritan characters.

We cannot, however, assert that the Samaritans, if they had not already possessed a copy of the Pentateuch upon the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, would have failed to obtain it from them.

Bleek admits that the worship of Jehovah, established among the Samaritans by the priest sent back by the king of Assyria (2 Kings xvii, 27), was, without doubt, based upon the Mosaic law, though not upon the Pentateuch as we now have it; and that, without doubt, the Samaritans, among whom the reformation of worship by Josiah extended, had heard of the discovery in the temple of an authentic copy of the law, and that it is possible that single chapters of it reached them. He thinks, however, it more probable that the formal reception of the Pentateuch among them in its present form, as an authentic codex of the divine law, did not take place until after the Babylonian exile.¹ De Wette is of opinion that the Samaritan Pentateuch was obtained from the Jews when the Samaritans built their temple on Mount Gerizim, in the time of Alexander the Great (about B. C. 330).²

Admission of Bleek.

The existence of a written code of the laws of Moses among the ten tribes and Samaritans is fatal to the hypothesis of the late origin of Deuteronomy, under Manasseh or Josiah. For the priest from among the ten tribes must

False hypothesis of late origin of Deuteronomy.

¹ Pp. 337, 338.

² Einleitung, p. 204.

have instructed the new colonists out of the Mosaic code, as it existed among his people, and the Samaritans could not have had the book of Deuteronomy unless it had been already acknowledged by the ten tribes of Israel; for if the Jews had added this book to the Mosaic code afterward, it would have been rejected by the Samaritans as a forgery.

The fact of the existence of the Mosaic code among the ten tribes, in connexion with the fact that one of the priests of those tribes taught the new colonists the knowledge of the God of Israel, furnishes a strong proof that the Samaritan Pentateuch has come down from the ten tribes, and that in this form it existed in the time of Solomon. This is, therefore, a valuable testimony to the existence of the *whole* Pentateuch as early as the time of that monarch. The hatred of the Jews by the Samaritans led the latter to reject every thing that pertained to Judah alone.

But it does not follow that the Samaritan Pentateuch is of equal authority with the Jewish. It was not to be expected that it would be preserved with all the care and accuracy with which that of the Jews has been preserved. Preserved among a people of purer faith, of wider culture, and of large numbers, the Jewish Pentateuch has had every thing in its favour.

The agreement between the Samaritan Pentateuch and that of the Septuagint, it seems to us, has been frequently overstated by scholars. It is true that there are many passages in which the two agree together, and differ from the Jewish Pentateuch; but in a far greater number of instances the Samaritan Pentateuch and that of the Septuagint differ from each other. Let us take, for example, the ten commandments. Where the Jewish Pentateuch and the Septuagint have, "*remember* the sabbath day to keep it holy," the Samaritan has, "*keep* the sabbath day," etc. The command to honour father and mother is stated in the same way in both the Jewish Pentateuch and the Samaritan; but the Septuagint has, "*that it may be well with thee . . . upon the good land,*" etc. The sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments stand in the same order in the Jewish and Samaritan texts, but are differently arranged in the Septuagint. In the command not to covet, both the Samaritan and the Septuagint have, in addition to the things prohibited in the Jewish text, "his field;" but the order of the words is not the same. The Septuagint has, in addition to both the Jewish and Samaritan texts, "nor any of his cattle." Also in the fourth commandment, "Thou shalt not do any work," the Samaritan and Septuagint supply the words "in it" to complete the sense.

In chronology the Jewish Pentateuch differs widely from the Septuagint, but less from the Samaritan. Nor have we any proof that the Samaritan Pentateuch has been interpolated from the Septuagint, or that the latter has been interpolated from the former. Not only the difference between them, but the history of the text of each of these copies, is inconsistent with such hypotheses.

In various places in the Samaritan Pentateuch we find explanatory remarks, taken from some other part of the book, added. In the account of God's meeting Balaam (Num. xxii, xxiii), in several instances the *angel of God* is substituted for God himself. But what is most remarkable, the archaisms are almost invariably exchanged for later words. *Matres lectionis*, especially ו and ך, with *shurek* and *tsere* and *chirek*, are used oftener than in the Jewish Pentateuch, for the *full* method of writing generally characterizes a later period of the Hebrew language, to which the Samaritans laboured to conform theirs.

But, upon the whole, the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees well with the Jewish, and is an independent witness to its integrity.

Hengstenberg attaches but little value to the Samaritan Pentateuch as an auxiliary proof of the genuineness of the Jewish, since he thinks it might have been obtained from the Jews after the Babylonian captivity, though he admits that the fact of the reception of the Pentateuch among the ten tribes furnishes a very probable proof that the Samaritan copy came down from them. Nor do we see that Hävernick makes any use of it in defence of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. That the Samaritan Pentateuch has come down from the ten tribes of Israel has been held by Morin, Houbigant, Capellus, Kenicott, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Stuart, and others. There are a few readings in it that seem preferable to those of the Jewish, but, taken as whole, the Samaritan Pentateuch is decidedly inferior.

Explanations
in the Samari-
tan Pentateuch

Hengsten-
berg's opinion.

Views of Häv-
ernick and
others.

CHAPTER XIX.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE ANTIQUITY, AUTHORITY, AND INTEGRITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

ONE of the most convincing methods of establishing the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is to show that it has existed ever since the time of Moses, and that it has always borne his name. We know that at the time of Christ all parties of the Jews—in Palestine, in Egypt, and in whatever parts of the world they were found—received the Pentateuch as the work of Moses. From this period we shall trace back the Pentateuch to the age of Moses.

The first book of Maccabees, written about B. C. 100, states that in the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes (about B. C. 170), if the *book of the covenant* was found with any one he was put to death (1 Macc. i, 57). Here the whole Pentateuch is called the book of the covenant. Jesus the son of Sirach (about B. C. 180 or earlier) speaks of the book of the covenant of the most high God, *the law which Moses commanded* (chap. xxiv, 23). Here, too, the reference to the Pentateuch is obvious.

The Pentateuch, as we have already seen, was translated into Greek about B. C. 280. This translation, forming a part of the LXX, agrees remarkably with the Hebrew Pentateuch, and is the most accurate part of the Greek version. The translators, because of their reverence for the work of Moses, took no liberty with the text.

The Pentateuch of the Samaritans agrees closely with the Jewish, and shows that no changes have been made in the latter since the Samaritan was taken from it. But the Samaritan Pentateuch could not have been derived from the Jewish later than B. C. 330, when Sanballat, with the permission of Alexander the Great, built the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim. For the Samaritans must have obtained it then, even if they did not already possess it.

Since the school of Ezra made no changes in the Pentateuch after B. C. 330, why should they have made any in it before? Its use for centuries, and its reputation as the work of Moses, rendered it sacred in the eyes of the priests and scribes, and would naturally

prevent it from being altered or enlarged. Even if any priest or scribe had attempted such a thing, it is not to be supposed that the mass of the priests and scribes would have consented to it.

Malachi, about B. C. 440, seventeen years after Ezra returned from Babylon, exhorts the people: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments" (iv, 4). Here the prophet recognizes the Pentateuch of that day as having been delivered in Horeb *for all Israel*, and not as something recently contrived for the Jews only. In Malachi i, 7, 12-14, in the offering of polluted sacrifices and blind and maimed animals, there is a reference to Lev. xxii, 22, and Deut. xv, 21. In the withholding of the tithes (iii, 8) we have a reference to Lev. xxvii, 30; Num. xviii, 21; Deut. xxvi, 12. In the Book of Nehemiah, B. C. 440, we find clear references to the Pentateuch: "And they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses which the LORD had commanded to Israel" (viii, 1). Further, in verse 14, we read: "And they found written in the law which the LORD had commanded by Moses that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month." This has reference to Lev. xxiii, 34, 42. Nehemiah does not seem to have had the least suspicion that this command, as well as the whole priestly system of the Pentateuch, was an interpolation and forgery of Ezra. In the prayer offered by the eight Levites there is a recapitulation of the Israelitish history and legislation of Moses in which there are references to all the five books of the Pentateuch (ix, 6-35). Also in xiii, 1, 2, passages are given which it is said "they read in the book of Moses"—the identical passages of our present Pentateuch.

Malachi's recognition of early origin of Pentateuch.

Nehemiah and Ezra in support of early origin of Pentateuch.

In the Book of Ezra it is stated that the Jews who went up with Zerubbabel from Babylon to Jerusalem (B. C. 536) built an altar in the latter city "to offer burnt offerings thereon, as it is written in the law of Moses the man of God. . . . And they offered burnt offerings thereon unto the LORD, even burnt offerings morning and evening. They kept also the feast of tabernacles, as it is written, and offered the daily burnt offerings by number, according to the custom, as the duty of every day required; and afterward offered the continual burnt offering, both of the new moons and of all the set feasts of the LORD that were consecrated," etc. (iii, 2-5). Here the reference is to Exod. xxix, 38, 39; Num. xxviii, 3, 4. The last clause of Ezra iii, 4, is the exact language of the last clause in Lev. xxiii, 37. These sacrifices were offered according to the Mosaic law about eighty years before Ezra came up to Jerusalem. It is, therefore,

clear that he could have had nothing to do with the prescriptions of the law concerning sacrifices.

Respecting Ezra himself, who went up to Jerusalem about B. C. 457, it is said: "He was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the LORD God of Israel had given" (Ezra vii, 6). "Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments." He was a student in the law, not its author, nor its amender, nor one who had incorporated traditions into it. The tradition of the Jews knows nothing of Ezra's having written any part of the law. "His merit is celebrated in these words: 'Ezra would have been worthy of the law's being given through him if Moses had not anticipated him.'"¹

Haggai. In this prophet, who prophesied about B. C. 520, when the Jews were rebuilding the temple, we find the following reference to the Mosaic law: "Ask now the priests concerning the law [*Torah*], saying, If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy? And the priest, answered and said, No. Then said Haggai, If one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, It shall be unclean" (ii, 11-13). In the last verse the reference is to Num. xix, 11: "He that toucheth the dead body of any man shall be unclean," and to xix, 22: "Whatsoever the unclean person toucheth shall be unclean."

Zechariah. In this prophet, who was contemporary with Haggai, we find references in xiv, 16, 18, 19, to the feasts of tabernacles, according to the law in Lev. xxiii, 34, 43, and Deut. xvi, 13; and in iii, 5, to the mitre upon the head of the high priest, according to the arrangement in Exod. xxxix, 28; Lev. viii, 9.

Ezekiel. This prophet, who lived in Chaldea during the first part of the Babylonian captivity, makes frequent references to the Mosaic laws, and even to some of those very laws which the new school of critics would have us believe Ezra, or the prophet himself, wrote. In iv, 14, Ezekiel declares: "My soul hath not been polluted: for from my youth up even till now have I not eaten of that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces; neither came there abominable flesh into my mouth." The "torn" refers to Exod. xxii, 31; "that which dieth of itself" to Lev. xvii, 15; and the "abominable thing" to Deut. xiv, 3: in which passages,

¹ In Sanhedrim 21b and Yer. Megilla i, 9 in Weber, System der Alt. Syn. Paläst. Theologie, p. 2, Leipzig, 1880.

it is forbidden to eat these things. In describing the righteous man, the prophet asserts that "he hath not come near to a menstruous woman" (xviii, 6), in reference to Lev. xviii, 19, and xx, 18: "And hath not oppressed any, but hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment; he that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase, . . . hath executed true judgment between man and man, hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to do truly; he is just," etc. (xviii, 7-9). Some of the foregoing prohibitions and injunctions refer to Exod. xxii, 21, 22, 25, 26; Lev. xix, 15; xxv, 14; Deut. xv, 7, 8; xxiv, 12, 13. In chap. xx we have a reference to God's revelation of himself to the Israelites in Egypt: "I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths. . . . But the house of Israel rebelled against me in the wilderness: they walked not in my statutes, and they despised my judgments: . . . then I said, I would pour out my fury upon them in the wilderness, to consume them. . . . Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, that I would not bring them into the land which I had given them" (11-15), in reference to Num. xiv, 28, 29. In the phrase, "Which, if a man do, he shall even live in them," there is the language of Lev. xviii, 5. The oath that the Israelites should be scattered among the heathen, and dispersed through the countries, refers to Lev. xxvi, 33, and to Deut. xxviii, 64; for in the former passage *וִרְה*, to scatter, is used, and in the latter *וַיִּפְּרֵן*, to disperse, both verbs being combined.

In xvii, 26, it is declared: "Her priests have violated my law [*Torah*], and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." Here the prophet refers to the *Torah* (law), and to the ordinances respecting things clean and unclean, as we find them in Lev. xxii. In xxiv, 7, we observe a reference to the precept in Lev. xvii, 13, where it is enjoined to pour out the blood, and to cover it with dust. In the command not to exhibit signs of grief (Ezek. xxiv, 18-23), the head is not to be uncovered, and the lip is not to be covered (with hair), with reference to Lev. x, 6, and xiii, 45.

Ezekiel's references to Leviticus and other parts of the Pentateuch.

In xxxvi, 27, it is said: "I will cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them;" and in verse 38

“the solemn feasts” are named. In xvi, 38-40, we find the following: “I will judge thee as women that break wedlock and shed blood are judged; . . . they shall stone thee with stones.” In Lev. xx, 10, and Deut. xxii, 22, nothing is said about the kind of death the adulteress shall die. If, therefore, the precept in Leviticus is later than the passage in Ezekiel, it is strange that the manner of the death of the adulteress is left undetermined.

In chap. xlv, 6-8, in the prophet's vision of the house of the LORD (B. C. 574), God directs him to say unto the house of Israel: “Let it suffice you of all your abominations, in that you have brought into my sanctuary strangers, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, even my house, when ye offer my bread [the name for sacrifice in Leviticus], the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of all your abominations. And ye have not kept the charge of mine holy things.” In these passages the reference is to Lev. xxi, 6-8; iii, 16; xvii, 11, where the bread of God and the fat and blood of sacrifice are mentioned. These sacrifices are declared to be of divine appointment.

In Ezekiel's description of the qualifications and duties of the future priests (xlv, 15-31), we find a repetition of the regulations for the most part in the Pentateuch. This proves his acquaintance with those books. In some matters, however, Ezekiel departs from the Pentateuchal regulations. This is not to be wondered at, in an ideal state of the future, in which the Levites have a tract of land nearly fifty miles by twenty (xlviii, 13): Issachar bordering on Simeon (verse 25), and Gad on Zebulun (verse 27). The city has twelve gates. All these descriptions are contrary to the geographical location of the tribes, and in contradiction with the number of gates which Jerusalem had. There are other descriptions of a similar unreal character. Was Ezekiel ignorant of the geography and topography of Palestine? Hardly. If, then, some of his regulations are different from those of the Pentateuch, does that prove his ignorance of it? Certainly the returning exiles never dreamed of fashioning their commonwealth after the ideal style of Ezekiel.

The Lamentations of Jeremiah. This book, written shortly after the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, contains several references to the institutions of the Jews which are found in our Pentateuch. “The ways of Zion do mourn, because none come to the solemn feasts” (i, 4). Here the reference is to the appointed feasts of the Pentateuch. “The heathen entered into her sanctuary whom thou didst command that they should not enter into thy congregation” (i, 10). Here the reference is to Deut. xxiii, 3, where it is

enjoined that "an Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord," etc. "The Lord hath caused the solemn feasts and the sabbaths to be forgotten in Zion" (ii, 6). "The law [*Torah*] is no more" (ii, 9). "Her Nazarites were purer than snow" (iv, 7). The institution of the Nazarites is found in Num. vi, 1-8.

The prophet Jeremiah. In this prophet, whose ministry extended from B. C. 629 to 589, we find many references to a code of laws corresponding to our Pentateuch, which were manifestly written. "The priests said not, Where is the LORD? and they that handle the law [*Torah*] knew me not" (ii, 8). "I had put her [adulterous Israel] away, and given her a bill of divorce" (iii, 8). This is based on Deut. xxiv, 3, where a man may, under given circumstances, give his wife a "bill of divorce" and dismiss her. "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void" (תהו וָבֵהוּ) (iv, 23). This is the exact language of Gen. i, 2, and shows that Jeremiah had before him what is called the *Elohistic* account of creation, and proves the falsity of the theory that this part of Genesis was written after the captivity.¹ "Behold, I will bring evil upon this people, . . . because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected it" (vi, 19). "How do ye say, We are wise, and the law [*Torah*] of the LORD is with us? Lo, certainly in vain made he it; the *pen of the scribes* is in vain" (viii, 8). Here it is evident that the reference is to the *written* Torah (law). "Because they have forsaken my law [*Torah*] which I set before them" (ix, 13). "Cursed be the man that obeyeth not the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, from the iron furnace, saying, Obey my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you: so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God: that I may perform the oath which I have sworn unto your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey" (xi, 3-5).

In this section we have a reference to the curse pronounced upon those who do not obey the law, based on Deut. xxvii, 26. "The iron furnace" is the exact language of Deut. iv, 20. "A land flowing with milk and honey" is the language of the Pentateuch. "Your fathers have not kept my law [*Torah*]" (xvi, 11); "The law shall not perish from the priest" (xviii, 18); "To walk in my law which I have set before you." (xxvi, 4): the combination of

¹ It is very probable that the phrase "When ye be multiplied and increased" (Jer. iii, 16) refers to Gen. i, 28: "Be fruitful and multiply," and to Gen. viii, 17, both *Elohistic* passages.

Jeremiah's references to the Pentateuch.

these three passages shows that "the law" (Torah) is the law of God in the hands of the priests, and that it is no new thing. "The planters shall plant vineyards and profane" them (xxxii, 5): here we have a reference to Lev. xix, 23, where it is enjoined that when the Israelites plant any kind of fruit trees, they shall not eat any of the fruit for *three* years. Hence, "to profane a vineyard" is to eat of its fruit. In xxxii, 31-33, God declares that he will make a new covenant with the house of Israel different from the one he made with them when he brought them out of Egypt. He further says that he will write this new covenant upon their hearts, which shows that the first covenant was written upon something else.

In xxxii, 8, Hanameel, the son of Jeremiah's uncle, addresses the prophet, respecting a field in Anathoth: "The right of inheritance is thine and the redemption is thine; buy it for thyself." This passage refers to Lev. xxv, 25, in which it is stated: "If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away a part of his possession, and if any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold." In xxxiv, 13, 14, the prophet speaks of the covenant God made with the Israelites when he brought them out of Egypt, in which a Hebrew slave is to be set free after six years' servitude. This law is found in Exod. xxi, 2, and Deut. xv, 12. "Neither have they feared, nor walked in my law, nor in my statutes, that I set before you and before your fathers" (xliv, 10). "Nor walked in his law, nor in his statutes, nor in his testimonies" (verse 23). "A fire and a flame . . . shall devour the corner of Moab, and the corner of the head of the tumultuous ones" (xlvi, 45). Gesenius¹ rightly regards this passage as an imitation of Num. xxiv, 17: "A scepter shall rise out of Israel and shall smite the corners of Moab."

The prophet Isaiah. In the first chapter of this prophet, who flourished B. C. 758-705, we find named, "sacrifices," "burnt offerings," "incense," "new moons," "sabbaths," "assemblies," "feasts," etc., as Jewish observances, doubtless the same as we have in our Pentateuch. "They have cast away the law [Torah] of the LORD of hosts" (v, 24). "Bind up the testimony, seal the law [Torah] among my disciples" (viii, 16). In these passages there is doubtless a reference to the Pentateuch. In xxiii, 18, we have "splendid garments;" that is, as Gesenius² explains it, "The splendor of the sacerdotal vestments handed down from antiquity." In xxiv, 5, we have the following: "They have transgressed the laws, broken the everlasting covenant."

¹ Heb. Lex., *עֵט*, and Com. Samart. Pent. ² See his Heb. Lex., *sub עֵט*.

“In that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book” (xxix, 18); that is, as Gesenius understands it, “the book of the law.”¹ We also read: “Children that will not hear the law of Jehovah” (xxx, 9); “seek ye out of the book of the LORD and read” (xxxiv, 16). The reference here seems to be to the fact that Isaiah’s prophecies form a part of a collection of sacred writings. “Thus saith the LORD, Where is the bill of your mother’s divorcement whom I have put away” (1, 1)? Here the reference is to Deut. xxiv, 1, where the law permits the husband to dismiss his wife with a bill of divorce. Both in Deuteronomy and Isaiah the same phrase, כִּפָּר כְּרִיתוֹת, is used, the latter being written defectively without the ו in Deuteronomy, as might be expected from its being the earlier writing. שָׁלַח, to dismiss, is used in both passages.

Nahum. In this prophet, who flourished about B. C. 630, we find the following: “O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows” (i, 15). This language implies the divine institution of the Jewish feasts, and refers to the regulations of the Pentateuch respecting vows.

Habakkuk. In this prophet (B. C. 625) there is a reference to the Pentateuch in the following words: “The law [Torah] is torpid” (i, 4).

Zephaniah. This prophet (B. C. 625) refers as follows to the law: “Her [Jerusalem’s] priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law [Torah]” (iii, 4).

Joel. This prophet, who flourished about B. C. 880, makes several references to the institutions of the Pentateuch. “The meat offering and the drink offering is cut off from the house of the LORD; the priests, the LORD’s ministers, mourn” (i, 9). “Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly: gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land into the house of the LORD your God, and cry unto the LORD” (verse 14). Again: “Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the people, sanctify the congregation, . . . let the priests, the ministers of the LORD, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Lord” (ii, 15-17). It is clear that Joel recognizes the divine authority of the priests, and certainly approves of their services. “The meat offering” (כִּנְוָה), and “the drink offering” (נִכְבֵּךְ), are the words of the Pentateuch. In Num. x, 2, 3, it is enjoined that “the calling of the assembly” shall be made by blowing trumpets.

Micah. This prophet, who began to prophesy about B. C. 750, makes several references to the Pentateuch. In chap. v, 6,

¹ Heb. Lex., *sub* כִּפָּר.

Assyria is coupled with the land of Nimrod in reference to Gen. x, 8-12; and in vi, 4, Miriam is named along with Moses and Aaron. The following passage is evidently taken from Micah's allusions to the Pentateuch. Numbers: "O my people, remember now what Balak king of Moab consulted, and what Balaam the son of Beor answered him from Shittim unto Gilgal" (chap. vi, 5). The passage, "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" (chap. vi, 8), seems to be based upon the following in Deut. x, 12: "And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul."

The Prophet Amos, who flourished about B. C. 800, shows in various passages his acquaintance with the Pentateuch. In chap. i, 11, there is a probable reference to Gen. xxvii, 41: "Because he [Edom] did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off all pity, and his anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath for ever." Allusion is also made to the forty years' wandering through the wilderness (chap. ii, 10). There is a clear reference in chap. ii, 11, 12, to the law in Numbers vi, 2-21: "And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites. . . . But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink." It was one of the requirements of the Nazarite that he should drink no wine. "They have despised the law of the LORD, and have not kept his commandments" (ii, 4).

"You only have I known of all the families of the earth" (Amos iii, 2) refers to Exodus xix, 5, and Deut. vii, 6. In "Bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes after three years" (chap. iv, 4), we have a clear reference to Deut. xiv, 28: "At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates." In Amos we have לְשִׁלֶּשֶׁת יָמִים, *at the end of three days*, literally. But Gesenius gives several examples of the use of יָמִים, *days* for *years*, and translates the passage: "*After the end of three years,*" or, better, *every three days*—in bitter irony. In either case the reference would be to the law requiring the bringing of tithes at the end of three years found only in Deut. xiv, 28. "I have smitten you with blasting and mildew" (chap. iv, 9), was a judgment threatened in Deut. xxviii, 22. Compare "I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt" (chap. iv, 10), with Deut. xxviii, 60: "Moreover, he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt." In chap. v, 22, "Though

ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts," we have named various sacrifices enjoined in the Pentateuch. In addition to these sacrifices we have in chap. iv, 5: "Offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven," in allusion to Lev. vii, 13. In chap. iv, 4, the command is given to bring the sacrifice every morning, thus referring to Num. xxviii, 3, 4. In ii, 7, "To profane my holy name," we have a reference to Lev. xx, 3. In chap. viii, 5, the new moon and the sabbath are mentioned as Israelitish institutions. We have in chap. v, 25, 26, a reference to the idolatry of the Israelites in the desert: "Ye have offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel. And ye have borne the tabernacle of your king, even Chiun your idol, the star of your god, which ye made for yourselves."¹ This language does not imply that the Israelites in the desert had not a knowledge of the true God, but simply that, while making sacrifices to the true God and performing the external rites of worship, they combined with it the idolatrous worship of Saturn,¹ whose image and tabernacle they carried with them in their wanderings. The whole history of the Jews in the Pentateuch shows their frequent lapses into idolatry.

The knowledge of the Pentateuch which Amos displays is remarkable, as he had received no training in the schools of the prophets, but was simply "a herdman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit." "And the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go prophesy unto my people Israel" (chap. vii, 14, 15).

Hosea. In this prophet, who began to prophesy about B. C. 785, we find a considerable number of references to the Pentateuch. The comparison of the children of Israel to a woman who leaves her husband and goes after other men is a favorite simile with Hosea to set forth the apostasy of Israel from the true God and their devotion to idolatrous worship. For example: "The land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord" (chap. i, 2); and "they have gone a whoring from under their God" (chap. iv, 12). The simile is obviously based on the language of the Pentateuch. In Exod. xxxiv, 15, it is said: "Lest thou make a covenant with the land, and *they go a whoring after their gods*, and do sacrifice unto their gods." Again, in Deut. xxxi, 16: "And this people will rise up, and *go a whoring after the gods* of the strangers of the land."

In the following passages we have a reference to the institutions of the Pentateuch: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her

¹ That Chiun means Saturn, see the Hebrew Lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst.

feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts" (ii, 11); "And I that am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the solemn feasts" (xii, 9). In the latter passage the reference is to the feast of tabernacles, as enjoined in Lev. xxiii, 42, 43, in which the people are to dwell in booths—the only passage in the Pentateuch in which the dwelling in booths or tabernacles is mentioned. This refutes the new school of Graf, Wellhausen, and others, who hold that Leviticus was not written until the Babylonian captivity, or even later. "Their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners; all that eat thereof shall be polluted" (ix, 4). In this passage there seems to be a reference to Deut. xxvi, 14. In xi, 8, Admah and Zeboim are named from Gen. xiv, 2. In chap. xii, 3, 4, we have a clear reference to the history in the Pentateuch: "He [Jacob] took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God: Yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto him: he found him in Beth-el, and there he spake with us." This is taken from Gen. xxv, 26; xxxii, 24-30; xxviii, 11-20. The second of these passages in Genesis is Elohistic, the name of *Elohim* (*God*) occurring twice in it.

But according to the new critical school of Kayser, Wellhausen, and others, the *Elohistic* portions of Genesis were written about the time of Ezra. Now, Hosea's reference to this Elohistic section is a palpable refutation of their theory. In chap. xii, 12, we have a reference to Gen. xxix, xxx: "And Jacob fled into the country of Syria, and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep." In ix, 10, Hosea, speaking of Israel in the wilderness, says: "But they went to Baal-peor, and separated themselves unto that shame; and their abominations were according as they loved." Here we have a clear reference to Num. xxv, in which there is a description of the conduct of Israel, who "joined himself unto Baal-peor," and of the calamities that overtook the people, and of the promise to Phinehas of an everlasting priesthood. The school of Wellhausen put this chapter of Numbers into the Codex of the Priests, which, according to their theory, was written about the time of Ezra. Could any refutation of this be clearer than Hosea's reference to this very chapter? The Pentateuch is clearly referred to in the passage, "Thou hast forgotten the law¹ [Torah] of thy God" (iv, 6). Schrader² acknowledges that Hosea was acquainted with Genesis.

¹ On Hosea viii, 12, see p. 145.

² In his edit. of De Wette's *Einleitung*, pp. 316-318.

CHAPTER XX.

ALLUSIONS TO THE PENTATEUCH IN THE BOOKS OF PROVERBS AND PSALMS.

THE Book of Proverbs. From the character of the Book of the Proverbs of Solomon we are not to expect any references to the Mosaic *history*, but to the Mosaic *precepts*. And such we actually find. Compare, "Let not mercy and truth forsake thee; *bind them about thy neck*" (chap. iii, 3); and in reference to moral precepts: "Bind them upon thy fingers" (chap. vii, 3), with Deut. vi, 8, "Thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes;" and also with Deut. xi, 18, and Exod. xiii, 19, upon which the passages from Proverbs are based. Compare, "My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord, neither be weary of his correction; for whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (chap. iii, 11, 12), with Deut. viii, 5, "Thou shalt also consider in thine heart, that, as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee." "A false balance is *abomination* to the Lord" (chap. xi, 1) is obviously based on Deut. xxv, 13-16, "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small: . . . For all that do such things . . . are an *abomination* unto the Lord thy God." "It is not good to accept the person of the wicked, to overthrow the righteous in judgment" (chap. xviii, 5) is said, very probably, in reference to Lev. xix, 15, and Deut. xvi, 19. "Remove not the *ancient landmark* which thy fathers have set" (chap. xxii, 28) refers to Deut. xix, 14, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's *landmark*, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it." "He that by usury and unjust gain increaseth his substance" (chap. xxviii, 8) has reference to the Mosaic law forbidding the loaning of any thing upon interest (Deut. xxiii, 19). "He that giveth unto the poor shall not lack" (chap. xxviii, 27) seems to be based on Deut. xv, 7-10. "Add thou not unto his [God's] words" (chap. xxx, 6) is derived from Deut. iv, 2, and xii, 32. The prayer of Agur (xxx, 8, 9) appears to be founded in part on Deut. viii, 8-17, where the Israelites are warned against forgetfulness of God when their goods shall increase.

The Book of Psalms. The Psalms—the earliest¹ of which were written about B. C. 1050 by David, and the last about B. C. 450—show an acquaintance on the part of their authors with the Pentateuch. No fair minded critic can deny our statement. The testimony is altogether free from suspicion, and is of the most satisfactory kind. Many of the Psalms furnish internal evidence of the age in which they were written. They afford incidental knowledge of the existing institutions in Israel, and refer to the Mosaic history in the most natural way, and allude to the law, the statutes, and the commandments, showing the existence of a Mosaic code which had a divine authority among them. All the references to the Mosaic law and history prove that they were the same that we now possess. In the very first Psalm, written, in all probability, by David, the good man is represented as delighting “in *the law of the Lord*; and in his *law* doth he meditate day and night.” In Psalm xv, 5, we have a reference to the law prohibiting lending on interest: “He that putteth not out his money to usury.” The eighteenth Psalm was undoubtedly written by David, and there is a reference to him in the fiftieth verse. In verse 22 we have a reference to the Mosaic law, “For all his judgments were before me, and I did not put away his statutes from me.” In Psalm xxxiii, 6–9, we have an allusion to Gen. i, “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made. . . . He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.” This Psalm, in all probability, belongs to David. And in Psalm lx, 7, which also belongs to him, we have a reference to Gen. xlix, 10: “Judah is my lawgiver.” Compare this with “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet,” etc.

In Psalm lxxviii, attributed to Asaph, a contemporary of David, and bearing internal evidence of belonging to that age, we have a sketch of the history of the Israelites from the time that God visited them in Egypt until David's reign. In the first part of this Psalm it is declared that Jehovah “established a *testimony* in Jacob, and appointed a *law* in Israel, which he commanded our fathers that they should make them known to their children, . . . who should arise and declare them to their children.” Here we have a reference to the command which God gave the children of Israel, recorded in Deut. vi, 7: “And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children;” and, “but teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons” (chap. iv, 9); “and ye shall teach them your children” (chap. xi, 19). The command to teach the children the law is found *only in Deuteronomy*, and we thus have a

¹ We must except from this statement the Ninetieth Psalm, which is attributed to Moses.

very old testimony to this book. In the history of Israel belonging to the Mosaic age, it is evident that the author of the Psalm had the Pentateuch before him. In describing the plagues of Egypt he has in most cases used the very words of the Pentateuch.

In Psalm lxxxix, 30, 31, it is said, in reference to David, in whose age it was written, "If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments." This evidently refers to a written Mosaic code. Psalm xcix, which seems to belong to the time of David, contains an allusion, after naming Moses, Aaron, and Samuel, to the Mosaic legislation: "He spake unto them in the cloudy pillar: they kept his testimonies, and the ordinance that he gave them."

Israelitish history exhibited in the Psalms.

Psalm cv contains a history of the Israelites from Abraham until their settlement in Canaan. Here the history in the Pentateuch is closely followed, and occasionally some of the facts are thrown into a poetical form. All the parts of this Psalm stand closely connected, and it bears a strong resemblance to Psalm lxxviii, which evidently belongs to Asaph, David's chief musician. The one hundred and fifth Psalm, as far as the 22d verse, is a part of the Psalm of which it is said, "Then on that day David delivered first (this) to thank the Lord into the hand of Asaph and his brethren" (1 Chron. xvi, 7). The psalm in Chronicles also contains substantially the 96th Psalm. The last part of the 105th was omitted on the occasion as not being suitable to the purpose, and another substituted in its place. Also Psalm cvi recapitulates the Mosaic history in such a way, with so many particulars, as to show an acquaintance with the Pentateuch. It belongs, most probably, to the age of David.

In the references to sacrifices and offerings in the Davidic Psalms, the terms employed, and the kinds of sacrifices and offerings, are the same as those of the Pentateuch. For example: "*Sacrifice* (זִבַח) and *offering* (קִנְיָה) thou didst not desire . . . *burnt offering* (עֹלָה) and *sin offering* (חַטָּאת)¹ hast thou not required" (Psa. xl, 6); and, "I will not reprove thee for thy *sacrifices* nor thy *burnt offerings*" (Psa. l, 8). We have already referred to the Mosaic institutions mentioned in the Psalms. In the Davidic Psalms we have, *law* (תּוֹרָה, *torah*), *statute* (חֻק, a *prescribed statute*), *judgment* (מִשְׁפָּט), and *commandment* (מִצְוָה), the identical terms of the Pentateuch. In view of all these facts, how absurd is the remark of Dr. Davidson² that *the law, the statutes, judgments, testimonies*

References to sacrifices and offerings same as in the Pentateuch.

¹ The form in the Pentateuch is חַטָּאת.

² Introduction, pp. 120, 121.

of the Lord, found in the Psalms, are general language, "referring not so much to the injunctions peculiar to the Mosaic religion as to the moral requirements which conscience, aided by the Spirit of God, is able to apprehend."

But besides the references to the statutes and institutions of the Pentateuch, we find the following in Psa. xl, 7: "Lo, I come with the *volume of the book* prescribed unto me." Gesenius understands this volume to be the book of the law; and it is difficult to refer it to any thing else and make good sense. This psalm is ascribed to David, and the inscription to the chief musician shows that it was written before the exile.

The examination of the Davidic Psalms establishes the fact that the Pentateuch existed and was recognised in the age of David as containing the law of Moses and the authentic history of the patriarchs and of the Mosaic times.

Recognition of
the Pentateuch
in David's time.



CHAPTER XXI.

TESTIMONIES FURNISHED BY THE HISTORY OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL AND KINGS TO THE EXISTENCE AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BEFORE giving the passages that refer to the institutions in the Pentateuch, we wish to direct attention to those which speak of the book of the law, or to the written law of Moses. In the charge which David, when about to die (about B. C. 1015), gives his son Solomon, he refers to the Pentateuch in these words:

David's refer-
ences to the
Pentateuch.

"And keep the charge of the Lord thy God to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies, *as it is written in the law of Moses,*" etc. (1 Kings ii, 3).

In 2 Kings xvii, 34-37, we have the following reference to the Pentateuch: "The law and the commandment which the Lord commanded the children of Jacob, whom he named Israel; with whom the Lord had made a covenant. . . . And the statutes, and the ordinances, and the law, and the commandment which he *wrote* for you," etc. But the most important testimony to the Pentateuch

The "Book of
the Law."

is to be found in the discovery of the *book of the law*, in the temple in the eighteenth year of King

Josiah (about B. C. 624). It is stated in 2 Kings xxii that when the Jewish temple was repaired by the pious Josiah, Hilkiah the high priest found in it a *book of the law*, and gave it to Shaphan

the scribe, who read it himself, and then read it to the king. The Jewish monarch was so astonished at its contents that he rent his clothes, and sent Hilkiah and others to inquire of the Lord for him, "and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found: for great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book, to do according unto all that which is written concerning us." When the king's messengers came to Huldah the prophetess she sent back word to the king: "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Tell the man that sent you to me, . . . I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read." This book is called by the historian in the next chapter (xxiii, 25) "*the law of Moses.*" It is evident that Huldah the prophetess was already acquainted with the book, and the king's language shows that his ancestors must have been acquainted with at least its purport, for he supposes them guilty for not obeying it. He is not surprised at the existence of such a book, but at its threatening contents.

This book of the law seems to have been the temple copy; nor is there anything strange respecting its former concealment or its discovery. For fifty-seven years preceding Josiah's reign a fearful apostasy existed in Judah. Manasseh, in whose steps Amon trod, had reigned for fifty-five years. "He did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, after the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel. For he built up again the high places which Hezekiah his father had destroyed; and he reared up altars for Baal, and made a grove [Astarte, or Venus], as did Ahab king of Israel; and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served them. And he built altars in the house of the Lord, of which the Lord said, In Jerusalem will I put my name. And he built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord" (2 Kings xxi, 2-5).

It is not strange, under such circumstances, that the book of the law had been neglected, and its threats quite forgotten. Views of Bleek, Davidson, and Schrader. Both Bleek and Davidson concede that this copy of the Mosaic law contained the Book of Deuteronomy. Schrader, in his edition of De Wette's Introduction, thinks that the book of the law found in the temple refers *exclusively* to Deuteronomy. This is not in the least probable, since the other books of the Pentateuch, as he admits, were in existence at that time. The threatenings of the book of the law referred to in 2 Kings xxii seem to refer especially to Deut. xxviii, xxix.

After the book of the law was read to the king, he gathered all

the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the prophets and priests, and read the book to them also. He commenced a reformation in both Judah and Samaria, and in the same year held a passover, such as had not before been held either in the days of the judges or the kings (2 Kings xxiii, 22).

In 2 Kings xxi, 7, 8, the writer states that in the declarations the LORD made to David and Solomon he said, "If they will observe to do according to all the law that my servant Moses commanded them."

We have already seen that in the times of David, and in the subsequent ages, *the book of the law of Moses* is mentioned as an existing authoritative document. We have traced it from the times of the Maccabees up to the time of David. We see no reason to doubt that during all these ages it was the identical Pentateuch that we now have. All the quotations from it and references to it show this fact.

The next inquiry is, Does the history of the times from King Josiah (when it is granted that a large part of the Pentateuch already existed) back to David and Samuel indicate the existence and authority of the Pentateuch? This must be answered in the affirmative, as the existing institutions and the references to the Pentateuch show. We may begin with the two books of Kings. In 1 Kings i, 39, it is stated that "Zadok the priest took a horn of oil out of the tabernacle and anointed Solomon." This holy oil of the tabernacle and its uses are described in Exodus xxx, 23-30. In the command given to slay Joab, who had been guilty of murder, it is said: "That thou mayest take away the innocent blood" (chap. ii, 31), evidently in accordance with Numbers xxxv, 33, "The land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." In chap. iii, 15, mention is made of "the ark of the covenant of the Lord," before which Solomon stood "and offered up burnt offerings, and offered peace offerings." The sacrifices here named are those of the Mosaic law; and the "ark of the covenant of the Lord" is the exact language of Deut. x, 8, and xxxi, 9, 25. In chapter iv, 13, are mentioned "the towns of Jair the son of Manasseh, which are in Gilead to him also pertained the region of Argob, which is in Bashan, threescore great cities with walls and brazen bars," which is manifestly taken from Numbers xxxii, 41, and Deut. iii, 4, 5. In chap. vi, 12, God says to Solomon, "If thou wilt walk in my statutes, and execute my judgments, and keep all my *commandments* to walk in them," etc. Here the precepts of the Lord are expressed in the *very words* of the Pentateuch. Compare ver. 13, "And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will not forsake my people Israel," with Exod. xxv, 8, "That I may dwell among them;" and Deut. xxxi, 6, "He [Jehovah] will not fail thee, nor forsake thee."

In the temple which Solomon built to Jehovah we find the arrangement of the sanctuary described in Exodus carried out so far as it was applicable. We have within, a "most holy place." The same is found in Exod. xxvi, 33, and Lev. xvi, 2. Compare "The whole altar that was by the oracle he overlaid with gold" with Exod. xxx, 3. "Thou shalt overlay it [the altar] with pure gold." Also compare "And within the oracle he made two cherubim" (chap. vi, 23), "And they stretched forth the wings of the cherubim, so that the wing of the one touched the one wall, and the wing of the other cherub touched the other wall; and their wings touched one another" (ver. 27); Exod. xxv, 20, and xxxvii, 9. Solomon also made a table of gold, upon which was placed the showbread (chap. vii, 48,) which was required by Exod. xxv, 30.

Parallel between Solomon's temple and the sanctuary in Exodus.

In chapter viii, 2, we find that "all the men of Israel assembled themselves unto King Solomon at the feast in the month Ethanim, which is the seventh month." This was the feast of tabernacles, which Moses commanded the children of Israel to keep in the seventh month (Lev. xxiii, 34). "And the priests took up the ark" (ver. 3). This was in accordance with Deut. xxxi, 9. "And they brought up the ark of the Lord, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle, even these did the priests and the Levites bring up" (ver. 4). The phrase, "tabernacle of the congregation," is the one used in the Pentateuch. The priests also brought the ark of the covenant into the most holy place.

"And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is *the covenant of the Lord* which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt" (chap. viii, 21). This covenant of the Lord here referred to by Solomon is evidently *the book of the law* of Moses. It is "the book of the covenant" mentioned in Exod. xxiv, 7, which Moses wrote and delivered to the priests (Deut. xxxi, 9). In Deut. xxxi, 24-26, it is stated that when Moses had made an end of writing the book of the law he commanded the priests to put it *in the side* of the ark of the covenant; and thus there is no contradiction of the statement (1 Kings viii, 9): "There was nothing *in the ark* save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb," etc., in which we have a reference to the Mosaic origin of these tables as given in Exod. xxv, 16; xxxi, 18.

The language of Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the temple contains several quotations from the Pentateuch: Who "keepeth covenant and mercy" (1 Kings viii, 23), is the exact language of Deut. vii, 9. Compare "When thy people Israel be smitten down before the enemy, because they have

Parallels contained in Solomon's prayer.

sinned against thee, and shall turn again to thee" (ver. 33), with Lev. xxvi, 17, and Deut. xxviii, 25. "When heaven is shut up and there is no rain, because they have sinned against thee," etc. (ver. 35), is of similar import to Lev. xxvi, 19, and Deut. xxviii, 23. Compare "If there be in the land famine, if there be pestilence, blasting, mildew, locust, or if there be caterpillar" (ver. 37), with Deut. xxviii, 21, 22, 38. "For thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance, as thou spakest by the hand of Moses thy servant, when thou broughtest our fathers out of Egypt" (ver. 53). Here it is impossible to escape the similarity to Exod. xix, 5, "Then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people;" and to Deut. xiv, 2, "The Lord had chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself;" and to Deut. ix, 29, "Yet they are thy people and thine inheritance." And when Solomon blessed the people, he said: "There hath not failed one word of all his good promise, which he promised by the hand of Moses his servant" (ver. 56). It is evident that Solomon refers to a *written* history of the Mosaic legislation. Compare "Israel shall be a proverb and a byword among all people" (chap. ix, 7), with "Thou shalt become . . . a proverb, and a byword, among all nations" (Deut. xxviii, 37). In "and they shall say, Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land, and to this house? and they shall answer, Because they forsook the Lord their God, who brought forth their fathers out of the land of Egypt," etc. (chap. ix, 8, 9), we have almost the identical words of Deut. xxix, 24-26. "Three times in a year did Solomon offer burnt offerings and peace offerings upon the altar which he built unto the Lord" (chap. ix, ver. 25): this seems to mean at the *three* great festivals established in the Pentateuch. The passage xi, 2, refers to Exod. xxxiv, 16, and to Deut. vii, 3, 4, in forbidding matrimonial alliances between the Israelites and the heathen. This reference, however, is made by the historian himself.

When the ten tribes revolted from under Rehoboam, and made Jeroboam king (B. C. 975), the latter built Shechem, and endeavoured to establish himself in his kingdom. But the greatest obstacle to the separate existence of the *ten* tribes was the religious bond existing between all the tribes, especially the unity of the sanctuary. "And Jeroboam said in his heart, Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David: if this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto their lord, even unto Rehoboam king of Judah" (1 Kings xii, 26, 27). It is evident from this that Jeroboam regarded his people as feeling bound to attend the great festivals at Jerusalem. Such a feeling of obliga-

Injunctions of the Pentateuch held the Jews at time of revolt from Rehoboam.

tion on the part of the rebellious tribes could spring only from an injunction in the Pentateuch, such as we find in Deut. xii, 5, 6, "But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come: and thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings." "Whereupon the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold, and said unto them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And he set the one in Bethel, and the other put he in Dan" (1 Kings xii, 28, 29). This was a renewal of the worship of the calf (or Apis) by Aaron and other Israelites, borrowed from Egypt. The ancient Egyptians worshipped Osiris, their great god, at Memphis, under the form of the sacred bull Apis; and at Heliopolis, under that of the ox, Mnevis. Diodorus Siculus tells us that the worship of Apis arose in the idea that the soul of Osiris migrated into this animal, and that through him Osiris continued to manifest himself to man through successive ages. The Egyptians had also *figures* of their gods, which "were only vicarious forms not intended to be looked upon as real personages" (Wilkinson).

The calves at Dan and Bethel imitations of the Egyptian Apis and Mnevis.

When Aaron instituted this worship in the desert, the intention was to worship the golden calf as a symbol of Jehovah, as is apparent from Aaron's declaration, "To-morrow is a feast of Jehovah." Jeroboam had become well acquainted with the calf worship of Egypt during his residence there (1 Kings xi, 40), and the *two calves*, in imitation of Apis and Mnevis among the Egyptians, were intended to symbolize Jehovah. But there was a further object in view. The Pentateuch commanded all the males to appear three times a year at the great festivals before the Lord in *one* place, which must have been inconvenient to many. Hence his language, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem." To remedy this inconvenience he set up *two* calves—one in Bethel, and the other in Dan—to accommodate the people in Middle and in Northern Palestine. In the institution of this worship he used the very language of Aaron. It was not necessary for Jeroboam to have but one place of worship, for he had not the sacred ark of the covenant.

The author of 2 Chron. states: "The priests and the Levites that were in all Israel resorted to him [Rehoboam] out of all their coasts. For the Levites left their suburbs and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem: for Jeroboam and his sons had cast them off from executing the priest's office unto the Lord" (chap. xi, 13, 14). Jeroboam "made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi" (1 Kings xii, 31). The ground of his rejection of

the sons of Levi evidently was, because they could not be brought to disobey the plain injunctions of the Pentateuch, the commands of Jehovah, and to assist Jeroboam in his idolatrous worship. Rather than serve him they preferred to sacrifice all their possessions. According to 2 Chron. xi, 16, the pious Israelites from the ten tribes still continued to come to Jerusalem to sacrifice to Jehovah. All this presupposes the existence and authority of the Pentateuch.

"Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah." He offered sacrifice on the altar in Bethel on this day of the eighth month, "which he had devised of his own heart" (1 Kings xii, 32, 33). According to Leviticus xxiii, 34, the festival was to be kept on the fifteenth day of the *seventh* month, so that Jeroboam changed only the *month*.

In 1 Kings xviii, 31, "Jacob, unto whom the word of the Lord came, saying, Israel shall be thy name," we have a reference to Gen. xxxii, 28. In the sacrifice offered by Elijah on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii, 33), it is stated that "he put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces." Here we find a compliance with Lev. i, 5-8: "He shall kill the bullock . . . and he shall flay the burnt offering, and cut it into his pieces . . . and lay the wood in order upon the fire." "And he [Elijah] went in the strength of that meat

Numerous parallels between the books of the Kings and the Pentateuch.

forty days and forty nights unto Horeb the Mount of God" (chap. xix, 8). In Exodus this mountain is so called, and there is a parallelism in the passage to the fast of "forty days and forty nights" of Moses (Exod. xxxiv, 28). "And Naboth said to Ahab, The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee" (chap. xxi, 3). This is in reference to Lev. xxv, 23: "The land shall not be sold forever;" and to Num. xxxvi, 7: "So shall not the inheritance of the children of Israel remove from tribe to tribe." On this ground Naboth refused to sell his vineyard to Ahab.

In the contrivance of Jezebel to effect the death of Naboth we recognize the law of the Pentateuch:¹ "And set two men, sons of Belial, before him, to bear witness against him, saying, Thou didst blaspheme God and the king. And then carry him out, and stone him, that he may die" (chap. xxi, 10). Compare with this, "Thou shalt not revile God, nor curse the ruler of thy people" (Exodus xxii, 28); and, "He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him" (Lev. xxiv, 16). The law of Moses required at least two witnesses to put any one to death (Numbers xxxv, 30; Deuteronomy xvii, 6). "And it came to pass in the morning, when the

¹ Here we have proofs that the law of Moses had force among the ten tribes.

meat offering was offered" (2 Kings iii, 20). Here we have an allusion to the usual time of the morning sacrifice as prescribed in Exod. xxix, 39, 40. "The creditor is come to take unto him my two sons to be bondmen" (chap. iv, 1). The law of Moses (Lev. xxv, 39, 40) allowed debtors to be sold for their debts for a term of years. In the case referred to the sons of the widow were demanded. "About this season, *according to the time of life*, thou shalt embrace a son" (chap. iv, 16). This language, addressed by Elisha to the Shunammite woman, is based on Gen. xviii, 10: "I will certainly return unto thee *according to the time of life*; and, lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son." "And there were four leprous men at the entering in of the gate" (chap. vii, 3). The Mosaic law required lepers to be excluded from the camp (Lev. xiii, 46). In accordance with this law we find that these lepers did not go into the city to announce to the king the flight of the Syrians, but called the porter.

In 2 Kings xii, 4, mention is made of "the money of every one that passeth the account," that is, numbered, as prescribed in Exod. xxx, 13, where every one that is numbered is required to pay half a shekel for the service of the tabernacle. "The trespass money and sin money was not brought into the house of the Lord: it was the priests'" (chap. xii, 16). In the Mosaic laws respecting sin offering and trespass offering the money paid was the property of the priests (Lev. v, 15, 18; vii, 7; Num. xviii, 9). When Amaziah was confirmed in the kingdom of Judah (about B. C. 839), it is stated (chap. xiv, 5, 6) that he put to death the servants who had slain "his father. But the children of the murderers he slew not: according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall be put to death for his own sin." This is the language of Deut. xxiv, 16, and it is found nowhere else in the Pentateuch. "And he sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree" (chap. xvi, 4). This is borrowed from Deut. xii, 2. In chap. xvi, 15, Ahaz commands the priest to offer upon the great altar "the morning burnt offering, and the evening meat offering." These offerings were required by Exod. xxix, 39-41.

In chap. xviii, 4, we have a reference to the history of the Pentateuch: "He [Hezekiah] brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it." Its institution by Moses for the healing of the Israelites is mentioned in Num. xxi, 9. In chap. xxi, 6, it is said that Manasseh "observed times, and used enchantments, and dealt with

familiar spirits and wizards: he wrought much wickedness in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger." The law of Moses absolutely forbade these things: "Neither shall ye use enchantment, nor observe times. Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them" (Lev. xix, 26, 31). Very similar is Deut. xviii, 10-12.

In the Second Book of Samuel we find several references to the Pentateuch. It is said in chap. vi, 6, 7, that when the ark of God was shaken, while it was conveyed, Uzzah put forth his hand to steady it, and that God smote him and he died. This is in accordance with the regulation of Moses, by which no one except Aaron and his sons was allowed to touch the ark, upon the penalty of death (Num. iv, 15). When David brought the ark of Jehovah to Jerusalem, he placed it in the tabernacle, and offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord (chap. vi, 17). These offerings were made in accordance with the Pentateuch. In chap. vii, 6, God says: "I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a *tent* and in a *tabernacle*." Tent and tabernacle are the words of the Pentateuch expressing the sanctuary set up in the desert. The tent was the covering placed over the tabernacle.

When David had been made king over Israel, in expressing his gratitude to God he exclaimed: "Thou art great, O Lord God: for there is none like thee, neither is there any God besides thee, according to all that we have heard with our ears. And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before thy people, which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, from the nations and their gods?" (2 Sam. vii, 22, 23). This language is based on Deut. iv, 7, 32-35. In chap. viii, 3, it is said that David smote the king of Zobah *as he went to recover his border at the river Euphrates*. Here we have a reference to Gen. xv, 18, where God promises to the seed of Abraham the land extending from the river of Egypt to the river Euphrates, and which Israel had not yet possessed. In Nathan's parable to David of the rich man who took the poor man's lamb, the Jewish monarch declared that he should restore the lamb fourfold (chap. xii, 6). The Mosaic law (Exod. xxii, 1) required that four sheep should be given for one that was stolen. The treatment that the king's wives should receive for his crime (chap. xii, 11) seems to refer to Deut. xxviii, 30. In chap. xv, 24, Zadok, and all the Levites with him, are represented as bearing the ark of the covenant of God. This was in accordance

Enchantments
-conveying of
the ark of God-

Language of
David found in
Deuteronomy.

with Num. iv, 15. Respecting the numbers of Israel, it is said: "As the sand is by the sea for multitude" (chap. xvii, 11). This is based on Gen. xxii, 17. In chap. xxii, 23, David says: "For all his judgments were before me: and as for his statutes, I did not depart from them." These laws are evidently the code of the Pentateuch.

Allusions in
1 Samuel to the
Pentateuch.

We find also in *First Samuel* a considerable number of references to either the language or institutions of the Pentateuch. The very first part of the history in this book exhibits to us at Shiloh *the tabernacle of the congregation*, in which was *the ark of the covenant*, whither the people assembled to sacrifice to Jehovah (about 1170 B. C). It is said (chap. i, 3) that Elkanah "went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice to the Lord of hosts in Shiloh." "Elkanah and all his house went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice and his vow" (chap. i, 21). This was evidently the yearly passover, the chief of the three festivals of the Israelites, which *the males only* were required to attend. Nor does the language exclude the attendance of Elkanah himself at the other two festivals.

In Hannah's prayer we find a reference to Deut. xxxii, 39, "The Lord killeth and maketh alive" (chap. ii, 6). And in chap. ii, 2, there is a probable allusion to Deut. iii, 24, and to xxvii, 4. In chap. ii, 18, we find Samuel ministering to the Lord. Samuel belonged to the tribe of Levi (1 Chron. vi, 28, 34-38). And in chap. ii, 22, it is stated that the women were assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. This was the arrangement existing in the time of Moses (Exod. xxxviii, 8). In 1 Sam. ii, 27, 28, it is said, "And there came a man of God unto Eli, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Did I plainly appear unto the house of thy father, when they were in Egypt in Pharaoh's house? and did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest, to offer upon mine altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before me? and did I give unto the house of thy father all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel?" Here the reference to the institutions of the Pentateuch is too plain to be mistaken. Compare Exod. xxviii, 1, 4; Num. xvi, 5; xviii, 1, 7; Lev. ii, 3, 10, etc., where all these things are mentioned. Compare "I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever" (chap. ii, 30), with Exod. xxix, 9: "And the priest's office shall be theirs [Aaron and his sons'] for a perpetual statute."

When the ark of God, carried away by the Philistines, brought upon them disaster, and they became anxious about its return, they concluded to restore it with a trespass offering, thus showing their

knowledge of such an offering among the Israelites as is prescribed in the Pentateuch. Compare chap. vi, 3, with Lev. v, 15

The language of the Philistines upon the occasion shows a knowledge of the facts of the Pentateuch: "Wherefore then do ye harden your hearts, as the Egyptians and Pharaoh hardened their hearts? when he had wrought wonderfully among them, did they not let the people go, and they departed?" (1 Sam. vi, 6). Compare chap. xiv, 32, 33, "And the people did eat them with the blood. Then they told Saul, saying, Behold, the people sin against the Lord, in that they eat with the blood," with Leviticus xvii, 10, "And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people."

"I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt" (chap. xv, 2). Here the allusion is especially to Deut. xxv, 17. Before Saul slaughtered the Amalekites he requested the Kenites to depart from among them: "For ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt" (chap. xv, 6). In Judges i, 16, it is stated that the children of the Kenite, Moses's father-in-law went up with the children of Judah into the desert of Judah. From this it appears that the Kenites were relatives of Moses, and are to be identified with Jethro and Hobab, who paid him friendly visits in the desert (Exod. xviii, 5-27; Num. x, 29-32).

"The Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent" (chap. xv, 29). This seems to repeat Num. xxiii, 19: "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent." "Sanctify yourselves, and come with me to the sacrifice" (chapter xvi, 5). According to Exodus xix, 10, for a meeting of a very sacred and solemn character the children of Israel were required to sanctify themselves. "Behold, to-morrow is the new moon, and I should not fail to sit with the king at meat" (chap. xx, 5). The new moon was a festive day according to Numbers x, 10. In chap. xxi mention is made of the showbread before the Lord. This was an arrangement prescribed in Exod. xxv, 30. "And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land" (chap. xxviii, 3). This was carrying out Exodus xxii, 18: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." "And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by URIM, nor by prophets" (chap. xxviii, 6). Here we have an allusion to the Mosaic appointment (Num. xxvii, 21), where it is commanded respecting Joshua: "He

shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of URIM before the Lord." In chap. xxx, 24, 25, it is stated that David made it a statute and an ordinance for Israel unto this day, that spoils should be equally divided between those who fought and those who remained with the stuff. In this regulation David seems to have had before his eyes the example mentioned in Num. xxxi, 27, where no general precept was enjoined.



CHAPTER XXII.

TRACES OF THE PENTATEUCH IN THE BOOKS OF RUTH AND JUDGES.

THE Book of Ruth. As the Book of Ruth contains but four chapters, we are not to expect many references in it to the Mosaic history and laws.

After Naomi and her daughter-in-law, Ruth, came to Bethlehem, we find Ruth addressing Naomi in the following language: "Let me now go to the field, and glean ears of corn after him in whose sight I shall find grace" (chap. ii, 2). This she did upon gaining her mother-in-law's consent, and the act was in accordance with the Mosaic law: "And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. . . . thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger" (Lev. xix, 9, 10). We find the same precept in Deut. xxiv, 19.

The redemption of land is referred to in chapter iv, 4: "If thou wilt redeem it, redeem it: but if thou wilt not redeem it, then tell me, that I may know: for there is none to redeem it besides thee: and I am after thee. And he said, I will redeem it;" but subsequently he declined. And when Ruth's near kinsman refused to redeem the inheritance of Naomi's husband, Boaz, the next of kin, purchased it, and remarked: "Moreover Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of Mahlon, have I purchased to be my wife, to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance, that the name of the dead be not cut off from among his brethren," etc. (chap. iv, 10). Here we have a reference to Deut. xxv, 5-10, in which are prescribed the regulations respecting the marriage of a brother to his brother's childless widow, that the name of the deceased brother "be not put out of Israel."

In chap. iv, 11, 12, mention is made of Leah and Rachel, and of Pharez and Tamar, from the Book of Genesis.

Book of Judges. The Book of Judges contains many allusions to the Books of Moses. "And they gave Hebron unto Caleb, as Moses said" (chap. i, 20). This is in accordance with Num. xiv, 24, where God declares in respect to Caleb, one of the spies who went to Hebron, "him will I bring into the land whereinto he went; and his seed shall possess it." The same declaration is also made in Deut. i, 36. "I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I swore unto your fathers; and I said, I will never break my covenant with you; and ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land; ye shall throw down their altars: but ye have not obeyed my voice" (chap. ii, 1, 2). In this passage we have a reference to Gen. xvii, 7, in which God declares to Abraham that his covenant with him shall be "for an everlasting covenant;" to Deut. vii, 2, "Thou shalt make no league [בְּרִית, *covenant*] with them;" and to Deut. xii, 3: "Ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their pillars." In chap. vi, 21, mention is made of *unleavened cakes*, bread that was appointed in various parts of the Pentateuch. Compare chap. vii, 3, where Gideon says to his host, "Whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return and depart early from Mount Gilead," with Deut. xx, 8, where the following direction is given to the officers, to be observed on the eve of a battle: "They shall say, What man is there that is fearful and fainthearted? let him go and return unto his house."

When Jephthah was about to fight the children of Ammon, he sends messengers to their king, to give him a summary of the most important circumstances connected with the affairs of the children of Israel and the children of Ammon (chap. xi, 14-26). This narrative is evidently taken from the Pentateuch, for the points of coincidence are too numerous to be accidental. We have mention of the Israelites coming to the Red Sea, just as we find in Numbers xxxiii, 10; the arrival in Kadesh (Num. xiii, 26); the message sent by the Israelites from that place to the king of Edom, "Let us pass, I pray thee, through thy country" (Num. xx, 17), and the refusal of the king of Edom; the compassing of the land of Edom, and the land of Moab, and the coming by the east side of the land of Moab (as we find Num. xxi, 4, 11); the pitching on the other side of the Arnon, without entering Moab, which is stated to have been on the border of the Arnon, just as we read in Num. xxi, 13; the sending of a message to Sihon, king of the Amorites, substantially as we find it in Num. xxi, 21, 22, and his refusal to let Israel pass through; his defeat, and the occupation of his country by the Israelites, just as we find related in Numbers

Quotations in
Judges taken
from the Pen-
tateuch.

xxi, 21-25. Reference is also made to Balaam, the son of Zippor (chap. xi, 25).

When the birth of Samson was predicted, Manoah's wife was charged to "drink not wine nor strong drink, and eat not any unclean thing: for, lo, thou shalt conceive and bear a son; and no razor shall come on his head: for the child shall be a Nazarite unto God from the womb" (chap. xiii, 4, 5). Here we have an allusion to the law of the Nazarite in Num. vi, 2-5, in which it is enjoined that he shall drink no wine nor strong drink; and that no razor shall come upon his head. Then said Micah, "Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest" (chap. xvii, 13). This language clearly shows that the priesthood properly belonged to the family of Levi, according to the Mosaic constitution.

The author of Judges acquainted with the whole Levitical law.

"And the children of Israel arose, and went up to Bethel, and asked counsel of God," etc. (chap. xx, 18); with this compare Numbers xxvii, 21: "He shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim before the Lord." In chap. xx, 26, we find the Israelites offering to Jehovah *burnt* offerings and *peace* offerings, which were enjoined by the Mosaic law. Mention is also made of the ark of the covenant of God (chap. xx, 27), before which was standing Phinehas the son of Eleazar the son of Aaron (ver. 28). In chap. xxi, 19, reference is made to "a feast of the Lord in Shiloh yearly." This was, doubtless, the pass-over. "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (chap. xxi, 25). The last part of this verse seems to have been taken from Deut. xii, 8.

CHAPTER XXIII.

PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE AND AUTHORITY OF THE PENTATEUCH IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

SOME of the opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch assume that the Book of Joshua belongs thereto, thus seeking to get rid of the testimony furnished by it to the authority of the Mosaic writings. But the archaisms of the Pentateuch disappear in Joshua, showing that the latter was not written by the same author.

In the very first chapter we have a reference to the book of the law of Moses: "That thou mayest observe to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee. . . . This book of the law shall not be part out of thy mouth" (verses 7, 8). "The Lord your God, he is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath" (chap. ii, 11). This is the same as Deut. iv, 39. In chap. iii the priests are represented as bearing the ark of the covenant of God. This is in accordance with the arrangement in Deut. xxxi, 9, 25. In chap. v, 4-6 we have a statement that all the men of war who came up out of Egypt perished in the wilderness, in which Israel wandered forty years on account of their disobedience, "unto whom the Lord sware that he would not show them the land which the Lord sware unto their fathers." Here there is the clearest reference to the history in the Pentateuch, especially to Num. xiv, 23, 33.

In reference to the king of Ai it is said, "And as soon as the sun was down, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcass down from the tree" (chap. viii, 29). So in reference to the five kings (chap. x, 27), "And it came to pass at the time of the going down of the sun, that Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees." In both of these passages there is a reference to the command in Deut. xxi, 22, 23, where it is enjoined that if a man is hung for a crime, "his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day."

In chap. viii, 30-35 we find that Joshua built an altar to Jehovah on Mount Ebal: "As Moses the servant of the Lord commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the *law of Moses*, an altar of whole stones, over which no man hath lifted up any iron: and they offered thereon burnt offerings unto the Lord, and sacrificed

peace offerings. And he wrote there upon the stones a copy of *the law of Moses*, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel. . . . And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that *Moses commanded* which Joshua *read* not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." The setting up of stones and writing upon them, the words of the law, the building of an altar and the offering of sacrifice on it, are prescribed in Deut. xxvii, 1-8. The reading of the law before all the people is enjoined in Deut. xxxi, 10-12.

Nothing can be clearer than the reference in the acts of Joshua to the Pentateuch, especially Deuteronomy. In chap. Reference in Joshua's acts to the Pentateuch. xi, 12, 15, 20, 23, respecting the extermination of the Canaanites and the distribution of their lands among the tribes of Israel, it is added, "as the Lord commanded Moses," a reference to Num. xxxiii, 52-54, Exod. xxxiv, 11, Deut. vii, 2, etc. "Only unto the tribe of Levi he gave none inheritance; the sacrifices of the Lord God of Israel made by fire are their inheritance, as he said unto them" (chap. xiii, 14). Here we have a reference to the support of the Levites according to Num. xviii, 19-24.

The historical facts in chaps. xiii and xiv, in relation to the Mo- Historical facts same in Joshua as in the Pentateuch. saic times, are the same as those contained in the Pentateuch. In chap. xiv, 9, it is said: "And Moses sware on that day, saying, Surely the land whereon thy feet have trodden shall be thine inheritance and thy children's for ever; because thou hast wholly followed the Lord." With this compare Deut. i, 36, in reference to this same Caleb: "To him will I give the land that he hath trodden upon, and to his children, because he hath wholly followed the Lord."

The account of the daughters of Zelophehad (chap. xvii, 3, 4) corresponds with Num. xxvii, 1-7. In chap. xx we have an account of the appointment of the six cities of refuge, as directed by Moses, to whom reference is made. Compare this chapter with Num. xxxv, 6, 11, 14. In chapter xxi the Levites are assigned forty-eight cities with their suburbs, as directed in Num. xxxv, 7. When the children of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh had assisted their brethren in subduing the land west of the Jordan, they returned to their tents at the request of Joshua. Afterwards they returned to the Jordan, and built on its west side, where the children of Israel had crossed, a great altar. The building of this altar gave much offence to the children of Israel west of the Jordan, and they gathered them-

selves together at Shiloh to fight against the two tribes and a half that were regarded as rebels on account of this act. "Thus saith the whole congregation of the Lord, What trespass is this that ye have committed against the God of Israel, to turn away this day from following the Lord, in that ye have builded you an altar, that ye might rebel this day against the Lord. . . . And it will be, seeing ye rebel to-day against the Lord, that to-morrow he will be wroth with the whole congregation of Israel. Notwithstanding, if the land of your possession be unclean, then pass ye over unto the land of the possession of the Lord, wherein the Lord's tabernacle dwelleth, and take possession among us: but rebel not against the Lord, nor rebel against us, in building you an altar besides the altar of the Lord our God."

The two tribes and a half immediately disclaimed any intention of offering sacrifices upon this altar, as they had built it simply as a witness between themselves and the other tribes of their right to participate in the sacrifices and offerings, and as a pattern of the altar in Shiloh. They said, "God forbid that we should rebel against the Lord, and turn this day from following the Lord, to build an altar for burnt offerings, for meat offerings, or for sacrifices, besides the altar of the Lord our God that is before his tabernacle" (chap. xxii). This satisfied the tribes west of the Jordan.

This history clearly shows that it was regarded as *rebellion against the Levitical precepts in full force in time of the Judges.* *God to offer sacrifice anywhere except upon the altar before the tabernacle of the congregation.* Accordingly, the precept in Lev. xvii, 3-5, 8, 9—which prohibits the offering of sacrifice anywhere except at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation—had full force.

In the following passage there is a clear reference to the Pentateuch: "Be ye therefore very courageous to keep and to do all that is written in the book of the law of Moses" (chap. xxiii, 6). The threats in the last part of chap. xxiii are evidently taken from the Pentateuch. The sketch of the history of the children of Israel and of the patriarchs, in the first part of chap. xxiv, is the same as that of the Pentateuch, and was evidently based on it. "And Joshua wrote these words in *the book of the law of God*" (chap. xxiv, 26). This book of the law is evidently our Pentateuch, for all the passages in Joshua touching upon the Israelitish history are taken from it, or, at least, accord with it, and in some instances actually refer to it.

Final proof of the antiquity of Joshua. The Book of Joshua, which contains so many references to the Pentateuch, must have been written before the time of David, for it is said in chap. xv, 63, "As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah

could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day." But David drove them out (2 Sam. v, 6, 7). When Joshua was written the Canaanites were still living in Gezer (chap. xvi, 10); but Solomon captured Gezer, burned it with fire, and slew the Canaanites in it (1 Kings ix, 16).

In this book Zidon is the conspicuous Phœnician city, for it is called *great* Zidon (chap. xi, 8; xix, 28); while Tyre is only once mentioned—the city, the fortress of Tyre (chap. xix, 29). But in the ages subsequent to David and Solomon Tyre held the first and Zidon a secondary position. This is certainly a proof of the great antiquity of the book.



CHAPTER XXIV.

REFLECTIONS ON THE REFERENCES TO THE PENTATEUCH IN THE WRITINGS OF THE ISRAELITES IN THE POST- MOAIC AGE.

THERE is no way of avoiding the force of the evidence in favour of the Pentateuch furnished in the post-Mosaic history of the Israelites, except that of denying the credibility of this history. But even in such case, the evidence afforded by the prophets and some of the Psalms of David and Asaph remains untouched.

But the history of the Israelites in the Old Testament bears every mark of truth, and it has been confirmed in many instances by the monuments of Assyria. There is an impartiality shown in the Old Testament narrative such as is found nowhere else. The faults, vices, and even crimes, of the greatest of the Hebrews are recorded by the impartial pen of the historian, by whom their actions are weighed, and approved or condemned as they accord with or depart from the great principles of the moral law, especially the Mosaic theological and ethical system.

Bleek treats the evidence furnished by the historical writers of the Old Testament to the Pentateuch in a very slighting manner. "As far as the historical books of the Old Testament are concerned," says he, "it is very difficult to determine definitely what belongs to the authors themselves of the books, and what belongs to the times and persons whose history they relate. Especially in the discourses which the actors deliver, it can seldom be maintained that the *very* words which they used are given us, and it can easily be, that the writer has attributed to persons of former times single expressions which have

Impartiality of
Old Testament
historians.

Existence of
Pentateuch in
time of Judges
acknowledged
by Bleek.

been taken from the relations and representations of his own age."¹ This, he thinks, is true of the Book of Joshua, of Chronicles especially, and partly also of the Books of Kings. "In respect to the Books of Judges and Samuel," he observes, "it has already been remarked, that the manner in which they speak of different altars that were erected to Jehovah in different places without any indication on the part of the writer that it was contrary to the law, and displeasing to Jehovah, would be incomprehensible if, at the time of the original authors of these books, the legislation in Deuteronomy had existed and had been acknowledged."² This is a tacit acknowledgment that the other books of the Pentateuch were existing in the age of the Judges.

Respecting the Psalms Bleek thinks that they do not furnish much evidence for the Pentateuch, as it is for the most part uncertain to what age they belong; at least, they furnish nothing that refers to Deuteronomy. But there are Psalms which undoubtedly belong to the age of David, and the remarks of Bleek are not to the point.

In the prophets he finds general allusion to the Mosaic laws and history, but no certain or probable reference to Deuteronomy. We beg that these views of Bleek be compared with the instances we have furnished of allusions to the Pentateuch, and quotations from it, found almost everywhere in the other books of the Old Testament.

In regard to Deuteronomy, we have pointed out many references to this book in the post-Mosaic history—some of them of such a character as are not to be evaded. For instance, when the historian states (2 Kings xiv, 5, 6) that Amaziah (about B. C. 830) did not slay the children of his father's murderers, on the ground that such a proceeding was contrary to what was written in the book of the law of Moses (in reference to Deut. xxiv, 16), and uses the very words of the law (found only in Deuteronomy), "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers:" if the account of Amaziah is real history, this king must have had the Pentateuch before him, of which Deuteronomy formed a part. And when we find that the priests "taught in Judah, and had the book of the law of the Lord with them" (about B. C. 912), it is real history or it is nothing.

It often happens that in relating the actions of men, their conduct is based upon the Mosaic law in such a way that if the passages referring to that law be unhistorical, the history of which they form an integral part must be rejected along with them.

In the allusions to the Pentateuch in Solomon's prayer at the

¹ Einleitung, p. 339.

² Ibid., p. 339.

dedication of the temple, we have no reason to suppose that they were not the real words of Solomon, but merely part of a prayer made up by the historian—after the manner of the speeches in Thucydides and Sallust—attributed to him. In an age when writing was common, and many of the Psalms were written, it is very probable that such a prayer on so important an occasion was written down at the time.

Solomon's dedicatory prayer, as given to us: his exact words.

The custom of making up speeches for historical characters was foreign to the Hebrews. Even if the references in the post-Mosaic writers to the Pentateuch were nothing more than the expressions of the writers themselves, they would be of great value as showing that, in their judgment, there was no period since Moses in which the Pentateuch did not exist.



CHAPTER XXV.

THE ALLEGED NON-OBSERVANCE OF PORTIONS OF THE MOSAIC LAW FOR SEVERAL CENTURIES AFTER MOSES, CONSIDERED IN ITS BEARING UPON THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

IF we find certain Mosaic institutions in the Pentateuch neglected by the Hebrews, it would be rash to infer from such neglect the non-existence of such institutions. That wicked Hebrews would violate the Mosaic code was to be expected. But even if we find pious Israelites disregarding some of the Mosaic enactments, it affords no certain ground for the conclusion that these enactments had no existence. Who doubts the piety of the Quakers? Yet with all their Christian meekness and morality they reject baptism, which is clearly enjoined in the New Testament. The Church of Rome forbids the sacramental cup to the laity, contrary to the teachings of the New Testament. The adoration of images, practiced to a great extent in that Church, is also contrary to the precepts of Scripture. In regard to the practice of Christian States, how widely do some of their laws differ from the doctrines of Christ, especially the laws of divorce! The Mosaic regulations requiring sacrifices to be offered at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation only (Lev. xvii, 3-9), and sacrifices and other kinds of offerings to be brought to the place which Jehovah should choose out of all the tribes, when the Israelites should have settled in Canaan (Deut. xii, 5, 11, 14, 18), seem to have been vio-

Violation of law not proof that there is no law.

lated in various instances in the period intervening between Moses and the building of the temple by Solomon. The apparent violation of these laws of the Pentateuch has led some to reject their Mosaic origin. This has been especially the case with the precept requiring the offerings to be brought to one place which Jehovah should choose. But it must be observed that the precepts of the Pentateuch respecting the place of sacrifice were generally obeyed, even in the unsettled condition of Israel in the days of the judges. From the days of Joshua to Samuel the tabernacle of the congregation was pitched in Shiloh, where ministering priests were found, and whither the Israelites resorted to keep the great annual festival. Of this we have already given ample proof. In the time of Joshua it was regarded as treason to offer sacrifice anywhere except upon the altar before the tabernacle of the congregation in Shiloh (Josh. xxii), and in no instance was sacrifice offered in any other place. *The holy place* (English version, *sanctuary*) mentioned in Joshua xxiv, 26, in which stood an oak, was probably a spot that had become sacred, either in the history of the patriarchs or during the conquest of Canaan, when Joshua came to Gerizim and Ebal.

In the history of the times of the Judges, we find in several instances sacrifices offered to Jehovah in other places than Shiloh. But the obvious reason for the offering of these irregular sacrifices was the appearance of Jehovah in each place. It was in the tabernacle that Jehovah usually manifested himself to his people, and by virtue of this the sacrifices were to be made, and the pious Israelite might easily infer that such extraordinary appearances of God away from the tabernacle justified, or even required, a sacrifice to be offered upon the spot. Instances of this we find in the sacrifice at Bochim (Judg. ii, 5), and in that offered by Manoah (xiii, 19). Still further, we find a command of God to Gideon to throw down the altar of Baal, and to build an altar to Jehovah, and to offer burnt sacrifice (Judg. vi, 25, 26).

In Judges xx, 26, it is said that all the children of Israel, and all the people, offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before Jehovah at Bethel. But it is added in the very next verse, that "the ark of the covenant of God was there in those days, and Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it in those days." It was the ark of God that was all important, and without this the tabernacle was of little consequence. The children of Israel, it would appear, brought the ark of God to Bethel, when they came up to fight the Benjamites at Gibeah. It was placed at Bethel because that was not only a spot sacred in their history, but also con-

venient to their encampment. Mention is also made (Judg. xxi, 4) in connexion with the war against the children of Benjamin of another offering at Bethel.

Shiloh was the seat of the tabernacle from the days of Joshua until at least the death of Eli, when the ark of God was captured by the Philistines. It is evident that Shiloh was Shiloh a sacred place. the place chosen of Jehovah for his worship. Hence the language of Psalm lxxviii, 60: "So that he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh the tent which he placed among men;" and of Jeremiah vii, 12: "But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I set my name at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel." In 2 Sam. vii, 6, God declares that from the time that he brought the children of Israel up out of Egypt unto that day, he had walked in a tent and in a tabernacle. About a hundred years after the ark had been captured by the Philistines—who kept it but seven months, and sent it back to the Israelites—it was brought from the house of Abinadab to Jerusalem by David, and put in a tent he had prepared for it.

In the beginning of Solomon's reign we find the tabernacle in Gibeon (1 Chron. xvi, 39; 2 Chron. i, 3). It is impossible to say how long it had been there. During the one hundred years from the death of Eli to the building of the temple by Pause in fixed place for worship of Jehovah. Solomon there was no fixed place for divine worship—the ark was in one place and the tabernacle in another. Shiloh had been rejected, but Jerusalem was not yet selected and fully prepared for the tabernacle and the ark. In this confused state it is said: "Only the people sacrificed in high places, because there was no house built unto the name of the Lord until those days" (1 Kings iii, 2).

In the time of Samuel, after the capture of the ark by the Philistines, we find that sacrifice was offered at Gilgal (1 Sam. xi, 15). Most probably the tabernacle of the congregation was then there.

Here the question arises how far were these practices contrary to the commands of the Pentateuch? Two Mosaic precepts bear upon this point, the one in Lev. xvii, 3-9, requiring sacrifices to be offered only at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; the other in Deut. xii, enjoining them to be offered in the place which Jehovah should choose out of all the tribes. There seems to have been a general compliance with the first of these precepts, and also with the second while the ark and tabernacle remained at Shiloh. The principal reason for the command to offer sacrifice at the door of the tabernacle seems to have been to prevent idolatry; for every offering made No real violation of the precept enjoining place of sacrifice. there was presented to Jehovah, whose presence was manifested in the

tabernacle. Hence it is added: "That they may bring them unto the Lord." That idolatry is the principal offence against which provision is made, appears also from the language following the precept, "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring." Accordingly under these circumstances sacrifices would naturally enough be offered to Jehovah wherever he appeared to the Israelites.

In respect to the place chosen out of all the tribes to which alone sacrifices should be brought, it is added, "When he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about" (Deut. xii, 10). And this seems to be a necessary condition: for it might be inconvenient, and even impossible, to go up *three* times a year to some *fixed locality*, which might be held by the enemies of Israel; or the people might be obstructed in their attempts to leave home, or their presence might be absolutely required there. In the age of Samuel the Israelites were frequently engaged in war with the Philistines, and a portion of the time, at least, they were completely in their power; for it is said (1 Sam. xiii, 19, 20), "Now there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel; for the Philistines said, Lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears. But all the Israelites went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock." Is it a matter of wonder, under these circumstances, that there was irregularity in the observance of the precepts concerning sacrifice? What an overwhelming proof of the non-existence of the Pentateuch among the Jews—if we did not absolutely know differently—would the present violation on their part of some of the fundamental laws of the Mosaic polity afford? The modern Jews do not slay the paschal lamb; they offer no sacrifices to God; their males do not go up *three times a year to Jerusalem*; the Rabbies, their teachers, are not exclusively of the tribe of Levi, to say nothing of other violations of the law.

The various parts of the Pentateuch are consistent respecting the place of worship. After the ten commandments were given, it was enjoined that the children of Israel should build an altar to the Lord and offer sacrifices thereon, with the promise: "In every place where I shall record my name [that is, shall appoint for divine worship] I will come unto thee," etc. (Exod. xx, 24). Here the place is left indefinite. But when the tabernacle had been built, it was enjoined upon the Israelites to bring their offerings only to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. xvii, 3-9). And when the Israelites were about to enter Canaan, they were directed to bring their offerings in that land to the place which Jehovah should choose (Deut. xii, 5, 11, 14). This indicates that the tab-

ernacle is no longer to be migrating, but to stand in a fixed locality. The very existence of the ark of the covenant, which is acknowledged to date from Moses, would seem to require one sole place of worship and offerings. In Exod. xxiii, 14, 17, 19, a part of the legislation acknowledged to be the oldest, the males are required to appear three times a year before the Lord, and the Israelites to bring the first of their firstfruits into the house of their God. This, too, seems to look to one sanctuary. There is not the slightest hint anywhere in the Pentateuchal legislation that the Israelites were at liberty to sacrifice to God where they pleased. *Unity of God, unity of sanctuary, and unity of the people, are fundamental ideas in the Pentateuch.* There could be no surer method of leading the people to idolatry than by allowing them to sacrifice on high places where other divinities than Jehovah might be worshipped. But when the sacrifices were offered at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, in which was the sacred ark, where Jehovah manifested himself, idolatry was impossible.

It is incredible that after the temple had been built, and the command to sacrifice only in the place which Jehovah should choose was a standing precept in Deut. xii, 5, etc., the injunction in Lev. xvii, 3-9, should have been invented and attributed to Moses, especially as it is enjoined: "This shall be a statute to them forever throughout their generations (verse 7).

The Hebrew prophets recognize the temple in Jerusalem as the sole place for the worship of Jehovah. Thus Joel (about B. C. 870), "Jehovah dwells in Zion" (iii, 17). The temple is the place for religious worship (ii, 15-17). "Jehovah shall utter his voice from Jerusalem" (Amos i, 2). "The Lord from his holy temple" (Micah i, 2). "The Lord of hosts dwelleth in mount Zion" (Isa. viii, 18). "Shall worship Jehovah in the holy mount at Jerusalem" (xxvii, 13). "For out of Zion shall go forth the law" (ii, 3). Similar is Micah iv, 2. The calf worship, and the idolatry in general, are condemned by the prophets (Hosea ii, 5-13; iv, 13; x, 8, 15; xiii, 2; Amos iii, 14; Micah i, 7).

The throwing down the altars of Jehovah among the ten tribes, to which Elijah refers (1 Kings xix, 14), indicates the hostility of the worshipers of Baal to Jehovah, and has nothing to do with the question of the legality of those altars.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY IN THE PENTATEUCH
AND ITS BEARING ON THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE
WORK.

IF the Pentateuch was really written by Moses, we have in that fact a strong proof of the truth of the history in which he was the principal actor, and which embraces about three fourths of the whole. But we may reverse the argument, and affirm, that if we find numerous internal marks of truth, a thorough knowledge of Egypt and of the topography of those regions through which the Israelites journeyed, and if the history in important particulars is confirmed by external evidence—ancient monuments, for example—then we have strong proof that the historian was contemporary with most of the events which he relates, and was, in all probability, Moses.

The Pentateuch begins with the history of creation, and gives us a cosmogony distinguished by a sublime simplicity differing widely from all the cosmogonies of the ancient world. In the old cosmogony of India, Vishnu, as Brahma, creates the world in the following order: 1. The creation of intellect, or Mahat, which is also called the creation of Brahma; 2. That of the rudimental principles; 3. The creation of the senses; 4. Inanimate bodies; 5. That of animals; 6. That of divinities; 7. That of man; 8. A creation that possesses both the qualities of goodness and darkness. Five creations are secondary and three are primary. But there is a ninth that is both primary and secondary.¹

The demons were born from the thigh of Brahma. From his mouth proceeded the gods. He formed birds from his vital vigour; sheep from his breast; goats from his mouth; kine from his belly and sides; horses, elephants, deer, camels, mules, etc., from his feet. From the hairs of his body sprang herbs, roots, and fruits.²

There sprang from the mouth of Brahma beings especially endowed with goodness; others from his breast, pervaded with the quality of foulness; others from his thighs, in whom foulness and darkness prevailed; and others from his feet, in whom the quality

¹ Wilson, Vishnu Purana, pp. 36-38.

² Ibid., pp. 40, 41.

The Mosaic cosmogony compared with the cosmogonies of heathen religions.

of darkness predominated. These were the four castes, Brahmans, Kshetriyas, Vaisyas, and Sudras.¹

How far the views of Plato fell below the grandeur of the Mosaic cosmogony appears from a passage in his *Timæus*. In his system man is the primal creation, from which were derived the fowls of heaven and the beasts of the field. "Birds," says he, "were derived from men who were guileless, indeed, but frivolous and devoted to the study of meteorology, believing in their simplicity that the proofs respecting these things were the most certain, on account of their being objects of sight. On the other hand, land animals and wild beasts sprang from men who made no use of philosophy, and who did not at all study the nature of the heavens on account of their no longer using the cycles in their heads, but following the lower passions as their guides. From these pursuits their arms and heads were drawn down toward the earth through a natural affinity," etc.²

In the history of creation we are not to expect anything more than an epitome. As the Book of Genesis is an introduction to the Mosaic dispensation, almost every occurrence is treated with brevity. As it is not the object of Revelation to teach *physical* science but *theological* and *moral* truth, we should expect the account of creation to be adapted to this purpose, and to be set forth in such language as would be intelligible to the ancient Hebrews. That the history of creation would be adapted to the conceptions and limited faculties of the people might be inferred from God's general method of teaching, in which language *anthropopathic* and *anthropomorphic* is used in describing divine actions.

In fundamental principles there is no compromise in the Bible, but in matters of secondary importance there is an accommodation in the Mosaic law to the condition of the Israelites. Respecting their law of divorce our Saviour said, "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives." If the law could be modified to suit their condition, so might the *form* of the history of creation.

The fundamental idea in the Mosaic account of creation is, that *Jehovah God is the creator of all things in heaven, earth, and under the earth*. Here there is no room left for the operations of any other god, and nature herself is shown to be a dependent creature of Jehovah, consequently there is no place for idolatry. Subordinate to this idea is the division of the work of creation into six periods of one day each, on which was founded the Jewish Sabbath.

¹Wilson, *Vishnu Purana*, p. 44.

²*Timæus*, 91. I make no reference to the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, for in his time the writings of Moses were known to the Greeks and Romans.

The *order* of creation contained in the first chapter of Genesis agrees in its general outline with the present state of geological science. After the creation of the heavens and of the earth the Almighty created light. That light existed at the earliest period of animal life is inferred from the fact that the trilobites, belonging to the lower Silurian formation, had perfect eyes.

The separation of the waters above the firmament from those below the firmament was the work of the second day. Whatever view be taken of the expression "waters above the firmament," it is evident that Moses knew the real source of rain. For it is said, "There went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground" (Gen. ii, 6). The separation of land and water, the formation of continents, followed by the creation of grass, herbs, and fruit trees, the work of the third day, are parts of geological history. "The facts to be presented under the Silurian age," says Dana, "teach that the great, yet unmade, continents, although so small in the amount of dry land, were not covered by the *deep* ocean, but only by *shallow* oceanic waters. They lay just beneath the waves, already outlined, prepared to commence that series of formations—the Silurian, Devonian, Carboniferous, and others—which was required to finish the crust for its ultimate continental purposes." "The Azoic age in geology witnessed, with little doubt, the appearance of the first continents, and, probably, of the first plants."¹

The creation of the sun, moon, and stars, on the fourth day, has but little connexion with geology, and belongs rather to astronomy. It seems strange that the sun, to us the great source of light and heat, should not be created till the fourth day, while light itself was created on the first day. Now no man of the Mosaic age, following his own unaided reason or imagination only, would ever have hit upon such an arrangement as we have in Genesis; and in the present state of physical science it is not so improbable as it seems at first sight; and in the future progress of science it may be rendered in the highest degree probable on scientific grounds.² According to modern science, the sun is a dark body surrounded by a luminous, gaseous envelope. Thus while light (אור) as a principle was cre-

¹Text Book of Geology, p. 77.

²What appears in one age an absurdity, may in another age become the strongest proof of a statement or doctrine. Thus Herodotus (liber iv, 42), in relating the circumnavigation of Africa from the Red Sea and returning through the Pillars of Hercules to Egypt by order of Necho, says, "They told me what is not credible, that while sailing around Africa *they had the sun on their right hand.*" But this circumstance is *to us* a strong proof that the voyage *was* made.

ated on the *first* day, it was not till the *fourth* that the sun, the *light-holder* (אֱלֹהִים) was created or arranged in its present form. Before the creation of the sun the earth seems to have derived no heat from any external source, but its surface was in all probability warmed from the internal heat. And this is supported by geology, which shows us that in the earlier period of the earth's history *no climatic differences existed*. Previous to the existence of the sun, it cannot be said with certainty in what way the periods of day and night were divided. We would, however, regard the light as located in *one* part of the universe, and the same part of the surface of the earth by its rotation brought alternately into light and darkness.

The work of the fifth day was the creation of the fishes of the sea and the fowls of heaven, followed, on the sixth day, by the creation of beasts, cattle and creeping things, ending in the formation of man in the image of God. Now, in the geological series, the creation of fish preceded that of reptiles and mammalia, and man is the last of the series. Here the Mosaic and the geological records agree.

It seems best to take the word "day" in Genesis i, ii, for an indefinite period of time. In Job xv, 32, and xxx, 25, *day* (יָמִים) is used for the whole *period of life*. In the same way the Greeks use *ἡμέρα*, *day*, and we employ it in the phrase "his day."

"The Etruscans relate that God created the world in six thousand years. In the first thousand he created the heaven and the earth; in the second, the firmament; in the third, the sea and the other waters of the earth; in the fourth, sun, moon, and stars; in the fifth, the animals belonging to air, water, and land; in the sixth, man alone. The Persian tradition also recognizes the six periods of creation."¹ "The principal Babylonian story of the creation," says Smith, "substantially agrees, as far as it is preserved, with the biblical account. According to it there was a chaos of watery matter before the creation, and from this all things were generated." Other "fragments refer to the creation of mankind, called Adam, as in the Bible. Another "fragment was supposed by Mr. Smith to relate to the fall of man, and to contain the speech of the deity to the newly-created pair. This, however, is extremely doubtful. The fragment is in so broken a condition that almost any thing can be made out of it."²

But it is too early yet to attempt an elaborate reconciliation of the Mosaic cosmogony with geology—a science which is not much more than half a century old, and is very imperfectly developed by reason of the vast regions over which it extends. It has not yet

¹ Dr. M'Caul, Mosaic Record of Creation.

² George Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis, by A. H. Sayce, p. 72.

been surely determined relatively or absolutely when the various orders of creation upon our planet first appeared. On the other hand, it is not easy to determine how far the Mosaic account of the creation was adapted to the conceptions of the Jews.

The recent origin of man is clearly shown from the biblical history; and geology confirms it in a most striking manner by showing the absence of human remains, and of any indication of human existence, except in the latest geological formations. Even those implements found in certain parts of Europe cannot prove any great antiquity for man, since we know not what length of time has intervened between the deposition of the strata in which they are found and the present age. Nor do we know what time has elapsed since those animals disappeared with whose bones human remains are found, even if we grant that these animals and men were contemporary.

A very high antiquity for the human race is inconsistent with the general ascertained facts of geology. It was impossible that man should be confined to one small territory for a long time, whether in a savage or civilized condition; for he roams over the earth, and every-where leaves traces of his existence. It is not possible that man should have existed in Europe thousands of years before he made his way into Asia. But the human race, without doubt, had its origin in Asia, and must soon have settled Egypt. Why then have we not traces of man's existence in Asia and in Egypt of as early a day as is alleged in behalf of the stone implements in certain parts of Europe?

According to Genesis, the primitive seat¹ of mankind was in Western Asia, somewhere near the Tigris and the Euphrates, and from this same region the sons of Noah after the deluge spread themselves over the earth. And this is confirmed by the fact that the Indo-Germanic languages (Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, etc.) have their origin in the region of Persia.²

The unity of the human race is undoubtedly taught in Genesis, and anatomy and physiology furnish strong proofs of the truth of this doctrine.

That man originally lived in a state of innocency and happiness, from which he fell, as taught in Genesis, is a widespread tradition. We find it described in the beautiful poetry of Ovid,³ who speaks of it as the "Golden Age," in which the earth yielded spontaneously her fruits for the human race, and men observed justice

The Mosaic account of the primitive condition of man agrees with universal tradition.

¹ Sargon calls Elam the country of "the four rivers." A. H. Sayce, p. 84.

² See Max Müller's *Science of Language*, 234, *et seq.*, and Humboldt's *Cosmos*, vol. i, p. 15.

³ *Metamorphoses*, liber i, 89-112.

and rectitude of their own accord, and were free from fear, as there was no judge to inflict penalties. This age, according to the poet, was followed by those of silver, brass, and iron. The ancient Greek poet, Hesiod,¹ refers to the primeval condition of man, characterizing it as a "Golden Age," when men lived like gods, free from care, and died as if overcome by sleep, and the earth yielded of her own accord abundant fruits. "In the Zend Avesta, Yima, the first Iranic king, lives in a secluded spot, where he and his people enjoy uninterrupted happiness. Neither sin, nor folly, nor violence, nor poverty, nor deformity has entrance into the region; nor does the evil spirit for awhile set foot there." "In the Chinese books we read, that 'During the period of the first heaven, the whole creation enjoyed a state of happiness: every thing was beautiful; every thing was good; all beings were perfect in their kind; . . . all things grew without labour, and universal fertility prevailed.' The literature of the Hindus tells of a 'first age of the world, when justice, in the form of a bull, kept herself firm on her four feet; virtue reigned; no good which mortals possessed was mixed with baseness; and man, free from diseases, saw all his wishes accomplished, and attained an age of four hundred years.' In the earliest of the Persian books the Fall would seem to be gradual; but in the later writings, which are of an uncertain date, a narrative appears which is most strikingly in accordance with that of Genesis."²

The longevity of the antediluvians has been regarded by some as incredible. But the numbers bear no indications of myth. The age of the antediluvians is given, the time when the eldest sons were born, and when they died;

The longevity
of the antedi-
luvians.

and these years are not put in round numbers as we would expect in a myth. It is impossible for physiologists to disprove the possibility of the antediluvians having reached the ages attributed to them. There is no way of judging, *à priori*, how long any animal may live; and in the early period of man's existence various causes, as climate and food, may have favoured longevity. But why may not the Almighty have granted to man a great age at first for the rapid increase of the race, and have shortened it afterward? That men do not reach an age of nine hundred years now is no proof that they never did. Geology clearly shows the vast changes that the physical and the animal world have passed through in their history. "The great Haller, when led to speak on the subject, declared the problem one which could not be solved, on account of the absence of sufficient data; while Buffon accepted the scriptural ac-

¹ Works and Days, lines 109-119.

² Hist. Illus. of the Old Testament, by Rawlinson and Hackett, pp. 9-11.

count, and thought he could see physical reasons why life should in the early ages have been so greatly extended.”¹ Lord Bolingbroke, in the last century, although he treated Moses and his history with great contempt, yet allowed “that the lives of men in the first ages of the world were probably much longer than ours.”² Josephus, in his *Antiquities*, in speaking of the great length of the lives of the antediluvians, remarks: “All those who have written works on antiquities, both the Greeks and the Barbarians, bear witness to my statements. For Manetho, who wrote an account of the Egyptians, and Berosus, who gave an account of the Chaldean affairs, and Mochus, and Hestæus, and the Egyptian Hieronymus, who wrote an account of the Phœnicians, agree with my statements. Hesiod, and Hecatæus, and Hellanicus, and Acousilaus, and Ephorus, and Nicolaus, relate that the ancients lived a *thousand years*.”³ In the Hindu accounts of the early ages, men in the first period were free from disease, and reached four hundred years.

What is most remarkable in the history of the antediluvian world is its freedom from the mythical history of gods and demi-gods that pervades the early records of other nations. In the Egyptian history, the reign of the gods and demi-gods extends over a period of more than seventeen thousand years.⁴

According to Genesis vii, viii, there was a universal deluge, which swept off all men and every living creature upon the face of the earth and in the heavens except Noah and his family, and the living creatures that were with him in the ark. If this account were nothing more than a tradition, it must be of great value. Its simplicity stamps it with the seal of truth. It was to be expected that an event of this kind would not be forgotten by the descendants of Noah. And we accordingly find among nearly all the nations of the earth a tradition of a great deluge.

After giving the traditions of various nations respecting a deluge, Professor Rawlinson remarks: “To conclude, therefore, that the deluge, in respect of mankind, was partial, because some of the great divisions of the human family had no tradition on the subject, is to draw a conclusion directly in the teeth of the evidence. The evidence shows a consentient belief—a belief that has all the appearance of being original and not derived—among members of ALL the great races into which ethnologists have divided mankind.”⁵ François Lenormant concludes his investigations on the deluge with

¹ *Aids to Faith*, Essay vi, sec. v.

² *Works*, vol. iii, p. 244, in *Leland's View of Deist. Writers*, ii, 365. ³ *Lib. i*, 3, 9.

⁴ *Osburn's Mon. Hist. Egypt*, p. 199.

⁵ *Illust. of Old Test.*, p. 21, 22.

the remark that he is in "a position to affirm that the account of the deluge is a universal tradition in all branches of the human family, with the sole exception of the black race. No religious or cosmogonic myth possesses this character of universality. It must necessarily be the reminiscence of an actual and terrible event which made so powerful an impression upon the imaginations of the first parents of our species that their descendants could never forget it."¹

A very ancient and remarkable account of a deluge has been found on tablets in the ruins of Nineveh, belonging to the reign of Assurbanipal, B. C. 670. The inscriptions on these tablets are supposed to be copies of very ancient records. In this description Surippakite is directed by the Assyrian divinity to build a ship for himself, as he intends to destroy the sinner and life, and to preserve in it "the seed of life, all of it, in the midst of the ship." He is also instructed of what dimensions to build it. It was covered without and within with bitumen. Surippakite is ordered to put into this ship his grain, furniture, goods, wealth, woman servants, female slaves, and young men. At the same time it is declared that the beasts of the field shall be sent to him to be put into the ship. The rain pours down from heaven for seven days. On the very first day the ship is carried to Mount Nizir, where it rests seven days. First a dove is sent forth from the ship, and, not finding any resting-place, returns. Next, a swallow is sent, which also returns. Afterwards there was sent forth a raven, which did not return. After the deluge ceased Surippakite built an altar on the peak of the mountain, and offered sacrifice to the gods.²

"The inscription," says Mr. Smith, "gives seven days for the flood, and seven days for the resting of the ark on the mountain; while the Bible gives the commencement of the flood on the seventeenth day of the second month, and its termination on the twenty-seventh day of the second month in the following year, making a total duration of one year and ten days. . . . There is, again, a difference as to the mountain on which the ark rested; Nizir, the place mentioned in the cuneiform text, being east of Assyria, probably between latitudes 35° and 36°, while Ararat, the mountain mentioned in the Bible, was north of Assyria, near Lake Van.

"In the account of sending forth the birds, there is a difference in detail between the Bible and the inscriptions which cannot be explained away; this and other similar differences will serve to show that neither of the two documents is copied directly from the

¹ The Beginnings of History, pp. 486, 487.

² We have abridged this statement from The Chaldean Account of Genesis, by George Smith. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co., 1876.

other."¹ The simplicity of the biblical account, and the dates that are given, stamp it as the original.

Osburn thinks he sees in the Egyptian *nou* or *nh*, which signifies "the primordial water," "the abyss," a reference to Noah, the name of the divine impersonation of the annual overflow in the Egyptian mythology being *Nh* or *Nuh*, the Hebrew נֹחַ or נָח Noah.²

After the description of the flood, we have an account of the peopling of the earth by the sons of Noah (Genesis x). This genealogical table bears the stamp of truth, and has been remarkably confirmed by modern researches. "Setting aside the cases where the ethnic names employed are of doubtful application, it cannot reasonably be questioned that the author has, in his account of the sons of Japhet, classified together the Cymry or Celts (Gomer), the Medes (Madai), and the Ionians or Greeks (Javan), thereby anticipating what has become known in modern times as 'the Indo-European theory,' or the essential unity of the Aryan (Asiatic) race with the principal races of Europe, indicated by the Celts and the Ionians. Nor can it be doubted that he has thrown together under the one head of 'children of Shem,' the Assyrians (Asshur), the Syrians (Aram), the Hebrews (Eber), and the Joktanian Arabs (Joktan), four of the principal races which modern ethnology recognises under the heading of 'Semitic.' Again, under the heading of 'sons of Ham,' the author has arranged 'Cush,' i. e., the Ethiopians; Mizraim, the people of Egypt; Sheba and Dedan, or certain of the Southern Arabs; and 'Nimrod,' or the ancient people of Babylon—four races between which the latest linguistic researches have established a close affinity. Beyond a question, the tendency of modern ethnological inquiry has been to establish the accuracy of the document called in Genesis the Toldoth Beni Noah, or genealogy of the sons of Noah (chap. x), and to create a feeling among scientific ethnologists that it is a record of the very highest value; one which, if it can be rightly interpreted, may be thoroughly trusted, and which is, as one of them has said, 'the most authentic record that we possess for the affiliation of nations.'"³

In Genesis x, 9, 10, mention is made of Nimrod, a mighty hunter before the Lord; and the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. "The four cities," says Bonomi, "which are recorded in Scripture to have been founded by Nimrod, Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh, were all in the land of Shinar, the

The story of Nimrod illustrated on ancient monuments.

¹ Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis, pp. 288, 289.

² Monumental History of Egypt, p. 240.

³ Rawlinson and Hackett. Hist. Ill. of Old Testament, pp. 25, 26.

southern part of Mesopotamia.”¹ Bonomi gives a cut of a gigantic figure of a man strangling a young lion, taken from the ruins of ancient Nineveh. He believes this to be a representation of the mighty hunter Nimrod. According to Gen. x, 8 Nimrod was the son of Cusli. “Recent researches in Mesopotamia,” says Rawlinson, “have revealed to us as the earliest seat of power and civilization in Western Asia, a Cushite kingdom, the site of which is Lower Babylonia; a main characteristic of which is its possession of large cities, and which even seems in an especial way to affect, in its political arrangements, the number *four*. Babel, Accad, and Erech (or Huruk), are names which occur in the early geographic nomenclature of this monarchy. Nimrod is a personage in its mythology. The records discovered do not, probably, mount up within some centuries of the foundation of the kingdom; but they present us with a picture in perfect harmony with the scriptural narrative—a picture of a state such as that set up by Nimrod would be likely to have become two or three centuries after its foundation.”²

In Gen. x, 11, it is said that “out of that land [Nimrod’s kingdom] went forth Asshur and builded Nineveh,” etc.³ “The recovered monuments show that the Moſaical account is, in all respects, true. The *early* Babylonians are proved to have been of an entirely distinct race from the Assyrians, whose language is Semitic, while that of their southern neighbours is Cushite. A Babylonian kingdom is found to have flourished before there was any independent Assyria, or any such city as Nineveh.”⁴

In the first part of the eleventh chapter of Genesis we have an account of the confusion of tongues at Babel or Babylon. There is in Abydenus, who wrote concerning Assyrian affairs, a passage that refers to the building of the tower of Babel and the confusion of the language of the builders: “There are some who say that the first men, having sprung from the earth, and being puffed up on account of their strength and size, and presuming to be superior to the gods, raised a lofty tower where Babylon now stands; and when it was approaching heaven the winds came to the assistance of the gods, and threw down the tower about the builders. The ruins of this tower are called Babylon. Men who had hitherto been of one tongue received from the gods many languages.”⁵

¹ Nineveh and its Palaces, p. 45.

² Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament, pp. 30, 31.

³ This is preferable to “he went forth to Assyria,” as ה local is not added to אֲשׁוּר, and this is confirmed by the LXX, which has Ἀσσοῦρ, the Targum of Onkelos, and the Peshito-Syriac, which have the “Assyrian.”

⁴ His. Illus., p. 33.

⁵ In Eusebius’ Præpar. Evan., ix, 14.

The story of the war of the giants against heaven, found in the Greek and Roman mythology, probably grew out of the building of the tower of Babel. A probable proof of the confusion of tongues is furnished "in the character of the language which appears on the earliest monuments of the country—monuments which reach back to a time probably as remote as B. C. 2300, and almost certainly anterior to the date of Abraham. This monumental language is especially remarkable for its *mixed* character. It is Turanian in its structure, Cushite or Ethiopian in the bulk of its vocabulary, while, at the same time, it appears to contain both Semitic and Aryan elements."¹

When Abraham visited Egypt (Gen. xii, 10–20) he found there a king² (Pharaoh) and princes. He was presented with sheep, oxen, asses, and camels, in addition to servants. In this list we miss horses, which seem to have been introduced into Egypt a short time before the Mosaic age (according to Wilkinson, vol. i, 386). But in the age of Solomon horses were abundant in Egypt. How natural it would have been for a writer subsequent to Moses to put *horses* among the gifts made to Abraham in Egypt. The ass is the most common animal in Egypt at the present day, and no doubt was known there from the most ancient times; and the same is true of oxen. Sheep are represented in a tomb below the pyramids, dating upward of four thousand years ago.³ The camel also appears among the gifts to Abraham. "It is remarkable," says Wilkinson, "that the camel, though known in Egypt as early at least as the time of Abraham, has never been met with, even in the latest paintings or hieroglyphics. Yet this does not prove it was even rare in the country; since the same would apply to fowls and pigeons, of which no instance occurs on the monuments among the stock of the farm-yard."⁴ Camels are at present⁵ employed in Egypt, and it is highly probable that they were used from the earliest times as the great means of commerce between Egypt and other countries separated from it by deserts.

¹Hist. Old Testament Illus., p. 28.

²Phouro (Coptic), the king, the name given to the Egyptian monarchs from the earliest times.

³See Wilkinson, vol. i, 166

⁴Manners and Customs, etc., vol. i, 234.

⁵When in Egypt, in December, 1869, the author saw, a short distance north of Cairo, a considerable number of camels coming from that city, and bound apparently for Suez.

CHAPTER XXVII.

FARTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY CONTAINED IN THE PENTATEUCH.

THE history of the patriarchs, as related in the Book of Genesis, is marked by simplicity, and by no means shows the conditions and relations of a subsequent age extended to the past. In the case of Abraham we have a striking instance of a custom different from the Mosaic enactment; for Sarah, his wife, was his half-sister (Gen. xx, 12), but such a union is forbidden by the law of Moses (Lev. xviii, 9). No one of the Hebrews, in the Mosaic age or subsequently, in making up a story, would have represented their great progenitor as living in a relation condemned by Moses. Jacob had two sisters for wives at the same time, which is forbidden in Lev. xviii, 18.

In connexion with the patriarchal history, the question arises, Does the biblical chronology allow a sufficient interval of time to elapse between the deluge and the building of the great pyramid for the settlement, the civilization, and the attainment of a high state of art at the latter period? The interval between the deluge and the birth of Abraham varies with the text from which the chronology is calculated. If taken from the Jewish Pentateuch, it is 292 years; if from the Samaritan, it is 942 years; but if from the Septuagint, it is 1,172 years. Now, it must be confessed that the numbers taken from the Jewish Pentateuch are too small. The great pyramid was built about 2,450 years before Christ, about 100 years before the deluge, according to the chronology of Usher. But if we suppose the sojourn in Egypt to have been 430 years instead of 215, then the great pyramid must have been built only a hundred years after the deluge, which is exceedingly improbable. Now, if we take the Samaritan Pentateuch as authority, and allow but 215 years for the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, we shall have the deluge B. C. 2936; or if the sojourn in Egypt was 430 years,¹ then the deluge was B. C. 3151. The Septuagint gives us still more time, making the deluge either B. C. 3168, or B. C. 3383.²

The time between the deluge and the building of the great pyramid.

¹ We decidedly prefer 430 years as the period of the sojourn in Egypt.

² Both the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint say the sojourn in Egypt and in the land of Canaan was 430 years (Exod. xii, 40), contrary to the Jewish Pentateuch.

We confess we have but little confidence in any system of chronology so ancient as the age of Abraham. For, in the first place, several generations may have been omitted: *e. g.*, we find the name of Cainan between Arphaxad and Salah in the Septuagint, which is wanting in the Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuch, but is found in Luke's genealogy of Christ. There are some striking instances of the omission of generations in the Books of Chronicles. Matthew, in the genealogy of our Lord, has done the same. In the next place, there is great liability to corruption in the transmission of numbers. Menes was the first king of Egypt; but his age is very uncertain. According to Josephus he reigned 1,300 years before Solomon. Wilkinson is disposed to place Menes about 2700 B. C. Gliddon and others adopt about the same date. But *twenty-six*¹ different dates have been assigned to the age of Menes, ranging from B. C. 6467 to B. C. 2182. We may assume B. C. 2700 as his most probable age; and this date is not inconsistent with the chronology of either the Samaritan or the Septuagint text.

In Genesis xiv there is an account of the rebellion of the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Bela, against Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and his three vassal kings, in which the former were completely defeated, and Lot was led away among the captives, but was rescued by Abraham, who, with his confederate Amorites, completely routed the victorious kings. Here the question arises, Do the recently discovered and deciphered monuments of Babylon give any confirmation to this history? The answer must be in the affirmative. For while profane history contains no account of the events here related, yet there are certain facts that confirm the history, though indirectly. "The change in the position of Babylon, the rise of the Elamites to power and pre-eminence, and the occurrence about this time of Elamitic expeditions into Palestine or the adjacent districts, are witnessed to by documents recently disinterred from the mounds of Mesopotamia. The name, too, of the Elamite king, though not yet actually found on any monument, is composed of elements both of which occur in Elamite documents separately, and is of a type exactly similar to other Elamitic names of the period. To give the evidence more fully, it is stated in an inscription of Asshur-bani-pal, the son of Esar-haddon, that 1,635 years before his own capture of Susa, or about B. C. 2286, Kudur-Nakhunta, then king of Elam, led an expedition into Babylon, took the towns, plundered the temples, and carried off the images of the gods to his own capital, where they remained to the time of the Assyrian

Some confirmations of the rebellion of the kings in Babylonian monuments.

¹Wuttke, p. 488.

conquest. From Babylonian documents of a date not much later (B. C. 2200-2100), it appears that an Elamitic dynasty had by that time been established in Babylonia itself, and that a king called Kudur-Mabuk, an Elamite prince, who held his court at Ur, in Lower Chaldea, carried his arms so far to the westward that he took the title of 'Ravager of the West,' or 'Ravager of Syria,' a title which is found inscribed upon his bricks. The element *Kudur*, which commences the name of this prince, and also that of Kudur-Nakhunta, is identical with the Hebrew *Chedor*; while *Lagamer* is elsewhere found as an Elamitic god, which is the case also with *Mabuk* and *Nakhunta*. Thus Chedorlaomer (Kudur-Lagamer) is a name of exactly the same type with Kudur-Nakhunta and Kudur-Mabuk. Its character is thoroughly Elamitic, and it is appropriate to the time at which the writer of Genesis places the monarch bearing it."¹ What a strong proof we here have of the reality of the history in which Abraham occupies so conspicuous a place! Such a history as this must have been written down either in the patriarchal age originally, or by some one in the position of Moses.

The cities of the plain, Sodom, Gomorrah, etc., must have stood at the upper end of the Dead Sea; and Dr. Tristram² has recently discovered the site of the ancient Zoar, in the ruins called Zi'ara, eight miles east of the north-east end of the Dead Sea, on the mountain side.

In the supplication which Abraham makes to God in behalf of Sodom, Professor Blunt³ finds a remarkable undesigned coincidence in the fact that Lot, who was the nephew of Abraham, dwelt in Sodom, while he makes no petition for the other cities of the plain, in which he did not feel the same deep interest.

In the blessing pronounced upon Esau it is said: "Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above" (Gen. xxvii, 39). Professor Palmer, who has recently explored Edom, remarks on it: "The country is extremely fertile, and presents a favourable contrast to the sterile region on the opposite side of the 'Arabah. Goodly streams flow through the valleys, which are filled with trees and flowers; while on the uplands to the east rich pasture-lands and corn-fields may every-where be seen."⁴

The history of Joseph in Egypt (Gen. xxxix-1) displays a most accurate knowledge⁵ of Egyptian affairs, and must have been written by Moses, or by some one in Egypt before the time of Moses.

¹ Rawlinson, *Hist. Illus. Old Testament*, pp. 39, 40.

² Land of Moab, pp. 341, 343.

³ *Scriptural Coincidences*, p. 31.

⁴ Desert of the Exodus, p. 362.

⁵ Bleek acknowledges the intimate acquaintance with Egyptian affairs here shown. *Einleitung*, p. 265.

It is stated (Genesis xxxix, 1) that Potiphar, captain of Pharaoh's guard, bought Joseph from the Ishmaelites. In the time of Joseph it is well known that the king of Egypt had soldiers and officers. Slavery existed in that country at a very early period. "The traffic in slaves," says Wilkinson, "was tolerated by the Egyptians." Potiphar, the name of Pharaoh's officer, is a Coptic word, meaning *belonging to the sun*.

The narrative of the attempt made by Potiphar's wife on the chastity of Joseph shows that women were not excluded from the society of men, as was the custom in some ancient countries. And this is confirmed by independent testimony. "Men and women either sat together, or separately, in a different part of the room."¹

Mention is made of the king's butler (cup-bearer), of the vine, and of the pressing of grapes into Pharaoh's cup (chap. xl, 1, 9-11). "Some have pretended to doubt," says Wilkinson, "that the vine was commonly cultivated, or even grown, in Egypt; but the frequent notice of it and of Egyptian wine in the sculptures, and the authority of ancient writers, sufficiently answer those objections."²

"And the birds did eat them (meats) out of the basket upon my head" (chap. xl, 17). Here we have a reference to the Egyptian custom of carrying baskets on the head. With this compare Herodotus's remark respecting the Egyptians: "Men carry loads on their heads, women on their shoulders." Wilkinson⁴ gives a cut representing this usage of carrying bread in a vessel on the head.

In Pharaoh's dream seven fat cows come up from the Nile and feed in a meadow; after which seven other cows that are lean come up also from the Nile, and devour the fat ones (chap. xli, 1-4). In the Egyptian mythology the cow was the symbol of the land of Egypt. Isis "was the goddess of the earth, which the Egyptians called their mother." According to Herodotus, ii, 41, "the image of Isis was the form of a woman with the horns of a cow." The cows, in the dream of Pharaoh, come up from the Nile, the source of the fertility of Egypt. The figure is purely Egyptian. The cows fed in a meadow, or, rather, in *marsh-grass* 𐩧𐩣𐩪, a Coptic word. The stalks mentioned in the second dream had *seven ears*. This⁶ was one of the varieties of wheat in ancient Egypt. To interpret his dream Pharaoh called in the sacred scribes and wise men, classes of priests; for the latter possessed all the wisdom of the Egyptians.

When Joseph was called from his dungeon by Pharaoh it is stated that he *shaved* himself before appearing before Pharaoh. This was the custom of the Egyptians. "Though foreigners who were brought

¹ Wilkinson, vol. i, 144.

² Ibid., vol. i, 45.

³ Lib. ii, 35.

⁴ Wilkinson, vol. i, 176.

⁶ Ibid., vol. ii, 39.

to Egypt as slaves had beards on their arrival in the country, we find that so soon as they were employed in the service of this civilized people they were obliged to conform to the cleanly habits of their masters; their beard and heads were shaved.¹ In the honours bestowed upon Joseph by Pharaoh mention is made of the *king's signet-ring, a chain of gold for the neck, and garments of fine linen* (or, rather, of cotton). The articles here enumerated are known to have been in use in Egypt long before the time of Joseph.²

The name of the daughter of Potipherah, whom Pharaoh gave to Joseph for wife, was *Asenath*, which means "*she is of Neith*, i. e., belongs to Neith, the Minerva of the Egyptians" (Gesenius). Pharaoh gave Joseph the name *Zophnath-paaneah*, which is Egyptian, meaning the *salvation* or *saviour of the age*, or the *supporter* or *deliverer of the age* (Gesenius.) How could a *Hebrew forger* of a later age make up all these Egyptian names?

The wife of Joseph was the daughter of the priest of On³ (or Heliopolis), the priests of which were the most learned of the Egyptians. The king thus bestowed upon Joseph the highest honour in this matrimonial alliance.

In Genesis xlvi, 34, it is said that "every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians." The ground of this feeling was the fact, that they had been in subjection to the shepherd kings. "This dominion of the shepherd kings lasted upwards of half a century. At length, about 1530 B. C., Amosis, the leader of the eighteenth dynasty, . . . drove the shepherds out of the country."⁴ Another reason, however, may have been that shepherds killed and ate cows, which were held sacred by the Egyptians. It has been thought very improbable that Egypt should have been afflicted with such a famine as is recorded in the history of Joseph. But as the fertility of Egypt depends on the overflowing of the Nile, which is caused by the tropical rains in the Abyssinian mountains, any large decrease in the quantity of water would produce a famine. Hengstenberg⁵ gives several instances of terrible famines in Egypt since the time of Mohammed, from several writers. Macrizi wrote a whole book on the famines of Egypt.

In Gen. xlvii, 22, it is said, "Only the land of the priests (הַכֹּהֲנִים, rightly rendered *priests*) bought he [Joseph] not [for Pharaoh]; for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them: wherefore they sold not their

¹Wilkinson, Manners, etc., vol. ii, p. 327. ²Ibid., etc.

³On, or Heliopolis, existed as early as B. C. 2000.

⁴Wilkinson, Manners, etc., vol; i, 307, 308.

⁵Die Bücher Moses und Egypten, 33-35.

lands." The priests of Egypt differed from those of the Hebrews in respect to possessions and privileges. "The priests," says Wilkinson,¹ "enjoyed great privileges. They were exempt from taxes; they consumed no part of their own income in any of their necessary expenses; and they had one of the three portions into which the land of Egypt was divided, free from all duties. They were provided for from the public stores, out of which they received a stated allowance of corn, and all the other necessaries of life." In chap. 1, 2, 3, mention is made of embalming Jacob, and in verse 26, of Joseph. This was a well-known custom of the Egyptians. It is one of the most certain facts of history that the Hebrews went down into Egypt, and, after a sojourn of many years there, left the country for Canaan. The history of Joseph gives the only explanation of an event that would be otherwise inexplicable—the entrance of the Hebrews into Egypt. For the ancient Egyptians had an aversion to foreigners. "They prevented all strangers from penetrating into the interior." It was not till the sixth century before Christ that foreigners acquired much knowledge of Egyptian affairs.²

The exact knowledge of Egyptian affairs and of the language (Coptic) of the country possessed by the author of the Pentateuch cannot be explained by supposed commercial relations³ existing between Egypt and Palestine centuries after Moses. We have commercial relations with Europe and Asia, such as the Hebrew nation in the age of David, and even in that of Solomon, never had, and yet how ignorant we are of many of the customs of the Old World, notwithstanding the number of travellers and books of travels. A writer six or eight centuries after the time of Joseph, living in Palestine, would have been under the necessity of reproducing the condition of things in Egypt in the time of Joseph, and of learning the Coptic language. But there is nothing in the history of Joseph to indicate a made-up story, and the simplest explanation of the precise knowledge displayed is, that it was written by Moses, or originally by some one living in Egypt before his time.

In Exodus ii, 3, it is stated that the infant Moses was placed in an ark (or boat) of papyrus daubed with bitumen and pitch. It was customary in Egypt to make boats of papyrus, and Wilkinson remarks: "Nor can there be any doubt that papyrus was known in Egypt at that time [the time of Moses], since we find it on objects which have been preserved of the same early date."⁴ The Israelites during their bondage in

The accuracy of the Pentateuch in its record of Egyptian usages.

¹ See Wilkinson, vol. i, p. 319.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii, 231.

³ De Wette would thus explain it. *Einleitung*, p. 264.

⁴ *Manners and Customs*, vol. ii, 120.

Egypt are represented as making brick under hard taskmasters, who compelled them to furnish a fixed quantity of brick without giving them straw with which to make them (Exod. v, 6-9, etc).

Bricks were made in Egypt as early, at least, as three centuries before Moses, but most probably eight or ten centuries before him. They were made both with straw and without it, and were unburnt.¹ The manufacture of them was a monopoly of the government. "To meet with Hebrews in the sculptures," says Wilkinson, "cannot reasonably be expected, since the remains in that part of Egypt where they lived have not been preserved; but it is curious to discover other foreign captives occupied in the same manner, overlooked by similar 'taskmasters,' and performing the very same labours as the Israelites described in the Bible; and no one can look at the paintings of Thebes representing brickmakers without a feeling of the highest interest."²

We have already seen that the making of brick was a government monopoly, and this corresponds well with the statement in Exodus, that "Pharaoh commanded the taskmasters of the people and their officers, saying, Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick," etc. (chap. v, 6, 7).

In the description of the plagues of Egypt we find an accurate knowledge of the habits of that country. When the Nile was turned to blood, "the Egyptians digged round about the river for water to drink; for they could not drink of the water of the river" (chap. vii, 24). At present, the inhabitants of Egypt use the water of the Nile, having filtered it. It is of an excellent quality. There is no doubt that it was used from the most ancient times, as there is no other source of supply.

In the plague of hail, "the flax and the barley were smitten; for the barley was in the ear and the flax was in flower. But the wheat and the rye (spelt) were not smitten, for they were late" (chap. ix, 31, 32). Wheat, barley, and flax were cultivated in Egypt from the earliest times; while Herodotus and Pliny speak of spelt as a product of the country. The Nile reaches the height of its inundation in the last of October. After this, wheat³ and barley are sown, the wheat requiring five months and the barley four for their growth and ripening, so that in the month of February, about which time

¹ Some Egyptian bricks containing *straw* we saw some years ago in Dr. Abbott's collection.

² Manners and Customs, vol. ii, 195, 197.

³ When in Egypt, in December, 1869, the author observed in the first part of the month that the wheat had just appeared above the ground, while the barley was well advanced.

the plague of hail occurred, the barley was in the ear, but the wheat was late, or not grown up. The minute exactness of the statement shows that the writer was an eye-witness. For it would never have entered the mind of a writer centuries afterward to give such particulars—rather, it would have been impossible for him to do it.

In the description of the conflict between Moses, Aaron, and the magicians of Egypt, it is stated that when Aaron threw down his rod and it became a serpent, the magicians, having been sent for by Pharaoh, did in like manner with their enchantments, and cast down their rods, which became serpents, but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods (chap. vii, 11, 12). Likewise in the account of the first and the second plague it is added: "And the magicians did so with their enchantments." In the third plague, however, they failed to accomplish anything, and confessed in it the finger of God. It was not to be supposed that the priests of Egypt would yield to the superior power and authority of Moses, and lose their influence with the people, without a violent struggle. They possessed all the learning of Egypt, and it may well be supposed that both the "wise men" and "sorcerers" were priests; at least, that the sorcerers were in their employ. We are not to suppose that the magicians of Egypt possessed supernatural power, for it is said that they produced their effects through enchantments (or *secret, magical arts*), a species of legerdemain. If they had possessed supernatural power they might have produced lice as well as frogs.

Aaron and the Egyptian priests are represented as having rods. This was an Egyptian custom. "When walking from home, Egyptian gentlemen frequently carried sticks" (Wilkinson). Northwest of Egypt, in Cyrenaica, there lived in ancient times the Psylli, a people celebrated as serpent-charmers (Pliny, Nat. Hist., lib. 7, 2, 2). Persons of similar skill have been found in modern Egypt.¹ Hasselquist states that the serpent-charmers of Egypt asserted that they *could turn a serpent into a stick, and compel it to lie as dead.*² This throws light on one of the feats of the magicians.

Before considering the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, it becomes proper to discuss the vexed question of their great increase in Egypt. The number of their males was about six hundred thousand (Exod. xii, 37). If this number was not repeated, and if we had not the number of each tribe,³ and the sum total afterwards given as six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty, we

The question of the great increase of the Israelites in Egypt considered.

¹ See Lane's Modern Egyptians.

² In Hengstenberg's Die Bücher Moses und Egypten.

³ See Num. i-iv.

might suppose that the text¹ had been corrupted. But with the facts before us, it is difficult to see how the numbers are to be rejected.

In considering the question, two points are first to be determined: the number of Israelites who went with Jacob down into Egypt, and the duration of the sojourn there. In Genesis xlii we have a list embracing those who came with Jacob into Egypt, bearing every indication of being the original family register from which the subsequent lists are in part taken. It is evident that this table was not made up in a post-Mosaic age to give the names of the heads of families that had become distinguished, since some persons in the list are never mentioned afterward, most probably because they left no families.

Objections have, indeed, been made to this genealogical record, and to the statements it gives respecting the descendants of Jacob who came with him into Egypt. It is said that "the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father, and their little ones, and their wives" (ver. 5), into Egypt. "His sons and his sons' sons with him, his daughters, and his sons' daughters, and all his seed, brought he with him into Egypt" (ver. 7). An enumeration is given of these descendants, and it is added: "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were threescore and six; and the sons of Joseph, which were born to him in Egypt, were two souls; all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten" (verses 26-27).

Objections to the list of Jacob's family.

There are several persons in this list who must have been born *after* Jacob entered Egypt, and there is nothing surprising in the statement that *they came thither with Jacob*, though not born till some years afterward, when we reflect that Joseph's two sons, though stated by the historian to *have been born there*, yet are said to *have come with Jacob into Egypt*. It is evident that Hezron and Hamul, sons of Pharez, were born there, and also that several sons of Benjamin were born after Jacob went down into Egypt. For Benjamin at that time was only about *twenty-two* or *twenty-three* years old, and *ten* sons are given him (ver. 21). It is utterly incredible that Benjamin at that time of life should have had so many sons, almost as many as his father had in his whole life by all his wives!² Four sons are attributed to Reuben in the genealogy (ver. 9). It is probable

Both the Samaritan text and the Septuagint agree with the number about 600,000 (Exodus xii, 37).

² Colenso, to make out his point, says that Benjamin was more than twenty-two years old at that time, according to the story. "It is, therefore, quite possible," says he, "that he may have had ten sons, perhaps by several wives."

that two of these were born in Egypt; for about a year before he came thither, or even less, he had but two, since he says after the first sending of the sons of Jacob into Egypt for corn: "Slay my two sons" (Gen. xlii, 37); if he had had more at that time he would have named them. It is stated (chap. xlvi, 12) that Er and Onan, sons of Judah, died in the land of Canaan, and it would seem that Hezron and Hamul, his grandsons, are substituted for them in the genealogical list.

The statement of the historian that the sons of Jacob brought their *little ones* (רַבֵּי, *little children*, boys and girls, Gesenius) and wives into Egypt, shows that the grandchildren of Jacob were *little children*, and that the historian knew well the ages of the sons of Jacob, their family affairs, and that several in his account, though said to have come into Egypt with Jacob, were really born in Egypt. Quite similar is the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Levi paid tithes in Abraham to Melchizedek, for he was in the loins of Abraham when the patriarch met that distinguished priest. (Heb. vii, 9, 10).

In like manner we could say of a family of French *descent* that *they* came from France. In the Hebrew mind the idea of the son existing in the father was deeply rooted. Jacob lived seventeen years after his arrival in Egypt, and it is very probable that the genealogical list gives the family history down to his death. It is evident that the historian aimed to give the round number seventy, which seems to have been sacred among the Hebrews,¹ and also to show from what a small number the Israelites had grown to be so great a nation; as it is said in Deut. x, 22: "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude." To this number seventy, the wives of the sons of Jacob are to be added; perhaps, also, other women. It is not unlikely that there were slaves in the household of Jacob, as we find that Abraham had three hundred and eighteen in his (Gen. xiv, 14); so that it is impossible to fix the whole number of the household of Jacob, though it must have numbered one or two hundred.

Respecting the length of the abode of the Israelites in Egypt, God declares to Abraham: "Thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterwards shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace;

¹Hence Gesenius remarks: "שִׁבְעִים, *seventy*, often as a larger round number Gen. i, 3; Exod. xv, 27; xxiv, 1; Num. xi, 16," etc.

thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." (Gen. xv, 13-16). If this language does not refer to the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, and state that that sojourn should last four hundred years (expressed prophetically in round numbers), it is difficult to say what language would refer to it. And this does not include the time that the patriarchs dwelt in Canaan, for the declaration is made in reference to *the seed* of Abraham, while he himself was to go to his fathers in peace. His seed was to dwell in a land not their own, not Canaan surely, which had been already promised to Abraham, but in the *fourth* generation they were to come thither again (to Canaan). The *fourth* generation, standing in close connexion with the *four hundred years*,¹ denotes the same period of time. Gesenius remarks on the word דור, *a generation*: "In the times of the patriarchs it was reckoned at a hundred years" (Heb. Lex). So also Fürst (Heb. Lex).

In Exodus xii, 40, the length of the abode in Egypt, as being historical, is fixed with exactness: "Now the sojourn of the children of Israel, which they sojourned² in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." The Samaritan Pentateuch reads: "The sojourn of the children of Israel and of their fathers, which they sojourned in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." The Septuagint has the following: "The sojourn of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan, was four hundred and thirty years." But the addition, "in the land of Canaan," is utterly inconsistent with the *four hundred years* during which the Israelites were to dwell in Egypt (Gen. xv, 13), which number both the Samaritan and Greek Pentateuch contain, in agreement with the Jewish. This period, then, of four hundred and thirty years rests upon strong grounds, and is a refutation of all the inferences and absurdities that Colenso draws from the short sojourn of two hundred and fifteen years.³

The only difficulty in connexion with this period of four hundred and thirty years is found in the fact that Moses and Aaron appear

¹ This number, *four hundred years*, is found in the Jewish, Samaritan, and Greek Pentateuch of the LXX, the Targum of Onkelos, and in the Peshito Syriac.

² We have somewhat departed from the English version in this passage. "The sojourn which they sojourned" is the force of the passage confirmed by the LXX, Peshito-Syriac, and the Vulgate.

³ St. Paul (Gal. iii, 17), speaking of the covenant that God made with Abraham, says that "the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul" it. But this period is incidentally mentioned, and the *number* of years taken from the LXX used by Paul's readers forms no part of the argument. If St. Paul had been questioned on the subject he would doubtless have answered that *he had no revelation on chronology*.

to be the great-grandsons of Levi, and it would be difficult to make four generations extend over four hundred and thirty years. But it is highly probable that several generations between Levi and Moses and Aaron have been omitted. It is well known that Matthew, in his genealogy of our Lord, omits several generations. In chapter i, 8, he says: "Joram begat Ozias" (Uzziah), while in fact there were three kings between these two; the order being, Joram, Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah (Ozias). In verse 11 he omits Jehoiakim after Josiah. In 1 Chron. xxvi, 24, in reference to the regulations of King David, it is said: "Shebuel, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses, was ruler of the treasures." Here we have about a dozen generations omitted between Shebuel and Gershom. Likewise in Ezra vii, 1-5, we have six generations omitted between Meraioth and Azariah, which are found in 1 Chron. vi, 6-9.

From Nahshon (mentioned Num. i, 7) to David (1 Chron. ii, 11-15) there are five generations, running through a period of about four hundred years. Now it is highly probable—we might say certain—that several generations have been omitted, as there would be about eighty years to a generation if this were not the case. That several generations have been omitted is rendered quite certain from the fact that from Aaron to Zadok, who was priest in the time of David, there were *ten* generations (1 Chron. vi, 3-11), *twice* as many as are given from Nahshon (in the time of Moses) to David. That several generations have been omitted between Levi and Moses and Aaron appears exceedingly probable from the fact that, according to 1 Chron. ii, 18-20, Bezaleel, a contemporary with Moses, mentioned Exod. xxxi, 2, was the *seventh* generation from Jacob; and from 1 Chron. vii, 20-27, it would seem that there were *eleven* generations from Jacob to Joshua. If, then, in one case we find *seven*, and in another case *eleven*, generations, extending to the time of Moses, it is difficult to think that Moses is only the *fourth* generation from Jacob.

It is also evident from Num. iii, 19, 27, 28, that there must have been several generations that have been omitted between Kohath and Moses. For in the first of these passages it is said that the sons of Kohath were Amram, Izehar, Hebron, and Uzziel; and in the other two that these sons gave the family names of Amramites, Izeharites, Hebronites, and Uzzielites, and that the number of their males from a month old and upward was eight thousand and six hundred. If no links are omitted in the genealogy, then the male descendants of the grandfather of Moses in the lifetime of the latter reached this great number of eight thousand six hundred, which is utterly in

credible, and would make the whole number of descendants seventeen or eighteen thousand. The historian could never have been guilty of such an absurdity as this. Here the question arises, Between what names do the omitted generations occur? As Kohath has such a large number of descendants, the omitted generations must be placed between him and Moses; and as it is said that Amram married Jochebed, his father's sister, daughter of Levi, born to him in Egypt (Num. xxvi, 59), we are compelled to interpolate the missing links between Amram and Moses. Nor does the statement that Jochebed bare to Amram Aaron and Moses negative it, for it is said in Genesis xlvi, 15, "These be the sons of Leah *which she bare to Jacob*," thirty-three, of whom *only six* were her own sons, and the rest were her grandchildren and great grandchildren. In the same way Matthew says, "Joram begat Ozias," although there were three generations intervening, so that in fact Ozias (Uzziah) was Joram's great-great-grandson.

Allowing an abode of four hundred and thirty years in fertile Egypt, there is no difficulty in the biblical statement that the adult males of the Hebrews amounted to about six hundred thousand. Population doubles every twenty-five years where there are no obstructions to its natural increase. On the supposition that the *whole* family of Jacob that went into Egypt consisted of only eighty-two persons, the lowest estimate, we should have at the end of four hundred and thirty years a population of more than twelve millions. But if we suppose the number eighty-two represents the number of the household of Jacob at his death, we should have more than seven millions as the number of the Israelites at the time of the exodus.¹ But if the abode in Egypt lasted but two hundred and fifteen years, and if at the beginning of this period there were but eighty-two persons, the whole number of the Israelites at the exodus would be only thirty-one or thirty-two thousand.² And to reach the sum of two millions, it was necessary that they should have numbered more than five thousand when they went down into Egypt.³ Although population may for a considerable length of time double itself every twenty-five years, yet it soon meets with checks that greatly retard it, so that it is impossible to reach sure results.

Respecting the large numbers that left Egypt, about two millions

¹ On the supposition that population doubles every twenty-five years, we should have the following formula for the whole number of Israelites at the end of 430 years, by dividing 430 by 25=17.2=the number of times the population would double. $82 \times 2^{17.2} = 12,346,084$. But if we count from the death of Jacob we shall have for the whole number, $82 \times 2^{16.42} = 7,706,032$.

² $215 \div 25 = 8.6$; $82 \times 2^{8.6} = 31,773$.

³ $2,000,000 \div 2^{8.6} = 5,161$.

of souls, Rawlinson remarks: "They seem required by the general tenor of the whole narrative, especially by the great unwillingness of the Egyptians to let the people go, and by their power within little more than a generation to conquer and occupy Canaan. In Germany the best critics, including so subtle and little credulous a writer as Ewald, accept them."¹

Respecting the great number of Israelites that left Egypt *at once*, Professor Rawlinson well remarks: "It is certain migrations of tribes quite as large as that of Israel is said to have been, have from time to time taken place in the East, and, indeed, in the West also. Such migrations have frequently been sudden. The emigrants have started off with their women, children, and all their possessions, on a certain day; they have traversed enormous distances, much greater than the Israelites traversed, and have finally settled themselves in new abodes." He gives a striking instance of this.²

When the Israelites were about to leave Egypt, Moses, in accordance with a divine direction, ordered the Israelites *to ask* of the Egyptians jewels of gold, jewels of silver, and raiment, and they did so. "And Jehovah gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians, and they *gave* these things unto them." In this passage we have departed from the English version, but in so doing we have better expressed the force of the Hebrew; the verb אָשַׁף, *to ask* (rendered *to borrow* by our translators), is very often used in the Hebrew Bible, but rarely ever in the sense *to borrow*. The *Hiphil* conjugation, הִשְׁאִיף, *to let ask*, properly *to offer willingly* (Fürst, Heb. Lex.), is translated *to lend* in our version without any sufficient authority. This *Hiphil* form occurs but twice in the Hebrew Bible—in 1 Sam. i, 28 and in Exod. xii, 36. In the former passage it has the sense of *given freely*, without any expectation of return; for Hannah says respecting Samuel, "I have given him to Jehovah all his days." Here the meaning "lent" would be improper. After the death of their firstborn the Egyptians were exceedingly anxious to get rid of the Israelites, and would cheerfully *GIVE* them almost any thing to effect this. "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men" (Exod. xii, 33).

Here the question arises, Did the Egyptians expect the Israelites

¹ In *Modern Skepticism*, p. 276.

² "It was on the 5th day of January, 1771, the *day* appointed by the high priests, that Oubacha began his march with *seventy thousand families*. Most of the hordes were there assembled in the steppes, on the left bank of the Volga, and *the whole multitude followed him*."—Hommaire de Hell. *Travels*, p. 227, E. T. in *Modern Skepticism*.

to return to Egypt? We cannot answer this with certainty; but it is very probable that they became ultimately convinced that the Israelites intended no return, and hence Pharaoh's obstinate refusal to let them go. Certainly Moses did not promise Pharaoh that they would return. It is evident, if the Egyptians did not expect the Israelites to return, that there could have been no *lending* to the Hebrews by them.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY CONTAINED IN THE PENTATEUCH—CONCLUSION.

THE passover of the Jews, instituted just before the Israelites left Egypt, in commemoration of the death of the firstborn of the Egyptians and the passing over—the preservation of—the firstborn sons of Israel, is a striking proof of the truth of the events it commemorates. It was ordered: "This day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to Jehovah throughout your generations: ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever" (Exod. xii, 14). We accordingly find the passover was kept on the fourteenth of the first month of the second year after the Israelites left Egypt (Num. ix, 5); and when Joshua entered Canaan he kept the passover on the fourteenth day of the month (Josh. v, 10); and there is no doubt that the yearly festival kept at Shiloh was the passover (Judges xxi, 19). When King Josiah introduced important reforms in Judah and in a part of Samaria, he kept the feast of the passover on a magnificent scale, and it is said, "Surely there was not holden such a passover from the days of the judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judah" (2 Kings xxiii, 22). This language implies that the passover had been kept in the days of the judges and in those of the kings.¹ In commemoration of the preservation of the firstborn of the sons of Israel, all the firstborn males

Internal credibility of the history of the institution of the passover.

¹ Colenso absurdly derives the passover from the Canaanitish custom of making their sons "pass over" to Moloch or Baal, the Sun-god; and thus the Hebrew historian has given a wrong origin to the festival in ascribing it to Jehovah's passing over the firstborn of Israel. He supposes this festival was kept, after the example of the tribes of Canaan, with human as well as animal sacrifices. But we have not a particle of proof that the Canaanites had any great spring festival of the kind. He utterly confounds two entirely different words, פָּסַח, *pasach*, to pass over, and יָקַרְבַּר *hee'ir*, to make pass over, to offer (to Moloch, for example). Colenso's The Pentateuch and the Moabite Stone.

of whatever kind were given to Jehovah, but the firstborn ass was to be redeemed with a lamb, or its neck was to be broken. The firstborn of men were to be redeemed (Exod. xiii, 12, 13).

If we suppose that the feast of the passover was originated ages after Moses, along with the book of Exodus, there would be the insuperable difficulty of its being stated that Moses had instituted the festival at the time of the exodus, and that he had expressly enjoined upon the Israelites its annual observance. But how could a nation be made to believe that they had kept such an observance from the days of Moses, when they had never heard of it before? But if we are to suppose that the festival had been kept by the Israelites from the earliest ages, it must have been for certain reasons. How, in that case, could a new history make them believe that it was for a purpose entirely different from what they for ages had supposed?

It is generally conceded that the land of Goshen, where the Israelites dwelt, was between the eastern branch of the Nile, the Pelusiac, and the Red Sea. The LXX, which is of considerable authority in Egyptian localities, renders Goshen by "Gesem in Arabia" (Gen. xlv, 34). At the time of Christ, the Greeks called that part of Egypt between the eastern branch of the Nile and the Red Sea, Arabia. According to Gen. xiii, 17, Goshen was near the Philistines. As to the route¹ of the Israelites, all that we can maintain with any Route of the exodus. certainty is, that they left Rameses (a locality that is not identified) in Goshen, thirty or forty miles west of Etham, on the borders of the desert, and that they crossed the upper end of the Red Sea above Ghebel Attaka, probably not far from Suez, and that they then most likely encamped by the *Wells of Moses*² (Ayûn Mousa),—probably so called from this circumstance—situated in the desert five or six miles south-east of Suez. After

¹ Some find a difficulty in Exodus xiii, 18, where, according to the English version, "the children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt." Colenso contends that מְהַלְּכֵי, rendered "harnessed," properly means "armed," and that it is absurd to suppose that, if six hundred thousand Hebrews had been armed, they would have been thrown into a panic at the sight of Pharaoh's army. The ancient versions generally render מְהַלְּכֵי *armed*. Gesenius gives it *fierce, active, eager, brave* in battle; and, indeed, the word is used in the sense *ready for battle, drawn up in line*, in several instances. It seems best to render the passage, "The children of Israel, *drawn up in regular order* (as if for battle), went up out of the land of Egypt." As they fought with the Amalekites within two months after leaving Egypt, it is evident that they had at that time already obtained arms from some source.

² Their first encampment after leaving Rameses was Succoth (Exod. xii, 37; Num. xxxiii, 5), which was excavated early in 1883 and identified by M. Naville. The names Pithom and Succoth (*Pitum* and *Thukut*) are found in combination on the monuments of the place. It is situated about ten miles west of Lake Timsah, near the Roman Heroöpolis, and was evidently a store city, built by Israelites (Exod. i, 11).

this "they went out into the wilderness of Shur; and they went three days in the wilderness, and found no water" (Exod. xv, 22). With the exception of the Wells of Moses, the country east of the Red Sea for many miles is a sandy desert. Professor Palmer remarks on the passage just quoted from Exodus, "I doubt if a more suggestive description could possibly be given of this monotonous, waterless waste, the only impressive feature of which is the long *siur*, or 'wall,' which forms its northern limit."

"The difficulty of providing water for the cattle by which they were accompanied has proved a great stumbling-block to many; but this Mr. Holland has considerably lessened by a novel and ingenious suggestion. He believes that, instead of being an incumbrance to the movements of the host, the cattle were used as beasts of burden, and that, in addition to the camp furniture, each carried its own supply of water, sufficient for several days, in water-skins slung at its sides, precisely as Sir Samuel Baker found them doing at the present day in Abyssinia."¹ "And when they came to Marah, they could not drink of the waters of Marah, for they were bitter." On this Professor Palmer remarks: "Now the soil throughout this part of the country being strongly impregnated with *natrún* [native carbonate of soda, the *nitre* of the Bible], produces none but brackish water; and it is worth observing that the first of these springs with which we meet, 'Ain Hawwárah, is reached on the third day of our desert journey to Suez."

They next "came to Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees." "Here, again," says Palmer, "our own experience accords with that of the Israelites, for our next station is in Wády Gharandel, which contains a considerable amount of vegetation, palm-trees in great numbers among the rest, and a perennial stream." "And they removed from Elim, and encamped by the Red Sea" (Num. xxxiii, 10). As the Israelites had wagons and a great deal of baggage, there was but one route to the sea that was practicable, by Wády Taiyebah, from which "the coast is open and passable; and, moreover, the mouth of the valley affords a fine clear space for their encampment by the sea," as Palmer clearly shows; and "the wilderness of Sin will be the narrow strip of desert which fringes the coast south of Wády Taiyebah."

According to Palmer, the only practicable route from the encampment at the Red Sea to Mount Sinai was at that time by Wády Feirán, in which he locates Rephidim. Palmer's location of route from the Red Sea. "If," says he, "we read the verse, (Exodus xix, 12), 'and they departed from Rephidim, and pitched in the wilderness of

¹ The Desert of the Exodus, p. 225.

Sinai,' as implying a break in the march between Rephidim and the Mount of the Law, we shall find that the natural route from Egypt to Sinai accords exactly with the simple and concise account given in the Bible of the exodus of the chosen people."

"In these conclusions all the members of the expedition are agreed. Mr. Holland, it is true, dissents upon one point, the position of Rephidim. . . . In the main facts of the routes, however, and in the identification of Jebel Músa with Mount Sinai, our investigations have led us to form one unanimous opinion.

"We are thus able not only to trace out a route by which the children of Israel could have journeyed, but also to show its identity with that so concisely but graphically laid down in the Pentateuch. We have seen, moreover, that it leads to a mountain answering in every respect to the description of the Mountain of the Law. The chain of topographical evidence is complete."¹

Professor Palmer identifies Rás Susáfeh, the magnificent bluff at the north end of Jebel Músa, as the Mount of the Law. This bluff fronts the great plain Er Ráhah, and commands a view of its entire extent. The plain, according to the measurements of Captain Palmer, made on the spot, is large enough to accommodate two millions of human beings, allowing about a square yard to each one.* He found, also, numerous traditions among the Arabs of the Sinaitic Peninsula respecting Moses and the other Israelites. The alleged barrenness of the Arabian peninsula has been made an objection to the history of the sojourn of the Israelites in the desert. But, apart from the divine power that supported them in a miraculous way, Palmer has found many indications that the peninsula was once far more fertile than it is now.

The next station of the Israelites after leaving Sinai was Kibroth-hattaavah, the graves of those that lusted. Palmer identifies this station with a place called by the Arabs Erweis el Ebeirig, "covered with small inclosures of stones. These are evidently the remains of a large encampment, but they differ essentially in their arrangement from any others which I have seen in Sinai or elsewhere in Arabia. . . . The remains extend for miles around, and on examining them more carefully during a second visit to the Peninsula, with Mr. Drake, we found our first impression fully confirmed, and collected abundant proofs that it was in reality a deserted camp. The small stones which formerly served, as they do in the present day, for hearths, in many places still showed signs of the action of fire, and on digging beneath the surface we found pieces of charcoal in great abundance. Here and

The next station after Sinai identified.

¹ Desert of the Exodus, p. 228.

² Ibid., pp. 99, 102.

there were larger inclosures marking the encampment of some person more important than the rest, and just outside the camp were a number of stone heaps, which, from their shape and position, could be nothing else but graves. The site is a most commanding one, and admirably suited for the assembling of a large concourse of people.

“Arab tradition declares these curious remains to be ‘the relics of a large Pilgrim or Hajj caravan, who in remote ages pitched their tents at this spot on their way to ‘Ain Hudherah, and who were soon afterward lost in the desert of the Tih, and never heard of again. For various reasons I am inclined to believe that this legend is authentic, that it refers to the Israelites, and that we have in the scattered stones of Erweis el Ebeirig real traces of the exodus.”¹

The next encampment was Hazeroth, which Palmer evidently identifies with ‘Ain Hudherah, one day’s journey from the place identified as Kibroth-hattaavah. The subsequent stations, for the most part, have not yet been identified. “As the piece of country,” says Professor Palmer, “north-east of ‘Ain Hudherah and south-west of the ‘Azázimeh mountains did not fall within our line of march, I cannot speak with certainty as to the identification of individual stations; but I have no doubt whatever as to the general direction of the Israelites’ journey, and believe that all, or at least a great portion, of the unidentified names may be recovered in that district. Among them we notice Rissah, Haradah, Tahath, which correspond in etymology with Rasa, ‘Arabeh, and Elt’hi. . . . Heshmonah, again, is undoubtedly identical with Heshmon.”² Ezion-geber was at the head of the Elanitic gulf. The wilderness of Zin, Palmer locates in the south-east corner of the desert Et Tih; Kadesh he identifies with ‘Ain Gadis; and thinks that the name was applied to the whole adjacent region.

In Numbers xxii-xxiv we have an account of Balaam and Balak, and their sacrifices to procure a curse upon Israel, in which there is shown an accurate knowledge of the topography of the land of Moab. On this narrative Dr. Tristram remarks: “Balak met the prophet at the banks of the Arnon, the frontier of his kingdom (Num. xxii, 36). He then takes him to Kirjath-huzoth, ‘the city of streets’ (ver. 39), probably Kiriathaim, and its high place, the top of Attarus, with its commanding prospect. This is the first conspicuous eminence north of the Arnon. Then, proceeding northward, the next day he brings him on to the high places of Baal (ver. 41), or Bamoth Baal—probably Baal-meon, evidently, from its name, sacred to Baal, which was changed by the Reubenites into Beth-meon (Num. xxvii, 38). This was the second

Probability of identifying the other stations.

Topography of Moab correctly given in the story of Balaam.

¹ Desert of the Exodus, pp. 212. 213.

² Ibid., p. 419.

position whence he had a commanding view of the future country of Israel. Afterward they proceeded to Pisgah, or Nebo (chap. xxiii, 14); and, finally, to the top of Peor, facing Jeshimon—*i. e.*, the ridge north of Nebo and due west of Heshbon—where there is a group of ruins. Thus, with every reasonable probability, we have the identification of the four sacrificial stations of Balak and Balaam."¹

Without giving any more particulars, we may remark that the Pentateuch displays an accuracy of topography which could have been obtained only from a *personal* acquaintance on the part of the historian with the regions of the Exodus—such an acquaintance as the Hebrew lawgiver possessed. In the ages subsequent to Moses, who among the Israelites was intimately acquainted with all the localities of the Arabian peninsula from the north end of the Red Sea to the mountains of Moab? Does not the topographical exactness of the Anabasis establish it as an accurate historical work, and prove that its author must have accompanied the expedition of the younger Cyrus? Certainly the geographical knowledge displayed in the exodus of the Israelites shows that it is veritable history.

Near the close of the wandering of the Israelites, while they dwelt in the land of Shittim, we find that "the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab. And they called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods" (Num. xxv, 1, 2). On account of these crimes the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, followed by a plague in which twenty-four thousand perished, and the order was given to the judges to slay all the men who were joined to Baal-peor. As a punishment for the seduction of Israel, Jehovah commanded Moses to take vengeance on the Midianites. He accordingly warred on the Midianites, and slew all their males, and at the command of Moses all the women that had a carnal knowledge of men, and also the male children. This was undoubtedly a severe sentence.² The Midianites, however, were not exterminated, as they became powerful enough afterward to greatly afflict the Israelites. The victory over the Midianites was gained without the loss of a single man among the Israelites (Num. xxxi, 49), evidently through the providence of God, though Tacitus speaks of the capture, by the Romans, of a fortified position in Armenia in which all the men were slain, while the Romans lost not a single man, and had very few wounded.³ Strabo also informs us

¹ Land of Moab, pp. 318, 319.

² This belongs to the general subject of the extermination of the Canaanites, which will be hereafter considered.

³ Annals, xiii, 39.

that in an invasion of Arabia by the Romans, in a pitched battle, the latter slew about ten thousand Arabs, while they themselves lost but two men. He attributes the great disparity in loss to the unskillful use of arms on the part of the Arabs.¹ Had Colenso known these historical facts he could scarcely have said that the biblical statement, that not a man was lost in the conflict with the Midianites, is "in utter defiance of reason and common sense,"² even on his theory that no divine protection was afforded the Israelites. He calculates, from the number of captured virgins, that the Israelites must have slain in battle eighty-eight thousand warriors—a most unsafe estimate, as it is most likely many of the Midianite men escaped while the women were captured.

Colenso has raised several questions respecting this history which we have not yet touched. In Exodus xvi, 16, in regard to the gathering of the manna, it is commanded, "Take ye every man for them which are in his tents." Other objections made by Colenso.

From this he infers that the historian teaches that the Israelites in the deserts had tents, and he calculates that two hundred thousand tents would have been required to accommodate them; but he is utterly at a loss to conceive where the Israelites could have obtained the tents, or how they could have transported them. The statement that the Israelites dwelt in booths he rejects as untrue. The feast of tabernacles, or of booths, is enjoined in Leviticus xxiii, and it is stated, "That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt" (Lev. xxiii, 43). It is also enjoined in Deut. xvi, 13, and is referred to in Zech. xiv, 16; Neh. viii, 14-17.

But the expression, "Take ye every man for them which are in his tent" (Exod. xvi, 16), does not prove that the children of Israel generally had tents, for the Hebrew word אֹהֶל, rendered *tent*, also means *dwelling, habitation, people, race, family* (see Gesenius and Fürst); so the passage means that the manna was to be taken to the *dwelling* of each, whether a *tent* or a *booth*. The children of Israel may have brought a considerable number of tents with them from Egypt, or have made them soon afterward. As they were a pastoral people, it is not likely that they were destitute of tents.

Colenso finds great difficulty in the statement that "Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, . . . gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Moses did as Jehovah commanded him; and the assembly was gathered together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation" (Lev. viii, 1-4).

¹ Lib. xvi, 781, 782.

² Lecture xvi, 218.

Here Moses is ordered to collect the whole assembly of Israel at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to be present at the consecration of Aaron and his sons. It was proper to extend this invitation or command to the whole assembly, though it seems there was no penalty for not complying with it, and most likely it was not expected that all, or even one fourth part, would appear. Nor is it said that the *whole* congregation did so appear, but simply that *the assembly* was collected at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. The command or invitation was to be carried out as far as possible. How often do we find in our day notices of important meetings to be held *in* a church which will scarcely accommodate a thousand persons, where the public, consisting of many tens of thousands, are invited to attend. The apostles were commanded by our Saviour to go into *all the world* and preach the Gospel to *every creature*, which was absolutely impossible, for they could not reach the one hundredth part of mankind. They were to execute the command as far as possible.

It is stated in the Gospel of Mark (i, 33), "*all* the city was gathered together at the door." But how was this possible? Parallel expressions from the gospels and Demosthenes. In the Gospel of Matthew it is said that there went out to John the Baptist "*Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan.*" But, notwithstanding this language, it is not probable that *one tenth* of the people really went out to John. The effect produced by our Saviour's raising Lazarus from the dead called forth the remark of the Pharisees: "Behold, the world is gone after him" (John xii, 19). Now, to say nothing about the meaning "universe," which *κόσμος* had among the Greek philosophers, how few, comparatively, among men had gone after Christ! But take a single example from a profane author. Demosthenes,¹ speaking of the times of Philip of Macedon, remarks: "The whole world (*πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη*) was full of traitors," meaning the principal portions of Greece only.

So much for the absurdity which Colenso finds in the statements of the Pentateuch respecting the assembling of the congregation at the door of the tabernacle.

In Deut. i, 1, it is stated: "These are the words which Moses spake unto all Israel;" and in ch. v, 1, "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them." Here Colenso finds an absurdity, in supposing that the voice of Moses could reach all Israel; and we confess that if the statement had been that it reached *every one* of the children of Israel—so numerous were they—the declaration would have been incredible without supposing a miracle. What Moses said

¹ De Corona, sec. 48.

was addressed to all Israel, whether they could hear him or not, and those who could not hear could easily learn from others who did; and Moses wrote it down for all.

In the command given to the priest respecting the burning of the sacrifice without the camp, Colenso finds another absurdity: "Even the whole bullock shall he [the priest] carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn ^{the command to burn the sacrifice without the camp.} וַיִּבְרַח on the wood with fire" (Lev. iv, 12). Judging from the size of the camp, Colenso infers that "the offal of these sacrifices would have had to be carried by Aaron himself, or one of his sons, a distance of six miles." There is no need to suppose, as he does, that the priest had to carry the offal on his back, or that he carried it at all. The Hebrew word וַיִּבְרַח means *he* (the priest) *shall send forth*, or *cause to go forth*. We have no good reason for supposing either that the priest himself carried out the offal, or that it had to be carried six miles. We do not know how far the tabernacle was pitched from the border of the camp.

Equally absurd—rather more so—are the remarks of Colenso respecting the distance to which the Israelites would have been compelled to go to attend to the necessities of nature (Deut. xxiii, 12-14), for the camp to which reference is here made was *but a part of the host* of Israel. For it is said when the host, כַּחֲתָנָה , a *single camp* (not *all the hosts, camps*), goes forth. The whole regulation has reference to the Israelites when they shall have entered the land of Canaan; and we find a full account of the rules of war in Deut. xx, which no one can read without seeing that it refers to the Israelites when they shall have settled in that land.

There is one peculiarity of Colenso which must be noticed. Whenever any subject admits of different views or explanations, the one which creates a difficulty or absurdity is almost invariably adopted by him. No other document of either the ancient or modern world would be treated in the same way.

If the Pentateuch was written by Moses, or even by one of his contemporaries, the truth of the history in the last four books follows as a natural consequence; and this consideration furnishes a ground of objection to its being contemporary history in the eyes of those whose philosophic system admits of nothing supernatural. Hence De Wette remarks: "If it is at least doubtful to the thinking intellect that such miracles really occurred, the question arises whether they did not so appear to the eye-witnesses and participants of the history, or were supposed by the reporters to have occurred in a

The opinion of De Wette as to the miraculous features of the Pentateuch considered.

natural way, but set forth in a poetic-miraculous light? But this must be denied as soon as the narratives are carefully considered. For there is wholly wanting in them that credulous, poetic frame of mind which would contain the key to the miraculous."¹ He further observes: "It would be rash to conclude that these narratives of miracles were absolute inventions. There lies at the bottom of them a genuine historical tradition, which, united to certain signs, and borne in the songs of the people, was transmitted orally. An ideal poetical element blends itself with the real historical in the traditions of the people, by which the tradition is gradually transformed into the miraculous and the ideal. To effect this the songs of the people especially contribute, which, in the bold lyric flight of the imagination, represent in a supernatural light that which was naturally worthy of astonishment and wonder, and these representations are easily misunderstood by a people believing in miracles."² If this statement of De Wette were correct, it would be strange that the Mosaic history, with the exception of a few songs, is uniformly prose. If it had been preserved as poetry, why should it not have been written down as such, and so continued, like the historical Psalms?³ But the largest portion of the Mosaic history could, from its very nature, never have had a poetic form. If poetry had exaggerated the original natural history, it is singular that an historian should have been so ignorant of poetic usage and license as to take its exaggerations for sober fact.

A great portion of the miraculous history of the Pentateuch is sober truth or it is deliberate falsehood. Of this character are the plagues of Egypt, especially the death of the firstborn of the Egyptians, which are real history and supernatural, or they are fiction.

Colenso, in his view of miracles, goes beyond even De Wette. Colenso's general objection to the miracles of the Pentateuch. "The order," says he, "of this wondrous universe, so manifold, so diverse, yet all tending to unity, to one great central Cause, a miracle, if really witnessed, would be like a jarring discord in the midst of a mighty music—not a sign of the master-musician's presence, but a token that for once he had failed to subdue the rebellious elements—would, in short, be simply frightful."⁴ What shall we say to a miracle's being "a jarring discord in the midst of a mighty music?" Is this world nothing but harmonious music? What shall we say of earthquakes burying whole cities with thousands of human beings; of inundations laying waste vast tracts, and destroying human life; of famines, pes-

¹ Schrader's De Wette's Einleitung, p. 257.

² Ibid., pp. 258, 259. ³ Psalm lxxviii, for example.

⁴ Lectures on the Pentateuch, etc., p. 369. London, 1873.

tilences, tornadoes, sweeping away houses, and sending ships with their precious freight beneath the waves of the deep? Is all this music in the ears and harmony to the eyes of Colenso? To these discordant and destructive forces add the passions of men, exhibited in horrible wars and devastations. In the midst of such a world as this, is an extraordinary display of omnipotent power in punishing the wicked and delivering the good—the manifestation of the divine power and Godhead, the revelation of Jehovah to man, a great light in the midst of moral darkness—is all this nothing but a jarring discord? In the midst of the wrongs and the darkness of the world, who has not felt as did Isaiah, and prayed, “Oh that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down?”

Colenso seems to have but little faith in the miracles of Christ, “whose doings, however,” says he, “we now see but indistinctly through the mists of those many years which had elapsed between the time when Jesus lived on earth and the time when those narratives were written.”¹ In this course he is consistent, for a rejection of the Pentateuch, with the divine authority of the Jewish religion, must necessarily lead to the rejection of the authority of the Gospels—though Colenso professes to believe in Christ as the Saviour of men. If the Christian religion was founded in miracles (and Christ was the greatest of all miracles), is it not reasonable to suppose that Judaism, its foundation, was also established by miracles?

The only way in which the supernatural in the Bible can, with any show of reason, be rejected, is by ignoring a personal God in nature, and reducing the whole universe to a system of blind forces. If God has acted in creation, if man is his workmanship, revelation and redemption are highly credible. In fact, creation is a miracle; life is a perpetual miracle. Struggle as we may, we can never get rid of the supernatural, without a belief in which all religion is impossible.² If there is anywhere in the Bible a single prophecy, or a single miracle, then the chain of purely natural causes is at once broken, and the whole series of biblical prophecies and miracles becomes credible. The history of aerolites furnishes a remarkable proof of the danger of rejecting

Miracles not inconceivable as the foundation of a religion.

¹Lectures on the Pentateuch, p. 376. 1873.

²John Stuart Mill takes decided ground against Hume's famous argument upon miracles: “All, therefore, which Hume has made out—and this he must be considered to have made out—is, that no evidence can be sufficient to prove a miracle to any one who did not previously believe the existence of a being or beings with supernatural power, or who believed himself to have full proof that the character of the Being whom he recognizes is inconsistent with his having seen fit to interfere on the occasion in question.”—Logic, p. 376.

well-authenticated facts merely because they do not coincide with our own experience. Writers in all ages had mentioned instances of the fall of meteoric stones from the heavens, but down till the beginning of this century all these accounts were treated as fables, as the tales of the ignorant and the superstitious.¹ An *à priori* judgment that stones do not fall upon the earth misled the whole scientific world till a shower of stones fell at L'Aigle, in Normandy, in 1803. It was not testimony that misled the scientists, but a *prejudice against the facts to which testimony was given*. And may not the whole rationalistic world be similarly deceived in the rejection of the miracles of the Bible?

In the case of the aerolites² one difficulty—rather the principal difficulty—was to explain how they originated. To explain the biblical miracles we have an adequate cause in the Deity, and a sufficient reason for their performance in the fact that they were to reveal the character and will of Jehovah in the midst of abounding idolatry.

The history in the Pentateuch shows the most intimate acquaintance on the part of the writer with the events related. Numerous particulars are given, which, had they not been recorded at the time, must have faded away in the lapse of ages. Objects seen at a distance present themselves to us only in great outline. Nowhere does the author of the Pentateuch appear to write from conjecture, or to be feeling his way in the dark, or to narrate from the report of others. He³ everywhere shows himself the master of his materials. How different it is with the great writers of the early Roman history in the Augustan age! Livy, in his Introduction, recognizes the fact that the early history of Rome is embellished with fable. Nor does he proceed far in his narrative before he says of a certain event, "There are *two* different accounts respecting this." So in reference to Romulus and Remus, he says, "There is a report." And when he speaks of the oath which Hannibal when a boy took to cherish hostility to Rome, he says, such is "the report."

When the Greek historian, Herodotus, is relating the history of Cyrus the Great, he remarks that he could give three other accounts

¹ "That arrogant spirit of incredulity which rejects facts without attempting to investigate them, is in some cases almost more injurious than an unquestioning credulity."—Humboldt's *Cosmos*, vol. i, p. 123.

² How easy it would be to disprove the reality of aerolites on Hume's principles! We [the great mass of men] have never seen stones fall from heaven, but we have known men to lie.

³ Blunt, in his *Scriptural Coincidences*, gives a considerable number of *undesigned* coincidences in the Pentateuch, establishing the truth of the history.

of him.¹ How unlike is the language of the author of the Pentateuch! There is the air of reality and naturalness in the books of Moses, which impresses the reader with the feeling that he is reading genuine history.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE COMMAND TO EXTERMINATE THE CANAANITES, AND THE GENERAL SEVERITY OF THE MOSAIC SYSTEM.

OF “the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee: that they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against the Lord your God” (Deut. xx, 16–18). Similar commands are found in other parts of the Pentateuch.

Now it must be observed that it is expressly said that the Canaanites were to be exterminated on account of their wickedness. In Lev. xviii, after enumerating various abominable things to be avoided, it is added: “For all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled; that the land spew not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spewed out the nations that were before you.” “Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast them out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land: but, for the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee. Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee” (Deut. ix, 4, 5). In accordance with these declarations, it is said (in Gen. xv, 16) to Abraham, “The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.”

A divine order only could justify the extermination of the Canaanites.

The children of Israel were warned that if they practised the abominations of the Canaanites the land would vomit them forth also, so that they had before them perpetually the proof of Jehovah's hatred of sin in the extermination of the Canaanites, and an example of what might be expected to overtake themselves if they

forsook Jehovah and abandoned themselves to vice and crime. That the Almighty should send a plague upon a wicked city, and destroy every living being in it, the old man with the infant, involving all in one common ruin, would excite no surprise. If a city or large community were sunk by an earthquake on account of the crimes of its people, no one would think that the destruction of the infants with their wicked parents was inconsistent with the moral attributes of God. But, instead of the pestilence or earthquake, suppose we substitute an angel from heaven, there would still be no objection to the divine goodness or justice on that score. Can we not substitute men instead of an angel to accomplish the same work? The great point is, *the act, not the agent.*

In the extermination of the Canaanites the weakness and vanity of their gods were clearly seen, and thus a powerful blow was given to the whole system of idolatry.

Nothing but a divine command could authorize the Israelites to take possession of the lands of the Canaanites, and to destroy the inhabitants. Without this it would have been robbery and murder. God alone has the right to dispose of the lands and lives of nations. The destruction of the ancient world by water, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, the destruction of Korah and his company, with the women and children, by the earth's opening her mouth and swallowing them up on account of the rebellion against Moses, are examples of guilt and punishment involving innocent children with guilty parents in ruin.

But if we banish these examples to the region of the mythical nothing is gained. For with our own eyes we see innocent children suffer on account of the crimes and vices of their parents; we behold earthquakes and inundations, famine and pestilence, destroying the good and the bad, the gray-headed sinner and the unsinning little one. All this occurs in a world that God has constituted, the laws of which he has established, the consequences of which laws he must have foreseen. *They are the divine acts.* "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" (Amos iii, 6). Far more difficult is it to reconcile with the divine goodness the swallowing up of whole towns by an earthquake than the extermination of the Canaanites. The latter were cut off for their abominable vices and crimes, while cities have been buried by earthquakes without our perceiving that the inhabitants were worse than those of cities exempt from such visitations.

In the affairs of this world Providence often employs one nation

as the means of punishing another. The Jews themselves were frequently punished for their sins by means of heathen nations. But the most striking and dreadful example of this kind occurred in the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, A. D. 70, and its utter demolition. Thousands upon thousands fell by the pestilence, famine, and the sword; the old man and the infant perished alike in the general overthrow. No man can read the Bible with any faith in its teachings, and deny that this terrible calamity overtook the Jews on account of their great sins, especially their rejection of the Son of God. Thus, while the Israelites were the punishers of the Canaanites, they, in turn, were punished for their dreadful crimes by the Romans, the executors of the divine decree.

God uses one nation as his instrument to punish other nations.

The existence of evil, with its consequent woes, is a mystery which no finite mind can solve; how to reconcile its existence with the attributes of a Being infinitely wise and good has been the problem of the ages. The rejection of revelation affords no relief, nor does Atheism itself.

But not only towards the Canaanites is severity shown in the Pentateuch, but also towards disobedient Israelites. As the temptation to idolatry was very strong, and as it struck at the very foundation of true religion, being nothing less than treason against God, it was punished with death. We have already seen that Korah and his company, for their rebellion against Moses, were swallowed up by the earth; and nowhere is any leniency shown towards transgressors. But it must be observed that in that age of the world severe penalties were more necessary than now to restrain men from crime, especially from idolatry. The laws of Draco were written in blood, and so were those of the twelve tables at Rome. In proportion as nations become civilized, cultivated, and virtuous, they mitigate the severity of their penal codes. The Mosaic system was not perfect, but was adapted to the condition of the Israelites in Palestine in that period of the world's history. Some evils were tolerated because they were so deeply interwoven in the fabric of ancient society that their immediate eradication would have been impossible. Some of the Mosaic laws were mitigations of existing evils. Respecting the Mosaic law of divorce, our Saviour said to the Jews: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so."¹ What Solon said of the code he had given Athens is applicable to the Mosaic system, that it was not

An even-handed severity shown towards both Israelites and Canaanites.

The Mosaic system adapted to the people.

¹ Matt. xix, 8.

the best possible system, but the best the people were capable of receiving. To the same point is a remark of Mr. Jefferson, that if a legislator cannot do all the good he could wish, he must do what he can. But in fundamental principles there was no compromise in the Mosaic system.

But, notwithstanding the severity of the penal code of Moses, kindness to the poor and to strangers characterize his legislation in a remarkable degree.

“There is a comparative *purity* in the theology and morality of the Pentateuch, which argues not only its truth but its high original; for how else are we to account for a system like that of Moses in such an age and among such a people? how explain the fact that the doctrine of the unity, the self-existence, the providence, the perfections, of the great God of heaven and earth should thus have blazed forth (how far more brightly than even in the vaunted schools of Athens at its most refined era!) from the midst of a nation ever plunging into gross and grovelling idolatry; and that principles of social duty, of benevolence, and of self-restraint, extending even to the thoughts of the heart, should have been the produce of an age which the very provisions of the Levitical law itself show to have been full of savage and licentious abominations?”¹



CHAPTER XXX.

TESTIMONY OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

OUR Saviour and his apostles everywhere assume the Mosaic authorship and the divine authority of the Pentateuch. Our Saviour, in his controversy with the Jews, says: “For had you believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for *he wrote* of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?”² How absurd this language would be, on the theory that the Pentateuch was written ages after Moses!—If you do not believe in a work made up of traditions and myths in a late age and attributed to Moses, how can ye believe in me—and this language from him who is the *truth* itself!

In various passages Christ speaks also of Moses as if he was the author of the Pentateuch: “Have ye not read in *the book of Moses*,

¹ Blunt, *Scriptural Coincidences*, pp. 104, 105.

² John v, 46, 47.

how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham," etc. (Mark xii, 26). "If they hear not *Moses* and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead" (Luke xvi, 31). "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in *the law of Moses*," etc. (Luke xxiv, 44). "Did not *Moses* give you *the law*?" (John vii, 19.)

The Apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, says: "For *Moses* truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me," etc. (Acts iii, 22).

The Apostle Paul, in his address to Agrippa, observes in respect to his teaching: "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and *Moses* *did say* should come" (Acts xxvi, 22). And in Acts xxviii, 23, St. Paul expounded, "both out of *the law of Moses* and out of the prophets." "For *Moses* describeth (Greek, *writes*) the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth these things shall live by them" (Rom. x, 5). This refers to Lev. xviii, 5, which St. Paul here declares that Moses wrote. "For even unto this day, when *Moses* is read, the veil is upon their heart" (2 Cor. iii, 15).

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE EARLIER PROPHETS.

UNDER this title (נביאים ראשונים) the second division of the Hebrew Bible embraces Joshua (יהושע), Judges (שופטים), two Books of Samuel (שמואל), and two Books of Kings (מלכים).

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

This Book, the next after the Pentateuch, is so called from Joshua, the successor of Moses, and the leader of the Israelites in the conquest of Canaan. It takes up the thread of their history at the end of Deuteronomy, and continues it to the death of Joshua. It may be appropriately divided into two parts. The first division, containing chapters i-xii, gives an account of Joshua's conducting of the Israelites into the land of Canaan, of the capture of Jericho, Ai, the deception of Joshua by the Gibeonites and his league with them, the defeat and slaughter of the armies of the kings of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon, and the capture and the execution of the kings themselves, of Joshua's building an altar on Ebal, and inscribing on its stones a copy of the law of Moses, the capture

of Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, and Debir, and the conquest of southern Palestine. Besides these conquests it contains a description of the defeat of the combined forces of the various nations of Palestine at the waters of Merom, in the northern part of the country. The second division, containing chapters xiii-xxiv, gives an account of the lands that still remained to be possessed when Joshua was an old man, the allotments of the different tribes and the boundaries of their territories, the appointment of the cities of refuge, and of cities for the priests and the other Levites, Joshua's exhortation to the chiefs of the Israelites, his gathering of all the tribes to Shechem, his address to them, and his death.

THE UNITY OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

From the foregoing statement of the contents of the book of Joshua it is seen that there is a connexion, though not always close, between its various portions, and that the second division presupposes the first. De Wette and others think they find contradictions between the first and second parts of the book, and between it and Judges. But their view is a narrow one, and seems to have arisen from a predisposition to make Joshua, to a great extent, mythical.

In chap. xi, 16, 17, it is stated that "Joshua took all that land, the hills, and all the south country, and all the land of Goshen, and the valley, and the plain, and the mountain of Israel, and the valley of the same; even from the Bald Mountain, that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal-gad in the valley of Lebanon under Mount Hermon: and all their kings he took, and smote them, and slew them." But in chap. xiii, when Joshua was old and stricken in years, Jehovah says unto him, "There remaineth yet very much land to be possessed . . . all the borders of the Philistines, and all Geshuri, from Sihor, which is before Egypt, even unto the borders of Ekron northward, which is counted to the Canaanite: five lords of the Philistines; the Gazathites, and the Ashdothites, the Eshkalonites, the Gittites, and the Ekronites; also the Avites: on the south, all the land of the Canaanites, and Merarrah that is beside the Sidonians, unto Aphek, to the borders of the Amorites: and the land of the Giblites, and all Lebanon toward the sunrising, from Baal-gad under Mount Hermon unto the entering into (until you come to) Hamath. All the inhabitants of the hill country from Lebanon unto Misrephoth-maim, and all the Sidonians" (vers. 1-6). Yet these latter passages do not contradict the former respecting the extent of the conquests of Joshua. The first statement is a general one, and by no means asserts the entire conquest of the Philistines and *most southern* Canaanites, nor does it

Agreement between the first and second divisions.

contain any reference to the subjugation of the *most northern* nations of Palestine, which are named in the second part of Joshua as unsubdued.

In the second part, the land to be possessed in the north extended to Hamath on the Orontes, and Aphek (between Byblus and Baalbec), embracing the Sidonians and the Byblians (Giblites), whose land the Israelites never possessed. In this same part, among the Philistines unsubdued are mentioned Gazathites, Ashdothites, and Gittites (Gathites). Now, in the first part we have an indirect confirmatory proof of this fact in chap. xi, 22, where it is stated that no Anakim were left in the land of Israel except in Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod—a clear proof that the Israelites had not yet subdued these cities of the Philistines.

In the account of the conquests of Joshua it is stated that he took and destroyed Hebron and Debir (chap. x, 39); while in ch. xv, 13-17 it is said that Caleb drove from the former city the sons of Anak, and that Othniel took the latter.

Other apparent contradictions reconciled.

But here there is no contradiction; for whatever is done by a subordinate can be said to have been performed by the commander-in-chief himself.

In the list of the kings whom Joshua and the Israelites smote (chap. xii, 9-24) are named the kings of Jerusalem, Gezer, Dor, and Megiddo—places which, it seems, had not yet been taken (Josh. xv, 63; xvi, 10; xvii, 11, 12). But the kings of these towns, with the surrounding small towns and villages, could have been killed and the strongholds of the towns remained untaken, as we actually see in the case of Jerusalem, respecting which it is said: "The children of Judah had fought against Jerusalem, and had taken it, and smitten it with the edge of the sword, and set the city on fire" (Judges i, 8); but this was not the stronghold of Zion, for it is stated in Josh. xv, 63, that "the children of Judah," and in Judg. i, 21, "the children of Benjamin," did not, or could not, drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem, "but they dwell there unto this day." But David drove them out and took the stronghold (2 Sam. v, 6, 7).

As we find five kings coming forth to fight Joshua (ch. x, 5), so it is not unlikely that the kings of those cities not captured by him were slaughtered outside of the strongholds of their towns while defending their positions, which, excepting the strongholds, fell wholly into Joshua's hands (chap. xii, 7, 8).

The statement that Joshua burnt Hazor (ch. xi, 11) is not inconsistent with the fact that we find, more than a century afterward, Jabin, king of Canaan, reigning in Hazor (Judg. iv, 2), for there was ample time for the enemies of Israel to recover it and to rebuild it.

In Judges i we discover several events described which are already related as having occurred in the time of Joshua, viz.: the capture of Hebron and Debir, with the attendant circumstances. But these events related in Judges are not to be regarded as having occurred after Joshua's death. It is true, it is stated that *after the death of Joshua* the Israelites inquired of Jehovah who should first go up to fight against the Canaanites (ch. i, 1). But after the account of the slaughter of the Canaanites and the Perizzites, and the mutilation of Adoni-bezek, it is said, "they (the Israelites) brought him to Jerusalem, where he died" (Judg. i, 5-7). This statement presupposes that Jerusalem (with the exception of the stronghold of Zion) was already in possession of the Israelites, and it is followed with an account of its having been already taken, to which are added other previous conquests. This seems to us to be the most natural view. In Joshua we have a full statement, while in the first chapter of Judges we have isolated events, the order of which must be determined by Joshua. We cannot regard Josh. xiii, 3 as contradicted by xv, 45-47; for the former passage speaks of cities still in possession of the Philistines, while the latter refers to some of these cities as belonging to the inheritance of the tribe of Judah *obtained by lot*, but says not a word respecting their having been *already conquered*.

It has been urged, in opposition to the unity of Joshua, that in the first twelve chapters the word שֵׁבֶט, *shebet*, for *tribe*, prevails, while in the rest of the book מַטֵּה, *matteh*, is generally used to express the same thought. But מַטֵּה, *matteh*, is used in Josh. vii, 18, in close connexion with שֵׁבֶט, in verse 16. In the first half of the book שֵׁבֶט occurs about fifteen times, and in the second half about seventeen times. In the second part מַטֵּה occurs about fifty-three times. From such a use of words no valid argument can be drawn against the unity of the book.

The word מַחֲלָקָה, *division*, is first found in Joshua, in which it occurs twice in the first half of the book (chap. xi, 23; xii, 7), and once in the second part (chap. xviii, 10).

It is not true, as is alleged by Davidson, that Moses is termed *servant of Jehovah* in the historical sections only; for in chap. xiii, 8, which is geographical, in speaking of lands divided among different tribes, it is added, "Even as *Moses the servant of Jehovah* gave them."

That in the first division of the book the *priests* are named without any further designation, or with the simple addition *the Levites*, i. e., *Levitical priests*, while in the second division (chap. xxi, 4, 10, 13, 19)

The statement in Judg. i considered.

Alleged difference in certain terms of the two divisions of Joshua considered.

they are called *the sons of Aaron*, is entirely natural and consistent. For in the latter case the priests are especially discriminated from the other Levites, because an account is given of the cities allotted to the children of Merari, Gershon, and Kohath, to which latter Aaron and his sons, the priests, belonged; to them thirteen cities are assigned.

Dr. Davidson finds a difference of style between the first half of the book and the second. In the second division there is a great deal that is geographical, while the first part is entirely historical. Is not this sufficient to explain any want of elegance met with in the second part? Are geographical boundaries something to be rounded off in beautiful periods? Who looks for elegance in a description of the lines and courses of a plot of land?

In the account given of twelve stones being taken up from the midst of the Jordan, where the priests' feet stood firm, and of the setting up of twelve stones in the river, where the feet of the priests stood, Bleek thinks that two different narratives are blended into one; or, what is more probable, that the earlier account was revised. We can see no good reason for either of these views. They appear to be arbitrary conjectures.

Some of Bleek's objections considered.

The method pursued by Bleek in his treatment of this book is exceedingly arbitrary. As he refers Deuteronomy to the time of King Manasseh, every incident that has any relation to that book is, according to him, an interpolation or addition to the original form of the book of Joshua. In chapter viii, 30-35, we have an account of Joshua's building an altar on Mount Ebal, on the stones of which he writes the words of the law of Moses, and of his reading the blessings and the cursings, as he had been commanded by Moses in Deut. xxvii, 2-6, etc. Here, likewise, Bleek thinks there is at least a partial interpolation.

It is true that this section could be omitted without interfering with the thread of the narrative, but that is no proof of interpolation, as such passages are found in almost all histories.

In the account given of the erection of an altar at the Jordan by the two tribes and a half dwelling east of the river, and the circumstances connected with it, Bleek thinks that the story, by reason of its reference to Deuteronomy, bears the stamp of a comparatively late age. But the whole narrative is well connected and interwoven, and must be wholly retained or wholly rejected. Can we suppose that such a history—in which nine and a half tribes were gathered together to make war upon the rest of Israel for the erection of an altar supposed to be treason against God—is a pure myth?

In a book like that of Joshua, wherein, from its brevity, much in the history of the conquest of Canaan and in the life of the great captain is of necessity omitted, we should not expect to find all parts of the history dovetailed together. It is impossible, however, to maintain any hypothesis that would make the book a collection of fragments, or the work of a succession of revisers. Here we have no place for the Elohist and the Jehovist. Schrader, indeed, in his edition of De Wette, very fancifully distributes Joshua, as he does the Pentateuch, among the annalistic, theocratic, and prophetic narrators, and the author of Deuteronomy. Can we suppose that there were several histories of the times of Joshua written in the period of the judges, when there was but little literary activity among the people, or in the time of Joshua himself? As for Schrader's hypothesis, it is impossible to make any good sense out of it. For we cannot suppose that any writer gave simply such an account as the annalist, the theocratic or prophetic narrator of Schrader, presents us. Who can believe that the book of Joshua, in the annalist, began with chap. iv, 15-17: "And the Lord spake unto Joshua, saying, Command the priests that bear the ark of the testimony that they come up out of Jordan," etc.?

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE BOOK.

There is nothing in the book that might not have been written within twenty-five years after the death of Joshua, as the latest recorded event is the expedition of the Danites against Leshem (chap. xix, 47, 48); and the statement that "Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that overlived Joshua, and which had known all the works of the Lord that he had done for Israel" (chap. xxiv, 31), does not carry us far beyond his time. It is evident that it was written before the age of David and Solomon, for it is said that "the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day" (chapter xv, 63). But David drove these Jebusites out of Jerusalem (2 Sam. v, 6-9). Again, it is said that the Ephraimites "drove not out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer: but the Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites unto this day, and serve under tribute" (chapter xvi, 10). But in 1 Kings ix, 16, it is stated that "Pharaoh, king of Egypt, had gone up, and taken Gezer, and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and given it for a present unto his daughter, Solomon's wife." If the book of Joshua had been made up of fragments written principally before the time of David

Written probably within twenty-five years after the death of Joshua.

and Solomon, but combined and edited subsequently to their time, it is difficult to believe that those passages which speak of the Jebusites as still dwelling in Jerusalem, and the Canaanites in Gezer, would have been allowed to remain without remark. Nowhere in Joshua is there the remotest allusion to any thing pertaining to the times of the kings of Judah, or to the condition of affairs in the age of the judges. Of this the most natural explanation is, that the book was written in neither of those periods.

In Joshua x, 13, mention is made of the *book of Jasher*. As this is also referred to in 2 Sam. i, 18, as containing the lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan, it has been thought by De Wette that the Book of Joshua could not have been written before the time of David. But the proper title of this quoted book is the "*Book of the Upright*," a book reciting the acts of *just men*, not named after the author, for in that case the noun Jashar would not have had the article הַיָּשָׁר, No allusion in Joshua to the times of the Judges or the Kings.

the Jashar, or, *the upright*. Gesenius understands it to be "a collection or anthology of ancient Hebrew poems, . . . so called as celebrating the praises of upright men, or, perhaps, for some other cause" (Heb. Lex.). Fürst prefers to render it, "*the Book of the Israelites*, i. e., national book," according to a tradition in the Talmud (Heb. Lex.). It may, accordingly, have been a record of the actions of pious Israelites, written in the age of Joshua and subsequently.

The numerous particulars given in various parts of the Book of Joshua at least show that the author drew from original sources, if he was not contemporary with the events he relates.

In reference to Rahab the harlot it is said, "she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day" (chap. vi, 25), which most naturally means that Rahab was still alive when the book was written. Respecting the Gibeonites who had deceived Joshua, it is said he "made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, and for the altar of the Lord, even unto this day, in the place which he should choose" (chap. ix, 27), which shows that Jerusalem was not yet chosen.

From the brief manner in which Joshua pronounces a curse upon the rebuilders of Jericho (vi, 26), it is evident that the prophecy was written before the time of Ahab (918-897 B. C.), in whose days Hiel rebuilt it (1 Kings xvi, 34).

The language of Josh. v, 1 furnishes a probable proof that the writer was among those who crossed the Jordan. When they "heard that the Lord had dried up the waters of the Jordan from before the children of Israel, *until we were passed over*," etc. In the margin, however, עַד־כִּי־עָבַרְנוּ, until *they passed over*, is written, and so the passage

is rendered by the Septuagint, Targum, and Peshito-Syriac, which diminishes something of the force of the passage as it stands written in the Hebrew text, but is not conclusive against it.

In the time of the composition of the Book of Joshua Zidon is called "great Zidon" (Josh. xi, 8; xix, 28), and Tyre is of inferior importance (Josh. xix, 29); but in the time of the prophet Joel (B. C. 800) Tyre is of the first importance, and Zidon second (Joel iii, 4); so also in the time of Isaiah (chap. xxiii).

In various parts of the Book of Joshua occurs the phrase "unto this day." But this by no means indicates a long interval between the events and the time of the writer, and it is used simply to declare the facts or condition of things in the writer's time.

That Joshua was written *before* the Book of Judges is evident from the fact that Judges begins where Joshua leaves off, and recapitulates but few of the events recorded in the latter. In some instances there seems to be a quotation of Joshua in the Book of Judges, and in other instances an abridgment. As a general rule, in historical statements the circumstantial account is the primitive one, while the shorter, or abridged form, is later. For a subsequent writer, living far away in point of time from the events, has nothing of his own to add, and he often satisfies himself with giving the substance of what is well known. As an example of the quotation of Joshua in Judges, compare Josh. xv, 16-19 with Judges i, 12-15. Judges i, 19 is an abridgment of Josh. xvii, 15-18. Judges iii, 3 is an abridgment of Josh. xiii, 1-6. It is evident that Josh. xxiv, 28-31 is older than Judges ii, 6-9, for the last verse of the former states that "Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that overlived Joshua, and which had known all the works of the Lord, that he had done for Israel." To this passage the author of Judges, living at a later period, adds: "And also all that generation were gathered unto their fathers: and there arose another generation after them, which knew not the Lord, nor yet the works which he had done for Israel" (Judg. ii, 10).

It seems very clear, where the same facts are related both in Joshua and Judges, that in the former book the narratives are the originals, from their being fuller, and standing in close connexion with each other, while in the latter book they are comparatively isolated.

Respecting the *authorship* of the book it is impossible for us to speak with certainty. We may, however, confidently assert that it had not the same author as the books of the Pentateuch. For הוּ, *hu*, which occurs nearly two hundred times in the Pentateuch as feminine, meaning *she*, is never so used

Direct proof of Joshua being written before Judges.

The authorship of Joshua.

in Joshua, but a separate form הִי , *hi*, is employed to designate this gender, and occurs twenty times. In the Pentateuch the form of Jericho is always יְרִיחוֹ , *Yērēcho*, occurring eleven times, while in Joshua we have always the form יְרִיחוֹ , *Yērīcho*, occurring twenty-seven times. In the Pentateuch, when *the kingdom* of Og or Sihon is mentioned, it is מַמְלַכָּה , *mamlakhah*, but in Joshua it is מַמְלַכּוּת , *mamlakhuth*. There are some other words in which the Pentateuch and Joshua differ.

It is expressly stated that Joshua wrote the words of the covenant he made with the people in the book of the law of God (chap. xxiv, 25, 26). And there is nothing improbable in the supposition that he himself wrote memoirs of his time. These, with the description of the land given in a book (chap. xviii, 4-9), served as the basis of the work, which was probably composed by Eleazar or Phinehas. How far the book of Jashar was used it is impossible to say, as there is but one reference to it (chap. x, 13). According to the Talmud¹ the Book of Joshua was written by Joshua himself. To this work Eleazar, the son of Aaron, gave the conclusion, and Phinehas afterwards added the last verse. Though placed at the head of the prophets, it was still regarded as an appendage to the Pentateuch.

THE HISTORICAL CREDIBILITY OF JOSHUA.

The great outlines of the history must be undoubtedly true, if written either in the time of Joshua or in the subsequent age. In any event, the account of the settling of the Promised Land by the different tribes of Israel must be true, as we know they conquered the country and divided it among themselves. The numerous details given in various parts of the history indicate that many of the events were committed to writing soon after they occurred, and must be matters of fact.

The history is evidently contemporary.

All through the history the Israelites are represented as being directed by the Almighty, who aided them in their conquests. There is nothing improbable in this, if we believe that God brought them out of Egypt and led them through the desert; it was but the completion of the exodus.

Dr. Davidson admits: "that Joshua led the Israelites into the Promised Land after the death of Moses; that he conquered a great part of the territory belonging to the Canaanites, and distributed it among the various tribes; that the tabernacle was set up at Gilgal and Shiloh; and that there were two distributions of territory, the former, of the con-

The passages, said by Dr. Davidson to be mythical, considered.

¹ Fürst, p. 10.

quered parts in the southern half of Palestine, and the second, of other territory, cannot be disbelieved."¹ He, however, regards a part of the history as mythical. He admits nothing miraculous in the crossing of the Jordan by the Israelites; "for an army," he tells us, "could pass over the fords of Jordan without much difficulty, apart from any marvellous interference of Jehovah." In proof of this he cites the fact that the troops of David and Absalom crossed it, where there is no allusion to anything miraculous (2 Sam. xvii, xix). But the instances cited are not to the point, unless it can be shown that these passages occurred at the same season in which it was crossed by the Israelites. It is especially stated in the narrative: "for Jordan overfloweth all his banks all the time of harvest" (Josh. iii, 15).

If the Jordan had been very low at the time, this fact might have been attributed to Divine interposition, and the story might have arisen that Jehovah dried up the waters. But how could the story have arisen that the waters had been cut off, when, in fact, the Israelites must have been, without the interposition of Providence, near drowning in the passage at that season of the year? How could the story have arisen about the stones that were taken up from the Jordan at the time, and deposited in Gilgal, for the perpetual memorial of the drying up of the river?

Dr. Davidson also rejects the account of the falling of the walls of Jericho through the intervention of Jehovah. He thinks it was captured in a natural way. How, then, did the circumstantial account of its overthrow by Jehovah arise? The original account must in that case have been entirely forgotten, and the present account have been a sheer fabrication. But it is not likely that the capture of the first important city of Palestine should have been so soon forgotten, and that a history of its capture entirely different from that of the other cities should have been fabricated to take its place.

In the description of Joshua's defeat of the hosts of the five kings of the Amorites occurs an account of a remarkable miracle, the standing still of the sun and moon, which seems to create great difficulty, and has given rise to many discussions and conjectures: "Then spake Joshua to Jehovah in the day when Jehovah delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the

The standing
still of the sun
and moon.

¹ Vol. i, p. 430.

book of Jashar (the Upright)? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that Jehovah hearkened unto the voice of a man : for Jehovah fought for Israel " (chap. x, 12-14).

In this passage all that precedes "is not this written in the Book of Jashar?" beginning with "sun, stand thou," etc., must be a quotation from this poetical book. If nothing more than this poetical extract were given we might regard it as a bold figure, meaning nothing more than that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, that is, that it should not go down until he had subdued his enemies, and that in reality the sun seemed reluctant to set. And this might be confirmed by the song of Deborah (Judges v, 20): "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera." But the addition made by the sacred historian renders such an explanation as this a difficult one: "So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. . . And there was no day like that before or after it, that Jehovah hearkened unto the voice of a man : for Jehovah fought for Israel." In this remark there is nothing poetical, but the historian tells us that the sun remained in mid-heaven about a whole day. If the day was not lengthened, there was no place for this remark.

To this passage there seems to be an allusion in the prayer of Habakkuk, which refers to the wonders of the exodus : "The sun and the moon stood still in their habitation" Reference to this miracle in Habakkuk. (chap. iii, 11). Yet it is remarkable that this stupendous miracle is nowhere else referred to, either in the Old or in the New Testament. This fact, however, is no sufficient cause for its rejection. The principal difficulty respecting the standing still of the sun and moon seems to be, that under the circumstances no such magnificent miracle was necessary. But here it must be confessed that we have no means *à priori* of determining how far the Deity would control natural laws for the salvation of his people. In granting that Divine power assisted Joshua in the conquest of Canaan, we cannot consistently stint this power, or subject it to arbitrary rules of our own. This would be as inconsistent as it is in the case of Mr. Darwin, who, in creation, limits the Deity to the origination of a few primordial forms, into which he infused life. There seems to be no middle ground between accepting the miracle, or rejecting the account of it as an interpolation; but of the latter hypothesis we have no proof.

The language of Joshua addressed to the sun and moon has nothing inconsistent with the truths of astronomy. We are not to

suppose that Joshua was acquainted with the true system of the universe, nor do we suppose that the historian had any such knowledge. It made no difference to the Israelites whether the sun or earth stood still, provided the day was lengthened. Even a modern astronomer might use the language of Joshua, and the historian certainly, without inconsistency.

In the address of Joshua at Shechem he exhorts the people to put away the gods which their fathers served in Mesopotamia and in Egypt, and to serve the Lord (chap. xxiv, 14). This does not imply that the people in the time of Joshua were idolaters, but it warns them of the danger of relapsing into idolatry. And the answer of the people clearly shows that they were not idolaters, for they reply: "God forbid that we should forsake Jehovah to serve other gods" (chap. xxiv, 16). This harmonizes with the statement that "Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua," etc. (ver. 31)

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

THE Book of Judges (שופטים) stands next in the Hebrew Canon.

It takes its name from its being principally occupied with the history of those judges who ruled in the period between Joshua and the Prophet Samuel.

Chapters i, ii, iii, 1-7, contain isolated events that occurred in the history of the conquest of Canaan, in part a repetition of those in Joshua, and also a general statement of the sins, the punishments, and the deliverances of Israel in the days of the judges, which serves as an introduction to the more special history of these times. The next section (chapter iii, 8-xvi) embraces the names of thirteen judges, raised up by Providence for the deliverance of Israel, and gives a sketch of the history of the most conspicuous of them. The last five chapters (xvii-xxi) relate several important events which occurred in the times of the judges, but which do not belong to the thread of the narrative in the preceding chapters; viz., the affairs of Micah, the capture of Laish by the Danites, the war between the Benjamites and the other tribes of Israel growing out of the abuse, by a band of Benjamites, of a concubine of a Levite, and the contrivance by which the Benjamites obtained wives from the other tribes.

THE UNITY OF THE BOOK.

There is no sufficient ground for assigning this book to several authors, as some have done. It is evident that the main portion (chap. ii, 6-xvi) proceeded from *one* source; for it narrates the history of the judges, in which we can see no diversity of authorship; but, on the contrary, the ever-recurring phrase, "The children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord" (chaps. ii, 11, iii, 7, vi, 1), or with the addition of "again" to this phrase (chapters iii, 12, iv, 1, x, 6, xiii), points to *one* writer. In the history of Samson (chapters xiii-xvi) we have a connected account, evidently written by one author. In fact, the main portion of the book is quite closely connected together. The last five chapters (chapters xvii-xxi), disconnected from the chapters preceding, narrate events that belonged to the early part of the history of the judges. In respect to the use of language in different parts of the book, we may observe that מִשְׁכָּח , *mashakh*, in the sense of *to approach, to draw near*, seems to be found nowhere except in Judges iv, 6 and xx, 37. The Niphal form of זָאָק , *zaaq*, *to be gathered*, occurs in Judg. vi, 34, 35, and in xviii, 22, 23, $\text{אֵיטַר יְדֵי־יְמִינוֹ}$, *to be impeded of the right hand, to be left-handed*, Judges iii, 15; xx, 16; nowhere else. And, as the events related in them belong to the early period of the judges, and are described with so much vividness, there is no reason for referring their composition to an age later than that of the preceding chapters. This Bleek himself acknowledges.¹

Respecting the first part of the book (chapters i-ii, 5), there is no good reason for attributing it to another author than that of the middle portion. It begins with the statement, "Now after the death of Joshua, it came to pass that the children of Israel asked the Lord, saying, Who shall go up for us against the Canaanites first to fight against them? And the Lord said, Judah shall go up," etc. After this the chapter presents an account of conquests made by Judah and Simeon, and also by Joseph; and a statement is given of the places from which different tribes of Israel were unable to drive out the native inhabitants. Here it must be observed that some of the incidents are also recorded in the Book of Joshua as having occurred in his time, and it would seem best to suppose that the achievements of Judah are referred to in a general way, and that events which occurred both before and after the death of Joshua are not always discriminated.

In the beginning of the next chapter it is stated that the angel of

¹Page 349.

Jehovah rebuked the Israelites for making a covenant with the Canaanites, and not throwing down their altars; whereupon the Israelites wept and sacrificed to Jehovah. This is a very suitable introduction to the history that is to follow, which begins at the sixth verse, with the statement, "And when Joshua had let the people go, the children of Israel went every man unto his inheritance to possess the land." This is followed by the statement that the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua. Next we have an account of the death of Joshua, and the remark that all that generation were gathered unto their fathers. Another generation of men arises who know not Jehovah, and they sin against him. We can find no sufficient proof from the connexion of the history to justify the remark of Bleek,¹ that it is not at all probable that the historian would have written, "Now after the death of Joshua it came to pass" (ch. i, 1); and afterwards, "And Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died" (ch. ii, 8).

In chap. i, 1, 2, it is said, "The children of Israel asked the Lord, saying, Who shall go up for us against the Canaanites first, to fight against them? And the Lord said, Judah shall go up." With this compare, for a proof of sameness of authorship (xx, 18), "And the children of Israel asked counsel of God, and said, Which of us shall go up first to the battle against the children of Benjamin? And the Lord said, Judah shall go up first." In both passages we have בְּתִהְיֶה, *battehillah*, *first*, in the sense of making a beginning—the only passages in the Bible in which Gesenius so defines the word.

Criticism should be very careful not to lay down arbitrary laws in determining the unity of authorship respecting books written at so early an age of the world, when we have no other works of the same period with which to compare them. Even in regard to the finest productions of the age of Pericles in Greece, and of Augustus in Rome, this caution is needed. What have the first three chapters of Sallust's Jugurthine War to do with his history? yet who doubts the genuineness of those chapters? The search for separate and independent documents in the books of the Bible seems to have become a passion with many of the German critics, and it has been carried to a most ridiculous length.

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF JUDGES.

The Book of Judges bears internal evidence of being written before the middle of the reign of David; for in chap. i, 21 it is stated that "the children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem; but the Jeb-

Not written later than the middle of the reign of David.

¹ Einleitung, p. 345.

usites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day." David, however, took the stronghold of Zion, and drove out the Jebusites (2 Sam. v, 6-8). In Judges i, 29 it is said, "Neither did Ephraim drive out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer, but the Canaanites dwelt in Gezer among them." This could not have been written later than the reign of Solomon, as it was during the time of that monarch that Pharaoh, king of Egypt, captured Gezer, burnt it with fire, slew the Canaanites that dwelt in it, and gave it as a dowry to his daughter, the wife of Solomon (1 Kings ix, 16).

On the other hand, the book could not well have been written before the time of Saul, or the first part of the reign of David, as there seems to be a comparison between the times of the kings and those of the judges in the phrase, "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (chaps. xvii, 6; xxi, 25); or, simply, "In those days there was no king in Israel" (chaps. xviii, 1; xix, 1).

In chapter xviii, 30 it is stated, "The children of Dan set up the graven image (of Micah): and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of Dan *until the day of the captivity of the land.*" The latter part of this verse has an important bearing upon the date of the book; for if the Assyrian captivity is referred to, we shall be compelled either to treat the passage as an interpolation, or to refer the composition of the whole to some time subsequent to that event, that is, after B. C. 721. Houbigant conjectured that we should read, instead of גְלוֹת הָאָרֶץ, *captivity of the land*, גְלוֹת הָאָרְקָה, *captivity of the ark*, referring it to the capture of the ark of God by the Philistines at the death of Eli. This conjecture is adopted by Bleek and Davidson. The emendation gives a suitable meaning to the passage, but we see no sufficient reason to adopt it. But if the phrase גְלוֹת הָאָרֶץ, *captivity of the land*, is to be received as the true reading, the context forbids its reference to the *Assyrian* captivity; for the next verse, which is parallel and partly explanatory of this, reads: "And they set them up Micah's graven image, which he made, all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh." But, after the removal of the ark from Shiloh, and its capture by the Philistines, Shiloh could no longer be regarded as the house of God. Hence "the captivity of the land" refers to the victory gained over the Israelites by the Philistines, and the deplorable consequences to Israel that followed it. And this is confirmed by Psa. lxxviii, 60, 61: "So he

Could not have been written before the time of Saul.

Conjectural emendation in chap. xviii, 30.

forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh . . . and delivered his strength into captivity."

Dr. Davidson remarks on chaps. i, ii, 1-5 that this section "has an inherently vivid character, which favours its composition soon after the events described occurred." The same author refers chapters xvii-xxi to the time of the kings, "perhaps the reign of Saul, or the beginning of David's;" and, while admitting that the middle portion (chaps. ii, 6-xvi) contains materials as old as any other part of the book, and "that the constituent parts are authentic records of a pretty early date," he thinks the compiler of the whole work must be placed in the time of the later kings.¹ Bleek refers the composition of the book, as a whole, to the time of the earlier kings. Schrader absurdly refers the final composition, or present form of the book, to the close of the Jewish kingdom, about B. C. 600.²

Respecting the authorship of Judges, nothing is known. The Talmud,³ most of the rabbies, as well as many Christian theologians, attribute it to Samuel, and this is not at all improbable.

THE CHARACTER OF ITS HISTORY.

The Book of Judges bears every mark of being veritable history. There is a vividness in many of its narratives that is rarely surpassed. What a natural picture we have in the nineteenth chapter, in which the Jebusites are represented as still dwelling in Jerusalem! How many particulars are given which must have come from eye-witnesses! The song of Deborah, which celebrates the defeat of Sisera by Barak, is acknowledged to be a composition belonging to the time of the Judges. It is exceedingly spirited, and frequently sublime; and the vivid manner in which it sets forth in detail the conflict with Sisera shows that it must have been composed, even if not written, soon after the events described.

Even De Wette says of the history in the book: "Although the narrative is partly interwoven with miraculous and mythological traits, it bears the stamp, not only of a genuine, not over-refined tradition of the people, but even of a true historical transmission, and it gives us a vivid picture of the condition and of the morals of the people in those times."⁴ "The descriptions of the book," says Dr Davidson, "are, commonly, natural and graphic, bearing on their face the im-

De Wette's admissions as to the genuineness of this history.

¹ Page 466.

² Einleitung, p. 333.

³ Baba Batra, 14b. Fürst explains the Talmudic passage to mean that the *Prophet Samuel* edited the book from existing single narratives.—Ueber den Kanon, p. 11.

⁴ Schrader's De Wette, p. 327.

press of historical truth." ¹ But, notwithstanding this statement, he finds mythological exaggerations in the history of Gideon and Samson; that is, the supernatural parts of the history are myths. But would it not be absurd to suppose that the same writer who describes so faithfully and minutely events in some chapters, should, in others, give us so many myths when treating of the affairs of the same age, with which he seems to be equally familiar? Are we to reject every thing superhuman in the history of the Israelites?

Schrader thinks he finds repetitions and contradictions, and a different tone of representation, and a different economy, in various parts of the book. But the instances he cites amount to little or nothing. He finds a contradiction between chapter i, 18, where it is stated that "Judah took Gaza with the coast thereof, and Ekron with the coast thereof," and chapter iii, 3, where "five lords of the Philistines" are mentioned as being left unsubdued to prove Israel. It requires no deep investigation to remove the scarcely apparent discrepancy; for in the latter passage reference is made to the nations left *unsubdued at the death of Joshua*, which is perfectly plain from the latter part of the preceding chapter; but the former passage (chap. i, 18) speaks of what was done *after the death of Joshua*.

The opinion of Schrader as to Judges.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE BOOK OF RUTH.

THIS book, though placed in the Hagiographa, which is the fourth and last division of the Hebrew Bible, properly belongs to the period of the Judges, in whose times the events described in it occurred.

In the days of the judges of Israel, when there was a famine in the land, Elimelech, of Bethlehem-Judah, his wife Naomi, and his two sons, Mahlon and Chilion, went to sojourn in the land of Moab. Upon the death of Elimelech his two sons marry women of Moab—Orpah and Ruth. After the death of her two sons, Naomi, with her daughter-in-law Ruth, returns to Bethlehem. After this Ruth gleanes ears of corn in the field of Boaz, a relative of Elimelech. Boaz thus becomes acquainted with Ruth, and finally marries her. Of this union is born a son, Obed, the father of Jesse, the father of David (chaps. i-iv).

¹ Vol. i, page 469.

DESIGN OF THE BOOK.

The book was evidently written to give the ancestry of David, and ends with the verse, "And Obed begat Jesse, and Jesse begat David." To seek for any other design than this is useless.

ITS DATE AND AUTHOR.

It was probably written not later than the time of David. When he had become king over Israel, and gained a great reputation, it was natural that some one should write out his genealogy. Had the book been written after his time, it is likely that Solomon, at least, would also have been named.

The language of Ruth bears great similarity to that of the books of Judges and Samuel; yet there is a tendency in some instances towards Aramaic forms. The addition of yodh (י) to the second person singular, preterit feminine, in the words יִרְדֵּי, שִׁכְתֵּי (chapter iii, 3), and שִׁכְבֵּי (chap. iii, 4), is Aramaic; yet they may have been very ancient forms, as we have the same ending to the personal pronoun, second person feminine (in Judg. xvii, 2), אַתִּי. The form תַּעֲבֹרִי chap. ii, 8) is Aramaic. No stress is to be laid on the ending, nun (ן), second person, singular, future, in a few words, as it occurs in 1 Sam. i, 14; and second person plural, future, masculine termination (ן), occurs even in Genesis. Such forms are no proof of a late stage of the language.

The phrase לְנָשָׁא נָשִׁים, *to take wives* (chap. i, 4), though considered a late expression, is, nevertheless, found in Judges xxi, 23.

Bleek¹ observes on the Aramaic forms, "that they are not of such a nature that the age of the composition of the work can be determined from them with any degree of certainty."

If we were sure that no generations have been omitted between Obed and Jesse, it would be easy to fix the narrative as belonging to the times of the great-grandfather of David. But, as several generations between Hezron and Boaz are omitted (chap. iv, 18-21), a similar omission may have been made between Obed and Jesse.

CHARACTER OF THE NARRATIVE.

The history of Naomi and Ruth, and the marriage of the latter with Boaz, are given with great simplicity, and impress us deeply with their truth. Nowhere can there be found a more beautiful picture of the early country life of the Hebrews. Few, indeed, have regarded the narrative as a fiction.

The history a beautiful picture of Hebrew life.

¹Page 356.

And, indeed, what Hebrew would have thought of inventing the story that the great king of the nation sprang in part from Moabite blood!

“The little book of the gleaner Ruth,” says Humboldt, “presents us with a charming and exquisitely simple picture of nature. Goethe, at the period of his enthusiasm for the East, spoke of it ‘as the loveliest specimen of epic and idyllic poetry which we possess.’”¹

RABBINICAL VIEW OF THE BOOK OF RUTH.

“‘This book,’ says tradition, ‘on account of its contents would never have been admitted into the Kethubim (Hagiographa), as it contains no law, prophecy, or national history, were it not that the object of its admission was to show forth the divine favour bestowed upon Boaz for his liberality and benevolence, by making him the progenitor of the royal house of David.’ Tradition also held that the history of the woman related in it is really true, genuine, and credible; that the Prophet Samuel, after he had written the Book of Judges, composed this as a supplement, in order to describe the descent of David, whom he had anointed king, and to remind him of the noble simplicity of the morals of his ancestors. . . . And as the Psalter of David stood at the beginning of the Hagiographa, the Book of Ruth was prefixed to it as a prologue for the glorification of David.”²



CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

THE two Books of Samuel, doubtless, originally formed but *one*.³ and took the name of Samuel from his being the chief character in the first part of the history. In the Septuagint they form the first two of the four Books of Kings. From their character it is quite evident that they must be separated from the two Books of Kings in respect to date and authorship.

The books may be divided into three sections: the first embracing the period of the administration of the Prophet Samuel (1 Sam. i-xii); the second containing the history of the reign of Saul (chaps. xiii-xxxi); the third containing the reign of David (2 Sam. i-xxiv).

May be divided
into three sections.

¹ Cosmos, vol. ii, 415.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, pp. 62, 63.

³ In the time of Origen they constituted one book among the Hebrews. In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi, 25.

DATE AND AUTHORSHIP.

The two Books of Samuel end with the last political act of David, the numbering of the people. The Book of Kings opens with the statement that "David was old and stricken in years," and bears no necessary connexion with those preceding it. We have straight-way an account of the installation of Solomon as king. Thus the two Books of Samuel end with the official life of David, to which point of time the historian brings down his narrative.

These books do not appear to be compiled from preceding ones, and nowhere in them is there any reference to other historical works,¹—quite unlike the two Books of Kings, in which we find it stated, "And the rest of the acts of Solomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the Book of the Acts of Solomon?" (1 Kings xi, 41.) "Now the rest of the acts of Rehoboam, and all that he did, are they not written in the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah?" (1 Kings xiv, 29.) Besides these references we find *nine* others in 1 Kings, and many such references in 2 Kings. These facts separate the two Books of Samuel from those of Kings.

Nowhere in Samuel is there any reference to the Babylonian captivity, or, indeed, to the removal of the ten tribes by Written before the revolt of the ten tribes. Shalmaneser, nor even to the separation of the ten tribes from Judah at the beginning of the reign of Rehoboam, the successor of Solomon.

That we find in 1 Kings ii, 27–35 references to prophetic declarations recorded in 1 Sam. ii, 31–35, iii, 11–14, 2 Sam. iii, 27–29, and that in 1 Kings viii, 17–20 we find Solomon speaking of God's declaration to David respecting a temple to be built by his son, related in 2 Sam. vii, furnishes no proof that the original history embraced a portion of 1 Kings, on which Bleek lays some stress. That predictions are recorded by one writer, and their fulfillment by another, presents no difficulty except to those who have no faith in divine inspiration. The phrase "unto this day," occurring in various places (as 1 Sam. v, 5, xxx, 25, 2 Sam. vi, 8), does not necessarily imply a long period of time between the events and the recording of them.

There is nothing in the books that points to a period later than the first part of the reign of Solomon, or the close of that of David. In this connexion the two following passages are to be considered: "Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, Come and let us go to the seer; for he that is now called a

¹The exception is a single reference to the Book of Jashar, 2 Sam. i, 18.

prophet was beforetime called a seer" (1 Sam. ix, 9). "Then Achish gave him (David) Ziklag that day; wherefore Ziklag pertaineth unto the kings of Judah unto this day" (chapter xxvii, 6). The first of these passages affords no proof that the writer lived later than the age of David. In 1 Sam. ix, 19 Samuel calls himself a seer; but Nathan, a messenger of God contemporary with David, is called a *prophet* (נָבִי) (2 Sam. vii, 2); and in the superscription to Psalm li. Gad, another contemporary with David, is also called a *prophet* (נָבִי) (1 Sam. xxii, 5). The second of these passages, respecting Ziklag, has been thought to indicate that the writer lived not earlier than the reign of Rehoboam (about B. C. 975), in whose time the ten tribes revolted. Both the Septuagint and the Peshito-Syriac read: "Pertaineth to *the king* (not kings) of Judah," which might have been written in the time of David. But if we abide by the Hebrew reading, the passage could have been written in the beginning of Solomon's reign; for we are under no necessity of supposing that there is a reference in the passage to the division of the Israelites after the time of Solomon into the kingdom of Judah and the kingdom of Israel. The sacred historian states that Achish, the Philistine king, gave Ziklag to David, which, though situated within the kingdom of Judah, and afterwards assigned to Simeon (Josh. xix, 5), had not yet been possessed by either of these tribes. When David received the town he had been already anointed king, and he reigned "over the house of Judah" seven years and six months. The distinction between Israel and Judah already existed in his time, and grew out of the fact that David belonged to the tribe of Judah, over which alone he had first ruled seven years and a half, during a part of which time Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, reigned over Israel. Even Schrader¹ remarks, "The designation of collective Israel as ISRAEL and JUDAH (1 Sam. xviii, 16, 2 Sam. xxiv, 1), seems to belong to the time of David (Davidisch)." It is, indeed, possible that the passage respecting Ziklag's pertaining to the kings of Judah unto this day may be a later addition to the original text.

The passage, "she had on a long tunic, for thus do the virgin daughters of the king wear (future, *are accustomed to wear*) robes" (2 Sam. xiii, 18), affords no proof whatever of a long time intervening between the event and its recording.

Ewald places the composition of the books twenty or thirty years after the death of Solomon, and Bleek² at a somewhat later period, while Davidson³ prefers the reign of Asa, B. C. 940. It is natural

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 346.

² Einl., p. 363.

³ Intro., vol. i, p. 528.

for us to expect some reference in the Books of Chronicles to the Books of Samuel in respect to the sources of the history of David, and such reference there seems to be in 1 Chron. xxix, 29: "Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, they are written in the Book of Samuel the Seer, and in the Book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the Book of Gad the Seer." Samuel, it seems, wrote the history of his own times, and so did Nathan and Gad afterwards. Nathan, it is probable, survived David; at least, he is mentioned in the first chapter of 1 Kings.

It seems not improbable that Nathan wrote the two Books of Samuel. He was a contemporary of Gad the prophet, though The Prophet Nathan probably the author. younger, it would seem, and there was no good reason why he should make any use of what Gad wrote. The history of the time of Samuel he could have learned from the writings of Samuel, or from those who were still living and had participated in the events described in the first part of the book. On this supposition the work was written at the close of the reign of David or at the beginning of that of Solomon. It bears no marks of having been made up from the united writings of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad; yet in such case it would carry with it high authority.

According to the Talmud, Samuel wrote the work as far as the account of his death. The rest of 1 Samuel, and the whole of 2 Samuel, were written by Gad the seer and Nathan the prophet.¹

THE CHARACTER OF THE HISTORY.

The history is distinguished by simplicity, minuteness, and every indication of fairness and truth. Its three great characters, Samuel, Saul, and David, stand before us as real personages. In Samuel we see the faithful, blameless servant of Jehovah, possessing great power, yet never using it for his own selfish purposes. Saul everywhere appears as the fickle, rash king, always sinning and always repenting: David as a valiant warrior and just monarch, whose soul can always be touched with pity, especially toward Saul and his house.

Dr. Davidson, while acknowledging that the history in these books The opinions of modern critics concerning the books. "has the stamp of truth upon it," nevertheless finds contradictions in it; and in 2 Sam. xxi-xxiv, he thinks there is an historical basis, "altered and enlarged by the addition of legendary, miraculous, and improbable circumstances."² Here, again, his aversion to the supernatural appears; whatever has that appearance must be banished to the region of myths! As

¹ Fürst, Ueber den Kanon. p. 13.

² Vol. i, p. 521.

far as improbabilities are concerned, how many events of the most improbable character occur everywhere in profane history!

“The narrative,” says De Wette, “in the second book especially, bears a genuine historical stamp, and is drawn, if not from contemporary memorials, yet from a very lively and faithful (only here and there obscure and complicated) oral tradition, which, indeed, rests partly upon memorials, proverbs, and important names. With the exception of some pieces of the nature of Chronicles, it is so rich in living traits of character and descriptions, that in this respect it vies with the best written historical compositions, and at times becomes biographical; the natural connexion of the events is also often very satisfactory, though not set forth with sufficient clearness.”¹ Notwithstanding these acknowledgments of the high historical character of these books, De Wette and others think that they find inconsistencies and contradictions in them. These we shall briefly consider in the historical order.

In 1 Sam. vii, 13 it is stated, “So the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more into the coast (territories) of Israel; and the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel.” It has been objected that this is inconsistent with the language of chap. ix, 16, “that he [Saul] may save my people out of the hands of the Philistines: for I have looked upon my people, because their cry is come unto me.” But the former statement, that the Philistines “came no more,” obviously refers to the period of Samuel’s life—official life, perhaps. In the eighth chapter Samuel is spoken of as an *old* man, and it is said that he made his sons judges, and that their conduct was bad. After this a king is promised who will deliver the people of Israel from the Philistines. It seems that the inroads of the Philistines were made during the *administration of the wicked sons* of Samuel. The statements are sufficiently exact, except to a hypercritical spirit.

That Samuel, in accordance with a divine revelation, should anoint Saul to be king over Israel (1 Sam. ix, 15-17), has been considered inconsistent with his being chosen by lot by the people, who had demanded a king. And, indeed, if Samuel had not been directed by a divine communication in anointing Saul, and if Providence had not controlled the lot so that it would fall upon Saul, the whole proceeding would have been inconsistent and absurd. As God had acceded to the demand of the people to have a king, there was nothing in his making the selection inconsistent therewith. All this is, of course, unsatisfactory to those who believe that no divine communication was made to Samuel.

¹ In Schrader’s De Wette, p. 335.

In 1 Sam. x, 9-12, it is said that a company of prophets met Saul, and that the Spirit of God fell upon him, and he prophesied; from which it became a proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" But upon another occasion we find Saul prophesying before Samuel, and it is added, "Wherefore they say (*will say, are accustomed to say*), Is Saul also among the prophets? (1 Sam. xix, 24.) Here there is no reason to suppose that in the judgment of the writer Saul prophesied for the first time, and that the adage then arose. If he prophesied a second time, as the history shows, it was quite natural that the adage should be repeated.

In 1 Sam. x, 8, after Samuel has anointed Saul to be king, he tells him: "And thou shalt go down before me to Gilgal; and behold, I will go down unto thee, to offer burnt offerings, and to sacrifice sacrifices of peace offerings: seven days shalt thou tarry, till I come to thee, and show thee what thou shalt do." After this Saul is chosen by lot to be king, and, being sent for by men of Jabesh-gilead, east of the Jordan, to aid them against the Ammonites, he goes to their help, and defeats the Ammonites. After this Samuel says to the people, "Come and let us go to Gilgal to renew the kingdom there. And all the people went to Gilgal; and there they made Saul king before the Lord in Gilgal; and there they sacrificed sacrifices of peace-offerings before the Lord" (chap. xi, 14, 15). It is very evident that Samuel's direction to Saul after anointing him, to go down to Gilgal, where he would make offerings and tell him what to do, has reference to the meeting just mentioned, where Saul was made king. Nothing is said respecting Saul's going *first* to Gilgal; this was not necessary; but if he should do so, he was to tarry for Samuel seven days.

In the face of these facts it is not easy to see how De Wette can make the following passage refer to chap. x, 8: "And he (Saul) tarried seven days, according to the set time that Samuel had appointed: but Samuel came not to Gilgal; and the people were scattered from him" (chap. xiii, 8). When this appointment was made we know not; but it would seem that seven days was the usual time that Saul was to wait for Samuel. Saul had collected the army of the Israelites at Gilgal, and the Philistines gathered together to fight them. This was two years after Saul had been made king (chap. xiii, 1), and can have no reference to chap. x, 8.

While waiting for Samuel at Gilgal Saul forces himself to offer sacrifices, for which he is censured by Samuel, who informs him that his kingdom shall not continue.

In the fifteenth chapter Saul is sent to exterminate the Amalekites, but failing to carry out fully the command, the word of the Lord

comes to Samuel: "It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king, for he is turned back from following me," etc. (chap. xv, 11). After this Samuel tells Saul: "For thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel" (ver. 26). Here there is no inconsistency. In respect to the former transgression the declaration was, "Thy kingdom shall not continue;" while, on account of further disobedience, he is already rejected from being king. This is something more than a repetition.

In the account given of David's going forth to meet Goliath, it is stated that Saul inquired of Abner, "Whose son is this youth?" and that Abner replied, "As thy soul liveth, O king, I cannot tell;" and that, after David had returned to Saul with the head of the Philistine, he put the question to him, "Whose son art thou?" to which he replies, "I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite (1 Sam. xvii, 55-58). As the house of his father was to be made free in Israel, it was important to know this. It has been considered utterly incredible by some that Saul should not have known whose son David was, when he had already played before him, having been sent to him by Jesse at Saul's request.

It is true that it does seem singular that Saul, under the circumstances, should not have known David's father. But it may be explained by the consideration that the number of Saul's officers, acquaintances, and visitors, must have been very great, and that it might easily have happened that the name of David's father had escaped him at the time. How frequently it occurs that the names of persons with whom we are acquainted escape the memory when they have been some time absent from us. How many governors of States remember the names of all the men who have been employed near them, to say nothing of the *Christian* names of their fathers? With us, to know the son is to know the *surname* of the father; but with Saul it was entirely different. Further, Saul, in his hypochondriacal state, may have been subject to remarkable lapses of memory. But, if we are to reject every thing as unhistorical which *à priori* was improbable, what havoc we will make of history! How long David remained with Saul on his first visit to him (1 Sam. xvi, 21-23) it is impossible to say, but probably it was but for a short time. It is said that he became Saul's armour-bearer; but this may refer to what happened subsequently to David's fight with the Philistine; for after that event it is said that "Saul took him that day, and would let him go no more home to his father's house" (chap. xviii, 2). In the account of David, previous to his fight with the giant, it is said, in speaking of the three eldest sons of Jesse who followed Saul: "But

David went, and returned from Saul to feed his father's sheep at Bethlehem" (chap. xvii, 15).

The Vatican copy of the Septuagint omits chaps. xvii, 12-31, 55-58, and xviii, 1-5. This would remove all difficulty by the omission of the passage expressing Saul's ignorance of the name of David's father. But we have no sufficient authority for the rejection of the passages omitted in the Vatican copy of the LXX, as they are found in the Peshito-Syriac version and in the Targum. That Saul on two different occasions (1 Sam. xviii, 10, 11, xix, 10) hurled a javelin at David, has in it nothing strange; certainly nothing to lead us to infer that it is the same event twice related.

In chap. xix, 2 Jonathan informs David of Saul's intention to kill him; but in chap. xx, 1, 2, when David declares that Saul is seeking his life, Jonathan says: "God forbid; thou shalt not die: behold, my father will do nothing, either great or small, but that he will show it me." These passages De Wette regards as contradictory. But it must be remembered that after Jonathan had communicated to David Saul's intention to kill him, he remonstrated with his father against such an act, and *Saul swore that David should not be slain*. It is true that after this, when the evil spirit comes upon Saul, he again attempts to kill David, but David escapes from him. Again Jonathan, in the second instance, does not express himself very confidently, but declares his intention to sound his father, and to communicate the result to David. Jonathan would naturally have as good an opinion as possible of his father, and think that, notwithstanding his bad conduct, he would yet, in his better moments, have some regard for his oath. But suppose the two passages contain inconsistent sentiments—is the same man always consistent with himself?

In 1 Sam. xxi, 10-15; xxii, 1, it is said that David, for fear of Saul, fled to King Achish of Gath; but that, becoming alarmed when his warlike deeds were known to the king, he changed his behaviour and feigned madness, and left, with the king's decided approval. The superscription of the thirty-fourth Psalm confirms this: "A psalm of David when he changed his behaviour before Abimelech, who drove him away, and he departed." But after this, perhaps about four years, David, with six hundred men and their families, goes to Achish, king of Gath, who gives him Ziklag in which to dwell (chap. xxvii). Why cannot both of these events be true? In the first instance it seems he was alone, and became alarmed; he afterwards took courage and went with his six hundred men. Who that should read of an individual or of a company of soldiers playing the coward one day in battle, but on another occasion acting with bravery,

would ever imagine a contradiction or absurdity in the statements?

In chap. xxiv Saul, in seeking David in the wilderness of Engedi, goes into a cave in which David lies concealed, and his skirt is cut off by the latter. This is an entirely different event from that described in chap. xxvi, where Saul, seeking David in the wilderness of Ziph, encamps and goes to sleep with a spear stuck by his pillow, which spear David carries away.

The death of Samuel is twice related in nearly the same words, (1 Sam. xxv, 1, xxviii, 3). But the second statement, that he was dead, is required, or, at least, is made appropriate, by the account that follows—of the raising of Samuel by the witch of Endor.

In 2 Sam. iii, 14 David says: "Deliver me my wife Michal, which I espoused to me for a *hundred* foreskins of the Philistines." This does not contradict what is in 1 Sam. xviii, 27, that David brought *two hundred* foreskins of the Philistines to Saul for Michal, for the contract which Saul made with him was to bring *one hundred* foreskins of the Philistines (1 Sam. xviii, 25). David modestly names the smaller number.

Dr. Davidson finds a contradiction between 1 Sam. xv, 35: "And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death," and 1 Sam. xix, 24: "And he (Saul) prophesied before Samuel." The first of these passages Davidson renders: "Samuel did not see Saul again till the day of his death."¹ But the proper rendering of רָאָה, *raah*, in this passage is, *to visit, to go to see*, one of the meanings given by Gesenius—so the passage should be rendered, "And Samuel *visited* Saul no more till the day of his death," which is not contradicted by what is said of Saul's prophesying in the presence of Samuel, for in that case Saul *sought* Samuel.

Dr. Davidson finds a contradiction in the lists of Saul's sons. In 1 Sam. xiv, 49 we have Jonathan, Ishui, and Melchi-shua; but in chap. xxxi, 2 it is stated that the Philistines slew Jonathan, Abinadab, and Melchi-shua. But it seems best to suppose that the first list gives the sons of Saul at an earlier period of his reign, and that Abinadab was born afterwards. Ishui is probably the same who was afterward called Ishbosheth (*man of shame*), who alone of Saul's sons escaped death when the others were slain, and who ruled two years over eleven tribes in opposition to David

¹Vol. i, p. 513.

CHAPTER XXXV.

THE TWO BOOKS OF KINGS.

THE two Books of Kings, originally constituting but *one*¹ book, are so named from their embracing the history of the kings of Israel and Judah. They cover a period of about four hundred and fifty years, from the accession of Solomon to the throne of Israel to the thirty-seventh year of the Babylonian captivity.

The whole history may be divided into three periods. The first embraces the reign of Solomon over a united Israel (1 Kings i-xi). The second contains the history of the two separate kingdoms of Judah and of Israel, from the revolt of the ten tribes in the time of Rehoboam until these tribes were carried away captive beyond the Euphrates by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria (1 Kings xii-xxii; 2 Kings i-xvii). The third period embraces the history of the kingdom of Judah, from the time of the captivity of the ten tribes to the thirty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, at Babylon, about B.C. 562 (2 Kings xviii-xxv).

SOURCES AND TIME OF THEIR COMPOSITION.

The history everywhere refers to written documents, which were, doubtless, used by the author in the compilation of his work. At the end of the reign of Solomon it is said: "And the rest of the acts of Solomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the Book of the Acts of Solomon?" (1 Kings xi, 41.) In the subsequent part of the history, after the Israelites had been divided into the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, we have references both to "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel," and "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah." There are *eighteen* references to the former book, and *fifteen* to the latter.

Here the question arises, Were these books "of Chronicles," to which reference is made, records written during the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, or were they historical works written by two private individuals at a late period of the Hebrew monarchy? The last mention of "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" occurs

Were these books contemporary records, or compiled at a late period?

¹Origen in Euseb. Eccles. Hist., book vi, 25.

(2 Kings xxiv, 5) in reference to Jehoiakim (about B. C. 600), so that, on the supposition that, "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" was the work of a later writer, he must have lived at the beginning of the Babylonian captivity. But this is inadmissible, as there are indications in the Books of Kings that they are composed of documents written at an early period.

In reference to the remnant of the people of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, it is said: "Upon these did Solomon levy a tribute of bond-service unto this day" (1 Kings ix, 21). Here we have reference to a state of affairs, existing in the time of Solomon, hardly applicable to the divided kingdoms of Judah and Israel, and certainly inappropriate when the ten tribes had been removed, and the remnant of the Canaanites in their territory were no longer tributary to them. Again, in reference to the separation of the ten tribes from Judah in the reign of Rehoboam, it is said: "So Israel rebelled against the house of David unto this day" (1 Kings xii, 19). It is evident that this was written before the ten tribes were carried away captive by Shalmaneser, since the language was no longer applicable after that event.

Respecting the defection of the Edomites, it is stated: "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day" (2 Kings viii, 22). It is evident that this was written before the Babylonian captivity, otherwise the language would be inappropriate, as Judah was then carried away captive.

In the description of Solomon's temple occurs the following: "And they drew out the staves, that the ends of the staves were seen out in the holy place before the oracle, and they were not seen without: and there they are unto this day" (1 Kings viii, 8). But this language could not be used respecting the staves of the ark when the temple had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and all its sacred utensils had been removed; so that here, also, we have proof that the account was written before the Babylonian captivity.

As the author of the Books of Kings lived during the Babylonian captivity, it might have been expected that he would have made some change in passages no longer applicable to the condition of the people in his time. But this he did not deem necessary, as the altered circumstances were well known, and were not of such a nature as to demand that he should change the language of the original documents.

We cannot doubt that "The Book of the Chronicles¹ of the Kings of Judah," and "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel,"

¹ סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵיהֶם. *Book of the Affairs of the Days of the Kings.*

were the annals of the respective kings of the two kingdoms, written down for the most part during the reign of each king. Such annals are referred to in the book of Esther as being kept in the kingdom of Persia: "He (Ahasuerus) commanded to bring the book of the records of the Chronicles" (chap. vi, 1). When these were read, there was found recorded an important event in the reign of this very king.

Among the Hebrews we first find mention of a *recorder* in 2 Sam. viii, 16, where it is stated that in the time of David, "Jehoshaphat the son of Ahilud was recorder." Mention is also made of him in 2 Sam. xx, 24, and in 1 Kings iv, 3. The same office in the time of Hezekiah was held by Joah the son of Asaph (2 Kings xviii, 18, 37; Isaiah xxxvi, 3), and in the time of Josiah by Joah, the son of Jehozabab (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). Gesenius defines the word מַזְכִּיר, *mazkir*, (*recorder*, in English version), "a recorder, register, i. q., historiographer, the king's annalist, whose duty it was to record the deeds of the king and the events of his reign. . . . The same office is mentioned as existing in the Persian court, both ancient and modern" (Heb. Lex.).

It is true, we do not find any mention of a *recorder* in the kingdom of Israel, yet it is probable that the Israelites would have such an officer. But, independently of this, the history of Israel is so closely interwoven with that of Judah, that the historiographer of the latter kingdom would necessarily record a great deal of what occurred in the kingdom of Israel.

Bleek does not favour the view that the Books of Kings were composed from the annals of the kings of Judah and Israel, written during their reigns. "To me it is very probable," says he, "that what is cited under the titles of *The Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and of the Kings of Judah* was a larger work, which, for the most part, was not composed till a later period, and written *at once*."¹ This view has nothing in its favour, and must be altogether rejected, as it is contradicted by the facts of the case. Schrader,² while he supposes that the *annals* were used by the composer of the Book of Kings in an edition not finished before the death of Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiv, 5), about B. C. 600, acknowledges that "it is very probable, if not certain, that a series of chapters in them were written far earlier."

Dr. Davidson regards the work quoted by the author of Kings as "made up, not long before the downfall of Judah, of materials and monographs which had accumulated in the progress of time. It began before the commencement of the two kingdoms, and narrated

¹ Einleitung, p. 371.

² In De Wette's Einleitung, p. 357.

more or less fully the public acts of the kings and other leading personages. It was neither complete, nor alike valuable in all its parts. Another source was *oral tradition*."¹ We have no reason to believe that oral tradition was an element in the composition of the Books of Kings. Are we to suppose that *trustworthy* traditions of events unimportant, or even *any* tradition at all, existed centuries after the events occurred? It is a convenient way to get rid of the supernatural to suppose that all accounts of that nature have their origin in traditional elements incorporated into real, sober history.

We, indeed, find in the Books of Kings events that are not of a political character, but which belong to the theocracy, and accordingly have a suitable place in the annals of the kings of Judah and Israel; and we are, therefore, under no necessity of seeking *outside* of these *annals* the sources of the history in the Books of Kings.

The author of the Books of Kings wrote, it would seem, or at least finished his history, in the second half of the Babylonian captivity, as he states that Evil-merodach, king of Babylon, lifted up the head of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, out of prison, in the thirty-seventh year of his captivity, treated him kindly, and supported him all his life (2 Kings xxv, 27-30). As no mention is made of the close of the captivity, it cannot be doubted that that event had not yet occurred when the author wrote.

Probably written in the second half of the Babylonian captivity.

It is impossible to say who was the author of the two Books of Kings. Ancient Jewish tradition² attributed them to the prophet Jeremiah, which reference is followed by most of the rabbies, and many of the earlier Christian theologians, and has been adopted by Hävernick, but rejected by Bleek, Davidson, and Keil. It is not, indeed, probable that Jeremiah was alive when the incidents occurred which are recorded at the close of the book, where it is stated that Jehoiachin was taken out of prison at Babylon in the thirty-seventh year of his captivity, and supported all his life by Evil-merodach (2 Kings xxv, 27-30), for at this time Jeremiah would have been about *ninety* years of age. The peculiar phraseology employed in the Books of Kings nowhere occurs in Jeremiah. We, indeed, find that the history of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxiv, 18-20, xxv), is nearly verbatim with that of Jer. lii. But this last chapter of Jeremiah was not written by him, for at the close of chap. li it is added, "Thus far are the words of Jeremiah." It was probably inserted from the last book of 2 Kings. The author of these books doubt-

The author unknown.

¹ Introduction, vol. ii, p. 34.

² Baba Batra, 15 a, in Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 14.

less belonged to the tribe of Judah. He was evidently a pious man, and zealous for the worship of the true God, and probably endowed with the prophetic spirit.

CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY IN THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

The history is distinguished for its fidelity and impartiality, which are stamped on every page. Kings and the great men of Hebrew history are weighed in the impartial balances of the divine law, and justified or condemned according to their deeds. What but the stern love of truth and justice could have induced the sacred historian to describe the great crime of David and the apostasy of Solomon, two of their mightiest monarchs?

As the history was derived from contemporary annals, it rests upon the surest basis of truth, and is acknowledged by skeptical writers to be credible in a very high degree. "The genuine character of the books is well attested by internal evidence. . . . Though the history is compendious and extract-like, it bears on its face the stamp of fidelity."¹

A considerable number of the events recorded in these books receive confirmation from monumental sources. The famous Moabite stone discovered at Dhiban, east of the Jordan, in 1868, by Rev. Mr. Klein, contains an inscription in Hebrew showing that it was erected about B. C. 900, by Mesha, king of Moab, in commemoration of his deliverance from the Israelites. In 2 Sam. viii, 2 it is stated that David smote Moab, and that the Moabites became his servants, and brought gifts. How long this servitude lasted it is impossible to say, though it is probable that it ceased immediately after the separation of the ten tribes from Judah. It is certain that some time after this event Moab came under the dominion of the kings of Israel, for it is stated in 2 Kings i, 1, "Then Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab." We have also the further statement: "And Mesha king of Moab was a sheepmaster, and rendered unto the king of Israel a hundred thousand lambs, and a hundred thousand rams, with the wool. But it came to pass, when Ahab was dead, that the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel" (2 Kings iii, 4, 5). After this statement we have an account of the attempt of Jehoram, king of Israel, and successor to Ahab, to subdue Moab. For this purpose he united with the king of Judah and the king of Edom. At first the Moabites were defeated, and the king of Moab, in his distress, offered his eldest son, who was to succeed him, as a burnt offering upon the wall. Upon this event the Israelites returned to their own

Confirmations
of the Books
of Kings from
ancient monu-
ments.

¹Dr. Davidson, vol. ii, pp. 39, 40.

land, and there was great indignation against them (2 Kings iii). After this, it seems, the Moabites became independent. In commemoration of the deliverance of Moab, Mesha dedicated to the god Chemosh the celebrated stone on which were inscribed his remarkable achievements, of which we give the following: "I, Mesha, am son of Chemoshgad, king of Moab, the Dibonite. My father reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reigned after my father. And I erected this stone to Chemosh at Korcha, [a stone of sa]lvation, for he saved me from all despoilers, and let me see my desire upon all my enemies. Now Om[r]i, king of Israel, he oppressed Moab many days, for Chemosh was angry with his l[a]nd. His son succeeded him, and he also said, I will oppress Moab. In my days he said, [let us go], and I will see my desire on him and his house, and Israel said, I shall destroy it forever. Now Omri took the land Medeba, and [the enemy] occupied it [in his days, and in] the days of his son, forty years. And Chemosh [had mercy] on it in my days; and I built Baal-meon, and made therein the ditch, and I [built] Kirjathaim, for the men of Gad dwelt in the land [Atar]oth from of old, and the k[ing of I]srael fortified A[t]jaro[h], and I assaulted the wall and captured it." Mesha speaks also of capturing Nebo: "And I took from it [the ves]sels of Jehovah and offered them before Chemosh."¹

The inscription
on the Moabite
stone.

On this monument are found the following names, which also occur in the Hebrew Scriptures: Jehovah, Chemosh (the national god of the Moabites), Mesha, Omri, Moab, Gad, Israel, Medeba, Ataroth, Dibon, Baal-meon, Nebo, Jahaz, Beth-diblathaim, Aroer, Horonaim, and Kirjathaim.

This shows a remarkable confirmation of the Scripture history, and proves that the names we have in the Books of Kings have come down to us in their integrity, and that they represent real persons and places.

The monuments of Assyria, also, have furnished some remarkable confirmations of the history in these books: "Sa-
maria is known to the Assyrians for some centuries merely as Beth-Omri, 'the house' or 'city of Omri';" and even when they come into contact with Israelite monarchs of the house which succeeded Omri's upon the throne, they still regard them as descendants of the great chief, whom they view, perhaps, as the founder of the kingdom. Thus the Assyrian records agree generally with the Hebrew in the importance which they assign to this mon-

Confirmations
from Assyrian
monuments.

¹ From the inscription on the Moabite Stone, as translated and published by Christian D. Ginsburg, LL.D., London, 1871. Also Schlottmann and others have translated it.

arch, and especially confirm the fact (related in 1 Kings xvi, 24), that he was the founder of the later Israelite metropolis, Samaria."¹

"Omri's son and successor, Ahab, is mentioned by name in an Assyrian contemporary inscription, which, agreeably to the account given in the First Book of Kings with respect to the place of his ordinary residence (1 Kings xviii, 46; xxi, 1, 2), calls him 'Ahab of Jezreel.' . . . Among the confederate monarchs with whom he leagued himself was the Damascene king, Benhadad, whom Scripture also makes Ahab's contemporary."² "The Assyrian monument known as the 'Black Obelisk' contains a notice of the Israelitish monarch, Jehu, and another of the Syrian king who succeeded Benhadad, Hazael." The reference to Jehu on the Assyrian monuments is acknowledged by Schrader: "Tribute of Jehu, son of Omri. The reference to Jehu, the successor of the rulers of the house of Omri, is secured against all doubt by the simultaneous mention of Hazael (in the cuneiform writing, *Chaza'ilu*) of Damascus."³

In 2 Kings xv, 19 mention is made of the invasion of the land of Israel by "Pul, the king of Assyria." "Of this Pul," Mention of Pul, King of Assyria, by Berosus. says Rawlinson, "the Assyrian records tell us nothing. On the contrary, they in a certain sense exclude him, since in the lists of the Assyrian monarchs who reigned about this period . . . there is no mention of Pul, and no indication of any place at which his reign can be inserted. . . . In this silence of the Assyrian annals with respect to Pul, we turn to the ancient historian of Mesopotamia, Berosus,⁴ and we find that we have not turned to him in vain. Berosus mentioned Pul, and placed him exactly at this period; but he called him a 'Chaldean,' and not an 'Assyrian,' monarch."⁵ Rawlinson explains this by the fact that the king of the great empire of western Asia at any time after the rise of the Assyrian empire could be regarded as the "king of Assyria," as Nabopolassar in 2 Kings xxiii, 29, and Darius Hystaspis in Ezra vi, 22.

In 2 Kings xv, 29 it is stated that "in the days of Pekah king of Israel came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-bethmaachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gil-ead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria." Again, "And king Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria" (2 Kings xvi, 10). Here the history of the monarchs of Israel and Judah touches the Assyrian history, and finds abundant confirmation from the Assyrian monuments. "Tig-

¹ Hist. Illus. Old Test., Rawlinson and Hackett, pp. 121, 122.

² Ibid., pp. 122, 123.

³ De Wette—Schrader, p. 320.

⁴ He was born in the time of Alexander the Great.

⁵ Hist. Illus. Old Test., pp. 131, 132.

lath-pileser relates, that about his fifth year (B. C. 741), being engaged in wars in Southern Syria, he met and defeated a vast army under the command of Azariah, king of Judah, the great monarch whose host is reckoned in Chronicles at 307,500 men, and whose military measures are described at considerable length (2 Chron. xxvi, 6-15). Again, he relates that from his twelfth to his fourteenth year (B. C. 734-732) he carried on a war in the same regions with the two kings, Pekah of Samaria and Rezin of Damascus, who were confederate together, and that he besieged Rezin in his capital for two years, at the end of which time he captured him and put him to death, while he punished Pekah by mulcting him of a large portion of his dominions, and carrying off vast numbers of his subjects into captivity. It is scarcely necessary to point out how completely this account harmonizes with the scriptural narrative, according to which Pekah and Rezin, having formed an alliance against Ahaz, and having attacked him, Ahaz called in the aid of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, who 'hearkened to him, and . . . went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people captive to Kir, and slew Rezin' (2 Kings xvi, 9); and who likewise punished Pekah by invading his territory and carrying away the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half the tribe of Manasseh (2 Kings xv, 29; 1 Chron. v, 6, 26), and settling them in Gozan in the Khabour. Further, Tiglath-pileser relates, that before quitting Syria he held his court at Damascus, and there received submission and tribute from the neighbouring sovereigns, among whom he expressly mentions not only Pekah, of Samaria, but "*Yahu-Khazi* (i. e., Ahaz), king of Judah."¹ This illustrates the account of Ahaz's visit to Damascus "to meet Tiglath-pileser" (2 Kings xvi, 10). "The annals of Tiglath-pileser contain also some mention of the two Israelite monarchs, Menahem and Hoshea."

"The capture of Samaria, and the deportation of its people by the Assyrians, which terminated the reign of Hoshea, and at the same time brought the kingdom of Israel to an end, is noticed in the annals of Sargon, who was Shalmaneser's successor, and assigned by him to his first year, which was B. C. 722, 721. Here, it will be observed, there is an exact accord between the Assyrian and Hebrew dates, the Hebrew chronology placing the fall of Samaria in the one hundred and thirty-fifth year before the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, which was in the eighteenth year of that king, or B. C. 586 (and B. C. 586+135 producing B. C. 721). Again, Sargon relates that he carried away captive from Samaria 27,280 persons; and he subsequently states that he transported numerous prisoners from Babylonia to a place 'in the land of

Capture of Samaria noted in the annals of Sargon.

¹Hist. Illus. Old Test., pp. 134, 135.

the Hittites,' which is probably Samaria, though the inscription is not at this point quite legible (compare 2 Kings xvii, 24)."¹

In 2 Kings xviii, 7, 13-16 it is stated that Hezekiah, king of Judah, rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not, and that in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up "against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them." Hezekiah appeased Sennacherib by agreeing to pay him whatever he might demand. Sennacherib appointed him to pay "three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold. And Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house. At that time did Hezekiah cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of the Lord, and from the pillars which Hezekiah king of Judah had overlaid, and gave it to the king of Assyria." "The annals of Sennacherib, son and successor of Sargon," says Rawlinson, "contain a full account of this campaign. 'Because Hezekiah, king of Judah,' says Sennacherib, 'would not submit to my yoke, I came up against him, and by force of arms and by the might of my power *I took forty-six of his strong fenced cities*, and of the smaller towns which were scattered about I took and plundered a countless number. And from these places I captured and carried off as spoil 200,150 people, old and young, male and female, together with horses and mares, asses and camels, oxen and sheep, a countless multitude. And Hezekiah himself I shut up in Jerusalem like a bird in a cage, building towers round the city to hem him in, and raising banks of earth against the gates to prevent escape. . . . Then upon this Hezekiah there fell the fear of the power of my arms, and he sent out to me the chiefs and the elders of Jerusalem, *with thirty talents of gold* and eight hundred talents of silver, and divers treasures, a rich and immense booty. . . . All these things were brought to me at Nineveh, the seat of my government, Hezekiah having sent them by *way of tribute*, and as a token of submission to my power.' The close agreement of these two accounts is admitted on all hands, and is, indeed, so palpable that it is needless to enlarge upon it here. The Assyrian monarch, with pardonable pride, brings out fully all the details. . . . His main facts are exactly those which the Jewish historian puts on record, the only apparent discrepancy being in the number of the talents of silver, where he probably counts the whole of the treasure carried off, while the Hebrew writer intends to give the amount of the permanent tribute which was agreed upon."²

After Hezekiah had paid tribute to Sennacherib, the Assyrian

¹ Hist. Illus. Old Test., p. 138.

² Ibid., pp. 142, 143.

king sent a great force against Jerusalem, and a message to Hezekiah. "And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses" (2 Kings xix, 35). It was also prophesied: "Behold, I will send a blast upon him," etc. (chap. xix, 7).

Respecting this disaster, "the annals of Assyria are silent. Such silence is in no way surprising. It has always been the practice in the East to commemorate only the glories of the monarch, and to ignore his reverses and defeats. The Jewish records furnish a solitary exception to this practice. In the entire range of the Assyrian annals there is no case where a monarch admits a disaster, or even a check, to have happened to himself or his generals; and the only way in which we become distinctly aware from the annals themselves that Assyrian history was not an unbroken series of victories and conquests, is from an occasional reference to a defeat or loss as sustained by a former monarch."¹ But in the account of Egypt by Herodotus there seems to be a reference to the miraculous defeat of Sennacherib. In speaking of Sethon, a priest of Hephæstus, who made himself king of Egypt, he remarks that he had offended the soldiers; and when Sennacherib, king of the Arabians and the Assyrians, marched a great army against Egypt, Sethon in his distress, as the soldiers would not aid him, resorted to the temple, where the god appeared to him in a dream, and assured him he would suffer no injury by going out to meet Sennacherib's army. He accordingly set out for Pelusium with a force consisting only of traders, artisans, and hucksters. When he had reached the place where Sennacherib's army had encamped, the field-mice, during the night, had poured forth like a stream over the army of the Assyrians, and had eaten up their quivers, their bows, and the straps of their shields, so that on the next day, being deprived of their arms, they fled, and many of them perished. And now this king, in stone, stands in the temple of Hephæstus, having a mouse in his hand, with the following inscription: "WHOEVER BEHOLDS ME, LET HIM REVERENCE THE GODS" (book ii, 141). In Egyptian mythology, the *mouse* seems to have been the symbol of *the silent destructive workings of divine Providence*.

In 2 Kings xx, 12 mention is made of Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon. His name "appears in the Assyrian inscriptions, and also in the famous document known as the Canon of Ptolemy." In 1 Kings xiv, 25, 26 it is

Silence of Assyrian annals concerning the destruction of Sennacherib's army.

Merodach-Baladan in Assyrian inscriptions.

¹ Hist. Illus. Old Test., p. 144.

stated, that "it came to pass, in the fifth year of King Rehoboam that Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem: and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house: he even took away all: and he took away all the shields of gold which Solomon had made." Of this expedition there is a notice "contained in an inscription erected by Shishak (Sheshonk) at Karnak, which has been most carefully studied by modern scholars, and may be regarded as having completely yielded up its contents. This document is a list of countries, cities, and tribes conquered in his great expedition by Shishak, and regarded by him as tributaries. It contains not only a distinct mention of 'Judah,' as a 'kingdom' which Shishak had subjugated, but also a long list of Palestinian towns."¹

Josephus states, that according to the Phœnician records, "the temple in Jerusalem was built by King Solomon one hundred and forty-three years and eight months before the Tyrians founded Carthage."² He also quotes the testimony of Dius, who wrote of Phœnician affairs, that "when Solomon was king of Jerusalem he sent riddles to King Hiram."

Respecting the Babylonian captivity Josephus quotes the testimony of the Chaldean historian, Berosus, born in the time of Alexander the Great, that Nabopolassar sent his son Nebuchadnezzar with a great force when he had learned that the Jews had revolted, and mastered them, and burnt the temple which was in Jerusalem, and carried away all the people captive to Babylon; and that the city (of Jerusalem) was desolate for seventy years, until the time of Cyrus the king of the Persians.³

Lynx-eyed, skeptical criticism can find but few contradictions in the Books of Kings. In 1 Kings ix, 22 it is stated, that "of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bondmen." But this does not contradict what is said in 1 Kings v, 13, 14: "And King Solomon raised a levy out of all Israel; and the levy was thirty thousand men. And he sent them to Lebanon, ten thousand a month, by courses;" for this was but a brief service, somewhat like drafting men into the army, or compelling them to work a certain number of days on the public highways, as is often done, even in republican governments. Nor is there any force in the *indirect* contradictions sometimes alleged, nor have we space to pursue them.

¹Hist. Illus. Old. Test., p. 118. ²Against Apion, lib. i, 17. ³Ibid., 19.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

THE two Books of Chronicles, called in Hebrew **הַיְיָמִים הַיְיָרִי**, *dibh're hayyamim*, *daily affairs, journal of affairs*, originally made *one* book.¹ In the Septuagint they are called *παρλειπόμμενα*, *things omitted, or supplemental*. They are placed at the end of the Hebrew Bible, but as the events related in them generally belong to the same age as the Books of Kings, they appropriately follow those books, as in the English version.²

The first nine chapters contain the genealogies of the ancient world as found in Genesis, beginning with Adam, and also those of the Israelites in the times subsequent to the history in the Pentateuch, ending in the royal line with the sons of Elieoenai (chapter iii, 24), who lived after the return of the Jews from Babylon. Interspersed with these genealogies are historical incidents, and an account of the temple service in Jerusalem.

The second division of the books begins with the death of Saul and the accession of David to the kingdom of Israel, and ends with the death of Solomon (1 Chron. x-xxix; 2 Chron. i-ix). The third division begins with the reign of Rehoboam, the successor of Solomon, and embraces the history of the kingdom of *Judah only*, and reaches to the proclamation of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem (2 Chron. x-xxxvi).

THE DATE OF THEIR COMPOSITION AND THEIR AUTHORSHIP.

As the history in these books ends with the proclamation of Cyrus for the rebuilding of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxvi, 22, 23), about B. C. 536, the books could not have been composed before that monarch's reign. The use of the Persian word **אֲדָרְכּוֹן**, *adharkon*, *a daric*, in 1 Chron. xxix, 7, shows that the work could not have been composed before about B. C. 500, as *darics* are said to have been first introduced by Darius about that time.

¹ Origen (in Euseb., Hist. Eccles., vi, 25) speaks of Chronicles as making *one* book in Hebrew. Jerome calls them the *seventh* book in the Hagiographa. Preface to Samuel and Kings.

² Also in the Septuagint, Peshito-Syriac, and Vulgate.

Nor is it likely, if the books had been written in the Greek period after Alexander the Great, that the word *darics* would have occurred in it at all, especially as, according to Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities, "after the Persian conquest they were melted down and recoined under the type of Alexander."

It has been thought by some that the genealogies in 1 Chron. iii, 19-24, reach down to the time of Alexander the Great, or even later;¹ but this view is destitute of any good foundation, for the list goes no further than the sons of Hananiah, the son of Zerubbabel; and there is no proof that the subsequent names in the list were descendants of the previous ones, but they are, rather, parallel genealogies. But we are not compelled to rest on negative proof only, for we have some of the persons whose names occur in the last part of the list also in Ezra, who speaks of them as having gone up with him in the reign of Artaxerxes. He mentions Hattush, one of the descendants of David; the sons of Shechaniah, and Elihoenai.² Accordingly, the genealogies in Chronicles do not come down later than the time of Ezra, for Zerubbabel went up to Jerusalem in the beginning of the reign of Cyrus, B. C. 536, and the grandchildren of Zerubbabel, mentioned in 1 Chron. iii, 19-21, would be the contemporaries of Ezra, who went up to Jerusalem in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, about B. C. 457 (Ezra vii, 6, 7).

There is nothing in these Books of Chronicles belonging to an age later than that of Ezra, and this is a probable proof that they were composed in his time.

Respecting the author of the books, Fürst remarks that tradition Ezra probably says that Ezra composed the first nine chapters; and the author. if he did this, it was for an introduction to his Ezra-Nehemiah; that, respecting the written sources of the second part (1 Chron. x-xxix, 2 Chron. i-xxxvi), tradition is silent.³ But if Ezra wrote the first nine chapters, it is very probable that he wrote the other part of Chronicles.

Some very able biblical critics regard Ezra as the author of the Chronicles; as Eichhorn, Hävernicks, Keil, Fürst,⁴ etc. And this seems to us the best view. It is true, if Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah were all written by one author, we should be compelled to deny that Ezra was that author. But Nehemiah is plainly to be separated from Ezra, as we shall see in the sequel. There is good

¹ Dr. Zunz thinks that the Chronicles were composed about 260 B. C. Gottesdienst Vorträge, p. 33.

² Ezra viii. 1-4. In 1 Chron. iii, 24 the last man whose sons are named is Elihoenai, without the *h*.

³ Ueber den Kanon, pp. 120, 122.

⁴ In his Geschich. Bib. Lit., vol. ii, pp. 537, 538.

reason for believing that Ezra wrote the book that bears his name; and the Chronicles and that book are closely connected, and share the same spirit, and use the same style of language.

The last two verses of Chronicles are the same as the beginning of Ezra, referring to the decree of Cyrus respecting the building of the temple in Jerusalem. "The great affinity in language," says Keil, "the frequent references made to the law in similar formulas; the predilection for extended descriptions of the proceedings at acts of worship, along with the temple music and the songs of praise by the Levites, in standing liturgical formulas; also the predilection for genealogies and public registers—all which are common to the two works—elevate this probability of common authorship into a certainty."¹

As examples of words common to both Chronicles and Ezra, may be mentioned *כְּבוֹר*, *a cup*, which occurs three times in Chronicles, and the same number of times in Ezra; nowhere else in this sense. *פְּלִגָּה*, *a division* of the Levites, is found twice in

Examples of words common to Chronicles and Ezra.

Chronicles and once in Ezra; nowhere else in the Bible. The peculiar phrase, combining three prepositions, *עַד־לְמַרְחֹק*, *unto afar off*, is found only in 2 Chron. xxvi, 15, and in Ezra iii, 13. The Hithpael form of *נָדַב*, *הִתְנַדַּב*, *to give willingly, to offer spontaneously* gifts to Jehovah, occurs in this sense only in 1 Chron. xxix, 5, 6, 9, 14, 17, and in Ezra i, 6, ii, 68, and iii, 5. Elsewhere the Hithpael conjugation is used only in Judges v, 2, 9, 2 Chron. xvii, 16, in the sense *to volunteer for military service*, and in Nehemiah xi, 2, in the sense *to offer themselves* to dwell. The Hophal infinitive, *הִיטַר*, in the sense *foundation* (from *יָטַר*), occurs only in 2 Chron. iii, 3, and in Ezra iii, 11. *הִכִּין לְבָבוֹ לְדַרוֹשׁ*, *to set one's heart to seek*, is found in 2 Chron. xii, 14, xix, 3, xxx, 19, and in Ezra vii, 10. The phrase *בְּשֵׁמוֹת נִקְבוּ*, *expressed by name*, based on Num. i, 17, is elsewhere found only in 1 Chron. xii, 31, xvi, 41, 2 Chron. xxviii, 15, xxxi, 19, and in Ezra viii, 20. There are other usages of language common to Chronicles and to Ezra, but the examples given are the most striking, and of themselves furnish a highly probable proof of the identity of authorship of these books.

There is no good reason for supposing that Chronicles and Ezra originally formed *one* book; for, in that case, we would not have the same statement in the conclusion of Chronicles and in the beginning of Ezra. The language of Chronicles, though coloured with Chaldee bears no marks of being later than that of Ezra or Nehemiah. In fact, the Chaldaisms, *זְמַן*, *time*, and *שָׁלַט*, *to rule*, found in Ecclesiastes,

¹ Introduction, Clark's Pub., vol. ii, pp. 77, 78.

Nehemiah, and Esther, are wanting in Chronicles. The full method of writing David, דָּוִד, occurs in Ezra (chaps. iii, 10, viii, 20) as well as in Chronicles, and furnishes no proof of the lateness of the book. This full form is found even in the prophets Amos (chaps. vi, 5, ix, 11) and Hosea (chap. iii, 5).

THE PURPOSE OF THE AUTHOR.

As the Books of Samuel and those of Kings were already written, the question arises, For what purpose did the author of Chronicles, whom we suppose to be Ezra, write? to which the answer must be given from the examination of the books themselves. First of all, he intended to give the genealogies of the Israelites, which were but partially found in the other books of the Hebrew people; and then to give a connected history from the death of Saul to the proclamation of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem, limiting himself, after the separation of the ten tribes, to the house of Judah, omitting much that was found in Samuel and Kings, and interweaving new matter, especially in reference to the armies of David, and the service of the priests and Levites in the temple.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORY.

The author of Chronicles refers to various works treating of the principal portions of the history over which his books extend, and which he doubtless used in the composition of his own work.

The sources first named occur in 1 Chron. xxix, 29: "Now the acts of David the king, the first and last, behold, they are written in the Book of Samuel the seer, and in the Book of Nathan the prophet, and in the Book of Gad the seer." The word here rendered "book" is properly "*affairs*" (דְּבָרִים), and it is very probable that our present Books of Samuel are included in the reference, as they appear to be *original sources*. Mention is also made of the Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the Visions of Iddo the seer, in addition to the Book of Nathan the prophet, as sources for the history of Solomon (2 Chron. ix, 29). Other sources for the history of other kings are, the Book of Shemaiah the prophet, the Book of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies (2 Chron. xii, 15), the Commentary of the Prophet Iddo (2 Chron. xiii, 22), the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel (2 Chron. xvi, 11; xxv, 26; xxviii, 26; xxxii, 32); the same work or works referred to, as the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah (2 Chron. xxvii, 7; xxxv, 27; xxxvi, 8); the Book of the Kings of Israel (2 Chron. xx, 34; xxxiii, 18); the Commentary of the Book of the Kings (2 Chron. xxiv, 27). Reference is also made

to Isaiah the prophet (2 Chron. xxvi, 22); and to the vision of Isaiah the prophet (chap. xxxii, 32).

There can be no reasonable doubt that the Books of the Kings of Judah and Israel are the annals of those kingdoms which are referred to in these books as the sources of the history. The Commentary mentioned was, no doubt, the same as the annals of the kingdoms.

The question here arises, How far did the author of Chronicles make use of our Books of Kings? This question is not easily answered; for where the language is the same in Chronicles as that in Kings, the former may not be a quotation, but in both works the phraseology may have been derived from a common source. It is evident that with the original sources of the history of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel lying before the author of the Chronicles, there would be but little need of using our Books of Kings, which, for the most part, are mere epitomes of the history. But in the arrangement of the materials, he may, to a certain extent, have taken them as models.

The Books of Samuel and Kings used by the compiler of the Chronicles.

Keil's opinion is, that "in the historical narratives which are common to the Chronicles and the Books of Samuel and Kings these canonical books cannot have been employed. For in the parallel passages the Chronicles furnish a multitude of historical statements for which we seek in vain in those books; and they also differ often and in many ways from the parallel accounts as regards the arrangement and successive order of the individual points of importance, and also follow thoroughly a course of their own, both as to what they communicate and as to what they pass over."¹

Opinions of Keil, Bleek, and De Wette.

"We cannot doubt," says Bleek,² "that the author derived the materials of his work, at least by far the greatest part, from written sources—from older historical works. In regard to the relation of the Chronicles to our other Old Testament books, especially Samuel and Kings, considering the age of the author of Chronicles, there can be no doubt that he was acquainted with these books as writings possessing public authority, as elements of a canonical collection of holy Scriptures; and we can presuppose as certain that he made use of them for his work. It is in the highest degree probable that he has once expressly cited the Books of Samuel, as *דְּבָרֵי שְׁמוּאֵל הַרְאָה*, *the affairs of Samuel the seer* (1 Chron. xxix, 29). The comparison of the books themselves does not allow us to doubt that the author really made use of those books, and that they were for him in many things the chief source in his history of the kings."

¹ *Introd.*, vol. ii, p. 63. In Clark's For. Theol. Libr.

² *Einl.*, pp. 396, 397.

De Wette thus expresses his opinion: "That the accounts which run parallel with those in the Books of Samuel and Kings were taken from them the following considerations favour: The natural connexion in which the earlier accounts stand with such as the Chronicles have omitted; . . . the originality of those accounts in comparison with these in the Chronicles; the certainty that the writer of Chronicles must have known the earlier books." To which Schrader adds, as the special reason, "that the author of Chronicles has incorporated into his work such sections as were written by the author of the Books of Kings."¹ The first section which Schrader gives in Chronicles as having been written by the author of the Books of Kings is Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings viii, 12-53; 2 Chron. vi). But are we to suppose that Solomon's prayer was *made up* by the author of the Books of Kings? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that it was written down by some one at the time it was delivered? It is clear that the author of Kings, in his history of Solomon, followed an original document, for he says: "And the rest of the acts of Solomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the Book of the Acts of Solomon?" (1 Kings xi, 41.) It is true, the writing to which reference is here made may have perished before the composition of the Books of Chronicles, so that the author of this work took the prayer of Solomon from the Book of Kings. The other instances of quotation cited by Schrader have in them, sometimes, passages not found in the Books of Kings, so that it is evident that the author had other written sources to which he refers. The most reasonable of all theories is, that the author of Chronicles used the Books of Samuel and Kings, in addition to various other written sources.

CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY IN THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

The principal portion of the history in Chronicles is the same as that contained in the Books of Kings, and, accordingly, has all the claims to be considered genuine history which belong to the narratives in the earlier books. And where the author of Chronicles gives additional matter he refers us to the original sources whence he evidently drew his information.

"The Chronicles," says Bleek, "in our century, have been the subject of various investigations and lively disputes, mostly in respect to their relation to the other books of the Old Testament (Samuel and Kings), and their historical credibility."² Especially did De Wette attack these books in 1806, and subsequently endeavoured to show, against

Depreciation of the Books of Chronicles by modern skeptical critics.

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 379.

² Einleitung, p. 393.

Eichhorn, that their author had no other early written sources except Samuel and Kings, which he did not use faithfully or skillfully; that he partly misunderstood them, and partly altered them in an arbitrary manner, and made additions in the interest of the priests and Levites. Against him, in 1819, wrote Dahler, to whom Gramberg, a few years later, wrote a reply, denying all credibility to the Books of Chronicles. On the other hand, the books have been defended vigourously by Movers, Keil, Hävernick, and others. De Wette, in the fifth and sixth editions of his Introduction, softened and modified his earlier views.

Schrader remarks that the author of Chronicles "did not use exclusively our canonical Books of Samuel and Kings in the composition of his history. This is evident from the character of a great part of the accounts, peculiar to himself, which are given by the author. The different sources quoted in these Books of Chronicles lead to the same result."¹ He also remarks: "From a comparison of the parallel sections in Chronicles and in the Books of Samuel and Kings two things follow: on the one hand, that the author of Chronicles executed his work in accordance with his sources, and in many instances adhered closely to the letter of those sources; but, on the other hand, that he judged at the same time that an elaboration, to a certain extent more free, and upon the basis of the views of his own age, would not be unsuitable. The same may be presumed for those sections and remarks which assume a more independent position towards the parallel sections in the other historical books. And a more close investigation thoroughly confirms this supposition. Among sections of the latter kind we meet with such as excite just suspicion respecting their entire credibility, and their having been derived from authentic sources: partly, on account of their Levitical tendency; partly, on account of the improbability of their contents; and, finally, on account of their contradiction to the older, and, on this ground, generally more credible, accounts of the other books of the Old Testament. But we likewise find, on the other hand, such as carry in their very face the stamp of their being thoroughly historical, and are to be referred either to a good memory or to old sources. The Chronicles are not, therefore, to be at once rejected as an historical source. How far their statements are to be taken as credible must, in every instance, be separately investigated."² Such, then, is the present skeptical view respecting these books. Negative criticism has a dogmatic interest in reducing the historical credibility of the Chronicles to the lowest point. De Wette confesses this when he says: "As the entire

¹In De Wette's Einleitung, p. 380.

²Ibid., pp. 375. 376.

Jewish history, on its most interesting and important side, namely, that of religion and the manner of observing the worship of God, *after the accounts in the Chronicles have been put out of the way*, . . . assumes quite a different shape; so, also, the investigations about the Pentateuch take quite a different turn all at once; *a multitude of troublesome proofs, difficult to put out of the way, that the Mosaic books were in existence at an earlier time, vanish*," etc.¹

On the historical character of the Chronicles Dr. Davidson remarks: "The *general* credibility of the writer's communications may be safely asserted. In many cases they can be confirmed by independent testimony. Thus the victory of Asa over the Ethiopians, under Zerah [omitted in Kings], is described in a manner accordant with the historical relations of ancient Egypt. The Ethiopians marched from Egypt, and thither they went back. Accordingly, it may be inferred that this Ethiopian king possessed Egypt, and, therefore, that his territory extended nearly to the borders of Palestine. Herodotus relates that several of the Egyptian kings were Ethiopians. The successive and minute details in the narrative are such as bear the stamp of historical truth, not of fiction. . . .

"The invasion of Jerusalem by the Philistines and Arabians in the reign of Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi, 16-19) [not mentioned in Kings] is confirmed by Joel (chap. iij, 4-6). . . .

"The wars of Uzziah and Ahaz against the Philistines, as described in 2 Chron. xxvi, 6, and xxviii, 18, agree with Isaiah xiv, 28, etc., and Amos vi, 2." . . . Dr. Davidson, however, adds: "Yet it must not be concealed that there are serious suspicions against his accuracy in all places."²

Bleek thinks that the statements of the Chronicles are sometimes inexact, and remarks: "Where a comparison of the more ancient canonical books, especially Samuel and Kings, is at our command, we are bound to lay these at the foundation in forming our judgment, and not to depart from them. But we are not at all justified in regarding all things which the Chronicles contain, beyond what is in these books, as unhistorical, or purely arbitrary changes or enlargements, but we must consider them as having been derived by the author of Chronicles from other old sources; for the most part from the same which were used for the Books of Samuel, and especially for those of Kings."³

We have no good reason for questioning the fidelity of the author of the Chronicles in any instance. He had before him the original

¹ In Keil's Introduction, vol. ii, pp. 81, 82.

² Ibid., pp. 105, 106.

³ Einleitung, p. 400.

documents for the history he narrates, nor can we see that he has not fairly used them. We see no indications that he has magnified the office of the priests. It was natural that the author, who was in all probability a priest (Ezra), should interweave in his history some account of his professional brethren. How could one, writing in the interests of the priests, use the following language: "For the Levites were more upright in heart to sanctify themselves than the priests" (2 Chron. xxix, 34)?

The author of Chronicles has been charged with hatred towards the kingdom of Israel. But this nowhere appears. When Pekah, king of the ten tribes, slew a hundred and twenty thousand men of Judah, and carried away two hundred thousand captives, women, sons, and daughters, then certain of the heads of the children of Ephraim refused to receive the captives, but took them, "and with the spoil clothed all that were naked among them, and arrayed them, and shod them, and gave them to eat and to drink, and anointed them, and carried all the feeble of them upon asses, and brought them to Jericho . . . to their brethren" (2 Chron. xxviii, 6-15). Could such a statement respecting the treatment which the captive Jews received from the ten tribes, especially from the Ephraimites, have sprung from hate?

The *numbers* in the Books of Chronicles sometimes bear the marks of exaggeration, and occasionally, also, are at variance with those in Samuel and Kings. In other instances, however, the numbers in Chronicles are the smaller.

The book has, doubtless, suffered greatly from the errors of transcribers, as there is always a great liability to mistake in copying numbers; and, when the error is once committed, it is continued in each copy, as there is no check upon numbers. An error in the spelling of a word is corrected from a previous knowledge of its orthography. A mistake in writing a word is often corrected from the context. If we were sure that in the most ancient manuscripts numerals were designated by letters—the opinion of some¹—the errors in numbers could in some cases be easily explained. For *beth* (ב), *two*, might be readily mistaken for *kaph* (כ), *twenty*; and *dalet* (ד), *four*, for *resh* (ר), *two hundred*.

There are about *thirty-five* or *forty* statements in the Chronicles

¹ Among others Dr. Davidson holds this view. But in Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, by Roediger, it is remarked: "This numeral use did not, according to the existing MSS., take place in the O. T. text, and is found first on coins of the Maccabees (middle of 2d cent. B. C.)." Prof. Conant's Trans., p. 17. But it must be observed that the oldest of the Hebrew MSS. are not more than a thousand years old, and furnish no proof respecting the custom a thousand years before.

respecting either the age of the kings of Judah when they began to reign, or the years of their respective reigns, and in every case, except that of Ahaziah and Jehoiachin, the numbers correspond with those in the Book of Kings. If the numbers in the primitive documents used by the author of Chronicles were exaggerated, he is not responsible for it. But it is not at all probable that the most excessive of these numbers were in the original text of Chronicles. For how is it possible that the author of Chronicles could have supposed that Asa's army was five hundred and eighty thousand (of Judah and Benjamin) (2 Chron. xiv, 8), and that of Jehoshaphat, thirty or forty years later, one million one hundred and sixty thousand, and that forty or fifty years afterwards, when Amaziah numbered the forces, the whole number of warriors in Judah and Benjamin was three hundred thousand, and then shortly afterwards three hundred and seven thousand five hundred, when there was no cause to make the increase or diminution? We cannot attribute such stupidity as this to the author. A corruption of the original text in the excessive numbers is the most reasonable explanation.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE BOOK OF EZRA.

THIS book is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Chaldee. The Chaldee portions are chaps. iv, 8-vi, 18; vii, 12-26; this last part being the decree of Artaxerxes in favour of Ezra. The book is so named on account of Ezra's being the principal character in it, and perhaps also from his being its reputed author. It is separated from the Book of Nehemiah not only in the modern editions of the Hebrew Bible, but also in the Septuagint, the Peshito-Syriac, and the Vulgate.¹ In the time of Origen² and Jerome,³ Ezra and Nehemiah formed one book. Although both Ezra and Nehemiah treat of the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, there is no good reason for uniting them together as if they were the product of the same author, for Nehemiah is naturally separated from Ezra by the very language with which it begins: "The words of Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah." The second chapter of Ezra contains

¹ In the Vulgate Nehemiah is also called the Second Book of Ezra.

² In Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., book vi, chap. 25.

³ In preface to Samuel and Kings, Jerome, however, states that Ezra was divided into two books [Ezra and Nehemiah] among the Greeks and Latins.

a long list (seventy verses) of those who went up with Zerubbabel from Babylon to Jerusalem, and a statement of their beasts of burden and the contributions made for the building of the temple. This list is given with but little variation in Nehemiah vii, 6-70. If Ezra and Nehemiah were the work of a single author, or of a later editor, who compiled the whole from existing documents (Ezra-Nehemiah), what could have induced him to give this long list *twice*, and that, too, with *variations*?

The Book of Ezra naturally divides itself into *two* parts. The first contains an account of those who went up to Jerusalem from Babylon with Zerubbabel, in the beginning of Cyrus's reign, and the rebuilding and the dedication of the house of God (chaps. i-vi). The second division gives an account of the going up to Jerusalem of Ezra and his companions in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, and their acts after their arrival (chaps. vii-x).

THE UNITY OF THE BOOK AND ITS AUTHOR.

Skeptical critics, who, as far as possible, resolve the books of the Old Testament into separate and independent documents, apply the dissecting knife to Ezra. Thus Schrader attributes to Ezra that portion of the book beginning with chap. vii, 27, and ending with chap. ix, 15, in which Ezra speaks in the first person; to Ezra he also attributes the Chaldee document (chap. vii, 12-26). But chaps. vii, 1-11; x, in which the third person is used, he thinks, did not, in their present form, proceed from Ezra himself, but were composed upon the basis of Ezra's notes by a later writer who, he supposes, wrote the Book of Chronicles, and to whom he attributes also chaps. i, iii, iv, 1-7, 24; vi, 14, 16-18, 19-22.¹ Respecting chaps. vii-x Bleek² remarks: "The second part is in general, without doubt, composed by Ezra himself, who, for the most part, speaks of himself in the first person (chaps. vii, 27-ix). But even where he uses the third person, as in the entire tenth chapter, and in the beginning of this division (chap. vii, 1-11), it can in no way be inferred with any degree of certainty that Ezra himself did not write this part; but rather, as chapter tenth stands in close connexion with what precedes, there is the greatest probability that it was written by the same author. Likewise, it cannot be well supposed that Ezra began his narrative with chap. vii, 27, and it is also very probable that he would not have commenced it immediately with the letter of Artaxerxes (chap. vii, 12-26); rather, he would have prefixed to it an introduction, as we read in chap. vii, 1-10). Only it may be well supposed that it was retouched by a later

The objections of modern critics to the unity of Ezra considered.

¹ Einleitung, pp. 386, 388.

² Ibid., pp. 384, 385.

hand." Accordingly, he does not think the statement respecting Ezra, "he was a scribe *skilled* in the law of Moses," really proceeded from him, nor Ezra's genealogy (chap. vii, 1-5). But why Ezra could not say that he was *skilled* in the law of Moses, and write his own genealogy, is not easy to see.

We entirely agree with Bleek in the foregoing remarks, excepting what he says about the retouching of this part of Ezra. It is, indeed, utterly improbable that the book should have originally ended with chapter ninth, containing the prayer of Ezra for those who had taken strange wives, and should have given no account of the effect of that prayer—how that the Israelites assembled and solemnly pledged themselves to put their strange wives away.

Since chaps. vii-x must be conceded to have been written by Ezra, it remains to consider the first part (chaps. i-vi). As Ezra did not go up to Jerusalem till the seventh year of Artaxerxes (about B. C. 458), he had no share in the transactions recorded in the first part of the book, ending with the dedication of the temple in the sixth year of Darius (B. C. 515), and the celebration of the passover soon after (chap. vi, 15-22). Now, first of all, it must be observed that the beginning of the second part of Ezra, opening with these words, "Now, after these things, in the reign of Artaxerxes," naturally refers to a preceding part. As he wrote an account of the second company of exiles who returned to Jerusalem, it was quite natural that he should write a sketch of the preceding company that returned thither. When Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem he found a list of those who first went up to the city, and incorporated it into his book (Neh. vii, 5-73); this same list is found in Ezra ii. Doubtless there was also a list of the vessels and other articles to be used in the temple. There also existed the decree of Cyrus in favour of the Jews, the letter of their enemies to Artaxerxes, and his command to cease building the temple, and the decree of Darius for its rebuilding. These documents furnished Ezra with material for the first part of his history. There may have been other written memorials; besides, Ezra could have learned some things from old men who, in their youth, had been eye-witnesses of the transactions described. That the existing documents and memorials would be combined into an historical form in the time of Ezra, rather than a hundred years later—if, indeed, they had any separate existence that late—is very probable. The history in the first part of Ezra is consecutive, and well connected with the second part.

But if Ezra did not write the first part of the book—more than one half of it—why should a later writer have composed it and prefixed it to Ezra's writing, and not rather have called it Zerubbabel, or by

some other name? It could not be on account of its containing but six chapters, since some of the minor prophets contain but two or three chapters, and one of them has but a single chapter. Bleek himself acknowledges "that the narrative has an altogether good connexion and natural course, from the proclamation of Cyrus to the exiles to return to their home, to the impediments which the adversaries of the Jews threw in the way of the rebuilding of the temple"—that is, from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspis. It is in the fourth chapter that Bleek finds difficulties which he cannot solve on the hypothesis that it was written by Ezra, or any one in that age. In chap. iv, 5-8, it is stated that the people of the land "hired counsellors against them (the Jews), to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius, king of Persia. And in the reign of Ahasuerus, in the beginning of his reign, wrote they unto him an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem. And in the days of Artaxerxes, wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of their companions, unto Artaxerxes, king of Persia. Rehum, the chancellor, and Shimshai, the scribe, wrote a letter against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes, the king." After this the letter to Artaxerxes is given, in which they speak against the building of the city of Jerusalem, and in reply Artaxerxes forbids the building, whereupon the enemies of the Jews caused them to cease from their work. It is added: "Then ceased the work of the house of God which is at Jerusalem. So it ceased unto the second year of Darius, king of Persia" (chap. iv, 24).

As there is no mention made of building the temple in the letter to Artaxerxes and in his reply, but only of the building and fortifying of Jerusalem, Bleek thinks that the writer has made a mistake, and referred difficulties in the way of the rebuilding of Jerusalem in the times of Xerxes (B. C. 485-465), and in those of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B. C. 465-425), to the building of the temple which had already been finished a considerable length of time.¹ In reply to this, it must be remarked, that in the decree of Artaxerxes (Ezra iv, 19-22) there is no mention of the building of the walls of Jerusalem; the language of the decree is as follows: "Give ye now commandment to these men [the Jews] to cease, and that this city be not builded, until another commandment shall be given from me." It is the *city* that he decrees shall not be rebuilt. How could Artaxerxes Longimanus have decreed that Jerusalem should not be rebuilt, when the temple had been rebuilt and dedicated *fifty years before he began to reign*? If the Jews had been allowed to rebuild their temple, of course it was implied that they could build dwelling-

¹ Einleitung, pp. 386, 387.

houses also, as a necessary accompaniment. It is not to be supposed that they lived in Jerusalem a half century or more without dwellings; for, according to 2 Kings xxv, 8, 9, when Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem, Nebuzar-adan, his captain, "*burnt all the houses of Jerusalem.*" The language of decrees is required to be definite. If the temple of Jerusalem and its houses had been rebuilt, the decree of Artaxerxes would have named *walls* specifically. The decree of Artaxerxes was in answer to the letter of the enemies of the Jews, who declared that the Jews are "building the rebellious and the bad city, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations." "We certify the king that, if this city be builded again, and the walls thereof set up," etc. This language implies that the Jews had but recently commenced the work, and it is not appropriate to the times of Artaxerxes Longimanus. The decree forbidding the building of the city, of course, forbade also the construction of the temple.

Keil¹ supposes that Ezra iv, 6-23 refers to the hostile attempts of the adversaries of the Jews under Xerxes and in the first years of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and that it respects "the building up of the city and its walls," agreeing in this respect with Bleek. But the context, in addition to what we have already said, refutes this view; for immediately after the decree of Artaxerxes it is added, that the adversaries of the Jews "made them to cease by force and power. Then ceased the work of the house of God, which is at Jerusalem. So it ceased unto the second year of the reign of Darius, king of Persia" (chap. iv, 23, 24). It is difficult to see how the decree of Artaxerxes, in virtue of which the work on the temple ceased, was issued more than fifty years after the beginning of the reign of Darius!

When Nehemiah obtained from Artaxerxes Longimanus, in the twentieth year of his reign, permission to go up to Jerusalem, and to take a letter from him to the keeper of the king's forest, that he might obtain timber for the wall of the city and for other purposes, no objection was made, nor allusion to any decree by this king forbidding the building of the wall, and that in a narrative giving many particulars (Neh. ii). Between Cyrus and Darius but two monarchs are known to history—Cambyses and Smerdis—who must be the Persian kings during whose reign the building of the temple was frustrated (Ezra iv, 5-7). The first of these is called Ahasuerus: on which name Gesenius remarks, in reference to the present passage: "The order of time would require it to be understood of Cambyses" (Heb. Lex.). In Daniel ix, 1, Darius the Mede is called

¹ Introduction, vol. ii, p. 102.

the son of Ahasuerus, where, according to Gesenius, Ahasuerus stands for Astyages. It is evident, then, that the name cannot be restricted to the famous Xerxes. According to Gesenius the name is the same as the modern Persian, *lion king*. Artaxerxes (chap. iv, 7, etc.) is defined by Gesenius to be in this chapter Pseudo-Smerdis, who not improbably took the name of Artaxerxes on his accession. According to Gesenius, Artaxerxes means *mighty king*, and this title could be easily applied to the kings of Persia, whom the Greeks called the great kings.

There is no difficulty, then, in attributing the whole book to Ezra, and there is nothing in it belonging to a later age. It is no objection to its unity that Ezra begins the sketch of himself in the third person (chap. vii, 1-11), and then in the first (chap. vii, 27-ix), and then changes to the third (chap. x). An examination of the nature of the matter in each case either justifies or requires this change. This change of person occurs in other biblical writers. In the Book of Daniel, the unity of which is acknowledged by the most skeptical, in the first part (chaps i-vii, 14) Daniel speaks in the third person of himself, in the rest of the book (chaps. vii, 15-xii) in the first person. We find Isaiah speaking of himself in the *first* person in chap. vi of his prophecy, but in the very next chapter he says: "Then said the Lord unto Isaiah." Amos, in the beginning of the 7th chapter of his prophecy speaks of himself in the first person, but he changes it to the third in the 12th and 14th verses: "Amaziah said unto Amos." . . . "Then answered Amos." Any difference of style in the book is easily explained from its being partly made up of decrees, where, of course, the phraseology is naturally different from Ezra's.

That the "kings of Persia" have this designation in Ezra is to Schrader¹ a proof that the book in its present form is not older than the time of Alexander the Great, as it presupposes that the Persian empire had already fallen. According to this Ezra would never himself have written, "Cyrus king of Persia," or "Darius king of Persia," but simply "Cyrus the king," "Darius the king." But the Book of Ezra uses both of these formulæ. Isaiah, in the beginning of his prophecy, speaks of having seen his vision "in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah." Micah tells us that the word of the Lord came to him "in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah." Had the kingdom of Judah already perished when they wrote? Would it be improper for a Canadian or an Irishman to write: Victoria, Queen of England? or even for a citizen of the United States to write: R. B. Hayes,

¹ In De Wette's *Einleitung*, pp. 391, 392.

President of the United States? The Jews had been accustomed to have kings of their own, and it was natural for them, while in subjection to foreign rulers, to name the country over which they ruled.

According to the Talmudists,¹ Ezra wrote the book that bears his name, and this is the judgment of such critics as Hävernick and Keil, and we have already seen that it has everything in its favour.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH.

THIS book, so called from Nehemiah's being its chief character as well as its author, stands separate from the Book of Ezra in the modern editions of the Hebrew Bible, in the Septuagint, in the Peshito-Syriac, and in the Vulgate.² Unlike Ezra, it is written wholly in Hebrew.

In the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, Nehemiah, his cupbearer, is deeply afflicted by the intelligence he has received of the distressed condition of his countrymen in Judah, and obtains permission from the king to visit Jerusalem and to rebuild it. After this the book gives an account of the building of the wall of Jerusalem under his administration; a list of those who went up to the holy city with Zerubbabel; an account of the solemn and important religious services held there, and of the covenant made by the people; a list of the chief men dwelling in Jerusalem, and of others dwelling in Judah and Benjamin. This is followed by a list of the priests and Levites who went up with Zerubbabel, and of the arrangements made at the dedication of the wall. The book closes with a statement respecting the correction of abuses by Nehemiah.

THE UNITY OF THE BOOK AND ITS AUTHOR.

The different parts of this book are well connected, and in the most of it the connexion is very close, so that there is no room for the supposition that it is the work of more than one author. In the first half (chaps. i-vii, 5) Nehemiah speaks of himself in the first person, to which must be added, as undoubtedly his, the list of those who went up to Jerusalem and Judah at first, which carries us to the end of chapter vii. In chap-

The parts of the book closely connected.

¹ First, Ueber den Kanon, p. 116.

² In the Latin Vulgate it is called both *the Book of Nehemiah* and *Second Book of Ezra*.

ter viii Nehemiah retires, as it were, into the background, and Ezra the priest comes into view; his brethren, the Levites, take a prominent part in the religious services, and the following chapter (ix) is occupied with the prayer of certain Levites. In these two chapters the name of Nehemiah occurs but once, and then in the third person. There was no place for him in the performances. In the beginning of chapter x his name appears in the third person, first in the list of those who were sealed. But in this very chapter, standing in close connexion with what precedes, the first person plural is used in such a way as to identify the writer with them. Take as an example: "And we cast the lots among the priests," etc.; "And that we should bring the first fruits," etc. In chapter xi is an enumeration of those who dwelt in Jerusalem and in other cities, in which there is no place for the mention of Nehemiah, and accordingly his name is not found.

In the first part of chap. xii is a list of priests who went up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel. In the other portion the writer speaks of himself in the first person, and so he does in the concluding chapter. It is evident, then, that Nehemiah wrote at least three fourths of the book, and the middle of it is the only part (with the exception of a few verses) that is denied to be his. As the very beginning of the book asserts its author to be Nehemiah ("The words of Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah"), which is confirmed by his writing for the most part in the first person, none but the weightiest reasons should induce us to think that about one fourth of the whole is an interpolation, and that in the *middle*.

De Wette attributes to Nehemiah the first eight chapters. Schrader, then, taking up the subject, asserts that chaps. viii-x, 40, are an interpolation, made by the author of the Books of Chronicles upon the basis of contemporary notes; chap. xi, 3-36, Schrader thinks may have been written by Nehemiah—at least, that it belongs to his time; chap. xii, 1-26, he thinks cannot be Nehemiah's, but that it is quoted from annals referred to in verse 23; chap. xii, 27-42, he concedes to Nehemiah; chaps. xii, 43-xiii, 3, he supposes to have been written by the author of Chronicles. The remainder of the book (chap. xiii, 4-31) he attributes to Nehemiah.¹ This is, indeed, a fine specimen of critical dissection! Bleek regards Nehemiah as the author of the first seven chapters, and of the last three with the exception of chap. xii, 1-26, which, in its present form could not have been written by Nehemiah; he denies also chap. xii, 47, to be Nehemiah's. He supposes that originally the last three

¹ In De Wette's *Einleitung*, pp. 389, 390.

chapters were joined to the first seven—the work of Nehemiah—and that the three middle chapters were interpolated by a later hand.¹ Dr. Davidson's views are about the same² as those of Schrader.

Respecting the three chapters (viii, ix, x), which some deny to be Nehemiah's, it must first of all be observed that such an interpolation in the *middle* of a book is unnatural. A verse or two might be written on the margin, and afterwards incorporated into the text, but not whole chapters. Large additions may be made to an original work as a continuation. And, indeed, it is not likely that any one would take the liberty of interpolating so largely the work of their respected governor. But why should we suppose that the incidents recorded in the three middle chapters formed no part of the genuine narrative of Nehemiah? They stand in close connexion with what precedes. In chapter vii, 73, it is stated: "When the *seventh* month came, the children of Israel were in their cities." In the very first part of the next chapter (viii) Ezra reads the law of Moses to the assembled crowd in Jerusalem on "the first day of the *seventh* month." In the same chapter (viii, 14-18) it is stated that the Israelites dwelt "in booths in the feast of the *seventh* month," beginning on the fifteenth (Lev. xxiii, 39). And in the beginning of the next chapter (ix) it is stated that the Israelites held a fast on the twenty-fourth "day of this month" (the seventh), and the prayer offered on the occasion is given. The end of this prayer is closely connected with the following chapter (x). And in this chapter (x) the writer uses the first person plural in such a way as to show that he was a participator in the events. Now Nehemiah appears to have had a part in the transactions narrated (viii, 9; x, 1). The reading of the law of Moses before the assembled crowd of Israelites after the wall of Jerusalem had been rebuilt, and the grand celebration of the feast of tabernacles, the solemn fast, and the covenant which the people made to serve God (and Nehemiah appears among the covenanters), would not have been omitted by him in the circumstantial narrative of the events in the earliest part of his administration.

The minute particulars given in these three middle chapters (viii-x) show that they were written down by an eye-witness. Even Schrader admits that they were composed on the basis of notes made at the time. The long prayer (chap. ix, 5-38) offered by *eight* Levites on the solemn fast day was in all probability prepared for the great occasion—most likely written down and committed to memory. For, if it had been extemporaneous, how could *eight* Levites (verse 5) have

Objection to the authorship of Nehemiah considered.

The three chapters evidently written by an eye-witness.

¹ Einleitung, pp. 382-384.

² Introduction, vol. ii, pp. 137-150.

prayed it at once? In its original form it was incorporated by Nehemiah into his book, and thus has all the freshness and peculiarities of the *original* author, and it would be absurd to look into it for the style of Nehemiah. If it contained Nehemiah's peculiarities, that would be fatal to its claim of being thoroughly genuine.

Further, there are certain linguistic peculiarities found both in the middle section and in the undisputed part of the book. אֲדִירִים, *nobles*, occurs as "their nobles," both in chap. iii, 5, and in chap. x, 29; elsewhere but *ten* times in the Hebrew Bible, though the singular form is used fifteen times. The word occurs nowhere in Ezra. קָרְבָן, *a dedicatory gift*, occurs in this form in Nehemiah x, 35 and xiii, 31, in the phrase "an offering of wood," and nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. Now, this is certainly very remarkable, and seems of itself sufficient to establish the unity of authorship of these two parts of the book, and hence the unity of the whole book. מְנוּסָן, *appointed*, occurs in Neh. x, 35 and xiii, 31, and nowhere else, except Ezra x, 14.

Respecting chapter xii, 1-16 it is to be observed that the incorporation of such a list into the book by Nehemiah is altogether appropriate, as its object was to give the names The list in chapter xii. of the Levites who participated in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, of which we have an account in chapter xii, 27-47. Lists are found in other parts of his work. In chapter vii, 5 Nehemiah speaks of finding "a register of the genealogy of them which came up at the first," which he gives (chap. vii, 6-73). In chap. xii, 11 it is stated that "Joiada begat Jonathan, and Jonathan begat Jaddua." It has been alleged that this Jaddua is the same as the high priest Jaddus, mentioned by Josephus (*Antiq.*, xi, 8, 4, 5) as a contemporary with Alexander the Great (B. C. 332). Jaddus is the fifth in descent from Joshua (Neh. xii, 10, 11), who went up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 2; Neh. xii, 1) B. C. 536. The Jaddus in Nehemiah might have lived as early as B. C. 400. In Nehemiah xiii, 28, mention is made of a son of Joiada, who had married a daughter of Sanballat. He, accordingly, was a brother of Jonathan, the father of Jaddua, who might have been mentioned by Nehemiah, and might have been erroneously made, by Josephus, a contemporary of Alexander the Great. But it is best to regard the passage that speaks of Jaddua as an interpolation—his name at least. Jaddua is also mentioned in chapter xii, 22; and it is stated that the priests were recorded "to the reign of Darius the Persian," that is, either Darius Nothus (B. C. 425-404) or Codomannus (B. C. 336-330).

It is not improbable that this passage is an interpolation, written at first on the margin, and afterwards incorporated into the text

Those who can think that whole chapters were at a late period inserted in the book should have no difficulty in believing that a few verses were added to the original text, giving some facts belonging to a later age. In chapter xii, 26 mention is made of "the days of Nehemiah . . . and Ezra," and in verse 47 of the days of Zerubbabel and Nehemiah. But these words could have been written by Nehemiah after he had retired from the governorship if not before, as they refer to his *political* life. When we find nearly the whole of a work bearing internal evidence of having been written in a certain age by a certain author, and at the same time discover a few passages belonging to a later age, we, without hesitancy, consider them to be interpolations.

The Book of Nehemiah bears every mark of having been written by one who lived in the very midst of the events, which are described with a particularity and vividness rarely found.

CHARACTER OF THE HISTORY IN BOOKS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

The historical character of these books is above all suspicion. According to Ezra vi, 15, the house of God in Jerusalem was finished in the *sixth* year of the reign of Darius. This corresponds well with what we find in Zechariah and Haggai; for, according to the former, the foundations of the temple were already laid in the second year of Darius' reign, but the edifice was not yet finished (chapter iv, 9), though considerable progress had been made at that time (Haggai ii, 3). Ezra, and the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, his contemporaries, confirm each other in other matters respecting Jewish affairs in their age. Nehemiah is praised by Jesus the son of Sirach (not later than about B. C. 200) for rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem and its houses (chap. xlix, 13).

CHAPTER XXXIX.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

THIS book takes its name from the Jewish maid called originally הַרְחָה, *Hadhassah*, but *Esther*¹ after she became the wife of Ahasuerus (chap. ii, 7), as she is the principal character in the book.

¹ Esther is the same as the Persian *sitarch* (star of good fortune); Zend., *stara*; Greek, *ἀστὴρ*; Latin, *aster*; English, *star*. In Syriac, the star Venus. "This name, therefore, was particularly appropriate to the character and circumstances of Esther."—Gesenius, Heb. Lex.

The book relates that Ahasuerus, who reigned from India to Ethiopia, made a great feast in Shushan, the palace, and that when he was merry with wine he ordered the queen Vashti to be brought in, that he might show her beauty to his guests. Vashti, refusing to comply with his request, is deposed from being queen, and Esther (a Jewess, the cousin and adopted daughter of Mordecai) is chosen in her stead. Haman, the king's prime minister, taking umbrage at the want of respect shown him by Mordecai, obtains the king's decree for the slaughter of all the Jews in the kingdom. Esther obtains a counter decree. Mordecai is advanced to the highest place of honour, and Haman is hung. The Jews slaughter their enemies, and introduce the feast of Purim in commemoration of their deliverance. The book closes with a description of the greatness of Ahasuerus.

CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY.

Serious doubts have been expressed, at different times, by scholars of the credibility of the history contained in this book. Among these may be named Semler, Oeder, Corrodi, Michaelis, Bertholdt, De Wette, Gramberg, Vatke, Ewald, Bleek, and Davidson. It has been defended by Eichhorn (not fully, however), Jahn, Rosenmüller, Baumgarten, Hävernicks, Keil, and others. The modern Jews hold the book in high esteem, and Maimonides expresses the opinion that in the days of the Messiah the prophets and the Hagiographa will be done away, with the exception of the Book of Esther, which is as enduring as the Torah and the oral law. The Jerusalem Talmud says that eighty-five elders, among whom more than thirty were prophets, ridiculed the introduction of the Purim festival, through Esther and Mordecai, as an innovation against the law.¹ Julius Fürst² shows that objections were made at an early period, according to the Talmud, to inserting the Book of Esther in the Canon. It appears, therefore, that the book did not stand very high with the ancient Jews. But we are not aware that they ever called in question the credibility of its history.

The book is not found in the catalogue of Melito,³ bishop of Sardis, in the second half of the second century. It is found in the catalogue of Origen,⁴ and in that of Jerome,⁵ though omitted in a few of the catalogues of the earlier centuries. In modern times, Martin Luther⁶ especially expressed his

Not found in all catalogues of the Old Testament Canon.

¹ Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 405.

² In Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, book iv, 26.

³ Preface to Books of Samuel and Kings.

⁴ *Ueber den Kanon*, pp. 106, 107.

⁵ *Ibid.*, book iv, p. 25.

⁶ In Bleek's *Einleitung*, p. 406.

dislike of the Book of Esther, declaring that he wished that neither she nor her book had ever existed. Josephus,¹ in his Antiquities, gives a very full account of Esther's history, drawn mainly from our present book, and he remarks that "all the Jews who are in the world keep these days (14th and 15th Adar) as festive, and send gifts to each other." The festival is also referred to in 2 Maccabees xv, 36, as "the day of Mordecai."

This book, in its Greek version, has additions and interpolations. Mordecai's dream is prefixed to it; at the end twenty lines are added. In the third chapter is inserted the decree of Ahasuerus, and additional matter in chapters iv, v, and viii. The additions to the Hebrew text are added at the end of the book in the Vulgate. It is evident that they formed no part of it in the original Hebrew; for the Peshito-Syriac version, made from the Hebrew in the second century of the Christian era, has none of them.

It is remarkable that the name of God nowhere occurs in the book, although there were several occasions on which it might have been used. Mention is made of fasting The name of God nowhere in Esther. (chap. iv, 3, 16), and the sleeplessness of the king, which leads him to have the records searched, and thus Mordecai is raised to power (chap. vi, 1-11). The writer must have recognized the providence of God in this. But why did he refrain from using God's name? Riehm supposes that it was intentionally omitted, to guard against its profanation at the Purim feast, as the author intended the book to be read during those joyful festivities² (chap. ix, 22). This seems to us quite probable; at least, we know of no better reason for the omission.

Various opinions have been held respecting the Ahasuerus of this book. The Septuagint and Josephus suppose him to be Ahasuerus the Xerxes probably of profane history. Artaxerxes, but the almost universal opinion among the moderns is that Xerxes is intended. Accordingly, the question arises whether the events related in Esther harmonize with the known history of Xerxes.

In the *second* year of his reign Xerxes subdued the Egyptians who had revolted, and in the *fifth* year of his reign he started on his expedition for the conquest of Greece, from which he returned within the year. In Esther i, 3, 4, we find that Ahasuerus (Xerxes) made a feast in the *third* year of his reign, that is, soon after his return from Egypt, and before he started for Greece. In the *tenth* month of the *seventh* year of his reign Esther is taken in to Ahasuerus in his house royal (chap. ii, 16), that is, after his return from Greece. Here there is nothing inconsistent with the history of Xerxes. It is

¹ Chap. xi, 6, 1-13.

² In Bleek's Einleitung, p. 407.

not surprising that the author of the book passes over events which had no necessary connexion with his subject. According to Herodotus, (vii, 8), after Xerxes had subdued Egypt, in the second year of his reign, he gathered together the Persian nobles, to consult them about the expedition into Greece. This must have been in the *third* year, and it explains the feast which lasted one hundred and eighty days (chap. i, 4).

A difficulty meets us at the very threshold respecting the wives of Xerxes. According to Herodotus (vii, 61; ix, 109) Amestris was the wife of Xerxes, and from what he says in vii, 114 she evidently outlived him. It is possible that this may be Vashti, the deposed queen, whose place Esther took; or Vashti may have held the position of a "secondary wife," or, at a later period, may have been restored to the favour of Xerxes. We know too little about the private relations of Xerxes to pronounce any positive judgment upon the subject.

In giving the genealogy of Mordecai it is said that he was "the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, a Benjamite, who had been carried away from Jerusalem with the captivity which had been carried away with Jechoniah, king of Judah, whom Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had carried away" (chap. ii, 5, 6). It is probable that Kish (from whom Mordecai was the fourth in descent) was carried away captive from Judah by Nebuchadnezzar about a hundred years before the reign of Xerxes, and for this reason the author traces back the genealogy of Mordecai no farther than to him. Certainly there is no necessity of inferring from the passage that Mordecai himself was carried away in this captivity.

Bleek's first objection to the credibility of the history is the impossibility of supposing that a Persian despot, even if induced through a favourite to extirpate all the Jews, would publish the decree everywhere twelve months beforehand, and not merely secretly for the governors, but for the people themselves. But may it not have been Haman's intention, by giving notice so long beforehand of the intended slaughter, that the Jews should abandon their property and fly for their lives? That this is not stated in the account, which is very circumstantial, is no ground of objection, as the motives of actors in the world's history are generally concealed. Even if the author of the Book of Esther knew the real motive of Haman, which is not probable, yet he might have omitted to state it. There is no good reason for supposing that the edict against the Jews applied to those in Judea, for they are spoken of as "scattered abroad and dispersed among the people" (chap. iii, 8).

Bleek's objections to the credibility of Esther.

Also the circumstance that the king should not revoke the bloody edict, but give the Jews liberty to defend themselves, and that this could have resulted in the slaughter of seventy-five thousand men, subjects of the king, Bleek regards as incredible. Unnatural, too, he thinks it to be that the king should, to gratify Esther, issue another edict allowing the Jews to continue the slaughter of their enemies another day in Shushan. But are the facts of history to be determined by supposed probabilities? Are there not various acts of Xerxes in his expedition into Greece which are strange, and, to many persons, utterly incredible? How many both in ancient and in modern times have disbelieved and ridiculed the story that he cut a canal through the peninsula of Acte to avoid taking his fleet around Mount Athos?¹ How many improbabilities crowd into the history of Napoleon? How strange this simple fact, that the *king of Sweden was a Frenchman!* (Bernadotte). In respect to massacres, we have a remarkable (and infamous) example in the massacre of about sixty thousand Protestants in France on the night of St. Bartholomew.

Bleek also thinks it hard to believe that *all* Shushan should at one time (chap. iii, 15), through Haman's edict, be thrown into so much fear, and at another should have rejoiced (chap. iii, 15) on account of Mordecai's. But Bleek misrepresents the passage, for it is not said "*all* Shushan" in either place, but simply "Shushan." He also thinks it improbable that the king should have issued a decree that every man should rule in his own house; and difficult and obscure that Esther, as a royal spouse, should so long conceal her origin from the court, the king, and Haman himself, as represented in the history. But in matters of this kind we have no means of determining the limits of possibility—hardly those of probability.

The Book of Esther everywhere abounds with numerous particulars, dates, and names of persons, and there is but one possible conclusion—*it is genuine contemporary history, or it is a fabrication.* But it is difficult for us to suppose that the book, considering the intimate acquaintance it shows with Persian affairs, could have been fabricated after the fall of the Persian empire (B. C. 330). Respecting its knowledge of Persian affairs, Bleek remarks: "For its historical character the conspicuity of many special traits seems to speak, especially the mentioning of many single individuals otherwise unknown, the seven eunuchs, the seven highest officers of Xerxes, the ten sons of Haman. The customs and institutions at the Persian court, in part at least, also appear to be faithfully and vividly portrayed."²

¹ There can be no reasonable doubt about the truth of this. Even Grote believes it.

² Einleitung, p. 408.

But on the supposition that Esther was written during the Persian period, when the supposed events were recent, it is difficult to see how the book could have imposed upon any considerable number of Jews.

The strong proof of the historical character of Esther is furnished in the universal observance of the festival of Purim (פּוּרִים, *lot*) by the Jews (in accordance with its institution in this book), and so named from the casting of lots by Haman (chaps. iii, 7; ix, 24). We have already seen that Josephus speaks of the festival as kept by all the Jews in the world, and it is still kept by them in commemoration of their deliverance, just as we keep the Fourth of July in commemoration of the declaration of our national independence.

The festival of Purim an attestation of the truth of Esther.

If the book is not based on a real historical fact—the remarkable deliverance of the Jews in the reign of Ahasuerus—how was it possible for its author to make the Jews believe that such a deliverance had been wrought for them, and that the feast of Purim was instituted at the time, and that they had kept it up to the period at which the book was written?

Kamphausen¹ refers with approbation to the opinion of Nöldeke, that the Book of Esther is a skilful romance, written to establish and recommend to the Jews the celebration of the Purim festival, which originally was a purely *Persian* feast. Fürst seems inclined to this view, for he says: "The festival may have been originally a spring feast, which was borrowed from Persia" (Heb. Lex.). Truly a strange notion, that the Hebrews, having so many festivals of their own, should borrow one from the heathen who had made them captives, and that they should hold it near the time of the passover! Stranger still that the book which gave such a perverse account of the origin of the festival should have made the whole Jewish people believe that they were keeping Purim in commemoration of a great national deliverance, when, in fact, they were doing nothing more than observing a heathen feast! To believe that the Jews were thus deceived is more difficult than to believe the history in the book.

Bleek thinks it not improbable that some historical fact lies at the basis of the book, though it is uncertain what it is.²

THE DATE AND AUTHOR OF THE BOOK.

It is very probable that the book was written by a Jew at Susa during the Persian dominion. The Persian and Sanskrit words in it would indicate its Persian origin, and

Probably written at Susa.

¹ In Bleek's *Einleitung*, p. 407.

² *Ibid.*, p. 410.

the minute particulars given in the history show the proximity of the writer to the events.¹

According to the Talmud,² the men of the Great Council wrote out (edited) the Book of Esther. Aben-Ezra and most of the rabbies attribute it to Mordecai, in which belief many Christian theologians follow them. But we have no probable proof of this, though it is not to be altogether rejected.

CHARACTER OF THE BOOK.

Some Christian scholars, among whom is Bleek, take exception to Esther on account of the spirit of revenge found in it. But its admission into the canon was not based on its containing divine revelation, or wholesome doctrine, or examples for our imitation, but because it contains the history of a most remarkable deliverance wrought out by Providence in behalf of Israel.



CHAPTER XL.

THE POETICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE poetical books include Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and The Lamentations of Jeremiah, although portions of others are poetical. But before discussing these books, it is proper for us to consider Hebrew poetry.

THE POETRY OF THE HEBREWS.

The poetical element is deeply imbedded in the nature of man, and exhibits itself in all stages of intellectual development, among the barbarous as well as the most highly cultivated. Poetry is the offspring of a vivid imagination and of deep emotion, and is closely allied to eloquence. It is not surprising, then, that some of the sacred writers, under the mighty influence of the divine Spirit, pour forth the sublime doctrines of theology, the practical precepts of religion, and their joys and their sorrows, in the form of poetry; or that the prophets, when the fall of empires and the glory of the Messiah's kingdom were revealed to them in vision, should use in their descriptions the loftiest poetical language.

¹ Schrader refers the book to the Greek period, and this seems to be the view of Bleek.

² Baba Bat Furst, p 100.

The poetry of the Hebrews is thus of a peculiar and sacred character, and may be called *epic*, when it narrates the dealings of God with his people, of which Psalm lxxviii is an example; or *lyric*, when it expresses in song the religious experience of the writer, which is the character of most of the Psalms; or *didactic*, when it inculcates the duties of life, as the Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes; or *dramatic*, as it presents itself to us in the Book of Job; or *elegiac*, as in the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

There is no metre, and rarely is there rhyme, in Hebrew poetry, but "it is distinguished by a certain rhythmical adjustment and distribution of the periods and single sentences, and also by many peculiarities of idiom, form, and meaning of words, grammatical constructions and inflections, which are not usual in prose. This poetic diction is found not only in the so-called poetic books of the Old Testament, but also in single inserted sections in the historical books, and partly also in the prophetic writings; nevertheless, in the different books and sections in various degree, and with a gradual transition into prose, so that a very sharp distinction cannot be well made between poetry and prose."¹

Characteristics
of Hebrew po-
etry.

The *rhythm* of Hebrew poetry consists in a certain harmonious relation of the parts or members of the single verses to each other, called the parallelism of members. This parallelism of members is divided by Bishop Lowth into the *synonymous*, the *antithetical*, and the *synthetical*. The synonymous consists in repeating the thought of the first member in the second, or even in several following members. Of this kind the simplest consists of two members, of which the following are examples:—

Parallelism in
Hebrew poetry.

"How he had wrought his signs in Egypt,
And his wonders in the field of Zoan."

"He gave up their cattle also to the hail,
And their flocks to hot thunderbolts."

"Seek ye Jehovah while he may be found,
Call ye upon him while he is near."

The first two illustrations are taken from Psalm lxxviii, which is composed almost entirely of similar members; the third is taken from Isaiah lv, 6.

The second kind of parallelism is the *antithetic*, in which the second member stands in contrast with the first. This kind of parallelism

¹ Bleek, Einleitung, p. 81.

abounds in the Proverbs, of which the following are examples from ch. x, 2, 7 :—

“ Treasures of wickedness profit nothing,
But righteousness delivereth from death.”

“ The memory of the just is blessedness,
But the name of the wicked shall rot.”

The third kind of parallelism is the *synthetic*, which consists of several, and sometimes of many, members, closely connected together, and illustrating one subject. Of this kind the following is an example :—

“ I have been young, and now am old ;
Yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken,
Nor his seed begging bread.
Every day he is merciful, and lendeth ;
And his seed is blessed.”—Psalm xxxvii, 25, 26.

In the first of these lines there is an antithesis between the past and present, while in the two following pairs of lines the second line is an enlargement of the thought in the first, and may be called synonymous.

The description of a virtuous woman in Proverbs xxxi, 10–31 is an example of the synthetic parallelism, in which the members are, for the most part, synonymous or antithetic parallelisms.

It often happens in Hebrew poetry that a single thought is expressed in a single sentence, to which no other sentence, either synonymous or antithetical, corresponds ; this may be termed *simple rhythm* ; as—

“ I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of his wrath.”—Lam. iii, i.

What has been stated respecting Hebrew poetry has reference to its *logical* classification. But although Hebrew poetry has no prosody, yet the members of the stanzas sometimes have the same number of words, and form rhyme :—

Stanzas of the
same number
of words.

שְׁלוֹ הִרִיתִי וְרִפְרַפְתִּי
וְאָתָּו בְּעַרְפִּי וְרִפְצַפְצַנִּי

“ I was at ease, but he hath broken me asunder :
He hath also taken me by my neck, and shaken me to pieces.”—Job xvi, 12.

עָדָה וְצִלָּה שְׁמַעַן קוֹלִי
נָשִׂי לְמַדָּה הָאֲזַנָּה אֲמַרְתִּי
כִּי אִישׁ דָּרַגְתִּי לְפַעְעֵי
וְדָגְדָה לְתַבְרָתִי

“ Adah and Zillah, hear my voice ;
Ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech
For I have slain a man to my wounding,
And a young man to my hurt.”—Gen. iv, 23.

הַיְהִי־הֶסֶם עֲלֵי־דָשָׁא
אִם רֹגְעָה־שׁוֹר עַל־בְּלִילּוֹ

“Doth the wild ass bray over his grass?
Or loweth the ox over his fodder?”—Job vi, 5.

Sometimes the two poetic members are of unequal length, as :— Stanzas of unequal length.

תְּבִיר עֲצָבִים אֶפְרַיִם
הַיָּחִיד־לּוֹ

“Ephraim is joined to idols:
Let him alone.”—Hosea iv, 17.

At other times the harmony is expressed by four members of unequal length :—

כִּי כָלוּ בְּיָגוֹן יָמַי
וּשְׁנוֹתַי בְּאַנְחָה
כִּשְׁל בְּעֹנֵי כַחֲרִי
וְעֲצָמַי עֲשִׂישׁוּ

“For my life is spent with grief,
And my years with sighing:
My strength faileth because of mine iniquity,
And my bones are consumed.”—Psalm xxxi, 10.

In Habakkuk iii, 17, we have a stanza of six members :—

“Although the fig tree shall not blossom,
Neither shall fruit be in the vines;
The labour of the olive shall fail,
And the fields shall yield no meat;
The flock shall be cut off from the fold,
And there shall be no herd in the stalls.”

To this there are placed in antithesis, verses 18, 19 :—

“Yet I will rejoice in the Lord,
I will joy in the God of my salvation.
The Lord God is my strength,
And he will make my feet like hinds' feet,
And he will make me to walk upon mine high places.”

CHAPTER XLI.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

THIS book, so named from its hero, is one of the most remarkable in the canon, and has given rise to much controversy respecting its age, author, and object. It may be regarded as a *sacred drama*.

We have, first, *the prologue* (chap. i, ii); secondly, *the dialogue* (chaps. iii-xlii, 6); lastly, *the epilogue* (xlii, 7-17). The prologue

The work divides into prologue, dialogue, epilogue. contains a brief sketch of Job, its chief personage, who is represented as a pious man, living in the land of Uz, blessed with sons and daughters, and very rich. Satan, having obtained permission from God, destroys all Job's property, kills his children, and smites him with sore boils. The dialogues contain, first, the lamentation of Job over his calamities (chap. iii). After this, the discussion on Job's character and the divine government is conducted by him, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, in which Job's three friends argue that his disasters are divine judgments for his sins, while he vindicates himself, and maintains that the ways of Providence are inscrutable (chaps. iv-xxxi). This is followed by the speech of Elihu, who acts as mediator between Job and his friends (chaps. xxxii-xxxvii). The four following chapters (xxxviii-xli), with the exception of chap. xl, 3-5, contain the Almighty's description of his own power and works, and his expostulation with Job. In chap. xl, 3-5, and in chap. xlii, 1-6, Job humbles himself before God.

The *epilogue* contains God's reproof of Job's three friends, and his command to them to offer sacrifice for their folly, because they had not spoken right, as Job had; also a statement of the great prosperity—far greater than he had at first—that Job enjoyed in his latter days.

INTEGRITY OF THE BOOK.

Objections have been made in modern times to the genuineness of certain parts of the book. Carpzov supposed that while all the discourses were written down by Job himself before the time of Moses, the *prologue* and *epilogue* were added by Samuel. They have been rejected by Stuhlman, Bernstein, Knobel, and some others; but their genuineness is almost universally conceded. The *prologue* is necessary for the understanding of the book, and without it Job's character and his

Modern objections.

peculiar afflictions would be unknown. Without the *epilogue* the book would be incomplete, as it contains a vindication of Job, and shows divine providence in bringing him safely through all his trials, and making his latter end more glorious than the beginning. The genuineness of both the *prologue* and the *epilogue* is conceded by Schrader,¹ Bleek,² and Davidson.³

Some critics⁴ have regarded chaps. xxvii, 11–xxviii, 28 as a later addition, but their genuineness is almost universally conceded by the most recent critics. The description of the hippopotamus and the crocodile (chaps. xl, 15–xli, 34) has been regarded by some critics⁵ as an interpolation, but its genuineness is conceded by Schrader⁶ and Bleek.⁷

The discourses of Elihu (chaps. xxxii–xxxvii) have been rejected as spurious by many critics. They are characterized by De Wette⁸ as “dull, tedious, artificial, and obscure in their contents and in the mode of their presentation.” He also says that “they interrupt the connexion between the discourses of Job and those of God, and darken the contrast in which they stand to each other; that they anticipate what the latter discourses contain, even making them superfluous, while they offer a solution of mysteries by reflection, which, according to the latter discourses, is to be found in intuitive, believing resignation.”

Elihu, it is true, is not mentioned among the friends of Job (chap. ii, 11); nor is he named at the end of the book where Job’s three friends are reprovèd and commanded by God to offer sacrifice (chap. xlii, 7–9). Job and the three friends are the principal personages. Elihu, being a young man, is silent, until Job and his friends have ended the discussion, when he speaks, reprovèd both parties. He acted, in fact, as mediator, and, accordingly, it was not necessary to consider at all what he said, when the decision is made at the end (chap. xlii, 7–9) concerning the discussion. That Elihu’s speeches are interposed between Job’s discourses and the Almighty’s answer does not in any degree imply their spuriousness. Everything depends upon the taste of the writer. We are not authorized to lay down rules in such matters, and demand that every genuine drama or poem shall square exactly with our gratuitous canons.

We can by no means agree with De Wette respecting the dullness of the speeches of Elihu. They have no little merit, though as a whole they have scarcely the strength of the other addresses. But this may be what the author intended.

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 549.

² Pp. 660, 661. Vol. ii, pp. 200–202.

⁴ Eichhorn and others.

⁶ Ibid.

De Wette—Schrader, p. 550.

⁷ Einleitung, p. 664.

⁸ De Wette—Schrader, pp. 546–547.

The objections to the genuineness of the discourses of Elihu.

Quality of Elihu’s discourse.

Why should a young, rash man speak with all the power and wisdom of mature years? Do all Shakspeare's characters speak with the same force and wisdom? Even if we grant that the speeches were to set forth great principles, there is no reason for supposing that all the interlocutors must speak with the same ability, whatever their years or wisdom might be.

The linguistic peculiarities of Elihu's discourses afford no decisive proof of having proceeded from another author than of the rest of the book.

That Elihu calls Job by name, which is not done by any of the other speakers, grows out of the nature of the case. For, as Elihu acted as mediator between Job and his friends, it was necessary for him to distinguish Job from them. We confess that we do not see how the discourses of Elihu disturb the harmony of the book. They do not break in as something foreign to the subject, and they have, as far as we can see, the same style as the rest. The interpolation of *six* chapters (about one seventh of the whole) in the body of such a work is extremely improbable, and such a view is not to be adopted except for the most cogent reasons, which in the present instance do not exist. The genuineness of the discourses of Elihu has been denied by Stuhlmann, Bernstein, De Wette, Eichhorn, Ewald, Hirzel, Knobel, Delitzsch, Schrader, Davidson, Bleek, and others. On the other hand, their genuineness has been defended by Jahn, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Stäudlin, Umbreit, Köster, Stickel, Herbst, Welte, Hävernich, Schlottmann, Keil, and others. Bunsen and Kamphausen have adopted the theory that these discourses were inserted by the author himself as an addition after finishing the original work.¹

THE CHARACTER AND DESIGN OF JOB.

Here the question arises, Are we to regard the whole history of Job as entirely fictitious, the creation of the imagination of the author of the work, or altogether true, or as having merely a substratum of truth on which the book is founded? The last supposition seems the only tenable one.

The assumption that the book throughout is a *real* history involves us in difficulties. The discourses, in their present form, are too elegant, studied, and poetical, ever to have been delivered *extempore*. In the account of Job's prosperity in his latter days (chap. xlii, 12-17) the number of his sons and daughters is the same that he had before his afflictions; while the number of his sheep, camels, oxen, and asses, is just double of

The Book of Job hardly a history.

¹In Bleek, p. 661.

what he had in the beginning. These numbers do not bear the stamp of being real history, but, on the contrary, appear to be artificial. Nor can we accept as literally true the account of Satan's presenting himself among the sons of God before Jehovah, and of his obtaining from him permission to bring upon the holy servant of God so many dreadful afflictions, to prove to Satan the sincerity of Job's piety. But even if these things had occurred, no man could have known them unless God had revealed them to him, which, under the circumstances, is very improbable.

But the hypothesis that Job never existed—which was the view of one of the rabbies in the Talmud, of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of Le Clerc¹—is to be at once rejected, for he is mentioned in Ezekiel (chapter xiv, 14): "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God." To refer in such language to a fictitious character, and associate him with men who had a real existence, is extremely unnatural. Besides, it is foreign to the character of the ancient Hebrews to invent fictitious personages, and was not common even among the Greeks.

It is impossible for us to say with certainty how much of the history is real; but we may assume as true that Job was a man of distinguished piety and virtue, an eminent citizen of the land of Uz, who met with heavy calamities and afflictions, from which he ultimately recovered. His friends, also, are most probably real personages. According to the tradition of the Jews Job belonged to the seven heathen prophets of primitive times, and among these were his three friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar. He is represented as a pious, generous man, and in many respects is said to have stood even higher than the patriarch Abraham.² Bleek³ regards the book as resting on an historical basis, and even Schrader⁴ thinks the matter of the book was derived from tradition. The materials furnished the writer, either by tradition or written memorials, were worked up into the present highly artistic and sublimely poetical form.

The *design* of the author in writing it nowhere appears, either in the prologue or epilogue, but must be inferred from a consideration of the whole. From the prologue of the book we learn that Job "was perfect and upright, and one that feared God and eschewed evil;" and in the epilogue it is stated "that the Lord turned the captivity of Job . . . : also the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before." But nowhere is there assigned any reason for the great

¹ Bleek, p. 654.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 81.

³ Einleitung, p. 655.

⁴ De Wette—Schrader, p. 552.

sufferings that God brought upon him. Yet the palpable inference is, that however much a good man may suffer, Providence brings him safely through his afflictions, and in the end makes him happier.

But it is also evident from the discourses that the author of Job intended to refute the idea that a man's sufferings are necessarily the result of his sins, and an indication of the Almighty's displeasure. At the same time he inculcates God's sovereignty, the inscrutability of his counsels, and the duty of implicit faith in him, and resignation, without questioning or murmuring, to his providence. The author does not deny that men are ever punished for their sins in this world. This is evident from the language attributed to Job, in which, in several places, the doctrine of retribution *here* is clearly taught. See xxi, 17-20; xxvii, 13-23.

In the discussions in the book the question of retribution has reference to the present life only. The doctrine of the soul's immortality and future retribution is nowhere taught,¹ though it was probably held by the author.

THE DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK AND ITS AUTHOR.

Respecting the age in which the book was written, there has been a great diversity of opinion. Carpsov, Eichhorn, Jahn, Date of composition uncertain. Stuhlmann, and Bertholdt, supposed it was written before the time of Moses. The Talmud at one time asserts that it was written by Moses; at another, that it was composed by an Israelite, who returned to Palestine from the Babylonian captivity.² J. D. Michaelis and others attributed the book to Moses. It has been referred to the age of David or Solomon by Luther, Doederlein, Stäudlin, Rosenmüller, Welte, Hävernick, Schlottmann, and Keil. Others refer it to the seventh century before Christ, as De Wette, Schrader, Gesenius, Umbreit, Ewald, Stickel, and Davidson.

¹ The passage, Job xix, 26, as it stands in the English version, refers to a resurrection, but it is not supported by the Hebrew, which reads: "I know that my redeemer (*goel*) liveth, and at last he shall stand on the earth; and after these things have smitten my skin, shall this be; in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall behold for myself, and my eyes shall see, and not a stranger." Here Job expresses the conviction that God will vindicate him from all the charges of his friends, and he had just before expressed the wish that his words were written in a book (for future reference). This harmonizes with the close of the book, where God appears to Job and vindicates him, and Job then says, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee." The Septuagint, Peshito-Syriac, and Targum refer the passage to a temporal restoration, which seems demanded by the context.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 80.

No solid arguments can be found for either the pre-Mosaic or the Mosaic date. The language of Job clearly indicates a *post*-Mosaic age. The archaisms of the Pentateuch do not appear in it.

הוּא, masculine pronoun, *he*, which is found about two hundred times in the Pentateuch as a feminine, meaning

The language of Job post-Mosaic.

she, occurs but once, as a mistake,¹ for הִיא, the regular feminine. This regular feminine occurs but eleven times in the whole Pentateuch, but occurs *five* times in the Book of Job. אֵל, for אֱלֹהִים, *these*, found in the Pentateuch, does not occur in Job. The names of constellations and the mention of the Zodiac most probably belong to a post-Mosaic time.²

Nor is it at all probable that Moses would have written such a work, which seems to contradict one of the leading ideas of the Mosaic legislation, namely, that obedience to God is rewarded with temporal blessings, and that disobedience is followed by the judgments of heaven. Moses promised the Israelites that if they were obedient, God would put upon them none

Not probable that Moses is the author of Job.

of the diseases of Egypt: "For I am the Lord that healeth thee" (Exod. xv, 26). Besides this, Moses was too much employed with his own legislation to engage in such a task. Further, the artistic character of the poem seems clearly to indicate a date far later than Moses. And between the time of Moses and that of David no one would think of placing the authorship of such a book. We are thus brought to the conclusion that we cannot attribute the composition of Job to a period earlier than that of David, and few will refer it to the time of the Babylonian captivity, or later. Accordingly, we find that the supposed time of the composition fluctuates between the reign of David and the Captivity.

The Book of Job seems to have been well known to Ezekiel the prophet, and to his contemporaries, from the way in which he speaks of Job (xiv, 14, 20). It is probable that Jeremiah made use of the Book of Job. Compare Jer. xx, 14-18 with Job iii; Jer. xx, 7, 8 with Job xii, 4 and xix, 7; Lam. ii, 16 with Job xvi, 9, 10. There are also other passages that are similar in both books. In Isaiah, compare xix, 5 with Job xiv, 11; lix, 4 with Job xv, 35. In these passages there are close resemblances. We also find passages quite

¹ Job xxx: 11. The pronouns are transposed, הוּא, masculine, *he*, being put with a feminine הִיא, and הוּא, *she*, with a masculine noun. The Masorites have made the correction in the margin.

² כְּסִיל, *Chesil, Orion*; כִּימָה, *Kimah, Pleiades*: עֶרֶשׁ and עֶרֶשׁ, *Ash, Wagon, the Great Bear*; מַזְרָוֹת, *Mazzaroth, the Zodiac* (chaps. ix, 9; xxxviii, 31, 32). The first two constellations are found also in the prophet Amos (chap. v 8), and the last in 2 Kings xxiii, 5.

similar in Amos and in Job. But whether the prophets made use of this book, or the author of the book used their writings, cannot be certainly determined, unless we find independent proof of the priority of Job.

The most flourishing period of Hebrew poetry was the age of David and Solomon, and to the latter it seems most natural to refer this poem. This is confirmed by peculiarities of language common to the Proverbs of Solomon and Job. The verb *עלם*, *alas, to exult*, is found only in Job xx, 18; xxxix, 13, and in Proverbs vii, 18. The noun *תְּחַבְּלוֹת*, *guiding, steering*, occurs only in Proverbs (five times) and in Job xxxvii, 12. *אָרַךְ* is found in Prov. xvi, 26 as a verb, and in Job xxxiii, 7 as a noun. It is found nowhere else. *פֶּיַד*, *calamity*, occurs *three* times in Job, and once in Proverbs; nowhere else. *רָכַס בַּשַּׁעַר*, *to crush in the gate*, is found only in Job v, 4 (Hithpael), and in Proverbs xxii, 22 (Piel). *To drink iniquity like water* (Job xv, 16), *to drink scorning like water* (chapter xxxiv, 7), like *to drink violence* (Prov xxvi, 6), a phraseology which appears nowhere else. *אַבְדוֹן*, *destruction*, occurs *three* times in Job, once in Proverbs, and once in Psalm lxxxviii; nowhere else. *תְּיַשִּׁיחַ*, *deliverance, purpose*, occurs *six* times in Job, *four* times in Proverbs; elsewhere *once* in Isaiah, and *once* in Micah. There are some other points of affinity in the language of these books.

In Job xxii, 24; xxviii, 16, mention is made of the *gold of Ophir*. This reference is especially suitable to the age of Solomon (who brought gold from Ophir), but could be also used for two or three centuries after, as we find the same reference in Isaiah xiii, 12, and in Psalm xlv, 9, but would not likely occur before the time of David and Solomon. We may therefore conclude, with great probability, that Job was written in the time of Solomon; and the peaceful reign of that monarch afforded abundance of leisure for such a work.

Respecting the *author* of the book and his *native land*, it is certain that he was an Israelite, dwelling, most probably, in Southern Judea. There is not the slightest proof of its having been written in any other language originally, and afterwards translated into Hebrew.¹ The local allusions refer to a hilly country, a land of brooks that fail in dry weather, where ice and snow are occasionally seen; a tract through which the caravans from Tema and Sheba (Sabæans) passed, and were often disappointed in finding that the brooks had become dry (Job vi, 15-20).

¹ At the end of the Book of Job, in the Septuagint, it is said: "This is translated from the Syriac book." But this remark at such a late period is of little or no value

Reference is also made to the river Jordan (chap. xl, 23). The description of the behemoth (hippopotamus) and the crocodile (leviathan) (chaps. xl, 15-xli, 34) shows that the writer must have visited Egypt, and that these animals made upon him a deep impression, from the fact that they were strange to him.

Job himself, the hero of the book, lived in the land of Uz, which Gesenius locates "in the northern part of Arabia Deserta, between Idumea, Palestine, and the Euphrates, adjacent to Babylon and the Euphrates" (Heb. Lex.).

It is impossible to determine the age in which Job himself lived. The absence of all reference to the Mosaic legislation in the discussions does not prove that the author of the book placed him before the time of the Hebrew law-giver, since, though he lived after the Mosaic legislation, it would have been improper to represent him and his friends, who were without the pale of Israel, as discussing the principles of that legislation, or drawing illustrations from it. Had he lived many centuries before the author of the book but little would probably have been known of his history, and he would not have been considered of sufficient importance, or prominent enough in the public eye, to be the hero of the story. Accordingly, we think it most likely that he lived near the age of David, a short time before the author of the book. We attach no importance to the statement at the end of the book in the Septuagint, that his name was at first Jobab, the fifth in descent from Abraham.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

The Book of Job has been considered, in all ages of the Church, as one of the most sublime of the Bible, and is surpassed only by some of the grandest passages in Isaiah, and by the prayer of Habakkuk. Gibbon, speaking of Mohammed's composition of the Koran, remarks: "His loftiest strains must yield to the sublime simplicity of the Book of Job, composed in a remote age, in the same country, and in the same language."¹ It is evident that the utterances of Job's friends were often wrong, for God is represented as finally reproving them on account of their speeches, and even Job himself modifies, in some of his later words, what he had before said. And although he is commended at the close of the book for his teachings, yet God demands of him: "Who is this that hideth counsel (wisdom) by

¹ Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. v. p. 110. The passage is not quite correct respecting the language, as Job was written in Hebrew, and the Koran in Arabic.

words without knowledge?" Job replies: "Therefore I have uttered that I understood not."

The book has its value apart from its exalted poetical character, as illustrating the inscrutable providence of God, and the delivery of his people out of all their afflictions.

CHAPTER XLII.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.¹

THIS book contains one hundred and fifty psalms of a highly devotional character, and expressive of deep religious experience, suitable to all conditions of religious life, and without a parallel in the annals of religious literature. The whole collection is divided into *five* parts or books. The first includes Psalms i-xli; the second, Psalms xlii-lxxii; the third, Psalms lxxiii-lxxxix; the fourth, Psalms xc-cvi; the fifth, Psalms cvii-cl. At the end of each of these parts is found a doxology, which is also given in the Septuagint, of varying form, which was intended to mark a division, after the manner of the five Books of Moses. The doxology at the end of the first division is: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting, and to everlasting. Amen, and amen" (Psa. xli, 13).

Of these psalms the superscriptions attribute seventy-three to David; twelve have the superscription, לְאָסָף, *to* or *for Asaph*, where we are to understand that the preposition (לְ) indicates Asaph as the author, in the same way that psalms are designated as having been written by David (לְדָוִד). Eleven are attributed in the same way to the sons of Korah; one of them (Psalm lxxxviii), more specifically, to Heman the Ezrahite. One is ascribed to Moses, one to Ethan the Ezrahite, two to Solomon, and fifty are anonymous. The authors of our English version² have sometimes mistranslated the titles of the psalms.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE SUPERSCRPTIONS.

Many recent critics regard the superscriptions as possessing little or no authority, and they attribute them, not to the authors, but rather to the collectors of the psalms. It is not easy to determine, in every case, whether the super-

¹ The Hebrew title is תְּהִלִּים, *tehillim*, *hymns*, *psalms*. Septuagint, ψαλμοί, *songs sung to a stringed instrument*.

² The correct superscription is given in the margin when not given in the text.

scription was put there by the author of the psalm or not.¹ In examining the superscriptions contained in the Septuagint, we find that of the seventy-three psalms attributed to David in the Hebrew text, his name is omitted from five of them; and that his name is affixed to fourteen which are anonymous in the Hebrew text. Also, the name of Solomon is omitted from the superscription of Psalm cxxvii. With these exceptions, the same names stand in the Septuagint as are found in the Hebrew text.

When the Septuagint version was made, it is very evident that some of the superscriptions had already become obscure, as is clear from the manner in which they are translated; and this is a proof of the antiquity of the superscriptions.

Gesenius remarks on the word לְמַנְצֵחַ, *to the chief musician*, found in the superscription to fifty-three psalms: "This inscription is wholly wanting in all the psalms of a later age, composed after the destruction of the temple and its worship; and its significance was already lost in the time of the LXX." Accordingly, the superscriptions to the psalms in which this word occurs must have been affixed *before* the Babylonian captivity. In the superscription to Psalm lx, ascribed to David, it is stated that it was composed "when he strove with Aram-naharaim (Syria of the rivers), and with Aram-zobah, when Joab returned, and smote of Edom, in the Valley of Salt, twelve thousand." It is evident that this superscription was not taken from 2 Sam. viii, 13, for it is there said that David smote in the Valley of Salt *eighteen* thousand; nor was it taken from 1 Chron. xviii, 12, for there the number is the same as in the passage in Samuel. The conclusion is, that the superscription must have been affixed by David himself, or by some one soon after, who had information independent of the Books of Samuel.

In the superscription to the seventh Psalm it is stated that David sang it concerning the words of Cush the Benjamite. There is no mention in the history of David of any one of this name, so that the superscription must have been affixed when the affair that gave rise to the psalm was still recent.

If the superscriptions had been affixed from mere conjecture, it is probable that instead of fifty anonymous psalms, we would have none of that description. We might have expected that many of them would, in that case, have been assigned to Solomon, while, in fact, but two bear his name. One is ascribed to Moses, one to Heman, and one to Ethan, both Ezrahites.

The superscriptions not conjectural.

¹ Theodore of Mopsuestia († 429) led the way in the denial of the genuineness of these inscriptions.—Leontius of Byzantium, liber iii, Adversus Incorrupticolos et Nestor.

There is nothing in these psalms to lead any one to suppose that they must have been written by these authors, and the names must have been affixed, if not by the authors themselves, by some one, on historical grounds.¹

"It is not improbable," says Bleek, "that the Hebrew poets themselves, when they wrote and put into circulation their songs, sometimes designated them with their names or the occasion of their being written, as is altogether common among the Arabian poets, and was, at least, very often the case with the Hebrew prophets."²

The question then arises, Is there internal evidence that the supercriptions of some of these psalms are wrong? Bleek asserts that in some cases they *are evidently false*, of which he gives Psalms lix, cxii, and cxliv as examples. But it is not clear to us that David was not the author of these psalms. On the contrary, Psalm cxliv contains internal evidence of having been written by David, as it is said in verse 10, "Who delivereth David his servant from the hurtful sword;" and there is nothing in the psalm that conflicts with this view. Respecting Psalm lix, it is stated that it was written "when Saul sent, and they watched the house to kill him." This psalm is in every respect suitable to the occasion with the exception of one word in the English version, "the *heathen*." The word עֲוֹלָם, *goyim*, rendered "heathen," has the accessory idea of *enemies, oppressors*. It is not strange that David, when speaking of his enemies among the Israelites, should speak also of wicked men in general. We would have no good reason to expect that he would name Saul, whom he always treated mercifully. Nor do we see anything in Psalm cxii that might not have been written by David. Bleek also rejects, as not belonging to David, Psalms xiv, liii, cviii, and cxxiv. Of these, two contain the same passage, which might indicate their composition during the Babylonian captivity, but may have no reference to that event: "O that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion! when the Lord bringeth back the captivity of his people, Jacob shall rejoice and Israel shall be glad" (Psalm xiv, 7; liii, 6). As both of these psalms contain in their superscriptions the expression "To the chief musician," they must have been written while the temple was still standing; for Gesenius, with great propriety, refers the psalms with this superscription to the period preceding the captivity. The contents of the two psalms have no reference to the Babylonian captivity, but to the general wickedness of men, and

¹ It is not likely that Moses himself would have added to his name "man of God;" this is not the usage in the Pentateuch.

² Page 617.

the Psalmist prays for the salvation, the conversion, of the people, which was to come forth from Mount Zion, where Jehovah especially dwelt in the tabernacle of Israel. The Psalmist uses Jacob and Israel as synonymous, which he would not probably have done had the nation already been divided into the kingdoms of Judah and Israel. *To bring back the captivity* (שׁוּב שְׁבוּיָהוּ) does not always imply *the returning of a people to their native country*, for it is said, "the Lord turned the captivity of Job" (xlii, 10). Also in Hosea vi, 11, the phrase means *to restore to prosperity and righteousness*: "O Judah, he hath set a harvest for thee, when I return the captivity of my people;" and in Ezekiel xvi, 53, etc.

Bleek thinks that the following psalms, though attributed to David in the superscriptions, were probably not written by him: iv, xxiii, xxv, xxvi, xxviii, xxix, xxxi, xxxiv, xxxvii, xl, David's authorship of certain psalms denied by Bleek. lviii, lix, lxxxvi, ciii, cxxxi, cxxxiii, cxxxix, cxliii, and cxlv. But there is no sufficient reason for denying these psalms to be David's. De Wette acknowledges as undoubtedly belonging to David, Psalms vi, viii, xv, xviii, xxiii, xxix, xxx, xxxii, ci. Schrader questions the Davidic authorship of Psalm xxiii, but he adds to De Wette's list, iii, vii, xi. Hitzig attributes to David fourteen psalms,¹ and Ewald eleven.² No better proof can be furnished of the arbitrary character of some of the German criticisms than the fact that two of the psalms which Ewald attributes to David are referred by Hitzig to the times of the Maccabees, about nine hundred years later than David.

Dr. Davidson, while he rejects a part of the superscriptions to the psalms, nevertheless remarks: "The best method of proceeding is to assume the alleged Davidic authority till internal evidence proves the contrary."³

In Psalm li, after an earnest prayer for forgiveness of individual sin, David is represented as praying: "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem" (verse 18). It is not necessary to suppose that this language is a proof that the prayer was uttered about the time of the Babylonian captivity. For the first part of the language was suitable in the age of David, and the last may have been applicable also, for Jerusalem may not have been completely walled in at this period of David's reign; or the language may be figurative, imploring a return of prosperity. The last verse of the psalm speaks of the sacrifices in which God would then delight.

¹ Psalms iii, iv, vii-xiii, xv-xix.

² Psalms iii, iv, vii, viii, xi, xviii, xix, xxiv, xxxii, ci, cx; and xv, xxix he attributes to the time of David.

³ Vol. ii, p. 255.

Bleek, while acknowledging that David is the author of this psalm, thinks that the last two verses were added at the time of the Babylonian captivity.¹ If they necessarily refer to that period, we would greatly prefer this view to the rejection of the psalm as David's.

In 2 Sam. xxii there is given a psalm as David's which is the same as Psalm xviii, and has substantially the same superscription. Also in 1 Chron. xvi, 7 a psalm is attributed to David that corresponds in part to the first fifteen verses of Psalm cv, which is anonymous. We are, therefore, authorized in attributing to David the whole of this psalm, which is anonymous. In 2 Sam. xxiii, 1, David is called "the sweet Psalmist of Israel." Here the foundation for our belief of his high poetic character is laid, and we can easily believe that he wrote a large number of psalms.

Respecting the anonymous psalms, De Wette remarks:² "Many of the anonymous psalms of them may, indeed, belong to David and his contemporaries, but they cannot be ascertained with certainty." It is probable that, in some instances, psalms appear as anonymous which originally were united to one psalm, or more, that preceded, and had a superscription giving the author. Psalms ix and x are united in the LXX, and, probably, made but one originally.³

Twelve psalms are attributed to Asaph: Psa. l, lxxiii-lxxxiii. That Asaph wrote psalms is stated in 2 Chronicles xxix, 30: "Hezekiah the king, and the princes, commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the words of David and of Asaph the seer. And they sang praises with gladness." According to 1 Chron. xvi, 5, Asaph was at the head of the singers in the time of David. Schrader thinks⁴ we cannot, with any certainty, ascribe these psalms to Asaph, and Bleek is unfavourable to the genuineness of any of them, and thinks that Psa. lxxx, lxxxi, lxxxiii, and perhaps lxxxii, belong to a poet of the kingdom of Israel; while Psalms lxiv-lxxvi, lxxix, and perhaps the rest, belong to a Jewish poet near the exile.⁵ Dr. Davidson⁶ thinks that Asaph wrote Psalm l, and probably lxxiii, but no more of those assigned to him. Keil attributes seven of these psalms to the Asaph of David's time, and the remaining five to later members of his family.⁷ There are only two of these psalms that cannot well be referred to the Davidic Asaph, lxxiv and lxxix, which, from their allusions, seem to belong to a later age than that of David or Solomon. They may, indeed, belong to a later Asaph.

Ten psalms are attributed to the sons of Korah: xlii, xlv, xlv-xlix.

¹ Page 633.

² This was an ancient Jewish tradition.

³ Page 620.

⁴ Vol. ii, p. 258.

⁵ De Wette—Schrader, p. 523.

⁶ De Wette—Schrader, p. 523.

⁷ Introduction, vol. i, p. 460.

lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvii. Psalm lxxxviii is inscribed both to the sons of Korah, and is also called the Psalm of Heman the Ezrahite. The Korahites are mentioned in 1 Chron. ix, 19 as being keepers of the gates of the tabernacle in the times of Samuel and David; also in 2 Chron. xx, 19, in the time of Jehoshaphat, it is stated that the children of the Korahites stood up to praise the Lord. It is thus impossible to fix the date of these psalms. But it is probable that the earliest of them was written in the time of Solomon, and perhaps none of them later than the time of Hezekiah. Psalm lxxxv opens with the declaration: "Lord, thou hast been favourable unto thy land: thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob." As this is directed to the chief musician, indicating that the temple was standing, it is best to suppose that there is no reference to the return from Babylon, but perhaps a deliverance from the Assyrian power in the time of Hezekiah.

Psalm lxxii is inscribed to Solomon, but perhaps in this instance the ζ is to be translated *for*, as the prayer seems to be made for Solomon, or rather, for him as a type of the Messiah, and it would seem by David, as at the end of the prayer it is said: "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended." Psalm cxxii is attributed to Solomon, and we see no reason to doubt it. Psalm lxxxviii is attributed to the sons of Korah, but it is afterwards added in the superscription: "A Psalm of Heman, the Ezrahite." But Heman was one of the sons of Korah, as appears from 1 Chron. vi, 33: "Of the sons of the Kohathites; Heman, a singer." Now the sons of Korah were Kohathites (Exodus vi, 18-21). Heman is mentioned in 1 Kings iv, 31 in connexion with Ethan the Ezrahite, to whom Psalm lxxxix is attributed: "He (Solomon) was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman," etc. Heman and Ethan were, it appears, contemporaries of Solomon. There is no good reason for denying to Heman the authorship of Psalm lxxxviii, nor to Ethan that of lxxxix. It is true that the latter psalm represents the crown of David as cast down to the ground. But it is very probable that this refers to the rebellion of Absalom, when David fled from Jerusalem.

Psalm xc is attributed to Moses, and Bleek remarks: "There is no sufficient ground for denying it to be his, and it certainly bears a very ancient stamp."¹ Of the fifty anonymous psalms David, no doubt, wrote a considerable number, but it is difficult to decide how many. Two of the Psalms, at least (cxxvi and cxxxvii), were written after the Babylonian captivity. The Talmudists² call those psalms which give neither the name of the author nor the occasion,

¹ Einleitung, p. 618.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, etc., p. 73.

Psalms attributed to the sons of Korah.

Authorship of other psalms.

aim and end, *orphans*. They ascribed these psalms to various persons; among them to Adam, Moses, Abraham, Melchizedek, etc.¹

Hitzig, and a few other critics, have referred some of the psalms to the period of the Maccabees. But such a date for any of them is generally discarded. It has met with decided opposition from Gesenius, and finds no sympathy with De Wette. The canon was closed long before the Maccabean age, and inspiration had ceased. On this subject Bleek well remarks: "In fact, there is no psalm in our Psalter which on any sufficient ground can be placed later than the time of Nehemiah, about 300 years before the age of the Maccabees, and but few bring us down so far as the age of Nehemiah."²

ORIGIN OF THE COLLECTION OF THE PSALMS.

The first question that here arises is, Did our Book of Psalms take its present form from successive additions at different times, or were the Psalms collected at once, and formed into a book, as we now have them? The question has been differently answered. Keil's view is as follows: "Our collection of the Psalms has been made at one time, and, it would seem, under the charge of one man, on account of the principle, which is easily recognized running through it, of internal and real affinity of the Psalms, of resemblance in their subject-matter, and of identity in tendency and destination. According to this real principle of resemblance and analogy in the individual songs, the first place in the collection is allotted to the psalms of David and his contemporaries, namely, Asaph and his choir, Ethan, Heman, and the other sons of Korah, who were reckoned the creators and masters of psalmody. Then, according to the prevalent use of the two divine names, *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, which divides them into two classes, the psalms of the master-singers were distributed into three books, so that the *first* book was the portion assigned to the Jehovah psalms of David; the *second* book to the Elohim psalms of the sons of Korah, of Asaph, of David, of Solomon, and of some unknown authors; and the *third* book to the remaining psalms of Asaph and of the sons of Korah, which are in part of a mixed character, that is, Jehovah-Elohistic, and in part purely Jehovistic. . . .

"The other part of the collection has been arranged according to the same law, taking the order of time into account. In this way the psalm of Moses (xc), as the oldest, has been placed at the head

¹ *Ibid.*, 66. Fürst, however, does not think that the Talmudists really supposed that Adam wrote any of them, but that such an author would suit them.

² *Einleitung*, pp. 623, 624. Delitzsch is said to lean towards a Maccabean date for Psalms lxxiv and lxxix.

of that collection followed by (a) a decade of anonymous psalms belonging to the period from Solomon's reign till the exile (Psa. xci-c); (b) a series of songs of the age of the exile and on to Ezra (Psa. ci-cxix); (c) the collection of pilgrim psalms (Psa. cxx-cxxxiv); (d) the last group, temple and hallelujah psalms (Psa. cxxxv-cl)."¹

On the other hand, Bleek thinks the collection was formed at different times: the first two sections (i-lxxii) before the Babylonian captivity, and that the other three (lxxiii-cl), most probably, were added by Nehemiah.²

Keil's view cannot, as a whole, be fully adopted; and Bleek's opinion, so far as it acknowledges that a collection of psalms was made before the Babylonian captivity, is, no doubt, true. To obtain a clear view of the matter, we must advert to certain historical facts.

In 1 Chron. xv, 16-27 it is stated that David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren to be *singers*. We accordingly find that Chenaniah was the leader of the singers. David appointed Levites, of whom Asaph was chief, to thank and praise the Lord God of Israel, and delivered into the hand of Asaph and his brethren first a psalm³ to thank the Lord.

The psalm is composed of Psalm cv, 1-15; xcvi, 1-9; a few verses of cvi, and a few from some other source. It is not improbable that we have in 1 Chron. xvi, 7-36 but a part of all that was sung on the occasion of David's bringing the ark of God into Jerusalem. Again, in the time of David, we find two hundred and eighty-eight persons were instructed in the songs of the Lord, at the head of whom were Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman (1 Chron. xxv, 6, 7).

When the temple was dedicated to Jehovah the Levites praised the Lord, according to David's appointment, with instruments of music (2 Chron vii, 6). Jehoshaphat also appointed singers unto the Lord (2 Chron. xx, 21); and Jehoiada carried out the arrangement made by David with respect to singing (2 Chron. xxiii, 18). A more important passage still is 2 Chron. xxix, 30, in which it is stated that "Hezekiah the king, and the princes, commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the *words of David, and of Asaph the seer.*"

It is evident from the foregoing that David instituted the singing of psalms as a part of divine worship, and that in the time of Hezekiah there was a collection of the psalms, which at least embraced those of David and Asaph.

A collection in existence in the time of Hezekiah.

At the end of the seventy-second Psalm it says: "The prayers

¹ Introduction to Old Testament in Clark's For. Theo. Lib., vol. i, pp. 464, 465.

² Einleitung, pp. 625, 626.

³ There is no word in the original corresponding to "psalm."

of David the son of Jesse are ended." This is followed by eleven psalms of Asaph. But David did not write all of these seventy-two psalms, for seven of them are ascribed to the sons of Korah and one to Asaph, and some are anonymous, though at least several of these were in all probability written by David.

It is very probable that the statement, "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended," was originally placed at the end of *all* his collected prayers or psalms, if not by the author himself, by some one soon after they were written, and that a part of them were removed to their present position in the collection by the last collector and arranger of the Psalms, probably by Ezra or Nehemiah. The psalms of the sons of Korah, and the one of Asaph, now found in the first seventy-two psalms, were probably inserted by the final collector. If the psalms of David found in the last part of the collection had been composed subsequently to those in the first half, their position could be easily explained, but this is not probable.

Here the question arises, Upon what principles did the collector proceed in arranging the Psalms? Keil states, as we have seen, that those psalms of David in which the name Jehovah predominates were placed in the first book, while those in which Elohim predominates were put with similar psalms in the second book, while the third book presents no uniformity in respect to the use of the divine names. But Psalms lxxxvi, ci, ciii, cix, cx, cxxii, cxxiv, cxxxi, cxxxviii, cxl-cxlv, are ascribed to David, and so is a part of cv, (1 Chron. xvi, 7); and they are either entirely or partly Jehovistic, and have been excluded from the first book on some different ground from that of the divine names. Of these psalms of David, cxxii, cxxiv, cxxxi, and cxxxiii are songs of degrees,¹ and are placed with eleven other psalms bearing a similar name. In some of the psalms of David, in the first part of the collection, Elohim is found quite often. In those of Asaph the name Jehovah generally prevails, and this is true of the psalms of the sons of Korah.

If Jehovah were exclusively used in certain psalms, and Elohim in others, there might have been some reason for arranging them with reference to these names. But to determine the arrangement by

¹ Different explanations have been given of this name. Gesenius thinks it most probable that "the name refers to the peculiar rhythm obvious in some of them, by which the sense advances by *degrees*, or steps, some words of a preceding clause being repeated at the beginning of the succeeding one, with additions and amplification, so that the sense, as it were, *ascends*; e. g., Psa. cxxi: 1. 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh MY HELP. 2. MY HELP cometh from the LORD. 3. He will not,' etc."

considering whether Jehovah or Elohim is used the oftener in them seems very artificial, and admits of serious doubt, and it seems impossible to state certainly the grounds of the classification in respect to the most of them.

THE VARIOUS CLASSES OF PSALMS.

Almost every variety is found in the Book of Psalms: *didactic poems*, as Psalms xxxvii, xlix, and l; *hymns, or songs of praise* to Jehovah, as viii, xix, civ; *psalms of thanksgiving*, as xxxiv, xcii, xcv, xcvi; *psalms of penitence*, as xxxviii, li; *historical psalms*, as lxxviii, cv; *Messianic psalms*, as ii, xvi, xxii, xl, xlv, lxxii, cx. It is impossible to classify them very definitely, as many of them are not limited to a single subject.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE PSALMS.

Bleek is of the opinion that some of the psalms underwent changes at the hands of later poets, who revised, abridged, or enlarged them to adapt them to the various relations of the people and to divine service, just as we modify our hymns; and that, before the psalms received their fixed form as a part of the canon, minor changes were made in orthography and language.¹

That later poets revised the psalms is destitute of all proof, and it is not natural to suppose that subsequent writers would alter the language of David and other great poets, especially when no necessity existed for making changes. Nor do we see any proof that the psalms have suffered much by the errors of transcribers. In 2 Sam. xxii we have a psalm of David consisting of fifty verses. As the books of Samuel were written in the age of Solomon, or soon afterwards, it is interesting to compare this early written psalm with psalm xviii, in the collection, bearing the same inscription. The difference between the two is but slight, and we have no reason to suppose that greater changes occurred in the other psalms.

THE IMPRECATIONS IN THE PSALMS.

There are passages in the Psalms—contrary to their generally edifying character—which are deemed inconsistent with the teachings of Christ, and may be termed *imprecatory*. In Psalm lviii, 6-10 we have the following imprecation: "Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth: break out the great teeth of the young lions, O Lord. Let them melt away as waters. . . . The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked," etc. Again, in Psalm cxxxvii, 8, 9,

¹ Einleitung, pp. 632-635.

written after the Babylonian captivity, occurs the following: "O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy young children against the stones."

In Psalm lxxix David imprecates curses upon his enemies: "Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them. . . . Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous."

Respecting these passages it must be observed that the imperative mood in Hebrew is often used for a simple future.¹ The imprecations not upon private enemies. "Break their teeth, O God," is equivalent to, "Thou wilt break," etc. "Pour out thy wrath," for, "thou wilt pour out thy wrath." Sometimes a verb in the future tense is unnecessarily rendered by the imperative, and may be used to express results prophetically. But, after making every allowance for the Hebrew idiom, there will remain passages that contain imprecations on the wicked, and the question arises, How far are they inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity? Under the old dispensation the rule was "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth;" but our Saviour teaches us to love and pray for our enemies, i. e., *ἐχθροί*, private enemies, not public foes. St. Paul on one occasion said to the high-priest Ananias, "God is about to smite thee, thou whited wall" (Acts xxiii, 3); and he writes, "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord will reward him according to his work" (2 Tim. iv, 14). A Christian may heartily wish that the violators of the great principles of morality and religion may in this world receive condign punishment. It is necessary to the existence and well-being of society that the wicked should be punished, and a Christian is not called upon to extend his benevolence so far as to make laws a mere rope of sand. The pious Israelites of old, finding themselves surrounded by powerful nations deeply sunk in idolatry and crime, the deniers of the true God, and the oppressors of Israel and having in their sacred books the account of the extermination of the Canaanites by divine command for their crimes and abominable idolatries, would naturally wish and pray for the destruction of those whose conversion to the true God and whose moral reformation they deemed hopeless.

Respecting the bitter language employed towards Babylon in Psalm cxxxviii, it must be borne in mind that the Israelites had spent there a severe captivity, and that Isaiah and Jeremiah had predicted the judgments of God which would fall upon Babylon, and her utter ruin. Under these circumstances, the author of the psalm,

¹ See Roediger's Gesenius' Heb. Gram., pp. 232, 233.

speaking of Babylon as "to be destroyed," pronounces the man happy that will aid in blotting out all her inhabitants, young and old. But with all these concessions to their genuine theocratic spirit, it is still true that some of the passages in the psalms are not models for the imitation of Christians. They belong to the old dispensation.

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

THIS book, called in Hebrew 'מִשְׁלֵי,¹ and bearing the superscription, *Proverbs of Solomon* (מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה), *son of David, king of Israel*, consists of the short pithy sayings, the sage remarks, and the striking comparisons of Solomon, to which, in the last two chapters, are added the words of Agur and King Lemuel.

The first nine chapters treat of the blessings of wisdom and the dangers of unchastity. The second section (chapters Consists of four sections. x-xxiv) has the superscription, "The Proverbs of Solomon," and contains moral and religious precepts and prudential maxims. The third section (chaps. xxv-xxix) contains, as stated in the superscription, the "Proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out," and do not differ materially in their character from the foregoing. The last section contains the "Words of Agur, the son of Jakeh," the proverbs (chap. xxx) consisting of moral and philosophical reflections; and the "Words of King Lemuel, the proverbs which his mother taught him," enjoining upon him temperance and justice, and describing the qualities of a virtuous woman (chap. xxxi).

THE GENUINENESS OF THE PROVERBS ATTRIBUTED TO SOLOMON.

That Solomon wrote Proverbs is expressly stated in 1 Kings iv, 32: "He spake three thousand proverbs: and his songs were a thousand and five." In the Book of Proverbs there are eight hundred and forty-seven verses, which scarcely make so many proverbs. It is exceedingly improbable that the Proverbs of Solomon would soon perish, and thus there is presumptive proof of their genuineness. Our collection does not contain one third of what he wrote, and thus we have no reason to suppose that the proverbs of others

¹ מִשְׁלֵי, *Mashal*, a similitude, an apothegm, a proverb, a poem. Septuagint, Παροιμία; Vulgate, *Proverbium*.

have been attributed to Solomon. Nor are these proverbs unworthy of Solomon as a whole, nor do we find any among them that are unsuitable to him. And the very fact that the last two chapters in the collection are attributed respectively to Agur and to Lemuel, shows a clear discrimination in making the collection.

With characteristic skepticism, De Wette remarks on the Proverbs: "It is nowhere said that the first collection was made or caused by Solomon himself, and can by no means be proved; but it certainly belongs to the most flourishing period of Hebrew literature." Schrader observes: "In justice, a large share in the composition of the Proverbs themselves—especially in the collection (chaps. x-xxii, 16) which in general contains the oldest proverbs—must be conceded to Solomon. It is probable that in the order of time these are followed by the proverbs in chaps. xxii, 16-xxiv; xxv-xxix, next to which, in time, stands the large section chaps. i, 7-ix, which, on account of its relation to the Book of Job, and because in form and contents it perceptibly departs from chaps. x-xx, 16, as well as from chaps. xxv-xxix, is to be referred to a later period, perhaps to the seventh century" (B. C.).¹ The last two chapters, he thinks, belong to a still later age.

Bleek's view is about the same. He regards chaps. x-xxii, 1-16 as in all probability the oldest collection, though he thinks that in its present form it can hardly have proceeded from Solomon, but doubtless contains many genuine proverbs of his; and that to this section, chaps. xxii, 17-xxiv, 22, and chap. xxiv, 23-34, have been added. He confesses that it cannot be determined whether these small sections were added, along with chap. xxv and the following chapters, by Hezekiah's men, or were already found united to the central section; but in no event could they have been added later than the time of Hezekiah: and that it cannot be clearly made out when chaps. xxx and xxxi were added; possibly by Hezekiah's men, though probably at a later period, as were probably chaps. i-ix. This first section of the book, he thinks, was composed by the last editor of the book as a kind of introduction to the following proverbs of Solomon, and that chap. i, 1-6 was written as a preface to the whole book, especially to the proverbs of Solomon in it.²

But we can see no good reason for denying to Solomon the authorship of the first twenty-four chapters that bear his name, or for supposing that the proverbs which Hezekiah's men copied out (chaps. xxv-xxix) as Solomon's were not all his. It is true, that if Hezekiah's men had simply written down the proverbs which were floating among

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 537.

² Einleitung, p. 640.

the people as Solomon's there would be ground to question their genuineness. But the statement is, "These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, *copied out*." The Hebrew word rendered "*copied out*" is *הֵעֲרִיקוּ*, *they transferred, transcribed*, from one book into another; Septuagint, *ἐξεγράψαντο*, *they copied*.

We have already seen that Solomon spoke three thousand proverbs (1 Kings iv, 32). It is in the highest degree probable that he wrote them down, otherwise such a large number of proverbs would not have had definite form; and it is extremely unlikely that the number would have been known if they had not been written. Instead of saying, he *wrote* them, it is said he *spoke* (*דָּבַר*) them, indicating that Solomon himself was their author. It is also said that Solomon *spoke* of trees, etc., where we must understand that he *wrote* of them. At all events, the language in Prov. xxv, 1 shows that the men of Hezekiah transferred the proverbs in chaps. xxv-xxix from a larger *written* collection. It is exceedingly improbable that the first nine chapters of the book should have been written by the collector of the proverbs, or editor, instead of Solomon, and that the name of this Hebrew monarch should be placed at the head of them when the collector himself in that case wrote about one third of the whole, and that, too, when he has marked so carefully the source of all the proverbs in the collection, attributing one chapter to Agur, and another to King Lemuel.

The second division of the book begins with the superscription, "The Proverbs of Solomon." This superscription may seem superfluous when the fuller one was already standing at the beginning of the book. But it is most likely that the superscription was placed at the head of the second division as indicating a separate collection from the preceding, as many psalms of David, standing in immediate connexion, have each a superscription. The proverbs in the first section (chaps. i-ix) are principally—in a poetical point of view—*synonymous*, while those in the second division (chaps. x-xxiv) are generally *antithetical*. The last part (chaps. xxii, 17-xxiv) of the second division is evidently intended to go with the preceding, as belonging to Solomon; nor should the last twelve verses be excluded from it as being the product of several wise men, as it is unsuitable so to explain chap. xxiv, 23, but rather, according to the English version, "These things belong to the wise," i. e., are suitable for them. The preface to the Proverbs (chap. i, 2-6) may have been written by Solomon himself.

De Wette remarks that "chapters i-ix, on account of their hortatory tone and their strict doctrine of chastity, are more suitable for

a trainer of youth, a prophet, or priest, than for a king like Solomon.' Why such doctrines are unsuitable to a man of Solomon's wisdom and virtues simply because he was a king it is not easy to see. It was in the latter part of his life that he was led astray by idolatrous women. And all history is full of instances in which preaching and practising are widely at variance.

There are certain peculiarities of language that characterize all the proverbs attributed to Solomon, and thus confirm their unity of authorship: **חָכַר לֵב**, *lacking heart or understanding*, occurs in Prov. vi, 32; vii, 7; ix, 4, 16; x, 13, 21; xi, 12; xii, 11; xv, 21; xvii, 18; xxiv, 30. This phrase is found nowhere else. Similar is the phrase **חָכַר תְּבִינּוֹת**, *to lack understanding*, found only in xxviii, 16. The phrase **הוֹסִיף לִקְחָהּ**, *to increase learning*, occurs in Prov. i, 5; ix, 9; xvi, 21, 23; but nowhere else. **פָּרַע**, in the sense *to reject*, is found only in Prov. i, 25; iv, 15; viii, 33; xiii, 18; xv, 32. **מִדְּוֵינִים** (plural of **מִדְּוֵן**), *strife*, is found only in xviii, 19; xxi, 9, 19; xxiii, 29; xxxv, 24; xxxvi, 21; xxxvii, 15. **מִדְּוֵינִים**, *strife*, xviii, 18; xix, 13; and **מִדְּוֵינִים**, *strife*, vi, 14, 19; x, 12, are found nowhere else. **דָּלַף טָרַר**, *continual dropping*, found only in xix, 13; xxvii, 15. The phrase **חָרַשׁ רָע**, *to devise mischief*, is found only in iii, 29 (**רָעָה**, feminine); vi, 14; xii, 20; xiv, 22. There are other peculiarities common to the different sections, but these are the most important.

The thirtieth chapter is attributed to Agur and the thirty-first to King Lemuel. As the author of the other parts of the book is a real personage, there is no reason for supposing, with some, that they are merely symbolical designations. But they are persons otherwise unknown.

In almost every instance in the book the divine Being is called LORD (Jehovah); in the few exceptions, *Elohim*; but in Agur's prayer *Eloah* is once used (chap. xxx, 5). Keil assigns to Solomon chaps. i-xxix; Agur he regards as a real personage, but Lemuel he thinks is a symbolical name.¹

Ancient Jewish tradition² assigned the collecting of all the proverbs that bear the name of Solomon into our book to the men of King Hezekiah, who were regarded as forming a *literary society or college*. To this society it attributed the additions chaps. xxx, xxxi. It regarded Agur as a symbolical name of a wise man of the time of Solomon, the embodiment of the law and of wisdom; and Lemuel as the symbolic name of King Solomon.

¹ Introduction, vol. i, pp. 472, 477.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, pp. 75-78.

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.

THIS book (called in Hebrew קהלת,¹ *Koheleth*; Septuagint, Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς; Vulgate, *Ecclesiastes, a preacher*), purporting to be written by the son of David, king of Jerusalem, is a dissertation upon the unsatisfactory nature of all things human, and recommends the enjoyment of the blessings of life. At the same time it earnestly avows the importance of fearing God and keeping his commandments. The language is for the most part poetical and aphoristic, resembling in style the Book of Proverbs, but sometimes it passes over into prose.

The author opens the discussion with the exclamation, "Vanity of vanities," and describes the ceaseless changes in all human affairs (chap. i, 1-11), and then describes his high position, and the various ways in which he sought happiness without finding it (chap. i, 12-ii). He asserts that for everything there is an appointed time, enjoins the doing of good, and the enjoying of the fruits of one's labour, affirming that men and beasts are exposed to the same calamities (chap. iii). He next discusses the miseries of men, the advantages of society, with a few remarks on other matters (chap. iv). After this he gives religious precepts, and discourses on the vanity of riches, and recommends eating and drinking and enjoying the fruit of one's labour (chap. v). Next follow various remarks on the miseries of man, in which is cited the case of one who cannot enjoy his abundant wealth and honour (chap. vi).

In the following chapter (vii) the author gives utterance to proverbs and moral precepts, inculcating moderation, and calling attention to the fact that sometimes the righteous man perisheth in his righteousness, while the wicked man prolongs his life in wickedness. In chap. viii he delivers some moral precepts, and declares that he knows that "it shall be well with them that fear God," but "it shall not be well with the wicked." At the same time he asserts that good men sometimes meet with the fate of bad men, and wicked men attain what is due good men, and recommends that men shall enjoy the good things of this life.

¹ קהלת (from קהל, to convolve), one addressing a public assembly a preacher. The noun is masculine, with a feminine termination.

In chap. ix he again reiterates the doctrine that things come alike to all, whatever their moral character may be, and "that time and chance happeneth to them all." In chap. x he delivers various proverbs, and in chap. xi precepts, and exhorts the young man to enjoy himself in his youth, but at the same time to remember that for all these things God will bring him into judgment. He closes the book by an exhortation to remember the Creator in the days of one's youth, before the evil days come, and graphically depicts the miseries of old age, and sums up, as the conclusion of all that he has said, "Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Jerome remarks that the Hebrews say this conclusion of Ecclesiastes saved it from perishing with other writings of Solomon, a fate it would have deserved without it.¹

THE DESIGN OF THE BOOK.

It is clear from the author's conclusion that he has no intention to inculcate Atheism, Epicureanism, or the doctrines afterwards held by the Sadducees. In his discussion there is but little system, and he repeatedly returns to the doctrine that it is best to keep the commandments of God, to enjoy the fruit of one's labour, and that all is vanity in this world, but at the same time asserting man's responsibility to God for his actions.

Schrader gives the following account of the book: It "evidently transports us to a time when the old Hebrew doctrine of retribution, the old faith, in general, had already become a subject of the strongest doubts, and when men, almost despairing of any thing higher, believed that they could find in the enjoyment of earthly things the satisfaction they sought, and the internal harmony they missed. The Book of Ecclesiastes unfolds to us the picture of the discord in the soul of a pious man of this period. It transports us into the very midst of the surging conflict of thoughts fighting each other. The ancient faith appears to struggle with modern doubt for the mastery. But at last we see the former gain the victory over the latter, while the author states the position, as the sum of his discourse, 'Fear God, and keep his commandments.'" The only exception that can be justly made to the foregoing statement is, that we have no reason to suppose that skepticism respecting the doctrine of divine providence and retribution had become common, but, rather, that it was a growing tendency which developed itself afterwards in the doctrine of the Sadducees.

¹ Comment. on Ecclesiastes, *in fin.*

² De Wette—Schrader, p. 541

DATE AND AUTHCRSHIP.

The superscription of the book is, "The Words of the Preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem." And in chap. i, 12 the author says, "I, the Preacher, was king over Israel in Jerusalem." Solomon's name is not found in the book; it might be supposed that Solomon is not necessarily meant, and that the language "son of David" might be used to designate any of his descendants who was king in Jerusalem. But the statement that he was "king over Israel in Jerusalem," and that he was wiser than all those who had preceded him in Jerusalem (chap. i, 16), suits Solomon only.

But here the question arises, Is the author's title, "son of David, king in Jerusalem," a real or assumed one? It was the general opinion of the ancients that Solomon was really the author of Ecclesiastes. "As in antiquity," says Fürst, "a comprehensive wisdom superior to that of all other men is ascribed to Solomon only, it was natural that they should refer this book of an unknown teacher of wisdom to Solomon."¹ "When, at a later period, the view had become established that Solomon was not merely an *assumed* name, but was the real author of the work, the tradition was fixed that the college of Hezekiah edited and arranged the Book of Ecclesiastes, as it had before the Proverbs and Song of Solomon. As we have seen in the case of the Proverbs and the Song of Solomon, the reference here can be to the last days only of this college, in the latest Persian period, before the founding of the Great Council; and, especially, Ecclesiastes appears to be the last book edited."²

The book was treated by Jerome as the work of Solomon, and this was the prevailing opinion in the Christian Church until Grotius († 1645) rejected it as a writing of Solomon, and referred it to a later age on account of the peculiarities of its language. Modern critics, with but few exceptions, regard it as the work of an author who lived after the Babylonian captivity. Professor Stuart remarks with great propriety and truth, "The *diction* of this book differs so widely from that of Solomon in the Book of Proverbs, that it is difficult to believe that both came from the same pen. Chaucer does not differ more from Pope than Ecclesiastes from Proverbs. It seems to me, when I read Coheleth, that it presents one of those cases which leave no room for doubt, so striking and prominent is the discrepancy."³ Hengstenberg and

The book later in its composition than the time of Solomon.

Believed by the modern critics to be post-Solomonian.

¹ Ueber den Kanon, pp. 90, 91. Fürst shows that there was a slight departure from this tradition, p. 91.

² Ibid., p. 91.

³ On the Old Testament Canon, p. 139.

Keil refer the book to the age of Nehemiah and Ezra. Ewald refers it to the last part of the Persian dominion; De Wette¹ and Bleek to the last part of the Persian, or to the beginning of the Greek period; while Kamphausen² fixes upon the third century before Christ as the period in which it was probably written.

We think there can be but little doubt that it is the latest book of the Canon, and could not have been written earlier than the time of the prophet Malachi; but in all probability it was written still later. This is especially evident from the language, and also from the tone of the Book. One of the most striking peculiarities of the language is the frequent use of $\dot{\text{ש}}$, abbreviated from אֲשֶׁר , *who, which*, as a prefix to verbs. This usage was common in the Phœnician language and in the Rabbinical Hebrew, as appears from the Mishna (about A. D. 219³), but rarely occurs in the Old Testament⁴ outside of the Book of Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon.

Its Chaldaisms point to a period subsequent to the Babylonian captivity. אִלּוּ , *if*, vi, 6; בָּטַל , *to cease*, xii, 3; זְמַן , *time*, Ecclesiastes. iii, 1; פְּתָנָם , *sentence*, viii, 11; מְדִינָה , *province*, ii, 8; כָּשֶׁר , *to prosper*, x, 10; xi, 6; בִּפְשֶׁר , *explanation*, viii, 1; שָׁלַט , *to rule*, ii, 19; viii, 9; עָלָטוֹן , *ruling over*, viii, 4, 8; תְּקִיף , *strong, mighty*, vi, 10; עָקַן , *to be made straight*, i, 15; בְּבָר , *long ago, formerly*, i, 10; iii, 15. Several of these words are also found in books written after the Babylonian captivity. There are also other words indicating a late period.

In the Proverbs of Solomon Jehovah is the usual name for the divine Being; this word never occurs in Ecclesiastes, but instead thereof Elohim, which is used *forty times*. It would seem that the name Jehovah had at the time of the composition of the book already grown into disuse.

The age of the author of Ecclesiastes was one of despondency, not the flourishing period in which Solomon reigned. It is not at all probable that Solomon would speak of the oppression under the sun, in which the oppressed had no comforter, and that he would say that on the side of the oppressors was power (chap. iv, 1), as this would have been a reflection upon himself. It is evident that when the book was written the Jewish temple had been already rebuilt, for the author gives advice about going to the house of God (chap. v, 1).

While we are compelled on strong internal grounds to decide

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 543.

Kamphausen's Bleek, p. 648.

² At this time it received its present form, but it doubtless presents the state of the Hebrew at an earlier period.

⁴ It occurs several times in Psalm cxxxvii, 8, 9, written after the captivity.

against Solomon's being the author of the work, there is no one to whom we can with any probability ascribe it. Professor Douglas, in his additions to Keil's Introduction, makes a vigorous, but yet, we think, unsuccessful effort to show that the book proceeded from Solomon.

CHAPTER XLV.

THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

THE Hebrew title of this book is *Song¹ of the Songs, which is Solomon's* (שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים אֲשֶׁר לְשֹׁלֹמֹה), in which its authorship is clearly ascribed to Solomon and the phrase "Song of Songs" means the most beautiful of songs, i. e., the choicest of the songs, of Solomon.

The book consists of eight chapters, in which the deepest affections of two persons of opposite sex are set forth in the strongest, most beautiful, and often touching language. in the form of dialogues, often accompanied with an exquisitely beautiful description of the scenery in country life.

The book opens with a strong expression of love on the part of a female for a shepherd, to which he replies in affectionate, laudatory language. She answers in endearing words, to which he again replies in terms of praise and appreciation. She then speaks of her own pre-eminence and that of her lover, and he makes his address to her, to which she responds (chaps. i, ii). In the following chapter (chap. iii) she relates her search for her beloved, and the finding of him, after which she describes him, and compares him to Solomon in his glory. Her lover then answers (chap. iv), giving an exquisitely beautiful description of his beloved, to which she makes a brief response. In his dissatisfaction he seeks his beloved in the night, but before she opens to him he withdraws, and while she is in pursuit of him the watchmen smite her. She gives a beautiful description of his person (chap v). In the following chapter a third person is introduced, asking her where her beloved is gone, to whom she replies. After this he gives a beautiful description of his beloved, in which she is called a Shulamite, and prince's daughter. In replying to this, she invites him to take a walk with her into the fields (chaps. vi, vii). She expresses her deep affection for the object of her love. After this she speaks of a little sister that hath no breasts, and refers to Solomon's vineyard at Baal-hamon, and to her own vineyard, and closes by exhorting her beloved to make haste (chap. viii).

¹Septuagint, Ἄσμα Ἀσμάτων; Vulgate, *Canticum Canticorum*.

Delitzsch regards the whole book as referring to the ardent affection of two lovers for each other, beginning with their first love, and extending to a period beyond their nuptials. He divides the whole into six acts, and each of these again into two scenes: first, the mutual ardour of the lovers (chaps. i, 2-ii, 7); secondly, their seeking and finding each other (chaps. ii, 8-iii, 5); thirdly, the introduction of the bride, and the wedding (chaps. iii, 9-v, 1); fourthly, the love that was spured, but again won (chaps. v, 2-vi, 9); fifthly, how the charmingly beautiful Shulamite, even as princess, preserves her simplicity and humility (chaps. vi, 10-viii, 4); sixthly, the visit of Solomon and of the Shulamite to the house of the latter, and the confirmation of their alliance of love (chap. viii, 5-14). "This view," says Bleek, "presents many difficulties and improbabilities."¹ Schrader divides the book, in a somewhat different way, into *five* acts, in which he represents the Shulamite as being in love with a shepherd, and Solomon appearing as his rival, but without gaining her affections.² But this seems inadmissible, and it is better to regard the book as exhibiting the love of but two persons for each other.

DESIGN OF THE AUTHOR.

Respecting the design of the author, the most discordant views have been held. "The men of the Great Council," says Fürst, "and those who lived later in the Greek period, explained the Song of Solomon in a symbolical or allegorical manner, and thus it was saved for the Canon."³ "In the Midrash on the Song of Solomon it is said, on the passage 'Thy cheeks are comely with rows of pearls, thy neck with strings of pearls; we will make for thee golden chains with studs of silver: 'The rows of pearls are the five books of the Law; the strings of pearls are the Prophets; the golden chains are the Hagiographa; and the silver studs are the cantos of the Song of Solomon.' The song is also designated as *the mystical, the excellent scroll*."⁴

The Targum on this book, and many of the Jewish expositors, explain the song as setting forth in an allegorical way the relation existing between God and the Hebrew people, in which the Shulamite maiden represents the people of Israel, while her lover typifies Jehovah. Origen, in his Commentary on this book, remarks: "Understand that the bridegroom is Christ, and that the bride is the Church, without spot or wrinkle." In this method of exposition he is followed

¹ Einleitung, p. 645.

² De Wette—Schrader, p. 558.

³ Ueber den Kanon, p. 84.

⁴ Ibid., p. 85.

by most of the ancient Christian expositors, and by many of the moderns.

Respecting the symbolizing of the union of the soul with God by means of the love existing between two persons of different sexes, Professor Stuart remarks, "that extensive usage of a similar nature exists, and has for a long period existed, in the Oriental countries, e. g., among the Persians, the Turks, the Arabians, and the Hindoos. In the Musnavi of Jellaleddin, the poems of Jami, and above all in the Odes of Hafiz are many productions apparently of an amatory nature, which the Persians (there are some dissenters) regard as expressive of the intercourse of the soul with God."¹

Some reasons in Oriental usage for an allegorical interpretation.

Lane, in his *Modern Egyptians*, gives some specimens of songs sung by the dervishes of Egypt upon the festival of the birth of Mohammed which have considerable resemblance to the Song of Solomon, and are evidently intended to be of a highly devotional character, however different they may seem to be from our taste and sense of propriety. "I cannot entertain any doubt," says he, "as to the design of Solomon's Song."²

According to Keil³ the Song "depicts in dramatico-lyrical responsive songs, under the allegory of the bridal love of Solomon and Shulamith, the loving communion between the Lord and his Church, according to its ideal nature, as it results from the choice of Israel to be the Church of the Lord. According to this, every disturbance of that fellowship, springing out of Israel's infidelity, leads to an ever firmer establishment of the covenant of love by means of Israel's return to the true covenant of God, and this God's unchangeable love."

Delitzsch rejects the allegorical character of the Song, and endeavours to explain it with a reference to the history of the time. "Without Solomon's conscious aim, by the agency of the Holy Spirit it has taken such a form that the mystery of marriage sheds its rays upon us out of its ethereal love, its crystal mirror." Bleek also denies the allegorical meaning, and sees in the book nothing more than the expression of love of persons of different sexes for each other;⁴ and Schrader holds that it sets forth the glorification of true bridal love, exhibiting its real character in every trial; and, inasmuch as this tendency springs from the spirit of the purest morality, it justly entitles the book to a place in the canon without resorting to the allegorical exposition, which he thinks is devoid of all probability.⁵

Critics who doubt the allegorical interpretation.

¹ On the Old Test. Canon, p. 270. ² See his specimens in vol. ii, pp. 195-197.

³ *Introd.*, vol. i, pp. 503, 504. *Einl.*, p. 643. ⁴ De Wette—Schrader, p. 559.

It seems exceedingly improbable that the book would have been admitted into the canon if it had not been deemed to be of an allegorical character, setting forth the intimate relation existing between Jehovah and his chosen people; for it is in no sense historical, didactic, or prophetic. A poem, however beautiful it may be, if it aims at nothing higher than to set forth the mutual love of two persons of different sex, has no place in the canon. In the Old Testament, the intimate relation existing between Jehovah and Israel is typified by the relation existing between husband and wife. But it is true that the Song itself furnishes no key to its solution, and the spiritual sense nowhere crops out.

THE AUTHOR OF THE SONG.

Schrader, while he denies that the poem was written by Solomon, Opinions of modern critics. grants that in its original form it was composed perhaps in the *tenth* century before Christ, but was afterwards enriched by additions. He is inclined to think that it had its origin in the northern part of Palestine.¹

Bleek remarks, that "it may be supposed, with great probability, that the book has *one* author, to which supposition the similarity of character, representation, and language pervading the whole of it, and the recurrence of so many individual references, lead. Single passages clearly refer to Solomon and to his affairs in such a way that it scarcely admits of a doubt that they were written in the age and in the neighbourhood of this monarch. But these very passages also make it in the highest degree probable that not Solomon himself is the author, but another poet, in the time and in the neighbourhood of Solomon."² Davidson supposes, that although not written by Solomon, it appeared soon after his death.³

Keil remarks, that the statement of the superscription, that Solomon was the author of the book, "is thoroughly confirmed by the predominant circle of imagery in the poem, and by its references to matters of fact as well as by its language. The multitude of names of plants and animals which occur in it—nuts, aloes, cedar, cypress, vine, mandrakes, rose, camphire, frankincense, myrrh, spikenard, cinnamon, lily; and, again, hinds of the field, lions, kids, doves, leopards, mare, she-goats, young roes, gazelles, ewes, foxes, turtle; as well as of other natural objects and products (ivory, marble, sapphires, etc.), favour the belief that he was King Solomon, renowned equally as a prolific composer of songs, and as an eminent naturalist (1 Kings iv, 32, 33)."⁴

¹ De Wette—Schrader, pp. 560, 561.

² Introduction, vol. ii, p. 414.

³ Einleitung, pp. 644, 645.

⁴ Vol. i, pp. 501, 502.

The ancient tradition¹ of the Jews attributed the Song to Solomon, and this has been the prevalent opinion, and there is no good reason for denying that he was the author. It certainly was written in the age of Solomon, to which there are the most evident allusions (chap. s. i, 5; iii, 7-11; viii, 11, 12).

Respecting the language of the book, it is to be observed that it has some affinities with the Book of Proverbs; but at the same time it has in many places the shortened form, In its language like Proverbs. שׁ, שׁ, from אֲשֶׁר, characteristic of late Hebrew, but which was also used sometimes at an earlier period, as we find it twice in the Song of Deborah (Judges v, 7). פִּירֵס, *park*, occurs in iv, 13; but this word is also found in the Sanscrit, and furnishes no probable proof of the late origin of the book.

ITS CANONICITY.

Some of the ancient Jews attributed a very high value to this Song. Rabbi Akibah remarked, "Far be it from us to suppose that any one in Israel ever doubted the holiness of the Song, for the world was not worthy of the day on which the Song was given to Israel. Although all the Hagiographa are holy, this Song is most holy."² In the Targum on this Song it is stated that Solomon uttered it under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

The book is found in the Catalogue of the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament as given by Melito,³ bishop of Sardis, in the latter part of the second century, and also in the catalogues of the early Church. Origen and Jerome, however, following an old tradition of the Jews, did not think the book should be read before one is thirty years of age.⁴

¹ Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 86.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 83. Akibah lived in the first part of the second century.

³ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., iv, 26.

⁴ Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 83.

CHAPTER XLVI.

THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.

THIS small poetical book, containing in the Hebrew Bible the simple inscription אֵיכָה, (*How?*)—so called because the book begins with this word—stands in the English version of the Bible, in the Peshito-Syriac, and in the Vulgate, immediately after the Prophet Jeremiah, from which it is separated in the Septuagint by the Book of Baruch; but in the Hebrew Bible it stands in the Hagiographa just before the Book of Ecclesiastes. We introduce it here on account of its poetical character. In the Septuagint it bears the title, “Lamentations of Jeremiah” (Θρήνοι Ιερουσόλου), and has the following prefatory remarks: “And it came to pass, after Israel had been led away into captivity, and Jerusalem had been made desolate, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and sung this dirge over Jerusalem, and said.” In the Peshito-Syriac it has the inscription, “Lamentation of Jeremiah;” in the Vulgate, “**THRENI**, that is, **THE LAMENTATIONS OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH.**” It is called by Jerome “**CINOTH**” (קִינֹת), *Lamentations*.

It consists of five chapters. In the first the author pours forth, in language deeply pathetic, his sorrow for the desolations and miseries of Judah and Jerusalem on account of their sins. This mournful strain he continues in the next chapter, in which he laments the destruction of the temple; and in the third he describes, in deeply touching terms, his own sufferings and sorrows, and at the same time expresses hope and confidence in God. After this he reverts to the calamities that have overtaken Jerusalem, and prays for a restoration to the Divine favour (chaps. iv, v). Although no mention is made of Nebuchadnezzar having brought these calamities upon the land and the city, yet the notices of the Egyptians and Assyrians, to whom the Jews have submitted (chapter v, 6), and the nature of the calamities, leave no doubt that the dreadful catastrophe was brought upon them by Nebuchadnezzar when he destroyed the city and the temple, and led the people away captive to Babylon.

The arrangement of the verses in the first four chapters is highly artificial. The first two chapters contain each twenty-two verses of about two lines each. The first of these verses in each of the two chapters begins with א (Aleph), the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet; the second with ב (Beth); and

The versification highly artificial.

the other successive verses with the successive letters of the alphabet, ending with ט (Tâv). The third consists of sixty-six verses, averaging each about two thirds of a line in length. The first, second, and third verses begin severally with א (Aleph), the next three each with ב (Beth), and so on to the last three, which begin with ט (Tâv). The fourth chapter contains twenty-two verses, each something more than a line long, beginning with the successive letters of the Hebrew alphabet. The fifth chapter contains twenty-two verses, arranged without any reference to the order of the letters in the alphabet.

THE AUTHOR OF LAMENTATIONS.

We have already seen that the Septuagint attributes the book to Jeremiah; so does the Vulgate in nearly the same language. The most ancient Jewish tradition¹ ascribes it to the Prophet Jeremiah, and this has been the almost unanimous opinion. In confirmation of the ancient tradition De Wette remarks, that "we can appeal to its affinity in contents, spirit, tone, and language" with the prophecy of Jeremiah. With this judgment Bleek coincides.² Schrader³ thinks it very improbable, if not impossible, that Jeremiah should have written it, alleging that its author made use of Ezekiel (which statement admits of no proof), and that chap. v, 7 contradicts Jer. xxxi, 29, 30, which is not true. He supposes the book was written during the Babylonian captivity. Josephus evidently refers to this book when, speaking of the death of King Josiah, he observes: "Jeremiah, the prophet, wrote upon him a funereal dirge, which is still extant."⁴ But he is mistaken in supposing that it was composed on the death of that monarch, though it is stated in 2 Chronicles xxxv, 25 that Jeremiah lamented Josiah.

The book has a freshness and vividness clearly showing that it must have been written soon after the events of which it treats. Bleek thinks it was composed before the final catastrophe, in the interval between the surrender of the city and its destruction, while Jeremiah was still in Jerusalem (Jer. xxxix, 14). On this point, however, we are not certain.

¹ Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 87.

² De Wette—Schrader, pp. 531, 532.

³ Einleitung, p. 502.

⁴ Antiq., x, 5, 1.

CHAPTER XLVII.

THE PROPHETIC BOOKS.

HEBREW PROPHECY.

WHEN Moses warned the children of Israel against false prophets and deceivers, he promised them, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet (נָבִיא) from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken" (Deut. xviii, 15). This promise, although it has its highest fulfillment in Jesus Christ,¹ the greatest of all prophets, yet furnishes the basis of the prophetic office among the Hebrews.

In Judges vi, 8, it is said "that the Lord sent a prophet unto the children of Israel"—the only mention of a prophet in this book. The next use of the term prophet occurs in 1 Sam. iii, 20, where it is said that all Israel "knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord." Mention is made of "a company of prophets" in the time of Samuel (1 Sam. x, 10). In the time of David we read of "Nathan the prophet," "Gad the seer," and "Heman the seer." These appellations are used indiscriminately (1 Sam. ix, 9). In the time of Jeroboam we find "Ahijah the prophet" (1 Kings xiv, 2), "Iddo the seer," (2 Chron. ix, 29), and "Shemaiah the prophet" (chaps. xi, 2; xii, 15). Elijah, one of the most distinguished of the Hebrew prophets, flourished during the reign of the wicked Ahab. He was succeeded in the prophetic office by his disciple Elisha, almost as celebrated as his master. The ministry of these two prophets extended from about B. C. 910 to B. C. 838. During their time reference is made to "the sons of the prophets" (1 Kings xx, 35; 2 Kings ii, 3, 5, 7, 15; iv, 1, 38; v, 22; vi, 1; ix, 1), that is, "the disciples of the prophets," who appear to have established schools for the training of young men in the law of Moses, and if called of God to the extraordinary prophetic office, that they might be suitable instruments in the hands of Providence for the execution of their great mission.

Among these prophets, Samuel, Nathan, Gad (1 Chron. xxix, 29), Shemaiah, Iddo (2 Chron. xii, 15), and Ahijah (2 Chron. ix, 29), were writers. None of their works, however, are extant, unless we except the Books of Samuel, which, in all probability, were, in their present form, composed by Nathan. Of

¹ Acts iii, 22.

their prophecies we have but fragments in some of the historical books. It is very probable that their prophecies were of a local and fragmentary character.

The most brilliant period of Hebrew prophecy extended from about B. C. 880 to B. C. 430, during which flourished, in order of time,¹ Jonah, Obadiah, Joel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi. We have extant writings from all of them with the probable exception of Jonah.² It was during this period that the Hebrews came in contact with foreign nations, and their prophets, under the influence of the Divine Spirit, often take a wider range and a loftier flight, and predict the overthrow of the kingdoms hostile to Israel, the judgments or blessings of God upon his chosen people, and the glory of Messiah's reign.

The Hebrew prophets were distinguished by the purity of their lives, self-denial, and zeal for Jehovah, which often brought upon them the wrath and vengeance of wicked and idolatrous kings. As a class, they had no parallel in other nations. They did not belong to any particular tribe or family, but were selected by the Almighty himself as messengers, to whom he communicated his will and purpose, principally in visions. We sometimes find the prophets performing *symbolic* acts, to impress more deeply upon the people their prophecies. Thus Ahijah, in declaring unto Jeroboam that he should have ten tribes of Israel, "caught the new garment that was on him, and rent it in twelve pieces: and he said to Jeroboam, Take thee ten pieces: for thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee" (1 Kings xi, 30, 31).

Isaiah, by way of illustrating his prophecy, was directed to call his son "Maher-shalal-hash-baz," *hasting to the prey, speeding to the booty* (chap. viii, 1); and, to set forth God's judgment upon Egypt and Ethiopia he was commanded to walk naked and barefoot, which he did for three years (chap. xx, 2-4).

Jeremiah was sent to the Euphrates to hide a girdle in the hole of a rock, and long afterward he was ordered to get it again; and, having found it marred, it was made to represent the worthless condition of Israel (chap. xiii, 1-11).

For a sign to Israel Ezekiel was ordered to portray, by symbols, the siege of Jerusalem, and to lie upon his left side three hundred and ninety days, to bear the iniquity of the house of Israel; also to

¹ Some of them, however, were contemporary.

² We do not regard Jonah as the author of the book that bears his name.

Characteristics
of the Hebrew
prophets.

Symbolism of
the prophets.

lie upon his right side forty days, to bear the iniquity of the house of Judah (chap. iv, 1-8).

To illustrate the treachery of Israel Hosea was thus commanded: "Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms: for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord" (chap. i, 2). Again: "Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress, according to the love of the Lord toward the children of Israel," etc. (chap. iii, 1).

The question here arises, Were these *symbolic* actions really performed, or were they merely visions? In some instances they were, doubtless, *real* transactions, performed before the eyes of the people; in others, most probably, they were visions. According to Bleek,¹ Kimchi, Aben Ezra, and Moses Maimonides, distinguished rabbies, regarded the *symbolical* acts of the prophets as mere visions.

Respecting the character of the Hebrew prophecy, various opinions have been held. The first view is that of Eichhorn, who regarded nearly all the declarations in our prophetic writings which refer to events in the immediate future as poetical descriptions of events written after they had occurred. The absurdity of this view, Bleek² remarks, is universally acknowledged, and needs no refutation. The *second* view is, that the prophecies are the products of the human wisdom, experience, and judgment of the prophets respecting human affairs—the prediction of the future from the past and present. The *third* view is, that the prophecies are merely the purely human hopes and fears of the prophets, which they uttered when guided by patriotism and poetic imagination, without troubling themselves whether or not they would be fulfilled.

These last two views are prevalent among rationalistic critics, and are utterly at variance with the declarations of the prophets themselves, the teachings of the New Testament, and the wonderful fulfilment of their prophecies, which confirm the evangelical view expressed in the language of Peter: "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter i, 21).

Bleek, while not adopting the last two rationalistic views, thinks they have a measure of truth, but not the whole truth, and that it would be utterly false to consider the discourses of the prophets respecting the future as the product of the reflective understanding. "Among the prophecies," says he, "which are preserved, there are many respecting the genuineness of which there can be no doubt, in which single future events are predicted

Bleek's view.

¹ Einleitung, p. 427.

² Ibid., p. 431.

with great confidence in such a way that it is clearly seen that in the mind of the prophet no doubt existed respecting the certain and exact fulfilment of his prediction, and that a higher confidence directed him than any human insight and previous calculation could have instilled into him."¹

It has sometimes been objected that some of the prophecies have not been fulfilled. This is, to a certain extent, true; for there are prophecies respecting the universality of Christ's kingdom and the conversion of the Jews to Christianity that have not yet been fulfilled: but their accomplishment lies in the future, the fulness of time having not yet come. It is also true that there are some prophecies, whose fulfilment pertains to the past, which we cannot prove to have been fulfilled, owing to our imperfect knowledge of history.

But, further: it sometimes happens that a prophecy depends for its fulfilment upon the conduct of the persons whose prosperity or punishment is declared beforehand. Thus we find that God announced the severe judgments that he would bring upon Ahab for his wickedness; but Ahab, hearing them, repented in sackcloth; upon which God said, "Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? because he humbleth himself before me I will not bring the evil in his days: but in his sons' days," etc. (1 Kings xxi, 21-29).² The most of the prophecies, however, are of an absolute character; all the contingencies are foreseen, and the divine purpose is declared without conditions and limitations. Of such a character is the prophecy respecting the destruction of Babylon (Isa. xiii, 19-22).

From the great number of prophecies which have been accurately fulfilled the inspiration of the prophets is established, and we are authorized in concluding that all those prophecies still unfulfilled will receive their accomplishment in the future; and that those which pertain to the past were fulfilled, even in cases where the incompleteness of history renders us incapable of proving it.

The language of the prophets is often of a sublime character, full of bold imagery, and clothed in a poetic form, and is occasionally obscure from its great condensation and abruptness.

¹ Einleitung, p. 435.

² So of Nineveh: "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown;" but the people repented, and the city was saved.

Conclusion as
to fulfilment of
prophecy.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE HEBREW PROPHETS.

Obadiah prophesied in Judah.....	About B. C.	880
Joel " " " "	" "	870
Jonah " " in the kingdom of Israel and at Nineveh	" "	825
Amos " " chiefly in the kingdom of Israel.....	" "	795
Hosea " "	" "	785-725
Isaiah " " in Judah.....	" "	758-705
Micah " "	" "	750-725
Nahum lived in the kingdom of Israel, and prophesied against Nineveh.....	" "	630
Zephaniah prophesied in Judah.....	" "	630
Habakkuk " "	" "	625
Jeremiah " " chiefly in Judah.....	" "	628-587
Daniel " " in Babylon.....	" "	603-538
Ezekiel " " in Chaldea, among the Jewish captives	" "	595-574
Zechariah " " in Judah.....	" "	520-518 ¹
Haggai " "	" "	520
Malachi " "	" "	440

CHAPTER XLVIII.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

THIS book is justly placed in the Hebrew Bible at the head of the prophetic writings. Isaiah is the most sublime, versatile, and comprehensive of all the prophets. He rebukes the wicked, hypocritical Jews, exhorts them to repentance, and assures them of pardon. In the boldest and most eloquent language he predicts the overthrow and utter desolation of the great cities of the ancient world, and portrays in the most graphic manner the sufferings and the glory of the future Messiah,³ the universal extension of his kingdom, and the happiness of mankind under his mild and beneficent sway; and in language of incomparable grandeur he sets forth the attributes and prerogatives of Jehovah. Upon the whole, his prophecy is the most wonderful book of the ancient world.

It bears the inscription: "The vision (יִחְוֶה, singular for plural, *visions*) of Isaiah (יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, Yeshayahu),⁴ son of Amoz, which he saw

¹ The book, however, which bears his name, was probably not written until a short time before the Babylonian captivity.

² And perhaps also later.

³ Jerome regarded Isaiah not as a prophet only, but also as an evangelist and apostle.—Comment. on Isaiah.

⁴ "Help of Jehovah."

concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah."

Isaiah is mentioned in 2 Kings xix, where he consoles Hezekiah, and assures him of deliverance from the king of Assyria, whose defeat he predicts. He appears, also, in the subsequent history of Hezekiah (2 Kings xx).

This book is referred to as a source for the history of Hezekiah, under the title of "The vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz" (2 Chron. xxxii, 32). In addition to the book of prophecies Isaiah wrote the life of Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 22). From chaps. vii 3; viii, 3, 18, it appears that he was married, and had several children. He dwelt, it would seem, in Jerusalem, and laboured for the welfare of the people in the capital. Respecting the time and circumstances of his death nothing is known with certainty. The ancient tra- Personal his-
tory of Isalah.ditions of the Jews, followed by some of the early Christian fathers, state that he was sawed to pieces by the wicked King Manasseh, who made the streets of Jerusalem run with innocent blood (2 Kings xxi, 16).¹ There is nothing improbable in this tradition, and there seems to be a reference to it in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. xi, 37), where, in speaking of the ancient saints, it is said they "were sawn asunder."

It would seem, from chap. vi, that Isaiah was called to the prophetic office in the last year of Uzziah's reign, to which the vision described in that chapter most probably belongs. His prophetic office, accordingly, extended from about B. C. 758, through the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and at least fourteen years of that of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 13, etc.), embracing a period of forty-six years. We have no evidence, except what Jewish tradition affords, that he lived until the time of Manasseh. The reference to Isaiah as a source for the history of Hezekiah can mean no other book than the one we now possess, so that this reference furnishes no proof that Isaiah outlived Hezekiah. But if the Jewish tradition be received as true, his prophetic office was continued for sixty years or upwards.

The time of his prophetic labours embraced monarchs of widely different characters, and periods of varied religious con- The time of
Isalah's pro-
phetic labours.dition. The long reign of Uzziah was highly prosperous, and his fame spread far and wide (2 Chron. xxvi, 8, 15); but in his last days he was afflicted with leprosy (2 Kings xv, 5; 2 Chron. xxvi, 21). Notwithstanding his pious disposition, the people still burnt incense on the high places (2 Kings xv, 4). Jotham, although an upright monarch, was not especially distinguished for piety, and the people in his reign acted corruptly (2 Chron. xxvii, 2).

¹ See a collection of these traditions in Gesenius' Com. on Isaiah, vol. i, pp. 10-15

His successor, Ahaz, signalized his reign by abominable idolatries, and the kingdom of Judah was brought low (2 Chron. xxviii). Hezekiah, who succeeded him, was distinguished for piety and zeal in the destruction of idolatry and in the promotion of the worship of God (2 Chron. xxix). In the reign of this latter monarch Sennacherib, king of Assyria, invaded Judah, and took all its fenced cities, and demanded and received tribute from its king.

The book contains sixty-six chapters, and falls naturally into *three* parts. The first (chaps. i-xxxv) consists of rebukes of the children of Judah, earnest exhortations to them, the prophet's call to his sacred office, and prophecies respecting Judah, Israel, Moab, Edom, Damascus, Babylon, Assyria, Tyre, Ethiopia, and Egypt. The second part (chaps. xxxvi-xxxix) contains an account of the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, (in the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah), the deliverance of Jerusalem, the sickness and recovery of Hezekiah, the visit of the messengers of Merodach-baladan, king of Babylon, to him after his recovery, and Isaiah's prophecy to him of the Babylonian captivity. The third part (chaps. xl-lxvi) contains long prophetic and hortatory discourses, in which the prophet predicts the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, encourages the people to trust in Jehovah, and consoles them with the sure promises of Divine help. He also describes prophetically the sufferings of the Redeemer and the glory of his kingdom, and at the same time sets forth in lofty language the attributes and prerogatives of Jehovah. This division of Isaiah is called by the Germans "Book of Consolation" (Trostbuch).

ATTACKS ON THE GENUINENESS OF PORTIONS OF ISAIAH.

Respecting the genuineness of the prophecies of this book no doubt was expressed, so far as we know, in the ancient Jewish and Christian Churches. Aben Ezra, a distinguished Spanish rabbi of the twelfth century, was the first to intimate that the prophecies of the last part of the book were written by King Jechoniah at the time of the Babylonian captivity.

No attention, however, was paid to this intimation; but about 1780 J. B. Koppe, Professor at Göttingen, made additions to the German translation of Lowth's Isaiah, in which he opened the attack on the genuineness of a large portion of the prophecies. Gesenius, the distinguished Hebraist of the rationalistic school remarks on Koppe's criticism: "He first called attention to the necessity of rejecting, on historical grounds, as the prophet's, many parts of the collection. But as he went much too far in the separa-

tion of connected wholes, and often proceeded in an arbitrary manner his criticism lacks a firm support, and the collection appears to him as a loose heap of dissevered fragments of different poets of different ages shuffled like cards in a game. However groundless this appears upon closer examination, it has been implicitly followed by several of the moderns."¹

Since that time rationalistic criticism, with one voice, has denied the genuineness of the last part of Isaiah (chaps. xl-lxvi), and attributed it to an unknown prophet who lived at the time of the Babylonian captivity. It has also assailed the genuineness of single prophecies in other parts of the book. Eichhorn carried the hypothesis of separate documents so far as to divide the book into eighty-five oracles or fragments, which he attributed to very different authors and times. This is an extreme to which the skeptical criticism of the present time does not dare to go.

ANCIENT TESTIMONY TO THE GENUINENESS OF THESE PROPHECIES.

The apocryphal writer Jesus, the son of Sirach, a man of learning and great ability, who flourished in the beginning of the second or third century before Christ, thus bears his testimony to Isaiah and his prophecies: "Isaiah, the great prophet, faithful was he in his vision. In his days the sun went back and prolonged the life of the king. He saw by a mighty spirit the last times, and he comforted those who mourned in Zion. Forever he showed future things, and secret things before they came to pass" (chap. xlvi, 22-25). In this testimony there is an obvious reference to the last great division of Isaiah (chaps. xl-lxvi). In the Septuagint, completed in all probability before the middle of the second century before Christ, all the prophecies of this book stand under the name of Isaiah, and so they do in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in the Latin Vulgate.

The distinguished Jewish historian, Josephus, born four years after the crucifixion of Christ, speaking of a temple built in Egypt by the Jew Onias, about B. C. 149, remarks: "The prophet Isaiah had predicted, about six hundred years before, the building of this temple by a Jew"² (Isa. xix, 19). He also states that God, "having moved the soul of Cyrus, caused him to write to all Asia that CYRUS THE KING SAYS: 'Since the supreme God has made me king of the inhabited earth, I am persuaded that he is the being whom the nation of the Israelites worship. For he predicted my name through the prophets, and

Opinion of Jesus, the son of Sirach.

Opinion of Josephus.

¹ Commentar über den Jesaia, vol. i, p. 136.

² De Bel. Jud., vii, 10, 3.

that I should build his temple in Jerusalem in the land of Judæa. These things Cyrus knew from his reading the book which Isaiah left of his prophecies, two hundred and ten years before."¹ The passages referring to Cyrus are chaps. xliv, 28; xlv, 1. So, at least, it is evident that Josephus recognised Isaiah as the author of the last division of the book, as well as of the former part. He appears to have had no suspicion that the latter portion belonged to the Babylonian captivity.

Ancient Jewish tradition² attributed the whole book to Isaiah, and ascribed the editing of it to Hezekiah and his companions.

In the New Testament the whole book is attributed to Isaiah, and we have quotations as the language of Isaiah in various places, Isaiah in New Testament. e. g., in Matt. iii, 3, from Isa. xl, 3; in Matt. iv, 15, from Isa. ix, 1, 2; in Matt. iv, 16, from Isa. xlii, 7; and in Matt. xiii, 14, our Saviour quotes as the prophecy of Isaiah, chap. vi, 9, 10. Matthew viii, 17, is a reference to Isa. liii, 4; Matt. xii, 17-20, is from Isa. xlii, 1-3; Luke iv, 17-19, from Isa. xli, 1, 2; John i, 23, from Isa. xl, 3; and Acts viii, 28-35, is a reference to Isa. liii, 7, 8. St. Paul also quotes as Isaiah's, in Rom. x, 16, 20, 21, Isa. liii, 1, lxxv, 1, 2.

Jewish history and tradition know no period when any of the prophecies in the Book of Isaiah were attributed to any other prophet; and the very fact that they are collected into one whole, at the head of which stands the name of Isaiah, is a clear proof that the collector—if the prophet himself did not arrange his prophecies—regarded them as belonging to him. There can be no doubt that a book of Isaiah's prophecies existed for more than a century before the Babylonian captivity. This book must have contained at least the greater portion of chaps. i-xxxix. If we are now to suppose that the author of the last part (chaps. xl-lxvi) was not Isaiah, but a prophet who lived at the time of the Babylonian captivity, how could it have come to pass that so great a prophet, who wrote nearly one half of the book, the sublimest portion, should have been wholly unknown, and that his work should have been added to Isaiah, though before the captivity it had no existence? Ezra doubtless made a collection of the canonical books, but how could he have been deceived respecting a book written in, or so near, his age?

The violent improbability, if not impossibility, of the writings of different prophets being blended together and attributed to one author, appears from the fact that the twelve minor prophets, though in ancient times contained in a single book, were carefully separated and distinguished, though

¹ *Antiq.*, liber xi, 1, 1.

² Fürst, *Ueber den Kanon*, pp. 14-17.

several of them are very small, Obadiah consisting of a single chapter, and Haggai of but two.

There is no reason to doubt that the prophets themselves inscribed their names at the beginning of the books of their prophecies, to give them authority among the people; and it is difficult to suppose that the last part of Isaiah (chaps. xl–lxvi), if it had been written by another prophet, would have been left anonymous.

The position which the book of the prophecies of Isaiah holds—standing at the head of the prophets—was assigned it by the Masorites and the Spanish manuscripts, and also by the Hebrews in the time of Jerome.¹ And David Kimchi, a celebrated rabbi (about A. D. 1200), remarks that in all good manuscripts Isaiah stands before Jeremiah.² Gesenius quotes a passage from the Talmud in which it is stated that the rabbies give the following order of the prophets: “Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the twelve minor prophets.” The ground of this arrangement of the Talmudists is stated to have been that they wished to place Isaiah, which is so full of consolation, immediately after Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who predicted so much concerning the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. Vitringa suspected that the arrangers of the canon placed Jeremiah immediately after Kings, because the last part of the latter book has much in common with this prophet. In the German and Gallic manuscripts Isaiah stands after Jeremiah and Ezekiel.³ Upon the whole, no sound argument can be adduced from the position of Isaiah in the canon in favour of the late origin of the last part of the book.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE BOOK, AND THE DATE OF THEIR COMPOSITION.

Rationalistic criticism is unable to do justice to the prophecies of Isaiah; for it allows no real divine inspiration, and limits the prophet's vision by the natural horizon. All that transcends this is pronounced spurious. Delitzsch well observes: “Modern criticism finds itself hampered between two prejudices: there is no real prophecy—there is no real miracle. This criticism calls itself free, but upon closer examination it is found in a dilemma. In this dilemma it has two magic words with which it fortifies itself against every impression of historical evidence. As it transforms the histories of miracles into traditions and myths, so it either transforms the prophecies into predictions after the events (*Vaticinia post eventum*), or brings the predicted events into such

¹ Preface to Samuel and Kings.

² In Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 17.

³ See Gesenius' Com. über Jesaia, vol. i, p. 23.

close connexion with the prophet that to foresee them did not require inspiration, but only combination."¹ The Rationalists "know exactly how far a prophet can see, and where he must stand to see so far; but we are not tempted to purchase this omniscience at the cost of the supernatural. We believe in the supernatural reality of prophecy, because history affords us irrefragable proofs of it, and because a supernatural interference (*eingreifen*, grasping into) of God in the interior and outward life of men still to-day occurs, and can be tested. But this interference is of various kinds and degrees, and likewise the distant view of the prophets is in proportion to their gift (*charisma*) of very different degrees."²

The *first twelve chapters* of Isaiah are undoubtedly genuine. Gesenius concedes their genuineness, with the exception of chapter vii, 1-16, and a few other verses. Knobel³ remarks: "All the prophecies contained in them are genuine." De Wette,⁴ also, and Bleek,⁵ concede their genuineness.

The first chapter, which describes the thoughtlessness, hypocrisy, and wickedness of the Jews, and the destruction of their cities and the desolation of their country, seems to have been written by Isaiah in the reign of Hezekiah, after the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, as the condition of things seems especially to suit that period. The prophet seems to have intended it as an introduction to his prophecies. In chap. ii, 2-4 there is a Messianic passage, the same as Micah iv, 1-3. As it stands in Isaiah distinct from the connexion, and forms part of a connected prophecy in Micah, it is, most probably, a quotation in the former from the latter.

At the head of the second chapter stands the inscription, "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." Chapters ii-iv contain threatenings of God's judgments upon the people of Judah for idolatry, wickedness, and pride, accompanied with the promise of future blessedness. Gesenius refers these prophecies to the reign of Ahaz, in which he is followed by some critics. Keil refers them to the time of Jotham. And this seems to us the most probable. For if these chapters do not belong to the reign of that monarch, it is difficult to assign any to his time. Chapter v contains a parable of a vineyard, addressed to Judah and Jerusalem, respecting Judah and Israel, and ends with the denunciation of divine judgments upon the wicked. This, also, probably belongs to the time of Jotham. Chapter vi

¹ Commentar über den Jesaia, p. 23.

² Ibid., p. 409.

³ Der Prophet Jesaia, xxii.

⁴ De Wette—Schrader, p. 425.

⁵ Einleitung, p. 457. Bleek, however, excepts chap. ii, 2-4, which he thinks was not written by Isaiah.

contains the prophet's call to his holy office, in the last year of Uzziah's reign. Chapter vii states, that in the days of Ahaz the kings of Syria and Israel combined against the king of Judah, and that the prophet predicted their defeat, giving Ahaz a sign, that a virgin should conceive and bear a son who should be called "Immanuel." Isaiah declares the impending judgments of God from the hands of the Assyrians. Chapters viii-ix, 7, contain a prediction of the overthrow of Damascus and Samaria by the Assyrians, and an exhortation to trust in God. They also contain a prediction of the Messiah's kingdom. The prophecy was in all probability delivered in the time of Ahaz. Chapter ix, 8-x, 4 is a prophecy respecting the destruction of Israel, delivered probably in the latter part of the reign of Ahaz. Chapter x, 5-34 predicts the invasion of Judah by the king of Assyria, and was probably written in the last part of the reign of Ahaz. Chapters xi and xii predict the appearance of the Messiah from the stem of Jesse, and his glorious reign over Jews and Gentiles.

PROPHECIES CONCERNING FOREIGN NATIONS (XIII-XXIII)—GENUINENESS OF XIII-XIV, 23.

This section is a prediction of the overthrow and perpetual desolation of Babylon, and the restoration of Israel. These prophecies are denied to be Isaiah's by Gesenius, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Knobel, and Bleek, on the ground that the stand-point of the Babylonian captivity is assumed in them. They attribute them to a prophet living in the last part of the captivity.¹ But the inscription attributes the section to Isaiah: "The burden (*or oracle*) against Babylon which Isaiah the son of Amoz did see" (chap. xiii, 1); and this should not be rejected without the most cogent reasons.

That Isaiah would deliver a prophecy against the Assyrian power, especially against Babylon, was extremely probable, as that power in his day had captured many cities of Judah, and threatened Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii, 13-xix, 37); and, also, because the prophet had predicted to Hezekiah that the Jewish people, with his treasures, should be carried away captive to Babylon. It was especially proper that he should deliver a prophecy against the oppressor of Israel. This probability is strengthened by the fact that Isaiah delivered predictions against nations and cities far less important than Babylon, and which had not such close relations with the Hebrews. In the early part of Hezekiah's reign the king of Assyria had taken captive the ten tribes, and removed them to

¹ Gesenius and Bleek acknowledge that the prophecy was written before the capture of Babylon by Cyrus.

his dominions, and colonized their land with his own subjects, partly from Babylon.

In the list of the foreign nations against which Isaiah directs his prophecies, Babylon stands first. Then follow Moab, Damascus, Ethiopia, Egypt, Babylon repeated, and Tyre. The Prophet Micah, a contemporary of Isaiah, predicts that the inhabitants of Jerusalem shall go to Babylon, and there be redeemed from their enemies (Micah iv, 10). In the prophecy of Isaiah respecting Babylon, God threatens to stir up the Medes against Babylon. The Medes were then beginning to attract attention. Their revolt from the Assyrians, soon after which they made Dejoces king, occurred, according to Herodotus (i, 95-102), about B. C. 710, but according to Ctesias, about B. C. 876.

If the prophecy had been written after the time of Cyrus, who captured Babylon, it would have been different, for Cyrus was the king of Persia, and united the Medes to his kingdom. He is always called in Scripture king of Persia (Ezra i, 1; iii, 7, etc.). Babylon, though captured by Cyrus, was not destroyed, but afterward gradually lost its splendour, so that about the time of Christ it had become a great desert (Strabo xvi, 738). It cannot be said that the prophecy was written after the event. The Prophet Jeremiah, about the beginning of the Babylonian captivity, delivers a prophecy in *two very long chapters*, in which he uses some of the very phrases employed by Isaiah. (Compare Jer. 1, 39, 40, with Isaiah xiii, 19, 20, etc.).

The prophecy in Isaiah is brief and strong, altogether in the style of Isaiah, and is, doubtless, the earlier one; while that in Jeremiah, from its extended form, is evidently the later.

The genuineness of the prophecy has been defended by Hengstenberg, Hävernack, Keil, Delitzsch, and others.

Chapter xiv, 24-27 is a prophecy against Assyria, the genuineness of which is acknowledged by Gesenius, De Wette, Knobel, and Bleek. Chapter xiv, 28-32 is a prophecy against the Philistines, delivered in the year that Ahaz died, warning them against rejoicing on account of his death. Its genuineness is acknowledged by Gesenius, De Wette, and Knobel. Chapters xv, xvi contain prophecies against Moab, threatening it with destruction. Gesenius thinks that these two chapters were written by a contemporary of Isaiah, or by an older prophet, and that the epilogue (chap. xvi, 13, 14) was written by Isaiah. Bleek thinks the principal prophecy proceeds either from Isaiah, or at least from some one in his time, and that the epilogue was added later. Also Knobel thinks chaps. xv and xvi belong to a prophet older than Isaiah. But there is no good reason for denying their genuineness. Chapter xvii, 1-11 is a prophecy against

Damascus and Samaria, the genuineness of which is conceded by Gesenius, De Wette, and other Rationalists. It belongs, probably, to the first part of Hezekiah's reign. Chapter xvii, 12-14 is a prophecy directed against the enemies of Judah, most probably the Assyrians. It is undoubtedly genuine, and belongs most probably to the first part of Hezekiah's reign. Chapter xviii contains a prophecy against the Ethiopians, the genuineness of which is not denied by Gesenius and De Wette. It belongs unquestionably to the time of Hezekiah. Chapter xix is a prophecy against Egypt. Its genuineness is conceded by Gesenius and De Wette, and Schrader remarks that "there is no good reason for doubting the integrity of the prophecy."¹ Bleek also attributes it to Isaiah.² It belongs to the time of Hezekiah. Chapter xx relates a symbolic action performed by Isaiah in the time of Sargon, king of Assyria, accompanied with a prophecy that the king of Assyria would lead captive the Egyptians and Ethiopians. It is undoubtedly genuine, and belongs to the time of Hezekiah. Chapter xxi, 1-10 is a prophecy against Babylon, which is denied by Gesenius, Knobel, and Bleek to be Isaiah's, and is referred by them to a prophet living at the time of the Babylonian captivity. Gesenius³ and Knobel,⁴ however, acknowledge that it was written before the capture of Babylon by Cyrus. But there is no sufficient ground for denying the prophecy to be Isaiah's. Chapter xxi, 11, 12 is an oracle respecting Dumah, an Ishmaelitic tribe in Arabia. Gesenius, Knobel, and Bleek find no reason to deny its genuineness. Chapter xxi, 13-17 is a prophecy concerning Arabia, which Gesenius and Bleek find no good ground for denying to be Isaiah's. Chapter xxii, 1-14 is a prophecy of the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, and it appears to have been delivered just before that event. There is no dispute about its genuineness. Chapter xxii, 15-19 is a prophecy against Shebna, who was over the treasury in the middle of Hezekiah's reign. Chapter xxii, 20-25 is a prediction respecting Eliakim, who is to take the place of Shebna. Chapter xxiii predicts the overthrow of Tyre. Rosenmüller and Bleek deny the genuineness of this prophecy, and attribute it to a prophet in the age of Jeremiah. On the other hand, its genuineness is acknowledged by such Rationalists as Gesenius⁵ and Knobel;⁶ and Schrader⁷ declares there are no sufficient reasons for its denial. The prophecy refers either to the siege of Tyre by Shalmaneser (Josephus, ix, 14) for five

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 418.

² Einleitung, p. 460.

³ Commentar über Jesaia, pp. 649, 650.

⁴ Der Prophet Jesaia, p. 148.

⁵ Commentar über Jesaia, pp. 707-718.

⁶ Der Prophet Jes., pp. 165-176.

⁷ De Wette—Schrader, p. 419.

years, or to the thirteen years' siege by Nebuchadnezzar (Josephus, **x, 11.**) Chaps. xxiv-xxvii contain prophecies setting forth the judgments of God upon the land, and assurances of Divine favour, and exhortations to trust in God. In them there appear to be references to Messianic times. These chapters are denied to be Isaiah's by Gesenius, Knobel, and Bleek.¹ The first two refer it to the period of the Babylonian captivity, while the latter thinks it probably belongs to the age of King Josiah, or to the one immediately afterward. On the other hand, the genuineness of the prophecy is defended by Rosenmüller,² Hävernick, Welte, Drechsler, Keil, and Delitzsch. Keil remarks that witness is given "to its genuineness by a multitude of our prophet's peculiar and characteristic images, turns, and expressions." There is nothing in it to indicate an age later than that of Isaiah.

CHAPTERS XXVIII-XXXIII.

Gesenius remarks on these chapters: "The character of Isaiah's Admission of Gesenius. style is clearly impressed upon the whole, and the peculiar range of thought and manner of representation of this prophet are so clearly found in them, that the reader who gives any attention to the subject, and is not utterly destitute of all perception of the peculiarities of language, cannot at all doubt the identity of the author of these chapters and chapters i-xii."³ The authorship of this section is conceded by De Wette and Bleek, and, so far as we know, it is universally acknowledged to belong to Isaiah.⁴

These chapters are referred by Gesenius to the period from the sixth to the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. They treat of the Assyrian invasion. Chapter xxviii is a prophecy against Ephraim and Jerusalem, in which their vices are reprov'd, and judgment threatened. Chapter xxix is a prophecy against Ariel (Jerusalem), followed by the promise of returning happiness. Chapter xxx contains a prophecy against those who look to Egypt for help against the Assyrians, and it also promises future prosperity. Chapter xxxi is also a prophecy against those who seek help in Egypt against the Assyrians, and contains, likewise, an assurance of deliverance from the Assyrians. Chapters xxxii and xxxiii contain prophecies, judgments, and promises of future prosperity respecting various classes of persons. Chapter xxxiv contains the judgments of God upon the nations of the world, especially upon the Edomites. Chapter xxxv describes the future prosperity of the people of God, and their final

¹ Bleek, however, does not express himself with confidence.

² Scholia in New Test., vol. ii, pp. 370, 371, 2d ed. ³ Com. über Jesaja, p. 825.

⁴ Koppe doubted the genuineness of chap. xxx, 1-27, and Ewald objects to the genuineness of chap. xxxiii.

deliverance from all their foes. Both chapters are denied to be Isaiah's, and are referred to the Babylonian captivity by Gesenius, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Knobel, Bleek, and others. On the other hand, their genuineness has been advocated by Caspari, Keil, Delitzsch, and others. Keil remarks that Caspari "not only gives copious proofs that Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah had read the prophecy against Edom in Isaiah xxxiv, and had adopted thoughts, images, and expressions from it in several of their prophecies; but, also, that he has thoroughly refuted the opinions adopted in opposition, that either the author of Isaiah xxxiv had the chapters of Jeremiah and Ezekiel in question floating before his mind's eye (*Ewald, Umbreit*), or that passages bearing affinity to Isaiah xxxiv had found their way by interpolation into Jeremiah l and li."¹ The two chapters are closely connected, so that whatever establishes the genuineness of one proves also that of the other. They contain much of what is found in Isaiah xxxii, xxxiii, as Ewald concedes; and there is no good reason for denying that they belong to Isaiah.

The *second* division of Isaiah is an historical section (xxxvi-xxxix), containing an account of the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, in the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah, and of Hezekiah's sickness and recovery, concluded with a prediction of the Babylonian captivity.

That Isaiah should write an historical section in the midst of his prophecies is in accordance with his usage. We find historical events in chapters vii and xx, and we know from 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, that Isaiah wrote an account of Hezekiah. It is exceedingly improbable that Isaiah would fail to write in his prophecies such an important event as the invasion of Judah and the threatened attack on Jerusalem by Sennacherib, and a prediction of the monarch's defeat. In 2 Kings xviii, 13-xx, 19, we have this same history almost *verbatim*, except that Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving (Isa. xxxviii, 9-20) is wanting. Here the question arises, Was this section in Isaiah taken from the Books of Kings? or is the narrative in Isaiah the original, and that in Kings the borrowed one? or are both drawn from a common source, the basis of the history in the Books of Kings?

Gesenius² regards the narrative in Isaiah as derived from 2 Kings; while Rosenmüller,³ Knobel,⁴ Keil, and others, think both narratives were derived from a common source. Delitzsch holds⁵ that the narrative in Isaiah is the original, which was used in the composition of the Books of Kings.

The conflicting views of critics.

The second division of Isaiah historical.

Views of Gesenius and others as to the second section of Isaiah.

¹ Keil's Introd. vol. i, pp. 318, 319.

² Commentar über Jesaia, pp. 932-936.

³ Scholia in Old Test., pp. 493, 494.

⁴ Der Prophet Jesaia, pp. 255-257.

⁵ Der Prophet Jesaia, pp. 372-374.

It is evident that the section in Isaiah could not have been derived wholly from the Books of Kings, for Hezekiah's *song of thanksgiving* is wanting in them.

There can be no doubt that Isaiah wrote the four chapters under discussion. In Isaiah xxxvi, 2, it is said that "Rabshakeh stood by the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field." This same phrase occurs in chapter vii, 3, showing that they proceeded from the same writer. In chapter xxxvii, 23, occurs the phrase, "the Holy One of Israel," which is found also in the passage, 2 Kings xix, 22, taken from Isaiah. This phrase is used by Isaiah *twenty-five* times from the first to the fifty-fifth chapter. But elsewhere it is found but *five* times in the whole Hebrew Bible, and these in the Book of Psalms and in Jeremiah. Such an expression is foreign to the composer of the Books of Kings, and the prophetic style of the section is inconsistent with his being its author.

Mention is made in Isaiah xxxvi, 22, of Joah, the recorder, in the time of Hezekiah. The history of this king's reign was written down in annals by this officer, and the compiler of the Book of Kings made use of these annals and the history of Hezekiah in our Book of Isaiah, when he narrated the most important events in that monarch's reign. In this way it is easy to explain the deviations in the two accounts. Nor has the account in Kings a decided advantage over that in the prophet. Even if its text were preferable, that fact would not prove its originality, since the last chapter of Jeremiah, evidently taken from 2 Kings xxv, exhibits a better text than the original. In the thirty-ninth chapter the Babylonian captivity is predicted, which forms a connecting link between the former and the latter part of Isaiah.

THE LAST GREAT DIVISION OF ISAIAH. (CHAPTERS XL-LXVI.)

This prophecy is naturally divided into *three* parts. The first embraces chapters xl-xlvi, ending with the verse, "There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked." The second includes chapters xlix-lvii, ending with the same words. The third contains chapters lviii-lxvi, ending with language of similar import.

The first division (chaps. xl-xlvi) opens with the most beautiful and cheering words of hope and comfort for Jerusalem, assuring her that her sins are forgiven. The prophet then sets forth, in language of great sublimity, the attributes of the Almighty. At the same time he speaks of the folly of idolatry, and moves forward in his prophetic course to describe God's servant (the Messiah) who shall instruct and redeem men, and be "a light of the Gentiles" (chaps. xl-xlii.) The prophet continues

Analysis of the first division of third section.

in a tone of affection for Israel, promises divine assistance, with bitter sarcasm shows the folly of idolatry, and dwells upon the sovereignty and goodness of God. He predicts the restoration of the cities of Judah, and the rebuilding of the temple, in which connexion he speaks of Cyrus as God's shepherd, and as upheld by him. He dwells upon the sovereignty of God, and his mercy and goodness to his people (chaps. xliii-xlv). He sets forth the foreknowledge of God in declaring the future, and then speaks of the folly of idolatry, especially in reference to Babylon, upon which he announces the judgments of God. He continues to speak of God's revelation of future things from the beginning, in which he remonstrates with his people, and declares his mercies toward them in ancient days. The prophet concludes with the declaration that there is no peace to the wicked (chaps. xlvi-xlviii).

In the second part (chaps. xli'x-lvii) the prophet predicts that the Messiah shall be the restorer of Israel and the light of the Gentiles, and assures the people of God's love to them, and that he will gather them from all quarters of the world. He declares the sins of the people to be the ground of their sufferings, and sets forth the providence of God, and promises salvation to the people (chapters xlix-lii, 12). There follows next a prophetic description of the wisdom, sufferings, and death of the Messiah¹ as the servant of the Lord (chaps. lii, 13-liii, 12). The prophet comforts the people of God with the sure promise of divine aid, and consequent prosperity, and exhorts them to seek his favour, that they may live. He also reproves the idolatry of the people, the blind dogs and the dumb watchmen of Israel; yet the mercy of God is promised, while it is declared that there is no peace to the wicked (chaps. liv-lvii).

In the third division (chaps. lviii-lxvi) the prophet expostulates with the people respecting their observance of the out-
ward ordinances of religion and their neglect of the moral law, and promises prosperity if they are obedient.

The third division of the last section.

He next proceeds to enumerate their transgressions (chaps. lviii-lix). After this he announces the glory of Israel in Messianic times; at the same time he sets forth the judgments of God, combined with a sketch of his kindness to Israel (lx-lxiii). He then expostulates with God in reference to the condition of Israel, the desolation

¹ This section is Messianic, and it is so explained by the ancient Targumist, Jonathan Ben Uzziel, and by many of the ancient Jewish commentators. This is the only consistent view. It is not applicable to the prophets, to the pious Israelites, or to the Jewish nation, none of whom can be *the* servant of the Lord. This servant is "to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel" (chap. xlix, 6). He cannot, therefore, be the same as Israel, nor could a mere prophet do his work.

of Judah and Jerusalem, and the ruins of the temple. He again reminds the people of their wickedness, and predicts the glory of Israel in future times, concluding with a threat of the punishment of the wicked (chaps. lxiv–lxvi).

GENUINENESS OF CHAPTERS XL–LXVI.

We have already remarked that rationalistic critics deny that this division belongs to Isaiah, and that they attribute it to a prophet living at the time of the Babylonian captivity.¹ Its genuineness has been defended by Jahn, Kleinert, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Delitzsch, Alexander, and others. The unity of the division has been established by Gesenius, Hitzig, and De Wette. In respect to the style of this division, it must be confessed that in general it is more flowing, and in some respects different from some of the earlier parts of the prophecies of Isaiah, but not so different as to require a different author. The discourses are generally longer and freer.

On the style of Isaiah, Ewald remarks: "This is the very foundation of Isaiah's greatness, as it is generally one of those *Isaiah's style.* things in which he stands out most pre-eminently, that whatever may be demanded by the subject of which he treats, every kind of discourse and every form of representation is ready at command." No man always writes in the same style; still less does one of great genius. But yet the matter and the phraseology of this section bear some striking points of coincidence with the other parts of Isaiah. What a close resemblance there is between the Messianic descriptions in the eleventh chapter—acknowledged to be Isaiah's—and some of the prophecies of the latter part of this section (chaps. lx–lxvi)! The phrase, "the Holy One of Israel," occurs *eleven* times in the first thirty-seven chapters of Isaiah, five times in the first twelve, and *fourteen* times in chaps. xli–lx. But outside of Isaiah it is found but six times, three of which occur in the Psalms, two in Jeremiah, and the remaining one in 2 Kings xix, 22, taken from Isaiah xxxvii, 23. This is very remarkable. Another peculiarity of Isaiah is, that he uses קָרָא, *to call*, or נִקְרָא, *to be called*, for simply *to be*; e. g., chaps. i, 26; ix, 6; xxx, 7; xxxv, 8; xlv, 5; xlvii, 1, 5; xlviii, 8; lvi, 7; lviii, 12; lx, 14, 18; lxi, 3; lxii, 12. In a similar sense אָמַר, chaps. iv, 3; xix, 18; lxii, 4. These peculiarities, running through the whole book, are explained by Gesenius—who denies the genuineness of about one half of the book—on the supposi-

¹ Bleek supposes that chaps. lvi, 9–lvii, 11 were written before the exile; and this is the view of Ewald, who thinks that chap. liii, 1–12 is from an older prophet, and chaps. lxiii, 7–lxvi, is a later supplement. Knobel seems favourable to the view that this last section is a later addition.

tion that the author of the later portion imitated the style of Isaiah, or, what is more probable, that a later hand gave uniformity to the whole.¹ Both of these suppositions are utterly unfounded, and in the highest degree improbable; but one of them necessarily follows from the denial of the genuineness of a larger portion of the book. Another peculiarity of Isaiah is the use of אָמַר, future of אָמַר, for the present, *says*, in the following passages: chaps. i, 11, 18; x, 8; xxxiii, 10; xl, 1, 25; xli, 6, 21; lxvi, 9. In other passages, however, the present is used, as in other prophets. יָצַא־צִיָּאִים, *shoots, offspring*, occurs in chaps. xxii, 24; xxxiv, 1; xlii, 5; xlv, 3; xlviii, 19; lxi, 9; lxv, 23; but nowhere else in the whole Hebrew Bible, except four times in Job. תְּעִצִּי, *thorn hedge*, occurs but *twice* in the Hebrew Bible, in the plural, Isaiah vii, 19, and in the singular, Isa. lv, 13; גִּזְעַ, *stock*, Isa. xi, 1; xl, 24; once in Job in the sense of *stump*, and found nowhere else; יְבֵרֵי־מַיִם, *streams of waters*, Isaiah xxx, 25, xlv, 4, and nowhere else in the Bible. There are some other linguistic peculiarities common to the first and last parts of the book, which may be alleged in proof of the unity of the whole, and, consequently, that Isaiah is the author of the whole book. But those we have given are the most striking. The latter part of Isaiah is free from Chaldaisms,² which would not be expected if it were written about the time of the captivity, or still later. That the last division of Isaiah should contain words not found in the other parts, is nothing more than might naturally be expected. It has been alleged that the stand-point of the last section (chaps. xl–lxvi) of Isaiah is the Babylonian captivity. But this is only in part true. For we find reference made to a state of things that does not suit the captivity.

Theory of Gesenius as to the style of the last division.

Linguistic peculiarities of Isaiah.

Bleek thinks it in the highest degree probable that the section lvi, 9–lvii, 11, was written before the Babylonian captivity. This is also the view of Ewald. Certainly the state of affairs described in this section belongs to an age earlier than that of the captivity, and may pertain to that of Isaiah. But why should this section be wrested from the great mass of prophecy with which it is connected, and be referred to a different age? Why should it not have great weight in determining the age of the whole division of the book?

¹ Commentar über den Jesaja. vol. ii, p. 29.

² The Chaldee colouring appears in Nehemiah, Chronicles, in the prophets Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, in Ecclesiastes, and in some of the later Psalms. Ezra and Daniel are partly in Chaldee. There are some Chaldee words in Jeremiah. אָנֹאֲלָה־יָרֵךְ, Isa. lxiii, 3, is a Syriasm, as Psalm lxxvi, 6, written before the captivity. In chap. liii, 10, הִתְקַלֵּר is also a Syriasm.

In chap. xl, 9 it is said: "O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!"¹ This verse seems clearly to convey the idea that Jerusalem and the cities of Judah were still in existence, i. e., that the captivity had not yet occurred. In chap. xliii, 22-24, God reproaches Israel for not offering sacrifices to him. But this presupposes that the temple was still standing. In chap. lvi, 4-7, it is promised to the eunuchs that they shall have a place in the house and within the walls of the Lord; and that their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon his altar if they keep the sabbaths and do the Divine will--which shows that the temple was still standing.

In chap. lviii, 6, we find this interrogatory: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?" The oppression which the Jews are here represented

as exercising is not consistent with a state of captivity at Babylon. Chapter lix describes a state of things scarcely consistent with the time of captivity. This is true, especially of verse 18, which refers to the judgments which God is about to inflict for sins. In chap. lxii, 6 it is said, "I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night." This is inconsistent with the supposition that Jerusalem at that time was a waste. In chap. lxvi, 3, 4, we have allusions to sacrifices and to future judgments that scarcely suit the captivity. Nor is it easy to see, if Jerusalem and the temple were in ruins, that it could be said: "A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple" (verse 6).

But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that there are several passages in which the country and Jerusalem are represented as being desolate, and the sanctuary profaned. "The holy cities are a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our holy and beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, *is destined to be burnt*" (Gesenius, Heb. Lex.), (chap. lxiv, 10, 11). The English version represents the burning as having already occurred. The phrase used, *הָיָה לְשָׂרֵפֶת אֵשׁ*, *destined to be burnt with fire*, occurs also in Isaiah ix, 4, but nowhere else. Also in chap. lxiii, 18, it is said: "Our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary."

But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that there are several passages in which the country and Jerusalem are represented as being desolate, and the sanctuary profaned. "The holy cities are a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our holy and beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, *is destined to be burnt*" (Gesenius, Heb. Lex.), (chap. lxiv, 10, 11). The English version represents the burning as having already occurred. The phrase used, *הָיָה לְשָׂרֵפֶת אֵשׁ*, *destined to be burnt with fire*, occurs also in Isaiah ix, 4, but nowhere else. Also in chap. lxiii, 18, it is said: "Our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary."

In the first place, it must be observed that Isaiah gives, in the first chapter of his prophecy, a fearful picture of the desolations of Judah,

¹ This is the proper rendering of the passage. The marginal reading in the English version is not admissible.

which were to be brought upon it, or had already been inflicted in the time of Hezekiah by Sennacherib. It is impossible to determine how far the prophet may have reference to these calamities. But, further, it is a peculiarity of the prophetic style that it often represents future events as already present or past. This grew out of the fact that the prophecies were often communicated to the prophets in visions, in which future events passed before their eyes as present realities. We find many passages in illustration of this. In Isaiah iii, 8, it is declared that "Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen." It is not questioned that this was written by Isaiah, and yet its fulfilment was in the prophet's time still in the future. Again, in xxi, 9: "He answered and said, Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods he hath broken unto the ground." Here, in a prophecy which Gesenius admits was written before the capture of Babylon, the city is represented as already fallen. In a similar way the future Messiah is spoken of as already born (Isaiah ix, 6). So in Isaiah's prophecy of the destruction of Tyre, the city is represented as already laid waste (chap. xxiii, 1).

In Jeremiah viii, 16, the prophet, in predicting the overthrow of Judah and Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, represents their work as already done: "For they are come, and have devoured the land, and all that is in it; the city, and those that dwell therein." Again: "Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not upon thy name: for they have eaten up Jacob, and devoured him, and consumed him, and made his habitation desolate" (chap. x, 25). Here the prophet calls for vengeance upon men for acts which they are going to perform, which he represents as already done: for the context shows that the desolation of Judah and Jerusalem was still in the future.

In Amos ix, 11, it is predicted: "In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and I will close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." When this prophecy was uttered the tabernacle had not yet fallen, though its restoration is predicted. In Micah iv, 8, it is declared, respecting the daughter of Zion: "Unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." It could be naturally inferred from this that Judah had no kings, but that the kingdom had been lost. Such, however, was not the case in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, the contemporaries of this prophet. In view of these facts it is evident that the references in Isaiah to some of the events or conditions of the country during the Babylonian captivity can furnish no conclusive proof that the last division of Isaiah was written during that period.

By far the greatest part of the last division of Isaiah is Messianic ; at least, it treats especially of the future glory of Israel. Isaiah had already predicted to Hezekiah the Babylonian captivity (Isaiah xxxix, 6, 7 ; 2 Kings xx, 17, 18). The prophet Micah about the same time foretells the captivity in Babylon and the return of the people : " O daughter of Zion, . . . thou shalt go even to Baby'on there shalt thou be delivered ; there the Lord shall redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies " (chap. iv, 10).

If the prophecies of Isaiah had been generally confined to the immediate future, we would expect little or nothing in reference to the deliverance from the captivity. But since he dwells in such glowing language upon the Messiah's kingdom and Israel's future glory it is but natural to expect the announcement of a return from Babylon. His prediction of the captivity furnishes him the theme upon which he enlarges. And, after all, he says but little about the return from Babylon, but dwells rather upon a greater and higher deliverance. " They shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of *many generations* " (Isa. lxi, 4), cannot be applied with any degree of force to the return from Babylon.

In chaps. xliv, 28 ; xlv, 1, Cyrus ¹ is referred to as the prince who is to rebuild the temple. He is called *Koresh, the sun*, but is not spoken of as the king of any particular country, nor are his lineaments drawn.

We have another instance in which the name of the individual is predicted by Prediction by specific names. who is to accomplish a great work. In 1 Kings xiii, 2, it is related that a prophet announced to the idolatrous altar of Jeroboam at Bethel : " O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord, Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name, and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall he burn upon thee." This prophecy was fulfilled by King Josiah about three hundred and fifty years after it was delivered (2 Kings xxiii, 15-20).

In different parts of the last division of Isaiah God represents himself as announcing events before they come to pass (chaps. xli, 22-26 ; xlili, 9 ; xlv, 21 ; xlvi, 10 ; xlviii, 3-7), as a proof that he alone is the true God. It is evident from this that the prophet regarded himself as revealing the future, and not as simply announcing what was before the eyes of all.

¹Josephus states that Cyrus read this prophecy in Isaiah respecting himself, and was induced by it to give the Jews permission to return to their own land. Antiq., xi, 1, 2. The decree of Cyrus in favour of the Jews is most easily explained on the supposition that he had read this prophecy of Isaiah.

It is very probable that Zephaniah (about B. C. 625) and Jeremiah (B. C. 629-588) have both quoted the last division of Isaiah. (Comp. Zephaniah ii, 15 with Isaiah xlvii, 8, 10.) Isaiah quoted by some other prophets. This latter prophet describes with withering sarcasm the folly of idolatry (chaps. xlv, 9-19; xlvi, 1, 7). Jeremiah evidently refers to these descriptions in chapter x, 3-15. Isaiah is, beyond doubt, the great original. There are also other passages in Jeremiah which, from their very character, seem to have been taken from Isaiah (chaps. xl-lxvi).

If there were found a few passages in Isaiah that must of necessity be referred to the time of the Babylonian captivity, we should prefer to regard them as interpolations, rather than to reject the genuineness of the last division of the book. But, happily, we are not driven to this necessity. For we are not authorized to limit the prophetic knowledge of Isaiah, nor have we any *à priori* method of determining how far the Almighty would disclose to him the future, nor how far he would assume the future as already present.

CHAPTER XLIX.

THE PROPHET JEREMIAH.

JEREMIAH was the son of Hilkiyah, of the priests in Anathoth, a city in the tribe of Benjamin, about three miles north-east of Jerusalem. He began his prophetic labours while quite young (chap. i, 6), in the thirteenth year of Josiah the son of Amon, king of Judah about B. C. 629), and continued them until the eleventh year of King Zedekiah, when the people of Jerusalem were carried away captive to Babylon—a period of about forty-one years. During the first part of his ministry he lived in Anathoth, as appears from chapter xi, 18-23. Here he purchased a piece of land (chapter Personal history of Jeremiah. xxxii, 6-15). At a later period he seems to have had a permanent residence in Jerusalem, until the city was taken by the Chaldeans. It appears that he was never married, as he gives us no intimation of his having either wife or children; and he was commanded not to take a wife, nor to have sons and daughters in the place, in view of the great calamities that were to befall the land (chap. xvi, 2-4). In the time of Zedekiah he was imprisoned and thrust into a miry dungeon, from which he was liberated by order of the king; though still confined to the court of the prison (chaps. xxxvii and xxxviii).

When at length the city of Jerusalem was captured, Jeremiah, in accordance with the command of Nebuchadnezzar, was released from prison, and kindly treated by Nebuzar-adan, the Chaldean general. Not long after this he went into Egypt, to Tahpanhes, with a company of Jews (chaps. xlii-xliv). As we hear nothing of him, it is uncertain whether he returned to Palestine or not, though it is probable that he did. Of his death we have no record.

The ministry of Jeremiah extended over a period of great corruption and idolatry among the people of Judah. The fifty-five years' reign of the wicked king Manasseh had sapped the foundations of religion and morality. Amon, his successor, reigned two years, and walked in the wicked course of his father. His successor, the pious Josiah, in the thirteenth year of whose reign Jeremiah began to prophesy, manifested great zeal in the service of God, and instituted important reforms: but the good results of his efforts were in a great measure destroyed by the wicked reigns of Jehohaz and Jehoiakim, his successors. The three months' reign of Jehoiachin was also wicked, and at its close he and all the chief men of Jerusalem, and the treasures of the city, were carried away captive to Babylon.

Jeremiah's book furnishes us with so much personal history that we have a clearer perception of his character than we possess of any other Hebrew prophet. He is exhibited as a man of great religious zeal, intrepidity, deep sympathies, and great fidelity, and as suffering very harsh treatment from idolatrous princes for his reproofs. His teachings are chiefly of a practical character. He rebukes the vices and crimes of his age, and earnestly preaches repentance. We miss in his book the sublime prophecies of Isaiah, and find but few Messianic passages in it.

The book naturally falls into *four* divisions. In the *first* we have an account of the call of Jeremiah to the prophetic office, of his messages to the people, of his expostulations with them, of his predictions of the divine judgments, a sketch of his ministry among the people, and the capture of Jerusalem (chs. i-xxxix). The *second* division (chs. xl-xlv) contains an account of affairs after the capture of Jerusalem, and states that the leaders of the Jewish people took all those who remained in Judah, with Jeremiah and Baruch, and went down to Tahpanhes, in Egypt. It also gives the prophecies of Jeremiah delivered there. Chapter xlv, however, gives the words addressed by Jeremiah to Baruch in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. The *third* division (chaps. xlvi-li) gives the prophecies of Jeremiah respecting Egypt, the Philistines, Tyre and Zidon, the Moabites, the Ammonites, Edom, Damascus, Elam.

His prophecy has four divisions.

and Babylon. The *fourth* division consists of but one chapter (lii), giving an account of the reign of Zedekiah and the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuzar-adan, the treatment which the king received from the Babylonian monarch, and the release of Jehoiachin from imprisonment in Babylon.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH, AND THE DATE OF THEIR DELIVERANCE.

The prophecies of Jeremiah are so interwoven with the events of his life, and bear so strongly the stamp of his age, that the genuineness of but few of them has been questioned. Their genuineness generally admitted. As Jeremiah began to prophesy in the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah, and continued in the prophetic office through the eighteen remaining years of Josiah, the three months of Jehoahaz (probably the same as Shallum, Jer. xxii, 11), the eleven years of Jehoiakim, the three months of Jehoiachin, and the eleven years of Zedekiah, the question arises, Under what reigns were the different prophecies delivered? In many instances it is stated when they were delivered, in others we have no guide but critical conjecture. We are certainly justified in attributing to the eighteen years during which he prophesied in the time of Josiah a considerable portion of his prophecies.

We think it probable that the first seventeen chapters were delivered in the reign of Josiah. Certainly a large portion of them belongs to this period. The prophet relates in the first chapters the particulars of his call to the prophetic office in the thirteenth year of Josiah. In chap. iii, 6 he states: "The Lord said also unto me in the days of Josiah the king," etc. After this the name of no ruler is mentioned throughout this section, and there is in it nothing unsuitable to the reign of Josiah. In the time of this pious king the prophet had protection even from wicked princes, and the men of Anathoth alone were dangerous foes. This section contains no denunciation of the king, but of the people. In the time of the subsequent wicked monarchs his difficulties with kings and princes begin. In chap. xiii, 18, however, it is said: "Say unto the king and to the queen, Humble yourselves, sit down: for from your heads shall come down even the crown of your glory." This may seem to indicate that the king and queen were to lose their position, and it may seem more applicable to some other rulers than to Josiah and his queen. The prediction might be considered as fulfilled by Josiah's death at Megiddo. The language, however, may be applied not to any individual monarch, but, generally, to the overthrow of the Jewish monarchy.

In these chapters the genuineness of chap. x, 1-16 is denied by De Wette and others, and the verses are attributed to a prophet living during the captivity, whom they suppose to have written the last part of Isaiah. Bleek supposes the section to be genuine, and thinks it belongs to the time of Zedekiah.¹ Verses 6-8, 10, are wanting in the LXX; but this furnishes no ground for their rejection. Verse 11 is in Chaldee, for which it is difficult to assign a good reason. It must be acknowledged that the sixteen verses under discussion strongly resemble the latter part of the prophecies of Isaiah: but this is to be explained by Jeremiah's imitating Isaiah, not by a later prophet's retouching him. In chapter viii nearly all verse 10, and the whole of verses 11 and 12 are omitted in the LXX; but, although Hitzig regards them as superfluous, and as interrupting the connexion, there is no good reason for their rejection. In chap. xi, verse 7, and nearly the whole of 8, are omitted in the LXX, but there is no sufficient reason for their being discarded from the text. Chap. xvii, 1-4, is wanting in the LXX, but Hitzig considers it genuine. Certainly its omission there does not justify us in throwing it out of the Hebrew text. Chapters xviii, xix, contain an account of Jeremiah's being sent down to the potter's house to see a work wrought on the wheels, which was marred, and of Jeremiah's application of it to the house of Israel. Chapter xx contains an account of Pashur's smiting Jeremiah—when he had heard the prophecy—and the incidents that followed it. These three chapters are closely connected, and belong, in all probability, to the time of Jehoiakim. Chapter xxi, 1-10 belongs to the time of Zedekiah. Chapters xxi, 11-xxii, 19 belong to the age of Jehoiakim, for Shallum (Jehoahaz) had already been deposed and carried into Egypt (chap. xxii, 11), and the reigning monarch is exhorted to imitate the virtues of his father (Josiah, evidently), and Jehoiakim is threatened with the burial of an ass—all of which point to the time of this monarch. Chapters xxii, 20-xxiii belong to the time of Jehoiachin (called also Coniah and Jechoniah), for God threatens to deliver him up to the Chaldeans (chap. xxii, 24-28). Chapter xxiv belongs to the first part of Zedekiah's reign, after Jehoiachin had been carried away captive to Babylon. Chapter xxv was delivered in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. A part of the 13th and the whole of the 14th verse are wanting in the LXX. After the 13th verse there is no longer a correspondence in the order of chapters between the Hebrew and the LXX. Chapter xxvii is attributed in the Hebrew text to the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, but the contents clearly

¹ Einleitung, p. 477.

show that it belongs to the time of Zedekiah, most probably to the early part of his reign.

The Peshito-Syriac reads, "*In the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah*, son of Josiah, king of Judah, came this word to Jeremiah from the Lord." The Septuagint has simply, "Thus saith the Lord." The present reading of the Hebrew¹ is evidently the error of a transcriber, repeating at the head of this chapter the very words with which the preceding chapter begins. In this chapter verses 7, 13, 17 are entirely wanting in the LXX, and the last five verses are found mutilated. Davidson² does not think the seventh verse genuine; he also supposes 16-22 to be spurious, and a *vaticinium ex eventu*. Hitzig³ regards the Hebrew text in general as corrupt in this chapter where it contains more than the LXX. De Wette thinks the chapter revised by a later hand.⁴

We cannot agree with these critics; for the mere fact that some of these verses are wanting in the LXX furnishes no sufficient proof that they were wanting in the Hebrew text before the time of Christ. The Septuagint has abridged the text. There is no doubt that the LXX sometimes took liberties with the text; but this whole chapter is well connected, and Jeremiah's advice and prophecy are suitable to the occasion. But what motive could a later writer have had to make the additions, some of which enjoin upon the people obedience to Nebuchadnezzar? Certainly this monarch, who overthrew the Jewish Commonwealth, was not very popular with the Jews. Nor is there anything in this chapter inconsistent with the style of Jeremiah.

Chapter xxviii belongs to the fourth year of Zedekiah, and xxix to the first year of that monarch's reign. In chapter xxix nearly the whole of verse 14, and all of 16-20, are omitted in the LXX. It is true that verses 16-19 do not seem to be suitable in a letter to the captives in Babylon, as they refer to the king (Zedekiah) and people still remaining in Judah, for Nebuchadnezzar had not yet completed the captivity of the Jews. But yet there were, perhaps, good reasons for the insertion of these verses in the letter of Jeremiah; for the captives in Babylon declared that God was raising up for them prophets in that city (verse 15). These false prophets,⁵ no doubt, proclaimed that God would restore the captives to their native land. Jeremiah, in reply to them, states that so far is this from being true,

¹ In Kennicott and De Rossi's Hebrew Bible, MS. 224 has the reading Zedekiah, and in MS. 180 Jehoiakim is wanting.

² Introduction, vol. iii, pp. 99, 100.

³ Der Proph. Jer., pp. 211-218.

⁴ De Wette—Schrader, p. 431.

⁵ In illustration of this see Jeremiah xxviii, 10, 11.

that Zedekiah and those who remain in Judah will be also brought to Babylon. It is very probable that the verses under consideration were omitted by the LXX on account of their supposed irrelevancy.

De Wette argues that chapters xxvii–xxix were revised by a later hand, from the use of the short form of several proper names in them: ירמיה (Jeremiah), יכניה (Jechoniah), זדקיה (Zedekiah), without the ending, ו. But no solid argument can be drawn from this in favour of a revisal of the chapters. A short form for Jehoiachin (כניהו, *Coniah*) is found in Jer. xxii, 24, 28. It is true that the shorter form for Jeremiah is used in the later books of the Hebrew Bible, though the longer form occurs in 1 Chron. xii, 13. For Zedekiah, the long form is used in this very section in chapter xxix, 21, and is found in a later author, 2 Chron. xviii, 10. We have no reason to suppose that Jeremiah always wrote his name in the same way; but even if he did, we do not know that copyists would do so. Dr. Davidson thinks there are some interpolations in the twenty-seventh chapter; but on chapters xxviii and xxix he remarks: "A regular glossing or working over of the text either by the Deutero-Isaiah, or any other such person, is hardly perceptible except to the eye of hypercriticism."¹

Chapters xxx, xxxi predict the restoration of Israel, and in chap. xxxi, 31–34 there is a reference to the New Testament dispensation. They were written, in all probability, about the time Zedekiah was carried away captive to Babylon. Chapter xxx, 10, 11 is wanting in the LXX. There is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the passage. Chapter xxxii belongs to the tenth year of the reign of Zedekiah, when the king of Babylon besieged Jerusalem. The next chapter (xxxiii) belongs to the same period. It contains a Messianic passage (verses 15, 16). Verses 14–26 are wanting in the LXX.

De Wette² thinks chapters xxx, xxxi, xxxiii were revised by a later writer, who, he imagines, wrote the second part of Isaiah. But Dr. Davidson supposes that the "Deutero-Isaiah had Jeremiah's prophecies in view in different places, and copied various expressions." It is difficult to see what purpose a later writer would have in retouching Jeremiah. Nor is it at all probable that the learned Jews would have made so free with the writings of the great prophet.

There is a considerable number of passages in Jeremiah which strongly resemble Isaiah, especially in the three chapters under discussion. And the question arises, Which is the original? This must be conceded to Isaiah, for the passages in Jeremiah that bear such close affinity with the last part of Isaiah are not in Jeremiah's style.

Isaiah the original in parallel passages.

¹ Introduction, vol. iii, p. 101.

² De Wette—Schrader, p. 429.

Chapter xxxiv belongs to the last part of the reign of Zedekiah when Jerusalem was besieged. Chapter xxxv pertains to the reign of Jehoiakim, but the year is not named; and the following chapter, xxxvi, records transactions that pertain to the fourth year of that monarch's reign.

Chapters xxxvii, xxxviii relate events, especially those with which Jeremiah was connected, in the last part of the reign of Zedekiah. Chapter xxxix gives an account of the capture of Jerusalem in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, and incidents following it. Verses 4-13 are wanting in the LXX. Chapters xl-xliv relate the events in Judah after the capture of Jerusalem, and the migration of the chief men, and all the remnant of the Jews in Judah, accompanied by Jeremiah, to Tahpanhes in Egypt. They also contain the prophecies there delivered by Jeremiah. Chapter xlv contains words of consolation to Baruch, delivered in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. Chapter xlvi, 1-12 contains a prophecy against Egypt and the army of Pharaoh-necho, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. Chapter xlvi, 13-26 is also a prophecy against Egypt, to which are added words of consolation to Israel (verses 27, 28), delivered also, it would seem, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim.

Chapter xlvii is a brief prophecy against the Philistines. It was delivered, the superscription states, "before that Pharaoh smote Gaza"—words which are wanting in the LXX. De Wette supposes the inscription to be false, because the prophet threatens the Philistines with destruction from the north, not from Egypt¹ (verse 2). It is very probable that the Philistines were threatened with destruction from the Chaldeans, and not from the Egyptians. The statement of the superscription, Before that Pharaoh smote *Gaza* the prophecy came to Jeremiah, is not false. Gaza, Askelon, and all the Philistines were to be ruined; hence it is evident that Pharaoh's smiting Gaza has nothing to do with the fulfilment of the prophecy. Chapter xlviii contains a prophecy against Moab, in which a very accurate knowledge of the geography of the country is shown. Verses 45-47 are wanting in the LXX. Chap. xlix contains prophecies respecting the Ammonites, the Edomites, Damascus, Kedar, and Hazor (verses 1-33), and against Elam (verses 34-39). With the exception of this last prophecy against Elam, belonging to the first part of Zedekiah's reign, it is impossible to determine in what reign Jeremiah delivered the prophecies in the last two chapters. Chapters l, li contain a very long and, in some respects, minute prophecy against Babylon, in which her utter desolation is predicted, and to be effected chiefly by the Medes. In chapter li, verses 45-48

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 428.

are wanting in the LXX. This prophecy was written in a book, and sent, in the fourth year of the reign of Zedekiah, to Babylon by Seraiah, who was commanded by Jeremiah to read it there, and then to bind a stone to it, and to cast it into the midst of the Euphrates, and to declare, "Thus shall Babylon sink and rise no more" (chapter li, 59-64).

The genuineness of the prophecy in these two chapters has been Objections to genuineness. assailed by Eichhorn, Gramberg, Knobel, Ewald, and others. Davidson is inclined to think that it was not composed by Jeremiah. But Hitzig remarks on this prophecy: "It exhibits many traces of its genuineness and grounds for it. The use of language (chapters l, 16; li, 1, 3, 7, 14, 45, 55) and the circle of images (chapter li, 7, 8, 34, 37), as well as the style, especially in turns like chapter li, 2, in the form of conclusion (chapter li, 57), and in the informal dialogue (chapter li, 51), unmistakably betray Jeremiah. This result is confirmed by chronological data. Assyria has fallen (chap. l, 18). Foreigners, the Chaldeans, have made an invasion into the land of Judah which especially endangered the temple (chaps. l, 11, li, 51); the land has been pillaged, people have been carried away from it (chap. li, 34), but Jerusalem is still inhabited (chap. li, 35); and, what historically cannot now be otherwise, the present king at Babylon is still Nebuchadnezzar"¹ (chapter l, 17). He, however, thinks the prophecy has been somewhat altered. De Wette finds in the prophecy expressions and turns of thought characteristic of Jeremiah, along with the peculiarities that belong to the second part of Isaiah; so that he suspects that a later author, who, he supposes, wrote the second part of Isaiah, revised this prophecy of Jeremiah.² Why should he not rather have supposed that Jeremiah imitated Isaiah?

Bleek remarks on the prophecy, that if it is not genuine we must suppose that some one "composed it in the name of Jeremiah, and added the epilogue, that the prophecy might pass for that prophet's—which, in itself, is not probable. But in the contents themselves are found indications that the prophecy was composed in Judea itself, as the sanctuary still exists on Zion (chaps. l, 5, li, 50), as well as the city of Jerusalem (chap. li, 35). To the same effect do the words (chap. li, 51), 'For strangers have forced themselves into the sanctuaries of the Lord's house,' suit well the given date in Zedekiah's time, as then, after Jehoiachin's captivity, Nebuchadnezzar had plundered the temple. But the words would not be applicable after it had been entirely destroyed."³ The expression, "vengeance

¹ Der Prophet Jeremia, p. 391.

² De Wette—Schrader, pp. 423, 429.

³ Einleitung, pp. 478, 479.

of his temple" (chapters 1, 28, li, 11), refers to the plundering of the temple when Jehoiachin was led into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxiv, 11-13).^o

We have, accordingly, all the proof of the genuineness and integrity of this prophecy that we can reasonably demand—
 the positive statement that it was written by Jeremiah (chap. li, 60), and numerous internal marks peculiar to Jeremiah, and allusions to a state of affairs in that prophet's time which no longer existed a few years subsequently. It is difficult to see how the prophecy could have been revised by a later hand without obliterating many of the traces of Jeremiah's style and times, and without introducing evidences of a later period.

The last chapter of Jeremiah (lii) describes the reign of Zedekiah, the capture of Jerusalem and the events connected with it, and the deliverance of Jehoiachin from imprisonment in Babylon. This chapter, we hold, was not written by Jeremiah, both on account of the words with which the preceding chapter closes, "Thus far are the words of Jeremiah,"¹ and the statement that Jehoiachin was released from prison in the thirty-seventh year of his captivity, and treated kindly all the days of his life. Had this been written by Jeremiah he would have been ninety years old, or more; but it is not probable that he reached such an age. The chapter was added by a later hand.

THE COLLECTION AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH.

We find that in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the Lord commanded Jeremiah to take a roll of a book, and to write in it all the words that he had spoken unto him against Judah and against all the nations up to that time. Baruch then wrote in a book the words from Jeremiah, and read them to the people, after which the king burnt up the book. Baruch took another roll, and wrote all the words of the first roll, to which many similar words were added (chapter xxxvi).

In this same year (fourth of Jehoiakim) mention is made of the prophecies, "even all that is written in this book," which is followed by a list of the nations concerning which Jeremiah prophesied (chap. xxv, 13). Some of these prophecies were delivered at a later period, but are here named in order to give a complete view. Reference is again made in chapter xlv, 1 to Baruch's having "written these words in a book at the mouth of Jeremiah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim." But this book contained none of the prophecies written

¹ These words are omitted in the LXX.

after the fourth year of that monarch. The long prophecy against Babylon was written by Jeremiah himself (chap. li, 60) in a separate book, and sent to Babylon. Baruch may have also written for Jeremiah the last of his prophecies, as we find that he accompanied the prophet into Egypt (chapter xliii, 6).

It seems rather singular that the prophecies of Jeremiah—with the exception of the first twenty chapters—are not all ways arranged in the order of time in which they are delivered. Nor is the arrangement in the LXX, which differs from the Hebrew text after chapter xxiv, in the order of time. But, after all, there is not much disorder in the arrangement of the prophecies and the events. Chapters xxiv—xxxix, with the exception of chapters xxv, xxvi, xxxv, xxxvi, contain the prophecies delivered and the events that occurred in the reign of Zedekiah. They end with the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple in the eleventh year of that monarch's reign, and are almost invariably arranged according to the order of time. But it is not easy to determine why the four chapters last named, belonging to the reign of Jehoiakim, were inserted among those pertaining to the reign of Zedekiah. Perhaps in the judgment of the arranger the matter which they contain rendered their present position suitable.

Chapters xl—xliv, treating of affairs subsequent to the capture of Jerusalem, stand in the right place. Chapter xlv, containing words of consolation for Baruch, was added as an appendage to the prophecies and history respecting the Jews. Though belonging to the fourth year of Jehoiakim, it was judged better to put it here, rather than to omit it altogether. The prophecies respecting *foreign* nations (chaps. xli—li) are arranged together, and placed at the end of Jeremiah's writings, as having no special relation to the events of his times. Chapter lii was added as an appendix by a later hand.

We have already seen that in several instances passages are found in the Hebrew text that are wanting in the LXX. It is not easy to explain this phenomenon. It would, indeed, seem probable that the translators of the Hebrew text must have had before them a Hebrew manuscript, which was somewhat different from our present masoretic text. But, at the same time, we are not sure that they did not take liberties with the text. On the other hand, we cannot doubt that when the canon was formed by Nehemiah, our present Hebrew text of Jeremiah made a part of it. If it could be supposed with any reason that Jeremiah published *two* editions of his prophecies, one at Tahpanhes, in Egypt, and that he returned to Jerusalem and published a *second* and enlarged one, the basis of our present Hebrew text, and that the Greek version

The prophecies of Jeremiah not in chronological order.

Differences between the Hebrew and the LXX.

was made from the former in Egypt, the difficulty would be in great part removed. But even in that case it would seem singular that the translators should not have obtained a Hebrew manuscript from Jerusalem, the seat of Jewish authority and learning. Yet it is in the highest degree probable that such manuscripts as were in authority at Jerusalem were used by Hebrews in Egypt B. C. 200-150, during which the Greek version of Jeremiah was probably made.

Movers, and some other critics, have a decided preference for the text of the LXX, which Bleek,¹ upon the whole, favours. So, also, does De Wette in the later editions of his Introduction. Hävernick and Keil most decidedly prefer the Hebrew text. Ewald and Schrader,² while acknowledging that the Hebrew text is, in the main, the more correct, yet think that in some instances the LXX has the better reading.

For ourselves, we adhere to the Hebrew text, from which we see no good reason to depart. Neither can it be done with safety.

CHAPTER L.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHECY OF EZEKIEL.

THE PERSON OF THE PROPHET.

THE Prophet Ezekiel³ lived and prophesied among the Jews who had been brought from Judea, in the captivity of Jehoiachin, by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and dispersed in different parts of his dominions. He was dwelling in the land of the Chaldeans, among the captive Jews, near the river Chebar,⁴ when, in the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, the heavens were opened to him, and he saw visions of God, and the divine word was communicated to him. His prophetic office continued about twenty-two years. At least, his written prophecies extend over that period, as we find that a divine communication was made to him as late as the twenty-seventh year of the captivity (chap. xxix, 17).

But little is known of his personal history. His father was Buzi,

¹ Einleitung, p. 489.

² De Wette—Schrader, p. 435.

³ יְחִזְקִיָּאל, *whom God makes strong.*

⁴ צְבַר, *Chebar*, is, doubtless, the same as צְבֹר, *Chabor*, in 2 Kings xvii, 6, whither the king of Assyria transported some of the Israelites; the Chaboras of the Greeks called Aborrhias by Strabo. It is a large river in Mesopotamia, flowing into the Euphrates at the ancient Circesium (Carchemish), the modern Kerkesiah. The river is now called Khabûr. It is about 180 miles from Babylon. Nöldeke and Schrader suppose Chebar to be a stream or canal of the Euphrates, not far from Babylon.

a priest, who is otherwise unknown to us. He was married, as mention is made of the death of his wife (chap. xxiv, 18), who died in the ninth year of the captivity. He had a house of his own in the land of his captivity (chaps. iii, 24; viii, 1). He probably began his prophetic duties in the thirtieth year of his age¹ (chap. i, 1). We have no account of his death.

The book may be divided into *five* parts. The *first* (chapters i-xxiv) contains prophecies respecting the children of Israel. The *second* (chaps. xxv-xxxii) contains prophecies respecting foreign nations. The *third* (chaps. xxxiii-xxxvii) embraces oracles, principally respecting Israel. The *fourth* (chaps. xxxviii, xxxix) gives the predictions of the prophet against Gog and Magog. The *fifth* (chaps. xl-xlvi) describes the measuring of Jerusalem and the temple, the sacrificial offerings, the divisions of the land among the different tribes of Israel, and kindred matters, which were revealed to the prophet in vision.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE PROPHECIES OF EZEKIEL.

The book of this prophet is of such a uniform and well-connected character, and contains so many traces of the age of the prophet, that the genuineness of the whole of it is acknowledged by all critics, with scarcely an exception.

"Ezekiel's prominent peculiarity," says De Wette, "is impressed upon the book from beginning to end." Again he remarks: "That Ezekiel, who generally speaks of himself in the first person, wrote down every thing himself, is subject to no doubt; he, nevertheless, appears not to have done this until late. Even the collecting of the prophecies can be referred to him, especially as they are arranged according to a definite plan."² Gesenius likewise gives his testimony to the genuineness of the whole book when he says: "The Book of Ezekiel belongs to that not very numerous class which from the beginning to the end maintain a unity of tone, which is evinced by favourite expressions and peculiar phrases; and by this, were there nothing else, every suspicion that particular sections may be spurious ought to be averted."³ The learned sceptical Jew, Dr. Zunz,⁴ stands alone in calling in question the age of these prophecies, and in referring them to a period bor-

¹ This seems to us to be the meaning of the words, "And it came to pass in the thirtieth year," the same as in English, "in my thirtieth year," expressed by the LXX, ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ ἔτει. The supposition that some unknown era is referred to from which the thirtieth year is reckoned, is untenable.

² De Wette—Schrader, pp. 444, 446.

³ In Keil, vol. i, p. 362.

⁴ Gottesdienst. Vorträge der Juden, pp. 157-162.

dering on the time of the Persian Dominion. Definite special prophecies are an offense to him. As his objections to the age of these prophecies have found no response, it is unnecessary to enter into a refutation of them.

In the arrangement of these prophecies the order of time is observed, except in two instances, namely, the prophecy against Egypt in the tenth year (chap. xxix, 1), and that against the same land in the twenty-seventh year (chap. xxix, 17-20). There is no reason whatever for supposing that the prophecies of Ezekiel are historical events thrown into the prophetic form. They bear every mark of being genuine prophecies. "In the person of Ezekiel," says Keil, "we meet with a character very decided and sharply marked, of genuine priestly turn of mind, with rich endowments, with uncommon imagination, with imposing energy, with a noble creative imagination, and with powerful, burning eloquence."¹

The language of Ezekiel abounds in Chaldaisms, and he is often careless in his grammatical forms. His prophetic style and imagery were, no doubt, more or less modified by his new surroundings in the land of Chaldea. He makes frequent use of the Pentateuch, and in some instances imitates Jeremiah.² A large part of his prophecies are presented in visions; and as he almost invariably gives the date of these wonderful scenes, and the circumstances connected with them, it is evident that he intended that they should be understood as real events. We have no reason to question their truth.

In respect to the *symbolical actions* which the prophet in several instances was ordered to perform, it is probable that they were *really* performed by him in an outward way, in most cases as signs to the people. We cannot doubt that the death of the wife of the prophet was a *reality*, at which the prophet, as a sign to the people, was ordered not to weep, that they, too, should not weep at the loss of dear relatives (chap. xxiv, 15-24). So the symbolical acts in chaps. iv, v, xii, xxi, 6, 7, must be understood, in all probability, as having been performed in the presence of Israelites in the captivity.³ "Ancient tradition," says Fürst, "relates that the men of the great assembly, i. e., the great Council of State, collected, arranged, and edited the prophecies of Ezekiel. . . . The prophecies had for a long time been collected, brought into chronological order, and reduced

¹ Introduction, vol. i, p. 355, in Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

² Compare chap. xviii, 2 with Jer. xxxi, 29; chap. xxxiii, 7 with Jer. vi, 17, etc.

³ Bleek thinks that *symbolical acts* were not really performed by the prophet, as they could not have been witnessed by those for whom they were intended. *Einführung*, pp. 514, 515. This is not altogether true, for they were witnessed by a *part* of the community. No symbolical act is ever witnessed by *all* the people for whom it is intended.

to a whole. More than three hundred years passed away, during which Ezekiel was regarded as a holy book, belonging to the national writings. Then it was discovered, upon closer examination, that its legal contents in the regulations of the priests do not stand in harmony with the arrangements in the Pentateuch, and it was determined in the schools to withdraw the book, as apocryphal, from public reading. Then came forward Chanania, the son of Hezekiah, the son of Garon, a younger contemporary of Hillel's, about the birth of Christ, and devoted himself most industriously to the removal of the difficulty, until he succeeded."¹

CHAPTER LI.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

IN the Hebrew Bible this book stands in the Hagiographa between Esther and Ezra. It derives its name from its author, Daniel, who is its chief historical character, and whose prophecies it contains. The author was carried away captive from Jerusalem to Babylon in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, and continued to occupy various positions of honour, and to receive divine communications, until the third year of Cyrus (chap x, 1), after which we hear no more of him. The time of his death is uncertain.

The book is naturally divided into two parts: first, *the historical*, giving an account of important events at Babylon in the author's time (chaps. i-vi); second, *the prophetic*, containing prophecies respecting future empires, the Messiah's kingdom, and the resurrection of the dead (chaps. vii-xii).

THE UNITY OF THE BOOK.

Eichhorn held that the book was composed by two authors, one of whom wrote chaps. ii, 4-vi, and the other chaps. vii-xii with i-ii, 3. Berthold was of the opinion that the different sections were written at different times by nine authors. But the theory of a plurality of authorship is now universally abandoned.

In chapters i-vii, 1, Daniel speaks of himself in the *third* person, but in the rest of the book in the *first*. The reason for this difference of persons is obvious. The first part is *historical*, in which it was necessary for the author to keep his subjectivity out of sight, and to consider himself as one of the actors

¹ Ueber den Kanon, pp. 21, 24.

in the scene. In the last six chapters he speaks of himself in the first person, because his prophecy is not historical. He describes visions that appeared to himself alone. Here individuality and subjectivity are conspicuous, and therefore the first person is altogether appropriate.

It is true that the book is written partly in Hebrew, and partly in Chaldee, but this does not militate against unity of authorship. The Chaldee begins in chapter ii, 4, with the address that the Chaldeans make to the king, and ends with chapter vii. But the first person is used in this seventh (Chaldee) chapter and in the remaining chapters, which are Hebrew. It is extremely improbable that a second author, in taking up the first six chapters of the first part, should add an additional chapter in Chaldee, and then finish the book in Hebrew. The second part of the book is, to a great extent, an enlargement of some of the prophecies in the first, and refers to them. The character of Daniel is the same throughout the whole book.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE BOOK.

It was the universal belief of the ancient Jewish and Christian Churches that the book was written by Daniel, who lived during the captivity at Babylon. Porphyry, a heathen philosopher belonging to the school of the New-Platonists († about A. D. 305), devoted the whole of the twelfth book of his fifteen against Christianity, in the attempt to show that this book is spurious, and that it was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (B. C. 175-164). Jerome remarks on Porphyry, that he asserted that the author of the book "did not so much predict the future as narrate the past; that whatever he said up to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes contained true history, but that his statements in reference to affairs beyond that period, because he was ignorant of the future, are false. Eusebius, bishop of Cesarea, in three books, Apollinarius, also, in one large book, and before these, in part, Methodius, have answered him in a very ingenious manner."¹

From the time of Porphyry we hear of no objections to the genuineness of the book until Spinoza, a Dutch Jew of the seventeenth century, gave expression to a suspicion that a writer later than Daniel wrote the first seven chapters from the Chaldean annals. In the first part of the eighteenth century a violent and elaborate attack was made on the genuineness of the book by Anthony Collins,² an English Deist. In the latter part

The objections
of Spinoza and
Collins.

¹ Preface to his Commentary on Daniel.

² In *The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered*. London, 1727. See Leland's *View of Deistical Writers*, vol. i, p. 123.

of the same century the book was attacked by Corrodi, in which he was followed by Eichhorn and Bertholdt, about the beginning of the present century. These attacks have been continued by De Wette, Bleek, Ewald, Lengerke, Hitzig, Bunsen, Davidson,¹ and others. On the other hand, it has been vigorously defended by Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Herbst, Keil, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Stuart, and others.

THE EXISTENCE, AGE, AND COUNTRY OF DANIEL.

Before discussing the genuineness of the book, it is proper to inquire into the *existence*, *age*, and *country* of Daniel. And here we must observe that there is not the slightest reason for supposing that Daniel is a mythical or poetical character. If a book is forged in the name of a person, it shows that at the time of the forgery not only was there no doubt of the existence of that person, but also that he was a man of great reputation. Otherwise, there would be no object in assuming his name. And to ascribe to him a different character, or to locate him in a country or in an age different from what tradition assigned him, would render the reception of the book quite impossible.

We need not, however, rely wholly upon an *à priori* argument in proof of his existence and reputation, for the prophet Ezekiel, who lived in the first part of the Babylonian captivity, refers to him in the following passages: "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God" (Ezek. xiv, 14). Again he says Ezekiel's reference to Daniel. (verse 20): "Though Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it," etc. The placing of Daniel along with Noah and Job would indicate that he lived in a time of great trial, and was distinguished for fidelity and righteousness, as were Noah and Job. There is no reason for supposing that in the order of their names there is necessarily a reference to the order of time in which they lived. It was natural that Noah, their ancestor, distinguished for righteousness, should stand first. Daniel stands next, not because he preceded Job in time, but *because he was Ezekiel's own countryman*; and Job was put last because he was a *foreigner*. In Ezekiel xxviii, 3, in the midst of a long prophecy against Tyre, the following occurs: "Behold, *thou art wiser than Daniel*; there is no secret that they can hide from thee." When Ezekiel used this language, Daniel, according to the book that bears his name, had been already in Babylon *eighteen* years, and had obtained the highest celebrity. His fame may have reached to Tyre when Ezekiel made the references; but there is nothing in the language indicating, in the slightest de-

¹ In Introduction, 1863.

gree, that Daniel was known in Tyre. Nor does the allusion require it, as Ezekiel did not read his prophecy in that city; at all events, the fame of Daniel would reach that city as soon as the prophecy would. Further, there was appropriateness in comparing the wisdom of Tyre with that of some *living* person. At the time when Ezekiel spoke of the righteousness of Noah, Daniel, and Job, Daniel had been already in Babylon *twelve* years, and had become renowned for piety and wisdom. The passages cited from Ezekiel show that Daniel was a man of great piety and wisdom, and well known to Ezekiel's contemporaries. Now, if Daniel did not live during the Babylonian captivity, to what period can we assign his history? We have a connected history of the Jews from the calling of Abraham to the captivity at Babylon, and there is nowhere mentioned a man of any eminence by the name of Daniel; *he must, therefore, have lived during the captivity.* Ewald and Bunsen, however, suppose that the Daniel mentioned by Ezekiel was, perhaps, a descendant of the kingdom of the ten tribes, who lived at the heathen court in Nineveh, and to whom prophecies respecting the kingdoms of the world were attributed in a book written in the time of Alexander the Great, or soon afterwards; and that this book was used by the author of the present Book of Daniel. Bleek justly rejects such a view as ungrounded and improbable, and as increasing the difficulty of explaining the origin of the book far more than diminishing it.¹ But Bleek's own hypothesis is just as improbable. He supposes that Bleek's hypothesis. "Ezekiel was acquainted with an older writing which treated of a Daniel as a man distinguished by legal piety and deep wisdom, but in such a way that nothing definite appeared respecting the age in which he lived. This book was, perhaps, lost at an early period, during the Babylonian captivity or immediately afterwards; at least, it was no longer in existence at the time of the composition of our Book of Daniel, [which Bleek thinks was written about B. C. 165]; and thus nothing more definite than what was afforded by the passages in Ezekiel was known to the author of our book and his contemporaries."² He thinks this left the author of the book what we may call a *carte blanche*, on which he could write whatever suited his purposes respecting Daniel.

But it is in the highest degree improbable that, if there had existed among the Hebrews prior to the captivity a man so distinguished as Ezekiel represents Daniel to be, there would have been no mention made of him in the historical books treating of the affairs of the Jews before the captivity. Nor is it probable that, if the biography of such a man had been written, it would have been lost, as that

¹ Einleitung, p. 613.

² Ibid., p. 612.

biography was the only history of the man. Memoirs and biographies in Jewish history were lost because the substance of them was incorporated into permanent historical works, or because they were of but little importance. Bleek acknowledges that the most of those learned men who refer the composition of the book to a later age, and do not accept its statements of particulars, assume that Daniel and his three companions were historical persons, who distinguished themselves through piety and wisdom in Babylon, and obtained favour and consideration with the rulers of the land.¹

There is a Daniel mentioned in Ezra viii, 2; and in Nehemiah x he is named with Hananiah and Azariah, though they do not stand together. In Nehemiah viii, 4 Mishael occurs. But in Nehemiah x we have Jeremiah, and Baruch, and Anathoth (which was also the name of the town where Jeremiah lived). The occurrence of the names of Jeremiah, and Baruch his secretary, and Anathoth, is just as singular as that of Daniel and two of his companions. But, in fact, there is nothing remarkable in it. For Nehemiah x contains more than *eighty* names, among which there is no improbability that the names of Daniel and some of his friends would be found. It is very probable, indeed, that a considerable number of persons would be named after Daniel and his companions, who were so distinguished in Babylon. The suspicion of Bleek is utterly groundless, that the author of the Book of Daniel borrowed the names of Daniel and his companions—who lived more than a hundred years earlier—from the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. And Davidson supposes that the author of Daniel had learned some particulars about these four persons, who returned from Babylon in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Not only did the ancient Jewish rabbies never doubt the existence of Daniel, but they compared him even to Moses.²

Before presenting the arguments in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of the book, we shall consider the

OBJECTIONS TO ITS GENUINENESS.

I. ITS POSITION IN THE CANON.

The Book of Daniel does not stand in the *third* division of the Hebrew Bible, embracing the later prophets, but in the *fourth* division, the *Hagiographa*, in which it forms the *ninth* book, and stands between Esther and Ezra. Now, the opponents of its genuineness hold that if the book had been written when the later prophets were arranged, it would have been placed along with them in the *third*

¹ Einleitung, p. 611. Davidson regards Daniel as "partly historical."

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 103.

division of the sacred canon, and not in the fourth; and its position, therefore, must be owing to the lateness of its composition.

But here the question arises, whether the arrangement of the books in the Hebrew Bible is the same now that it was when the canon was originally formed in the time of Nehemiah, or possibly soon after. We must answer this question in the negative. For example—in the time of Jerome the Book of Ruth was placed immediately after the Judges, and the Lamentations were joined to Jeremiah, though both of these books now stand in the Hagiographa, which is the third division. Jerome, however, adds, that some put them among the Hagiographa. In the time of Jerome the Hagiographa began with the Book of Job and ended with Esther; now it begins with Psalms and ends with Chronicles. In the time of Origen (first half of the third century) Ruth was joined to Judges, and Lamentations to Jeremiah, and Daniel stood between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Origen gives the books, he tells us, according to the Hebrews.¹

Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the last half of the second century, tells us that he went to the East, where the history in the Old Testament was transacted, and that he carefully ascertained the number of the books of the Old Testament, and the order in which they were arranged. In this catalogue he places Daniel between the minor prophets and Ezekiel.²

Josephus³ distributes the sacred books into three divisions: the *Five Books of Moses; the writings of the Prophets, in thirteen books; and the remaining four* (of the twenty-two), *containing praises to God and the practical duties of men.* It is evident, then, that in his time the *Book of Daniel stood among the Prophets.* And this is confirmed by Josephus' calling him Daniel *the Prophet.*⁴ Daniel is also called a *prophet* in Matt. xxiv, 15, which may be considered, at least, a proof that he was so regarded by Jews at the time of Christ. It would seem, then, to be quite certain that in the interval between Josephus (who died about A. D. 100) and Jerome (born about A. D. 345), the learned rabbies of the school of Tiberias *re-arranged* the books of the canon, and removed Daniel from the second division (of the prophets) and put him into the Hagiographa. Accordingly, in the Talmudic tradition,⁵ the visions of Daniel are not regarded as prophecies, and in the Midrasch it is said "Daniel was no prophet, but he who saw visions and revelations." At the same time rabbinical tradition⁶ declared that "respecting the seventy year-weeks, the ful-

¹ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. 25.

² Against Apion, i, 8.

³ Ueber den Kanon, p. 101.

⁴ Ibid., lib. iv, cap. 26.

⁵ Antiq., book. x, 11.

⁶ Ibid., p. 104.

filment of the ancient prophecies concerning the end of time, and other things, he erred, and effected nothing."

The rejection of the Messiah by the Jews led them to declare the seventy year-weeks of Daniel, which were to end with the cutting off of the Messiah, as unfulfilled, and that Daniel had made a mistake. It is not strange, under these circumstances, that they degraded Daniel from the prophetic rank, and put his book into the Hagiographa.

But suppose the book had been written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (about B. C. 165), and received by the Jewish Sanhedrin as a genuine work of Daniel, they would have immediately inserted it with the other prophets, as belonging to them, if they regarded Daniel as a real prophet. But if Daniel was not regarded by the arrangers of the canon in the time of Nehemiah as a prophet in the sense in which they held the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, they would, probably, have put it into the Hagiographa, though acknowledging the book to be genuine. But if Daniel had been written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, it could not have been admitted into the Hagiographa, for that division was already closed.

2. ALLEGED GREEK WORDS IN DANIEL.

In chap. iii, 5¹ occur the following names of musical instruments, which are alleged to be of Greek origin: קִיתְרוֹס, *gaythros*; סַבְכָּא, *sabbeka*; פִּסְנֵתֵרִין, *pesantherin*; סוּמְפוֹנְיָה, *sumponcyah*. On the hypothesis of their Greek origin, the opponents of the genuineness of the book allege that at the time of the Babylonian captivity it is unlikely that musical instruments with Greek names were found in Babylon; and consequently that the book must be referred to a period subsequent to Alexander the Great, when Grecian learning was widely diffused in the East.

The word קִיתְרוֹס is generally regarded as the Greek *κίθαρῖς* (or *κιθάρα*), *cithara*, or *harp*, which was in use at a very early period among the Greeks, and is found as the name of a musical instrument in Homer. It is very probably Greek, although Strabo represents some one as saying, "beating the *Asiatic cithara*."²

סַבְכָּא is supposed by some to be from the Greek *σαμβύκη*, but without reason. Fürst remarks that the word is "from the Aramæan, as a Syrian invented it" (Heb. Lex). Liddell and Scott remark on the Greek word *σαμβύκη*: "of barbarian origin, being, in fact, the Syrian *sabka* with *m* inserted, as in *ambubaia* (from Syriac *abābo*, a pipe)." Gesenius offers no objection to its Oriental origin (Heb.

¹ In verses 7 and 10 occurs the same list.

² Lib. x, 471.

Lex.). Strabo¹ speaks of the word as of foreign (i. e., Oriental) origin. The next word, פִּסְלֵרָה, has been generally supposed to be derived from the Greek ψαλτήριον, by changing the Greek λ into the Hebrew ך. Our translators render it *psaltery*. Pusey remarks: "The psaltery, as described by St. Augustine, corresponds with the 'santour,' as recognized by Layard on the bass-relief of Babylon." The word in Daniel and this "santour" were both probably derived from the Greek ψαλτήριον. The last of these four words, הַבִּנְיָן, is generally supposed to be from the Greek συμφωνία, *symphony*, used in Plato in the sense of *musical concord*, and in Aristotle for music, and in the same sense in Luke xv, 25. In Polybius (who died about B. C. 122) the word is used, in all probability, for a *concert of musicians*, in liber xxxi, 4. In the same author, liber xxvi, 10, the word also occurs, but whether in the sense of a *band of music* or an instrument it is not easy to determine. This latter passage, however, belongs to a lost book, and is taken from a late writer who gives the substance of the remarks of Polybius on the conduct of a certain individual. The fact that Luke uses it for *music in general*, or a *concert of musicians*, renders it extremely improbable, in connexion with other facts, that the word was used by the ancients for a musical instrument until some centuries after Christ. The form *symphonia* occurs in late Latin.

Gesenius regards the word as of Greek origin; but Fürst (Heb. Lex.) gives the definition, *Aram, fem., a double pipe, a bag-pipe*. As the Greeks, says he, themselves did not name the instrument so (*συμφωνία*), it may perhaps be Semitic, and come from בָּג, *a bag*, Talm., אֶרֶב, *a reed*. Or it may come, also, from רִב, *reed*. Bonomi² expresses the conviction that the word under discussion is a genuine Chaldee word, which he derives from רָב, *to lay, or lean*.

There are, then, but two or three words at most that can, with any probability, be referred to a Greek origin. Nor is it surprising that there should be found at Babylon two or three musical instruments bearing Greek names as early as about six hundred years before Christ; for the Greeks at a very early period displayed their inventive genius in music, as well as in other departments, and it is easy to see how their instruments of music might find their way to Babylon.

"Long before the Greeks began to write history," says Brandis they had, as friends and foes, come into manifold contact with the empire of the Assyrians. . . . The battle and victory of Sennacherib in the eighth century B. C. over a Greek army which had penetrated

¹ Lib. x, 47t.

² Nineveh and its Palaces, p. 408.

into Cilicia is fully attested by a relation out of the Babylonian history of Berosus. On the other hand, the extensive commerce of Greek colonies must not unfrequently have led Greek merchants into Assyrian territory."¹ "The name of Javan, or Greece, occurs in the inscriptions of Sargon [B. C. 722-705] among those from whom he received tribute. We know that articles of luxury formed part of the tribute to Assyria."² "In the monuments even of Sennacherib 'the Assyrian generals,' says Layard, are represented 'as welcomed by bands of men and women, dancing, singing, and playing upon instruments of music. First came five men; three carried harps of many strings, which they struck with both hands; a fourth played on the double pipes, such as are seen on the monuments of Egypt, and were used by the Greeks and Romans. . . . The fifth musician carried an instrument not unlike the modern santour of the East.'"³

Bonomi⁴ gives various cuts representing the musical instruments of the Ninevites, and compares them with those mentioned in the Book of Daniel. He derives the names of the latter wholly from the Semitic language.

De Wette acknowledges that, "of course, it is possible that Greek instruments and their names could be known to the Babylonians."⁴ And Rosenmüller remarks: "Nothing prevents musical instruments invented by the Greeks having been used among the Babylonians."⁶

In Genesis, in several places, there occurs the word פִּלְגֶשֶׁת , *pillegesh*, Greek words in *a concubine*, which, in all probability, was derived from Genesis. the Greek, *παλλακίς*, *παλλάκη*, *πάλλαξ*, as Fürst believes, and which Gesenius thinks may be true, as there is no word in the Semitic from which to derive it. In Genesis xv, 17, we have לַפִּיד , *lappid*, a torch, equivalent to the Greek *λαμπάς*. There is no verb in the Hebrew language from which to derive לַפִּיד , and it has but one cognate word. But the Greek *λαμπάς*, *λαμπάδος*, a lamp, from *λάμπω*, to shine, has a great number of cognate words, showing that the Greek is the primitive, and the Hebrew word the derived, not *vice versa*, as Gesenius and Fürst think.

Now, will any one contend that, on account of one or two Greek words in Genesis, this book was not composed until long after the Babylonian captivity? Some think the word לְאֵנָה (Ezra i, 9) comes from the Greek *κάρταλλος*. If this could be established, would it prove that Ezra was not written until after the time of Alexander the Great? Why, then, should two or three Greek words in

¹ In Pusey on Daniel, p. 31.

² Ibid., p. 32.

³ Ibid., pp. 32, 33.

⁴ Nineveh and its Palaces, London, 1857, pp. 405-409.

⁵ Fourth edition of his Einleit.

⁶ Scholia in Daniel.

Daniel, the names of musical instruments, which would travel with the instruments themselves, be thought to indicate that the book was written long after the Babylonian captivity? There is no Greek colouring in the book, as we might have expected had it been written in the time of the Maccabees.

3. THE SILENCE OF JESUS SIRACH.

The omission of Daniel in the list of the great men among the Jews (chaps. xliv-1) given by the son of Sirach, has been urged by some as an argument against the Book of Daniel being known to him. But the argument *a silentio* is in many cases very delusive. If applied either to sacred or profane history, it often leads to the most fallacious results. If a writer professes to give a catalogue of *all* the men who have distinguished themselves in any particular department, then the omission of any distinguished name in that department may be considered as a *probable* proof that, in the judgment of the writer, no such character existed. It would not be a *positive* proof, at all events, for there might be a lapse of memory only. But this is not the case here, for the son of Sirach does not profess to give a list of all the distinguished men of Israel. He begins in the following manner: "Let us praise distinguished men, even our fathers in their generation" (chap. xliv, 1). Enoch is the first name in his list. Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses, Joshua, and a few others of the early ages, follow. He altogether omits Jephthah, Gideon, and Samson, all of whom were distinguished men. He makes no mention of such later eminent Jews as Ezra or Mordecai, and passes over Esther in silence, while he gives us Zorobabel and Nehemiah. The remark of Bleek, that Ezra, perhaps, would not have been passed over if his book at that time (about B. C. 200-180) had formed a part of the canon, is entirely groundless, as there can be no doubt that the Book of Ezra was already in the canon, and that its author stood high. The history of Mordecai and Esther must have been well known to the son of Sirach. In chap. xlix, 10, the son of Sirach mentions the twelve (minor) prophets. Bretschneider, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and some others, regard this passage as spurious. The passage certainly interrupts the connexion, and makes the construction difficult. But we do not feel authorized to pronounce it spurious. The son of Sirach, before he finishes his list, goes back, and takes up Enoch again, and adds to his list Shem, Seth, and Adam. The reason assigned by some for the omission of Daniel is, that he lived at the Babylonian court, and did not labour among the Jewish people.

Omission by
the son of
Sirach.

But, further, some of the men in the list of the son of Sirach never wrote anything. It is not their *books* that he is praising, but their *deeds*. If Daniel was a man of any eminence he could with propriety have been placed in the catalogue though he had left no writings. The omission of his name, therefore, on the part of the son of Sirach, proves that no such character ever existed (if it proves anything), in clear contradiction to Ezekiel. Suppose the son of Sirach had praised Daniel without naming his book; this would have been another testimony to his existence and character only—not a confirmation of the genuineness of his book.

4. ALLEGED HISTORICAL ERRORS.

It is contended by the impugnors of the genuineness of the book that it contains historical errors. If this charge were true, we are not sure that it would prove the spuriousness of the book, though it would prove that the author was not in *every* thing inspired, and did not possess accurate knowledge on all the points of the history which he wrote. We shall, however, show that the charge of historical errors is unfounded. In Dan. i, 1, 2 we read, "In the *third* year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it. And the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand." In Jer. xxv, 1 we read, "The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the *fourth* year of Jehoiakim, . . . that was the *first* year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon." According to the latter passage, the first year of Nebuchadnezzar corresponds, in part at least, with the *fourth* year of Jehoiakim; and yet in the *third* year of Jehoiakim Nebuchadnezzar is called king in our book, evidently before he had mounted the throne. Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Stuart pursue nearly the same method in removing the discrepancy; and, as it seems to us quite satisfactory, we will adopt it. Berosus, the Chaldean historian (quoted by Josephus, lib. x, cap. xi), states that when Nebuchadnezzar's father, Nabuchodonosor, [Nabopollassar], heard that the governor whom he had set over Egypt and the places about Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia had revolted from him, he committed to Nebuchadnezzar his son some parts of his army, and sent them against him. Nebuchadnezzar gave him battle, defeated him, and recovered the country from under his subjection, and made it a branch of his kingdom. About this time Nebuchadnezzar heard that his father was dead, and, having settled the affairs of Egypt and the other countries, as also those that concerned the *captive Jews* and Phœnicians, and those of the Egyptian nations, and having committed the conveyance of them to Babylon to certain of his friends.

he went himself hastily with a few others over the desert to Babylon. So he took upon him the management of public affairs, and of the kingdom, which had been kept for him by one that was principal of the Chaldeans, and he received the entire dominions of his father, and appointed that, when the captives came, they should be placed as colonies in the most proper places of Babylonia.¹ The beginning of this expedition was probably in the end of the third year of Jehoiakim (the same as Dan. i, 1). In Jer. xlvi, 2 it is stated that Nebuchadnezzar, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, smote the army of Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates, in Carchemish. We may suppose that some months intervened between the setting out of the expedition of Nebuchadnezzar and the defeat of the Egyptian army at Carchemish. Now, since Jehoiakim had been set on the throne by the king of Egypt, there is nothing improbable in the supposition that before attacking the Egyptian army at Carchemish he besieged Jerusalem and carried away captives in the third year of Jehoiakim. This must have been one or two years before he became king. And Berosus makes mention of conquests made in Syria, and Jews taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar before he became king, which confirms the date in Dan. i, 1. The remark of Bleek² is entirely false, that, according to Jer. xxxvi, 9, 29, in the fifth year of Jehoiakim the Chaldeans had not yet come to Jerusalem. For in verse 29 the reference to the coming of the king of Babylon is not to his first appearance in Jerusalem, when Jehoiakim submitted to him, but to his entire overthrow of the country: "*The king of Babylon shall certainly come and destroy this land, and shall cause to cease from thence man and beast.*" This refers to the reigns of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah. It is not strange that Nebuchadnezzar is called king in the lifetime of his father. He may have been a co-regent with him; but even if he were not, the title of king could have been given to him by anticipation. We can speak of *General* Washington's accompanying Braddock in his expedition to Fort Du Quesne, though in fact he had not then attained the rank of general. In the same way we could speak of *President* Grant's campaign in the Wilderness.

And thus arises the apparent contradiction between Dan. ii, 1 and i, 5, 18. In the first of these passages it is stated that the dream of Nebuchadnezzar which Daniel interpreted occurred in the *second*³ year of the reign of that monarch. But according to the other passages Daniel was not brought in to appear before the king till the

¹ This is the substance of the passage. We have omitted some words not relevant to our purpose.

² Einleitung, p. 601.

³ Ewald supposes we should read *twelfth* instead of *second*.

end of *three* years. As Nebuchadnezzar is called king in chap. i, 1 by way of anticipation, the three years of Daniel's preparation to appear before the king begin one or two years before the full sovereignty of Nebuchadnezzar.

In Dan. v, 31, after the death of Belshazzar, it is stated that Darius the Median took the kingdom when he was about threescore and two years old. Some have denied the existence of such a monarch. But Gesenius well remarks on this monarch: "This was apparently Cyaxares II., the son and successor of Astyages, and uncle of Cyrus, who held the empire of Media between Astyages and Cyrus, yet so that Cyrus was his colleague and viceroy; on which account he alone is mentioned by Herodotus" (Heb. Proof of existence of Darius. Lex.). Xenophon¹ represents Cyaxares as succeeding Astyages. There is no reason for supposing that this king is a fiction of Xenophon. The passage in Æschylus (*Persæ*, 765-768) contains no probable reference to Darius.

Herodotus, Ctesias, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, and Polyænus, know nothing of a king between Astyages and Cyrus. But, if the book of Daniel be genuine—and, in discussing this subject, no one has a right to *assume* the contrary—his testimony is worth more than all these historians put together; and that he possessed accurate knowledge of Babylonian affairs we shall show in another place. The testimony of one credible eye-witness weighs more than that of a dozen men who write from rumour. Daniel was upon the spot; those historians were remote.

But if no such king as Darius the Median ever existed, can we believe that the author of the Book of Daniel, supposing it to have been forged in the Maccabean times, would have introduced him? Is it characteristic of the writers of history, or even of novelists, to introduce men as historical who, in the judgment of mankind, never existed? What would we think of even a novelist who should insert a king of England between James II. and William, Prince of Orange? The fame of Cyrus, as the conqueror of Babylon, completely eclipsed that of his predecessor, Darius; for it spread all over the East and the West. Daniel gives even the age of Darius upon his accession to the kingdom, which, if it is not an attempt, without any assignable purpose, to deceive, is a mark of intimate acquaintance with the monarch, or, at least, with his history. In the apocryphal addition to Daniel, written probably about the time of the Maccabees, we have this statement: "King Astyages was gathered to his fathers, and Cyrus the Persian received his kingdom." Had Daniel been

¹ *Cyropædia*, book i. Hengstenberg finds mention of this Darius in the Armenian Chronicle of Eusebius.

written in that age, it would, doubtless, have contained a very similar statement.

The account, in the third chapter, of Nebuchadnezzar's setting up a golden image, and commanding every body to worship it, has been severely criticised. The image is stated to have been sixty cubits (about ninety feet) high, and its breadth six cubits (about nine feet). These proportions, on the supposition that it was the Nebuchadnezzar's image. figure of a human being, have been pronounced monstrous. It should have been at least fifteen or twenty feet in breadth. But we know not what it was intended to represent. The image may have stood upon a pedestal, and the whole height may have been ninety feet, on which supposition all difficulty respecting the harmonious proportions of the figure vanishes. Nor is there any reason for supposing that the image was of solid gold. Wooden altars covered with gold are called golden by Moses. Comp. Exod. xxxvii, 25 with xxxix, 38, etc. The conduct, too, of Nebuchadnezzar, in requiring the Hebrew children to worship the image, has been thought to be inconsistent with the toleration which at that time was allowed all religions. But it must be borne in mind that the king, while willing to tolerate the religion of the Jews, expected from them an acknowledgment of his own. It was the *exclusiveness* of their religion that excited his hatred. Judaism admitted of no compromise. Other religions, without any sacrifice of their principles, could acknowledge the claims of other gods, and combine their worship with that of their own deities. It was the same spirit of exclusiveness that brought upon Christianity so much persecution in its early history.

The truth of the account of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity has been called in question by some critics, especially on the Nebuchadnezzar's insanity. ground of the silence of ancient history respecting it. But this silence can be easily explained. None of the other books of the Old Testament make any mention of the latter part of the life of Nebuchadnezzar. The historical books (with the exception of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, which treat of Jewish affairs in the Persian dominion) extend only to the captivity. There was no occasion, therefore, for these writers to refer to this event in the king's life. The oldest of the Greek historians, Herodotus, does not give us the history of Nebuchadnezzar at all. Of the Chaldean historians from whom we may expect any information about this occurrence there remain only Abydenus and Berosus. In Abydenus there is a passage in which Nebuchadnezzar is represented as ascending to the roof of his palace, where he becomes inspired by some god, and delivers a prophecy, in which he announces calamity to his country

from the coming Persian mule.¹ From the language he uses he seems to refer to his own madness and wanderings. Abydenus finishes the statement by saying, "Having predicted these things he disappeared."² In the judgment of the ancients, there was a close connexion between a prophetic spirit and madness. Respecting the Chaldean historians, it must be observed that they had a natural propensity to embellishment. It is not likely, therefore, that they would relate anything that would detract from the greatness of their kings. The remark of Rawlinson is appropriate here: "In the entire range of the Assyrian annals there is no case where a monarch admits a disaster, or even a check, to have happened to himself or his generals."³

Nebuchadnezzar's disease was lycanthropy, of which several instances are recorded in history. In the description of the king's madness strong expressions are used, in accordance with the custom of the Orientals; but there is nothing to warrant us in believing that he was metamorphosed into a brute.

The decree of Darius, that no man should ask a petition of any god or man, except of the king, for thirty days (Dan. vi, 7, 12), is considered by some as very improbable, since it would be a suspension of religious duties for the time. It has, however, been shown that the kings of the Medes and Persians were worshipped as representations and incarnations of Ormuzd; and Heeren remarks: "The person of the king in Asiatic kingdoms is the centre about which every thing moves. He is regarded not merely as ruler, but rather as proprietor of land and people." Plutarch relates that it was a custom among the Persians "to honour the king, and to worship the image of God, the preserver of all things." Curtius also says, "The Persians worship their kings among the gods." That the Assyrians⁴ really regarded their kings as incarnations of their divinity Ormuzd is proved from the monuments of Nineveh discovered by Layard.

5. THE ALLEGED CLEARNESS OF ITS PROPHECIES OF EVENTS UNTIL THE TIME OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES, AND THE OBSCURITY OF THOSE RESPECTING SUBSEQUENT ONES.

The prophecies of the Book of Daniel are represented by its opponents as being remarkably definite respecting events until the close of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (B. C. 164), after which they are quite obscure. If this allegation were true, it would be very far from proving what they allege, that the book was written

¹Evidently Cyrus.

²In Eusebius, *Præpar. Evang.*, liber ix, 41.

³*Hist. Illus. Old Testament*, p. 144.

⁴That Nineveh and Babylon were closely related in religious views will not be denied; and what is true of Nineveh may be generally affirmed of Babylon.

about the close of the life of that monarch. For we may state, in reply, that Daniel's prophecies respecting events until the end of the reign of Antiochus are not more definite than those of some other prophets. Jeremiah predicted that the Babylonian captivity should last *seventy years* (chaps. xxv, 11, 12; xxix, 10). What more definite than this? Also, in reference to the destruction of Babylon he is very definite, describing the manner of the capture of the city by the drying up of the Euphrates while her men were drunk (chaps. 1, 38; li, 36, 39). With the exception of a few Messianic passages, there is nothing definite after the times of the captivity. Isaiah, too, is very definite respecting Babylon (chap. xiii, 19-22). Also respecting Ephraim he is explicit: "Within *threescore and five years* shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people" (chap. vii, 8). He also predicts the destruction of Moab in the most precise language: "Within *three years*, as the years of a hireling," etc. (chap. xvi, 14); the addition, "*as the years of a hireling*," is to show that it shall be neither more nor less. And in chaps. lii, 13-liiii, he foretells our Saviour's history with great exactness.

But, further, the prophecies of Daniel extend beyond the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and some of them are very definite. Daniel predicts the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom during the fourth empire (the Roman) (chap. ii, 44); that, after *seventy weeks (of years)*, the vision and the prophecy should be sealed up, (completed), reconciliation made for iniquity, everlasting righteousness brought in, and the Most Holy anointed; and that, from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem to Prince Messiah,¹ the time should be sixty-nine weeks (483 years). Could the Roman empire, in all its grandeur and its wide dominion, and the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom at a definite time during its existence, have been foreseen by human wisdom even in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes?

PROOFS OF ITS GENUINENESS.

I. ITS ADMISSION INTO THE CANON.

It is an acknowledged fact that the Book of Daniel has been received by the Jews as a part of Holy Scripture ever since the time of Christ. Of this we have historical proof. According to Josephus the canon of Scripture was closed in the reign of Artaxerxes. He says, "From the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets who were after

¹ On these prophecies see especially Pusey on Daniel.

Moses wrote what was done in their time in thirteen books. It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, *but hath not been esteemed of like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time.*"¹ Now, if the Book of Daniel had not been written until about B. C. 164, *four hundred years* after the age of Daniel, supposing him to have lived during the captivity, how could it have found its way into the canon? "The Wisdom of Sirach," written in Hebrew not later than about 190 or 180 B. C., is a work of great merit, and stood high with the rabbies, but was never admitted into the canon, "because," as Fürst himself acknowledges, "the canon at that time was already closed."² The First Book of Maccabees, written also in Hebrew originally, about B. C. 120, a work of merit and reliability, and the Book of Tobit, written earlier, were excluded from the canon. What was it, then, that gave Daniel its reception into the canon? Evidently the belief that it was written by Daniel, who flourished in the Babylonian captivity. The book professes to have been written by him: "As for me Daniel," etc., chap. vii, 28; "A vision appeared unto me, Daniel," chap. viii, 1; "I Daniel fainted," etc., chap. viii, 27. If the book was not written by Daniel it is a forgery, a downright fraud, in which the author lies for God, pretending to have received revelations from God which he never received, and to have seen visions that he never witnessed. In the eyes of the Jews, and with all who have any moral sense, this was a great crime. The Mosaic law is very severe upon this point: "The prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, . . . even that prophet shall die" (Deut. xviii, 20). It is evident that the whole Jewish people—Sanhedrim and all—were deceived in the book if it be not genuine. But how could they believe that the book had existed as a canonical work for *four hundred years*, when it had just been forged? "The age of the Maccabees," says Hävernick, "was one in which Scripture learning already flourished." Not only does I. Maccabees mention *the assembly of the scribes* (*συναγωγή γραμματέων*) chap. vii, 12, but, also, the Book of Sirach praises the wisdom of the scribe (*σοφία γραμματέως*), xxxviii, 24. How could these men be deceived in such a plain case, if the book were a forgery? According to Bleek's view,³ the book was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, to encourage the Jews to resist that tyrant, and to obey the law of Moses, by the example of Daniel and his friends. But how a book forged at that time, of which they had heard nothing before

¹ Against Apion book i, sec. 8.

² Ueber den Kanon, p. 139.

³ Einleitung, pp. 604, 605.

could have nerved them to face death, is not easy to see. Martyrs are not made by fairy tales.

Nowhere in the traditions of the Jews, as delivered by the Talmudists, is there any intimation that even a doubt had been raised about the book among their ancestors. Had doubts existed upon the subject we should have heard of them, especially if the book had originated in an age so late as that of the Maccabees.

2. THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS.

In reference to one's being anxious respecting the knowledge of the future, Josephus says: "Let him be diligent in the reading of the Book of Daniel, *which he will find among the sacred writings.*"¹ And he says further, respecting his writings: "From them we believe that Daniel conversed with God; for he did not only prophesy of the future, as did the other prophets, but he also determined the time of their accomplishment." Again, in reference to certain calamities, he affirms: "Our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what *he wrote many years before they came to pass.* In the very same manner Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them. This man left in writing all these things, as God had showed them to him; insomuch that such as read his prophecies, and see how they have been fulfilled, would wonder at the honour wherewith God honoured Daniel, and may thence discover how the Epicureans are in error who cast providence out of human life."² He also states that Alexander the Great, after capturing Gaza, went up to Jerusalem, where he sacrificed to God, and *was shown the Book of Daniel*, in which he predicted that one of the Greeks should overturn the kingdom of Persia. Josephus also states that when Alexander was engaged in the siege of Tyre,³ he sent to the high priest of the Jews, requesting him to send him an auxiliary force, and also provisions, which the high priest refused to do, on the ground of sworn allegiance to Darius. Arrian, who, about A. D. 150, wrote the history of Alexander the Great, chiefly from documents written by the monarch's contemporaries, says, in speaking of Alexander's determination to make an expedition into Egypt, that "already the other parts of Syria, called *Palestine*, had submitted to him,"⁴ except Gaza, which he took by siege. Arrian, indeed, says nothing of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem, and of his offering sacrifice to God there, which, though true, he

¹ Antiq., book x, chap. x, sec. 4. He was born A. D. 37.

² Ibid., book x, chap. xi, sec. 7.

³ Ibid., book xi, chap. viii, sec. 3-5.

⁴ Lib. ii, cap. xxv.

may have omitted to mention from hatred of the Jews.¹ It is in itself very probable that Alexander offered sacrifice at Jerusalem, for it was his custom to offer sacrifice to all the gods to whose temples he could get access. He made war upon the Tyrians because they refused to admit him to sacrifice to Hercules.² But whether the prophecies of Daniel were shown to Alexander or not, the passage in Josephus furnishes a proof that the Jews believed that at that time the book was already in existence, and, what is important, was not kept secret.

3. THE LANGUAGE OF THE BOOK.

The language of the Book of Daniel exactly represents his age and position. About two fifths of the book are Hebrew; the remaining three fifths are Chaldee. Its Hebrew is as pure as that of almost any book of that age and of the immediately succeeding one. There is no blending of the two languages. The first chapter, and the first three verses of the second, are Hebrew. The Chaldee begins at the fourth verse, where the Chaldeans are represented as speaking in Aramaic (Chaldee), and ends with the seventh chapter. The remaining five chapters are Hebrew. Now, if the book had been written in the time of the Maccabees, nearly four hundred years after the captivity, would its Hebrew have been so pure? The Hebrew language disappeared from general use a short time—perhaps something less than a century—before the birth of Christ. In the age of the Maccabees the Hebrew language was on the point of being supplanted by the Chaldee, into which it gradually passed over. But the Hebrew of Daniel contains no indications of its

Purity of Daniel's Hebrew and Chaldee.

being in a transition state. Also, the Chaldee of Daniel is as pure as that of Ezra. The language of the book is inexplicable on the supposition that it was written in the Maccabean age; but on the supposition that Daniel wrote the book in the captivity at Babylon all is easy. He had acquired a knowledge of Hebrew before he was carried away to Babylon, where he became master of the Chaldee. We have in Ezra iv, 8-vi, 18, and vii, 12-26, Chaldee sections—chiefly decrees of Persian kings from Cyrus to Artaxerxes—the last not later than a hundred years after Daniel wrote. With this Chaldee of the Persian court can be compared that found in Daniel, which, if genuine, was used at the same court about the same time. The result of the comparison is a striking proof that the Chaldee of Daniel must belong to the same age with that of Ezra, and, consequently, that the author of Daniel

¹ As Arrian was a Pagan, and as Christianity and Judaism were objects of hatred to him, it is not surprising that he should pass over a recognition of Jehovah by Alexander.

² Liber ii, cap. xvi.

must have lived somewhere near Babylon during the captivity, or, at least, not long after it. This is made still stronger by comparing the Chaldee of Daniel with that of the Targums (Chaldee translations) of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel, written about one hundred and fifty or two hundred years¹ after the time of the Maccabees.

Respecting the peculiarities of the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra, and how it differs from that of the Targums, Dr. Pusey gives the following excellent *resumé* of a critical discussion of this subject by the Rev. Mr. M'Gill:²—

“1. In the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra the stronger aspirate *h* is used, where in the Chaldee of the Targums it is nearly effaced. This occurs so manifoldly as evidently to involve a principle of language. It is found in the characteristic letter of three conjugations; in verbs, whose last letter it is; in infinitives of derived conjugations; in the feminine of participles always in Daniel; in adjectives usually; in the emphatic form which in Chaldee represents the article; in the pronoun *I*, and three particles. All these peculiarities occur in Ezra as well as Daniel, and with the remarkable agreement in both, that, although in a lesser degree, they do use the later forms also. The language, then, was apparently still in an unfixd state. They are not Hebraisms, because many of the forms do not belong to Hebrew; all occur in Samaritan. It is a law of all languages, that gutturals weaken as time goes on.

M'Gill on the
Chaldee of Ez-
ra and Daniel.

“2. Two conjugations, which still existed in the time of Daniel and Ezra, were, the one mostly, the other wholly, effaced; and a conjugation was formed unknown to biblical Chaldee.

“3. A fuller orthography, implying a more prolonged pronunciation of vowels (Daveed for David), has long been recognized as belonging to the later Hebrew of the Old Testament. The same difference, though more extensive, is observed between the biblical Chaldee and the Targums.

“4. There are forms in biblical Chaldee, common with Syriac, which show that, at the time when it was written, the dialects of Assyria and Syria, East and West Aramaic, were not so much separated as in the time of the Targums. It is like the fusion of dialects in Homer. Here, too, the Eastern Aramaic became softer in the time of the Targums.

“5. This correspondence of the biblical Chaldee with the Syriac best explains a form of the substantive verb (לְהוֹיָא, ל instead of ו in the future) found only in biblical Chaldee, alike in Daniel and Ezra, yet insulated from all other Semitic forms.

¹ Onkelos and Jonathan flourished about the birth of Christ.

² In *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Jan. 1861.

"6. Daniel and Ezra use unabridged, and so older, forms.

"7. The biblical Chaldee has pronominal forms nearer the original Semitic pronoun, and Daniel the older form of the two.

"8. Other pronouns or particles are used in a form which ceased to be used in the Targums.

"9. In regard to the use of *n*, in the biblical Chaldee the older uncontracted forms prevail; in the older Targums, the later contracted forms; but there is considerable variety. In part, the biblical agrees with the Samaritan Chaldee.

"10. In one word, *haddabar*, 'councillor,' there is probably a trace of the article in its Hebrew form. . . .

"11. The Hebrew plural ending, *im* for *in*, occurs in two words in Daniel, and in a third in Ezra. . . .

"12. According to the punctuation, there was a dual at the time of the biblical Chaldee, which existed also in the Samaritan Chaldee, but was lost in the time of the Targums.

"13. There is a correspondence in other vowels between the biblical Chaldee and the Hebrew, as distinct from the Targums, inexplicable except on the ground of a real, accurate tradition.

"14. A letter (ψ) seems to have, at least, become less used, between the times of biblical Chaldee and the Targums.

"It may be added, that even in the space of these six chapters of Daniel there are a certain number of words which do not occur in the Targums or Gemara; quite as many, or more, probably, than would be found in any six chapters of any of the Hebrew historical scriptures. They are not technical words, which there might not be occasion to use elsewhere (as offices or dress or instruments, the names of which were disused with the things); but ordinary words of the language."¹

The phrase שִׁבְרֵי טַעַם , *to publish a decree*, is common to Daniel and Ezra; עֵצָה , *to counsel*, occurs in both books; likewise the Chaldee form הִפְּסוּ , *they*. The forms נִגְלִי in Ezra, and נִגְלִי in Daniel, meaning *a dunghill*, are very similar. That sagacious critic, J. D. Michaelis, regarded the peculiar Chaldee forms, which he considered Hebraisms, found in Daniel and Ezra, but wanting in even the oldest Targums, as a proof of the genuineness of both these biblical books.²

Nor can it be shown that the author of Daniel imitated Ezra: for some of their forms are different. Also between Daniel and Ezekiel there are points of resemblance; e. g., חַיֵּב , in *Piel*, *to make guilty*

¹ Daniel the Prophet, pp. 45-52. Dr. Pusey gives long notes, confirming and illustrating these statements.

² Chaldee Grammar, p. 25.

is found only in Dan. i, 10, and in the form חוב, *a debt*, only in Ezek. xviii, 7; קלל, *smooth*, is found only in Ezek. i, 7 and in Dan. x, 6; and לבוש הַפְּדִים, *clothed in linen*, in Dan. xii, 6, 7, and in Ezek. ix, 11, x, 2, etc.; and in no other biblical writer.

Resemblances
between Daniel
and Ezekiel.

We may conclude this part of our subject with a summary of the linguistic argument: 1. The purity of the Hebrew of Daniel, which shows that the language could not belong to an age long posterior to the captivity; 2. The correspondence of the Chaldee portion of the book with the Chaldee of Ezra, which indicates its proximity to the age of the captivity.

4. THE AUTHOR'S EXACT HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE.

If the Book of Daniel was composed in the Maccabean age, we may expect to find in it many historical errors. On the contrary, we find an exact knowledge of history, and an acquaintance with Persian customs and manners, which show the proximity of the author to the events he relates.

It appears from Dan. v, 30, that Belshazzar was king in Babylon when the city was captured by Cyrus. This statement, which was formerly an objection to the historical veracity of the author of the book, has proved to be a remarkable proof of his accuracy. For the king of Babylon, Nabonidus, is represented as being shut up in the city Borsippus¹ when Cyrus captured Babylon. But a cylinder has been discovered in Babylon, from which it is clear that Nabonidus (or Labynetus, according to Herodotus) associated with himself his son, Belshazzar, in the government.² This latter king was slain while Nabonidus was in Borsippus. Accordingly, Smith,³ in his list of Babylonian kings, puts: "Belsaruzur (Belshazzar), son of Nabonidus, associated with his father on the throne." Nebuchadnezzar is called Belshazzar's father by the queen of Babylon; but this need create no difficulty, as the word father is used in such an indefinite way as to express ancestor, author, or great officer.

In the account of Belshazzar's feast (chap. v, 1-4) it is stated that the king commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels taken from the temple at Jerusalem, that he and "his princes, his wives and his concubines, might drink therein." In confirmation of this usage of the Persians, different from that of the Greeks, we have the following in Herodotus, v, 18: "It is customary with us Persians, whenever we make a great feast, *to bring in our concubines and our wives to sit beside us.*" In chap. v, 30, Belshazzar is said to have

¹ According to Berosus, in Eusebius' Præpar. Evang., lib. ix, 40.

² See Rawlinson's Illustrations of Old Testament, p. 181.

³ Assyriar Discoveries, p. 445, made in 1873 and 1874.

been slain during the very night of the festivities. That the Babylonians would indulge in such festivities is not improbable, from the statement of Herodotus that they had laid up provisions for many

Confirmation of Daniel's statement by independent authorities.

years, and took no account of the siege (lib. i, 190, 191). According to Xenophon, Babylon was captured, and the king slain, in the night.¹ In chap. vi, 8, 12, 15, mention is made of the law of the *Medes and Persians*; but in the Book of Esther, written at a later period, and in reference to later events, the phraseology is *Persians* and *Medes*—Persians standing first, which is in accordance with the statement that Darius the *Mede* was king during the events which Daniel relates, and with the fact that in the time of Esther the Persians were the ruling power.

In Daniel vi, 1, it is said that it pleased Darius to set over the kingdom one hundred and twenty princes (satraps). Xenophon states that while Cyrus was in Babylon "he determined to send satraps to the conquered nations."² What Daniel attributes to Darius, the vicegerent of Cyrus, was suggested by Cyrus himself, in all probability, as the sovereign, or was their joint determination.

The account of the Magi could have been written only by one most intimately acquainted with Persian affairs, as was the case with Daniel. *Indefiniteness* respecting the classes, sects, and customs of a country is always characteristic of those who write at a remote distance, either in *time* or *space*, from the objects of their description. Daniel gives us, in chapter ii, 2, four classes of the Magi caste: חֲרָטְמִים, *sacred scribes*; אֲשָפִים, *magicians*; מְכַשְפִים, *sorcerers*; כְּשָרִים, *Chaldeans*. In chap. ii, 27 we have also חֲכָמִים, *wise men*; and גִּזְרֵי, *diviners* (astrologers). The investigations of Lenormant, the great Assyriologist, have remarkably confirmed Daniel on the classes of Magi.

No mention of prostration before the king when addressing him is made by Daniel. According to Arrian,³ Cyrus was the first king who was honoured in that way. As the Persians regarded their kings as the incarnation of Ormuzd, there was nothing strange in worshipping them. In the Maccabean age, prostration before kings had long been the custom. Could we have expected such exact historical knowledge in a writer of that age?

In Dan. ii, 5; iii, 29, Nebuchadnezzar threatens to make the houses of those who do not comply with his demands *dunghills* (*sinks*). The houses of Babylon were built of *unburnt brick*, and when demolished and made wet with rain they became *miry sinks*.

In Dan. iii, 6, Nebuchadnezzar declares that those who refuse to

¹ Cyropædia, liber vii.

² Ibid. liber viii.

³ Exped. Alexand., liber iv. 11

worship his golden image "shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning *fiery furnace*." In Jer. xxix, 22, we have a clear instance of the same kind of punishment: "The Lord make thee like Zedekiah, and like Ahab, *whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire*." Now, the Persians were *fire-worshippers*, and never punished criminals in this way; and we accordingly find that, as soon as the government of Babylon passed into the hands of the Medes and Persians, casting into a den of lions is substituted for it (Dan. vi, 7). Here is an historical discrimination which, in all probability, would not have been found in a writer of the Maccabean age, or even in any writer who was not personally acquainted with the transactions. Even the ancient Greek historian, Herodotus,¹ represents Cyrus the Great, a Persian *fire-worshipper*, as *burning* Cræsus—a gross error, that has been ridiculed by the critics.

In Daniel iv, 30, Nebuchadnezzar says: "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?" Nebuchadnezzar built a new palace of great dimensions and beauty. To this palace, with its environs, he here refers. The ruins of this second Babylon have been discovered by Layard.² This is another instance of historical accuracy. There is a remarkable correspondence between Herodotus (lib. i, 195) and Daniel (iii, 21) in reference to Babylonian dress. The former mentions garments reaching to the feet (trousers), a linen over-tunic, and a cloak; the latter mentions trousers, a tunic, and a cloak. (The English version is here defective).

The author of the book shows an acquaintance with the religion of Zoroaster. He represents Nebuchadnezzar as speaking (chap. iv, 13, 17, 23) of *watchers* exercising a superintendence in the affairs of the world. In the Bun-Dehesh, a commentary on the Zend-Avesta, a passage is quoted from the latter in reference to the watchers: "Ormuzd has set four watchers in the four quarters of the heavens." Could we have expected this allusion from a forger in Palestine in a later age?

But to place the argument in proof of the genuineness of Daniel drawn from its historical accuracy, in a clear light, it is necessary to compare it with the writings of the Maccabean age. The absurdities of the Book of Tobit are

Daniel compared with the Maccabean writings.

Liber i, 86.

² The name of Nebuchadnezzar has been found upon the brick (Layard's Nineveh, vol. ii, p. 138). Layard, in his second expedition to Nineveh and Babylon, says, in reference to the bricks of the latter place, "They record the building of the city by Nebuchadnezzar."—P. 532.

known to every reader of the Apocrypha. No one would for a moment compare this book with the Book of Daniel. Nor is the Book of Judith much better. The great power ascribed in the Book of Daniel to the Babylonian kings agrees remarkably well with what we know of Oriental nations; but in the *apocryphal addition* to Daniel, the Babylonians, in the affair of Bel and the Dragon, are represented as rising up against the king, and threatening him with death if he does not deliver up to them Daniel, and thereupon he accedes to their demand. The second and third Books of Maccabees are of little historical value. The first Book of Maccabees is of great value as an authentic history of the times of which it treats. It is not, however, free from some gross errors. For example, in chap. i, 6 it states that Alexander the Great, upon his death, had called to him the most distinguished of his servants, and divided his kingdom among them, which we know to be false. In chap. viii, 7 it states that the Romans took Antiochus the Great alive; but, in fact, they never captured him at all. In chap. viii, 8 it is said they took from him India, which, however, he never possessed. In chap. viii, 16 it is stated that the Romans entrust their government to *one* man annually, who rules over the whole country, and everybody obeys him. It is well known that they elected *two* consuls annually. We need not cite other errors. Now, if an author about the time of the Maccabees, writing of events that occurred and of customs that existed in his own age and in the ages immediately preceding, has committed such errors, what would he have done had he attempted to describe *Babylonian* history and customs?

5. OTHER ARGUMENTS IN PROOF OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE BOOK.

The symbolic form of Daniel's prophecies suits well the place of their delivery. In chaps. viii, 2, and x, 4, he represents river banks as the scenes of his visions. This was very appropriate for a prophet in Babylon, but not for one in Palestine. Daniel was familiar with the Euphrates, Tigris, and other streams, either in the vicinity of Babylon or not very remote; and we find that the Deity usually adapts himself to the conceptions and positions of the prophets in his revelations to them. The imagery of Daniel's vision in the seventh chapter is nearly the same as that found on monuments in the ruins of Nineveh. Daniel speaks of a lion that had *eagle's wings*, and of a leopard that had four *wings*. Here we are strongly reminded of the *winged bull* and other figures excavated by Layard. Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image is in exact accordance with Babylonian taste, for the Babylonians were remarkably fond of the grotesque and the rude. "In his [Daniel's] strains," remarks Schlosser,

who is no friend to Scripture, "a Chaldean and Babylonian style is so conspicuous that it strongly expresses the character of the times in which he lived."

The character of Daniel's prophecies suits his position. He was engaged in the State affairs of the greatest nation of the age. It is therefore very probable that he would be deeply anxious to know what would be the fate of this kingdom especially in relation to the influence it would have upon the chosen people. Further, it is probable, unless we deny all prophecy, that God would make known to him the future, and choose him for the office which the history ascribes to him.

Agreement between Daniel's circumstances and his work.

The *Messianic* character of the book is remarkable. Poverty of ideas and want of comprehensive views of the Messiah's kingdom mark the apocryphal writings. Daniel describes the four great kingdoms of the ancient world, and in his lofty flight passes rapidly to the fifth kingdom, that of the Messiah, which should break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and stand forever. In his description of the *Ancient of Days* he employs the most sublime imagery, and represents myriads as gathered before him for judgment. Are these lofty and pious conceptions consistent with base imposture?

In 1 Maccabees ii, 49-60, it is stated that Mattathias, when about to die, exhorted his sons to steadfastness in the law, by referring them to many distinguished examples of obedience to God in time of trial in different ages of the world. He names Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, and Elijah. Immediately following these worthies, and in the same list, are the following, found in the Book of Daniel: "Ananias, Azarias, and Mishael, by believing, were saved from the flame. Daniel in his simplicity [innocency] was saved from the mouth of the lions." Now, since the other names in this list are selected from the *written history* of the Jews, it is very probable that these last are also the names of distinguished Jews occurring in *written history*. If it had been a floating tradition, it is very improbable that it would have been cited. Mattathias died about B. C. 166, and the first Book of Maccabees was written probably forty years later. Even if Mattathias did not use the examples in Daniel attributed to him, the writer must have believed that the Book of Daniel was then in existence, which is an important point.

Between B. C. 285 and 140 the entire Old Testament was translated into Greek. In this version (the LXX), Daniel was included. The phrase, *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως*, *abomination of desolation*, 1 Macc. i, 54, was, in all probability, taken from Dan. ix, 27, in the LXX. These facts themselves make it probable that the Book of Daniel existed before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the third book of the

Sibylline Oracles, composed for the most part by an Alexandrian Jew of the Maccabean age, according to the recent critical investigations, there is an evident imitation of the Book of Daniel in several points. This is another probable proof of the existence of our book before the Maccabean age.

There is a striking difference between the book of Daniel and the apocryphal writings in a point we think worthy of notice—*its freedom from prayers in the midst of narratives.* Tobit, 1 Maccabees, Judith, and, indeed, *all* the apocryphal books—we know of no exception—abound with prayers and ejaculations. The Book of Esther, in Hebrew, contains no prayers; but there is no want of them in the Greek version. In Daniel not a word of prayer is mentioned as having been uttered by the Hebrew children in the fiery furnace. In the Greek version, however, prayers are put into their mouths. No prayers are ascribed to Daniel in the lions' den. Had Daniel¹ been written in the age of the apocryphal writers, it would, in all probability, have abounded in prayers and pious ejaculations. It is difficult to explain how the book could have arisen in the age of such writers, at the time the Greek version was made, and yet be wanting in the very additions characteristic of the times. In several places in chap. ix Daniel uses the name יהוה, *Jehovah*; but there can be no doubt that already, before the age of the Maccabees, the Jews had ceased to use that name, through a superstitious reverence.

If the Book of Daniel was not written about the time of the captivity, then we have no authentic history of that period. But if any events of importance occurred during that period—any events of the character of those in the book of Daniel—they would, in all probability, have been written about that time. The history in Daniel shows that God had not abandoned his people during the captivity, and that the Divine interposition in their behalf prepared the way for their return to their native land.

But we must not overlook the testimony of our Saviour and his apostles to the book. He calls Daniel *the prophet*, and refers to his prophecy concerning the abomination of desolation (Matt. xxiv, 15). The appellation our Saviour gives himself, "Son of man," is taken from Dan. vii, 13. The imagery in the Book of Revelation is partly borrowed from it; and Paul's description of the man of sin (2 Thess. ii) seems to have been partly derived from it. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to the Hebrew children in the fiery furnace and to Daniel in the lions' den (chap. xi, 33, 34).

* The prayer of Daniel in chap. ix is required by the circumstances.

APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF DANIEL.

In the LXX we find several long additions to the Hebrew and Chaldee text of Daniel. They consist of the *Story of Susanna* (sixty-four verses), prefixed to the book, the *Prayer of Azariah*, and the *Thanksgiving Hymn* of the three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace (sixty-seven verses), inserted between the twenty-third and twenty-fourth verses of chapter iii; and the *Story of Bel and the Dragon* (forty-two verses), placed at the end of the book. Fürst remarks that these additions are found also in the Talmuds and in the Midrash. From this he infers that they existed in Hebrew as well as in Aramaic and Greek, and that to suppose that the Greek was their original language is more than doubtful.¹ But it seems evident that the *Story of Susanna* was originally written in Greek from the *paronomasia* on *σχίνον* and *σχίσει*, and *πίνον* and *πίσαι*. These additions to the book of Daniel are totally destitute of authority.

 CHAPTER LII.

THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS.

THE twelve minor prophets are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Their works are small books, and, all combined, do not fill as many pages as the Prophet Ezekiel. Several of them contain each but two or three chapters; and one of them, Obadiah, but a single one. They stand in the *third* division of the Hebrew Bible, embracing later prophets, immediately after Ezekiel, in the order in which they stand in the English version. If the passage in Jesus Sirach² be genuine, they formed in his time one collection. It is evident that in the time of Josephus they made one book. In the canon of Melito³ and Jerome⁴ they formed *one* book. The ancient tradition of the Jews⁵ relates that they were united into *one* volume, because otherwise they might have been lost on account of their being so small. For the most part they are arranged in the order of time.

THE PROPHET HOSEA.⁶

This prophet exercised his ministry in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam,

¹ Ueber den Kanon, pp. 102, 103. ² xlix, 10. ³ In Euseb., Hist. Eccl., iv, 26

⁴ Preface to Samuel and Kings. ⁵ Fürst, p. 28. ⁶ Hebrew, *וְהוֹשֵׁעַ*, *Deliverance*

the son of Joash, king of Israel—a period of not less than sixty years. Nothing is known of his personal history. It is stated simply that he was the son of Beeri. According to a tradition² of the Jews he was a Reubenite, from beyond the Jordan. His prophecies were directed principally to Ephraim and Samaria, and but occasionally to Judah. He doubtless spent most of his time among the ten tribes, and he speaks of “our king” when referring to one of these princes (chapter vii, 5). It is not improbable that he was born in that kingdom.

The book may be appropriately divided into two parts: First, the symbolical actions of the prophet in entering upon his ministry (chaps. i–iii); and, secondly, the prophecies respecting the ten tribes chiefly, but also, in some instances, Judah (chaps. iv–xiv).

DATE OF COMPOSITION.

It cannot be certainly determined whether the prophecies were all written at the same time, or at different periods during the reign of the several monarchs whose names stand at the beginning of the book. Yet it is probable that they contain the substance of what the prophet at various times delivered orally, and that they were written down in their present form near the close of his life. From the many exhortations addressed to the ten tribes, and from the prophecy of the desolation of Samaria, the book bears internal evidence of having been written before the fall of Samaria (B. C. 721). It is evident that the *first* chapter was delivered, and in all probability written, before the death of Zachariah (about B. C. 772), the last king of the line of Jehu; for in chap. i, 4, Jehovah says, “I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu.”

Nowhere in the book is there any intimation that the house of Jehu had already fallen, or that Samaria had been taken by the Assyrian king. In chap. x, 14, it is said, “All thy fortresses shall be spoiled, as Shalman spoiled Beth-arbel in the day of battle.” But this passage throws no light upon the time of the composition of the book, for it is not certain that Shalman is the same as Shalmaneser, and if it were we do not know which one is meant, as *three Shalmanesers* reigned between B. C. 860 and B. C. 722. The Beth arbel³

¹ Jotham reigned sixteen years, and Ahaz sixteen; and from the death of Jeroboam II. to the death of Uzziah and the beginning of Jotham's reign, there were twenty-five years; which, added together, make a total of fifty-seven; and, by allowing one or two years in the reign of Jeroboam, and one or two in that of Hezekiah, we have about sixty years.

² Ueber den Kanon, p. 29

³ Fürst supposes this to be Arbela in Persia; while Gesenius thinks it is probably Arbela in Galilee.

spoken of is probably Arbela, near Gaugamela, in Persia. It is probable that Hosea left the kingdom of the ten tribes, and came to Judah, with his book of prophecies, some time before the capture of Samaria. Hence it was preserved, and put among the other prophets.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECIES OF HOSEA.

“The style of Hosea,” says Keil, “is highly poetical, rich in bold and powerful imagery, full of vigorous thinking and beautiful delineation, yet often abrupt, bounding from one image to another, and by no means free from difficulties and obscurities. The language has many peculiar words and unusual constructions.”¹ He is also distinguished for directness, and for the practical character of his teachings.

THE PROPHET JOEL.²

Nothing is known of the personal history of this prophet. He is simply called the son of Pethuel (chap. i, 1). His prophecies are directed to Judah and Jerusalem (chapters ii, 1, 15, 17, 23, 32; iii, 1, 6, 8, 16-21), and, in all probability, he dwelt in Jerusalem.

The book is naturally divided into *two* parts. The *first*, embracing chaps. i, ii, 1-17, contains a description of the plagues that have come upon the land of Judah, especially the plague of locusts, and also an announcement of the judgments of the Almighty that are about to overtake the people. The *second* part, embracing chaps. ii, 18-iii, contains promises of deliverance and prosperity to Judah, and announces the blessings and judgments of God in Messianic times.

Two questions arise respecting the plague of locusts: Does the prophet predict the plague, or does he describe it as already existing? Is the plague of locusts to be understood literally, or allegorically, for great armies of men? Bleek remarks that Luther, Calvin, and most of the recent expositors, regard it as a description of a present plague, and that most recent interpreters understand it of *real* locusts. Hengstenberg regards it as prophetic and allegorical, as a “poetical description, and not one of natural history;” a representation of destructive invading armies, under the figure of devouring locusts.

The language used in the very beginning of the description indicates that it is something already present: “Hear this, ye old men, and give ear, all ye inhabitants of the land. Hath this been in your

¹ Introduction, vol. i, p. 371, in Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

² Hebrew, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *To whom Jehovah is God.*

days, or even in the days of your fathers? Tell ye your children of it, and let your children tell their children, and their children another generation. That which the palmer-worm hath left hath the locust eaten," etc. (chap. i, 2-4). If it be conceded that the plague is described as something present, it will follow that the description is literal; for no one would think of representing an army of men who were laying waste the country and *slaughtering* human beings as a swarm of locusts *destroying all the vegetation, and climbing up upon the houses, and entering in at the windows*. But on the supposition that the description is prophetic and allegorical, there arises this difficulty, that it is too minute. Parables and allegories never admit of minute application, and are expressed in general terms. From chapter i, 20, it appears that a drought at the same time had come upon the land. This must be taken literally, and furnishes presumptive proof that the other is literal also. Some of the verbs in the description are in the future tense; but the Hebrew often uses this tense for the present. The locusts are called a *nation* (יָד), but this word is used in various passages for "flights or troops of animals" (Gesenius). In chapter ii, 17, the priests are exhorted to pray to the Lord to spare his heritage, that the heathen may not use a song of derision against them. In chap. ii, 19, God promises to send corn, wine, and oil to his people, and no more to make them a reproach among the heathen. It is obvious that the destruction of the country by the locusts would furnish the heathen an occasion to revile the Israelites as being abandoned of God, or to assert that he was unable to save them.

THE DATE OF THE PROPHECY OF JOEL.

There is nothing definite in the book respecting the age to which it belongs. From the way in which Judah and Jerusalem are named, it is clear that it was written after the separation of the ten tribes from the house of David, and while the temple was still standing (chapter ii, 17). Bunsen places it as early as B. C. 950; and Hilgenfeld subsequently to the return of the Jews from Babylon. These are the two extremes. Schrader decides in favour of B. C. 870 as the date of the prophecy. He fixes upon this date for the following reasons: first, there is no mention made either of the Syrians (and, therefore, the prophecy is earlier than 2 Kings xii, 17), or of the Assyrians (for this reason it is previous to Amos), but simply of Phœnicians and Philistines (chap. iii, 4; compare 2 Chron. xxi, 16), Egyptians and Edomites (chapter iii, 19; compare 2 Kings viii, 20-22; xiv, 7), as people hostile to Israel; secondly, the institutions of the Mosaic law are presupposed;

Written after
the revolt of
the ten tribes.

and, finally, Joel is imitated by Amos (compare Amos i, 2 with Joel iii, 16).¹ On very similar grounds Keil² decides in favour of a date between B. C. 877 and B. C. 847.

But it must be observed that it is impossible to determine on internal grounds whether Amos has quoted Joel or Joel Amos; and the fact that Joel does not speak of the Assyrians among the enemies of Judah does not compel us to place him earlier than about the middle of the eighth century before Christ, when the Assyrians appeared as the enemies of Israel. In chapter iii, 4-8, the prophet remonstrates with Tyre and Sidon and the coasts of Palestine (Philistines), because they "have taken away my silver and my gold," and carried into their temples "my goodly, pleasant things;" "The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians," etc. It is in the highest degree probable that the prophet here refers to an irruption of the Philistines and others, who broke into the house of King Jehoram and carried away all its substance, "and his sons, also, and his wives" (2 Chron. xxi, 16, 17). This was about B. C. 887. It seems that at the same time the Philistines damaged the temple in Jerusalem, as not many years afterward mention is made of breaches in the house of the Lord (2 Kings xii, 4-16). We may conclude that the book was written about B. C. 870. Bleek,³ from certain resemblances it bears to Amos, places it about B. C. 800. Fürst places it B. C. 885.⁴

CHARACTER OF HIS PROPHECY.

On this point Bleek well remarks: "In a literary, *poetical* point of view, Joel's prophecy belongs to the finest productions of Hebrew literature. In florid, vivid description it is unsurpassed. Also in respect to its prophetic, *Messianic* character it is important; although, of course, in this it stands somewhat behind the predictions of many other prophets."⁵

THE PROPHET AMOS.⁶

Of this prophet we know nothing more than what is derived from his own writings. He informs us in the beginning of his prophecy that he was one of the herdmen of Tekoa,⁷ and that in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah, and in those of Jeroboam, son of Joash, king of Israel, two years before the earthquake, he received the oracles

¹ De Wette--Schrader, p. 454.

² *Intro.*, i, p. 376, in Clark's *For. Theo. Lib.*

³ *Einleitung*, p. 530.

⁴ *Ueber den Kanon*, p. 30.

⁵ *Einleitung*, p. 531.

⁶ Hebrew, עָמוֹס, *Borne*.

⁷ A town about twelve miles south of Jerusalem, on the borders of the Desert of Judea.

concerning Israel. He further tells us that he was no prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but "a herdman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit; and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel" (chapter vii, 14, 15). While engaged in the prophetic office at Bethel, Amaziah, priest of that place, sent a message to Jeroboam, king of Israel, that Amos was conspiring against him; at the same time he exhorted the prophet to flee into the land of Judea and prophesy (chap. vii, 10-13). It is probable that he soon afterward left for the kingdom of Judah, where he doubtless wrote this book. Of his prophecies only the passages chaps. ii, 4, 5, vi, 1, concern Judah and Jerusalem, his special mission being to the ten tribes.

This book may be divided into two parts: the *first* (chaps. i-vi) containing prophecies against various nations, and reproofs and exhortations to Israel; the *second* (chapters vii-ix) containing *visions*, setting forth the divine judgments upon Israel, and also *Messianic* prophecies.

THE DATE OF THE PROPHECIES OF AMOS.

Amos states in the first verse that he received his oracles in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, king of Israel, and in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah, two years before the earthquake. From this it appears that he received his commission that year, but we are unable to determine from it how long his ministry among the ten tribes lasted, though it is probable that it was completed in that single year. Jeroboam reigned from B. C. 825 to B. C. 784, and Uzziah from B. C. 810 to B. C. 758. Internal evidence confirms the superscription, for reference is made in chapter vii, 10 to Jeroboam as a contemporary. In Zechariah xiv, 5 reference is made to the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah. According to the tradition of the Jews,¹ the earthquake occurred in the twenty-seventh year of the reign of Uzziah (about B. C. 783). As Jeroboam's reign ended B. C. 784, it is obvious that we cannot place Amos later than that date. Could we rest upon the Jewish tradition respecting the year of the earthquake, the date of the prophecy could be fixed with great accuracy at B. C. 785; but in the uncertainty of the tradition we may place it about B. C. 795.

CHARACTER OF HIS PROPHECY.

Respecting the literary character of Amos, Bleek remarks: "His language is poetical, even in narrating visions, but upon the whole it is very plain, calm, measured. In general it is pure."² "Nowhere

¹Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, pp. 30, 31.

²Einleitung, p. 535.

else, ' says Ewald, "in the prophets do we meet with images from country life in such pure originality and loveliness, and in such inexhaustible fulness."

THE PROPHET OBADIAH.¹

Nothing of a personal character is known of this prophet. According to a tradition in the Talmud he was an Idumean who, at a later period passed over to Judaism and became Ahab's steward, and because he protected and supported a hundred prophets received the prophetic gift.² This tradition seems to us to be of little value. It is evident from his prophecy that he was a Jew, living in Judah.

The prophecy consists of but a single chapter of twenty-one verses, and is the smallest of the prophetic books. It is chiefly of a threatening character, and is directed against the Edomites on account of their violence toward the children of Judah in the day of calamity, when Jerusalem was captured. At the same time judgment is declared against all the heathen; but salvation and restoration are promised to the house of Jacob. Jacob and Joseph are to consume Esau as stubble; the children of Israel that have been led away captive are to return, and deliverers shall stand on Zion to judge the mount of Esau.

DATE OF THE PROPHECY.

It is difficult to fix the date of this prophecy, as we have to rely altogether upon internal evidence of an obscure character; and hence the greatest diversity of opinion respecting it exists among biblical critics. In determining the age of Obadiah's prophecy, it is necessary to consider what relation it bears to a very similar one in Jer. xlix, 7-22, against Edom. From an examination of the prophecy in both of these prophets it is evident that one of them has copied the other. Which, then, is the original? If Jeremiah is to be so regarded, we have the singular spectacle of a prophet making his appearance with a single chapter of matter, called a *vision*, principally borrowed from a great prophet living just before him! What place could there be for him! On the other hand, if Obadiah is the original, there is nothing strange in Jeremiah's borrowing from him in his own great prophetic book, just as he has borrowed from Isaiah. Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Caspari, Keil, Kleinert, and others, are in favour of the originality of Ob-

¹ Hebrew, עֲבַדְיָהוּ, *Worshipper of Jehovah*.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 32.

diah, while Bertholdt, Knobel, Hitzig, Bleek, and others, favour that of Jeremiah.

The capture of Jerusalem to which Obadiah refers cannot be that made by Nebuchadnezzar, for he carried away the people of Jerusalem to Babylon. The language of the prophet refers to a very different captivity: "The captivity of Jerusalem, which is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the south" (ver 20). This most probably refers to the capture of the city in the reign of Jehoram (about B. C. 887), when the Philistines and the Arabians made an irruption into Judah and Jerusalem, and took captives, and carried off valuable property (2 Chron. xxi, 16, 17). To this Joel seems to refer (chap. iii, 4-6). He represents the children of Judah and Jerusalem as sold to the Grecians. The captivity of Jerusalem in Sepharad (Obadiah 20)—a district in or about Asia Minor—seems to be that of a part of the people carried away at that time.

It seems best, then, to refer the plundering of Jerusalem, to which reference is made in Obadiah, to the reign of Jehoram, and the prophecy to the time immediately subsequent, or about B. C. 880. If it be conceded that Jeremiah quotes Obadiah, it will confirm this date. Hoffman and Delitzsch hold that Obadiah prophesied under Jehoram, and he is placed by Keil¹ in the same age (about B. C. 889-884). Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and others, place him in the reign of Uzziah. Aben Ezra, Luther, and many recent writers, including Bleek, hold that Obadiah prophesied immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

THE BOOK OF JONAH.²

It is stated in the beginning of this book that "the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the son of Amittai." He is evidently the same as "Jonah the son of Amittai the prophet, . . . of Gath-hepher,"³ who is mentioned in 2 Kings xiv, 25, in which it is stated that Jeroboam II. (B. C. 825-784) restored the coast of Israel according to the word of the Lord by this prophet. With the exception of this statement, all that we know about him depends on the book that bears his name.

This prophecy contains an account of Jonah's being sent by the Lord to preach to the Ninevites, his refusal to go, his taking ship for Tarshish, the storm, his being thrown overboard by the sailors to assuage it, his being swallowed by a sea monster, his restoration to land, his obedience to the second summons to declare to the Nin-

¹ Introduction, vol. i, pp. 390, 391.

² Hebrew, יוֹנָה, *A dove.*

³ The same as Gittah-hepher (Josh. xix, 13), a city of Zebulun.

evites that in forty days their city should be overthrown, their repentance, and Jonah's anger.

CHARACTER AND DESIGN OF THE BOOK.

This book is wholly unlike any other book of the Old Testament in its history, and in the singularity of Jonah's mission; and it is accordingly not at all strange that it should give offence even to critics who are not especially skeptical, and that the most widely diverging views have been taken of it. Some few skeptics have produced two heathen myths, those of Hesione and Andromeda, as parallels to the account of Jonah being preserved in the belly of a fish, and have supposed that some connexion exists between them and this event in the life of Jonah. One of these is found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, xi, 211-220, and in Diodorus Siculus, iv, 42. The other in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, iv, 670-739, and is, perhaps, nothing more than a variation of the preceding. But it is difficult to see what connexion these myths have with the history of Jonah. The idea that a Jewish writer would work up a heathen myth is so improbable that it should be rejected at once.

Nor should the idea that the Book of Jonah is pure fiction find much favour; as it was utterly foreign to the spirit of the ancient Hebrews to invent such histories. De Wette¹ observes, that "it is probable that the material of the book was derived from the traditions among the people and the prophets; for narratives of that kind in antiquity were not pure inventions. But whether real facts, and what ones out of the history of Jonah, lie at the foundation of the book, cannot be shown either from the thanksgiving hymn, chap. ii, 3, *ff.*, and from Tobit xiv, 4, or ascertained by an arbitrary dissection of the materials."

Bunsen supposed that the thanksgiving hymn of Jonah (chapter ii, 2-10) was a genuine production of that prophet, who composed it upon his being saved from the sea; and that this hymn, being misunderstood, furnished the occasion for representing the history of Jonah in the form in which we find it. Upon the basis of this song Bunsen attempted to restore what he deemed to be the real facts, though, as Bleek thinks, unsuccessfully. This latter writer, while admitting that the author of the book may possibly have found something in tradition which he followed, yet, in denying that the book has an historical aim, though a purely didactic one, seems to deprive it of all historical foundation whatever.²

"It is possible," says Davidson,³ "that a true prophetic tradition

¹ De Wette—Schrader, p. 462.

² Einleitung, pp. 569-579.

³ Introduction, vol. iii, 279, 280.

The opinion of Davidson. may lie at the foundation of the book. Jonah may have prophesied to the Ninevites, and various particulars respecting his mission may either have been written by himself or handed down orally. . . . We consider the much greater part of the book fictitious. A historical germ formed the foundation on which the writer worked."

The book has been held to be a didactic fiction by Semler, Herder, Michaelis, Stäudlin, and others. Hermann Van der Hardt, Less, and others, regard the book as a historical allegory; while Jahn and Pareau consider it a parable, and Gramberg and F. C. Baur, a poetical myth; and Abarbanel, in the fifteenth century, "relying upon what is said of Jonah's falling asleep in the ship, wished the narrative about the fish that swallowed him to be taken for a dream." On the other hand, the book has been earnestly defended by Lilienthal, Hess, Lüderwald, Piper, Steudel, Sack, Hävernick, Baumgarten, Stuart, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Keil, and others.

Keil expresses himself strongly in favour of the historical character of the book. "Its contents," says he, "are neither pure fiction, allegory, nor myth; nor yet a prophetic legend, wrought up poetically with a moral or didactic aim, embellished into a miraculous story, and mingled with mythical elements; but, with all its miracles, it is to be taken for a true history of deep prophetic-symbolic and typical significance."¹ Delitzsch characterizes the book

Defenders of the authenticity of Jonah. as "a confession of sin written down by the corrected prophet under a deep feeling of shame and godly self-denial, as he was moved by the Holy Spirit, which is incorporated with the prophetic writings for this reason, that Jonah, prophesying there in a manner contrary to his own wishes, was a type of Christ who was to come, in and through whom alone believers, even of the Old Testament age (Jonah iii, 5), have a share in grace."²

The book was regarded by the ancient Jews and Christians as real history. In the Book of Tobit, which was, in all probability, written some centuries before Christ, and evidently in Hebrew, Tobit declares that he believes "what the Prophet Jonah said concerning Nineveh, that it shall be destroyed" (chap. xiv, 4); and again, respecting this city, "that certainly those things will come to pass which Jonah the Prophet spoke" (chap. xiv, 8).

In the Targum of Jonathan Ben-Uzziel³ on the Prophet Nahum, it is said that Jonah the Prophet, the son of Amittai, prophesied against Nineveh. Josephus⁴ gives an account of Jonah, taken almost exclusively from this book, and adds: "I have narrated the account

¹ Introduction, vol i, p. 395, in Clark's For. Theol. Lib.

² Ibid., p. 398.

³ Made about the time of Christ.

⁴ Antiq., ix, 10,

concerning him as I have found it written." In the time of the Talmudists¹ the book was regarded as historical.

The book does not profess to be written by Jonah. The first person is nowhere used except in the psalm of thanksgiving. The language of the book seems to belong to a quite late period. The use of שָׁל for אֲשֶׁר, *which*, in the phrase בְּשַׁלְמִי, *because of whom* (chap. i, 7), and in בְּשַׁלִּי, *on my account*, belongs to late Hebrew. טַעַם, *mandate, decree* (Jonah iii, 7), is from the Chaldee; כַּפְיָנָה, *ship*, is the same as Syriac and Arabic; נִשְׁבַּר, *to suffer shipwreck* (chap. i, 4), is found elsewhere in this sense (Ezekiel xxvii, 34; 2 Chronicles xx, 37); הֶעֱבִיר, in the sense *to remove* (chap. iii, 6), belongs to late Hebrew. כִּהְלֵךְ, *a walk, way* (chap. iii, 3, 4),

Peculiarities of the language of this book.

is also a late Hebrew word; and הִתְעַשֶׂה, *to think upon* (chap. i, 6), is the same as the Chaldee. But if the book was written by Jonah, it was composed at least as early as about B. C. 825. The language seems altogether inconsistent with such an early date, and would indicate a period just before, or very soon after, the Babylonian captivity. Respecting Jewish tradition in reference to the author of the book, Fürst remarks: "Since, with the exception of the inserted prayer, nothing indicates that the prophet himself composed it—as it for the most part is only a narrative respecting Jonah—in the Talmudic period the question respecting its author was left altogether undecided."²

The writer's aim seems to be *didactic*: to show, first of all, the folly of disobeying God when one is called to perform important work; but especially to set forth in a conspicuous manner the greatness of the Divine mercy to all men who repent of their sins, though they may not be of the covenant people. In contrast with this, the purpose is to show in a striking way the narrowness of the soul of the prophet, who preferred that all the inhabitants of this great city, the innocent with the guilty, should be cut off, rather than that a doubt should be cast upon the reality of his prophetic mission.

The writer's purpose.

The tone of the book stands out in marked contrast with the narrow and exclusive spirit of the Jews, and approximates the liberality of Christianity. It is difficult to see how the history of such a mission³ to Nineveh could have arisen had it not been based upon a well-authenticated fact. Nor would the book have been admitted among the prophets if there had been any serious doubts about the truth of that mission. We have still other grounds for holding fast

¹ Ueber den Kanon, p. 33.

² Ibid., p. 33.

³ In Ezek. iii, 5, 6 there is a not improbable reference to this mission.

to the reality of the mission of Jonah to the Ninevites. Christ refers to this in such a way that he must have regarded it as a fact. "The men of Nineveh," says he, "shall rise in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, behold, a greater than Jonah is here."¹ He says further: "As Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation."² Or, as it stands in Matthew xii, 39, 40. "There shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonah: for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's (κῆτος, *shark, whale*, etc.) belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."³

THE PROPHET MICAH.⁴

This prophet was a native of Moresheth, a town in Judah, about thirty miles south-west from Jerusalem. He prophesied concerning Samaria and Jerusalem in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. He seems to have spent his time for the most part in Judah, but must have also visited the ten tribes when he delivered his prophecy respecting them. He is mentioned in Jeremiah xxvi, 18 as "Micah the Morasthite," who prophesied in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, respecting the utter desolation of Jerusalem.

Chapters i-iii contain prophecies directed to Samaria and Judah, threatening them with the judgments of God on account of the sins of the people. Chapters iv, v refer chiefly to the Messiah, and to the prosperity of Israel under his reign. Chapters vi, vii describe true religion, rebuke the wickedness of the people, and, at the same time, encourage them to look to God for pardon.

THE DATE OF HIS PROPHECY.

Although Micah states that the word of the Lord came to him in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, it is not to be supposed

¹ Matt. xii, 41. Luke xi, 32 has the same passage.

² Luke xi, 30.

³ The passage in which mention is made of Jonah being in the whale's belly is found only in Matt. xii, 40. In the allusion to Jonah it is omitted by Luke (xi, 30-32.) Neander thinks that the reference in Matt. xii, 40 to the *resurrection* of Christ "is quite foreign to the original sense and connexion of the passage," and that "the verse in question is a commentary by a later hand."—*Life of Christ*, pp. 245, 246. M'Clintock and Blumenthal's Trans. It is true that the verse seems out of place but we have no sufficient authority for its rejection.

⁴ קִיבְיָהּ, *Who as Jehovah?*

that the prophecies were written down at various times during a period of twenty-five or thirty years, but rather that his book gives the substance of the prophecies which he delivered at different times and afterward wrote down. Thus the question is, When did he compose the book? It must have been before the capture of Samaria and the removal of the ten tribes; for we find in chap. vi, 16 the complaint that "the statutes of Omri are kept, and all the works of the house of Ahab." From the whole tone of the book it is evident that at the time of its composition Samaria was not yet captured. But this event occurred in the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, B. C. 721. According to Jeremiah xxvi, 18 the prophecy contained in Micah iii, 12, respecting the utter desolation of Jerusalem, was delivered in the time of Hezekiah. The book, therefore, must have been composed between the first and sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, B. C. 727-721.

Respecting the character of his prophetic style, Keil says: "The prophetic discourse of Micah is like Isaiah's in the boldness and loftiness of the thought; in the rounding off, the clearness and the liveliness of the representation; in the wealth of imagery and comparisons (chaps. i, 8, 16; ii, 12, 13; iv, 9, 10, etc.), and other rhetorical figures, such as individualizing, dialogue (chaps. vi, 1-8; vii, 7-20), paronomasia, and play upon words (specially accumulated at chap. i, 10-15). Yet he is distinguished from him by quick and sudden changes from threatening to promise, and the reverse (chapters ii, 12, 13; iv, 9-14; vii, 11, *ff.*), which remind us of Hosea. The diction soars poetically, and is rhythmically rounded off; and the language is classically pure."¹

THE PROPHET NAHUM.²

The book bears the inscription, "The oracle respecting Nineveh; the book of the vision of Nahum the Elkoshite." Apart from his prophecy nothing is known of him, and there has been a dispute even respecting the place, Elkosh, where he was born; some regarding it as a town of Galilee; others as the village *El-kûsh*, near Mosul. Jerome³ mentions the ruins of a village in Galilee by the name of *Elcesi* (אֵלְקֵסִי), pointed out to him by a guide. Fürst⁴ remarks that

¹ Introduction, vol. i, p. 405, in Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

² נְחֻמִּים, *Consolation*.

³ Preface to Nahum. He also remarks that some think that his father was *EL-cus*, who, according to the Hebrew tradition, was himself a prophet

⁴ Ueber den Kanon, p. 36.

the tradition that his birth-place, Elkosh, was Elcesi in Galilee, and not Elkesh on the eastern bank of the Tigris, has much in its favour; and that his abode was probably Capernaum (Kefar-Nachum), named after the prophet.

The prophecy refers to *one* subject, the ruin of Nineveh. In preparing the way for the prediction of its overthrow the prophet dwells upon the attributes of God—that he is zealous and avengeth, reserving wrath for his enemies; irresistible in power; slow to anger, good; and a stronghold in the day of trouble. After this he proceeds to describe the wickedness and corruption of Nineveh, and the dreadful fate that awaits her on account of her wickedness (chaps. i-iii).

DATE OF COMPOSITION.

It is clear from the language of the book that when it was composed Nineveh was still standing. This great city, according to Herodotus, was captured by Cyaxares and the Medes (chap. i, 106). The following account of the capture and destruction of Nineveh is given by George Smith: "A coalition of Necho, king of Egypt, Cyaxares, king of Media, and Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, was formed against Assyria, and the Medes and Babylonians, after defeating the Assyrian forces, laid siege to Nineveh. The lofty walls of the city long resisted their efforts, but after two years there happened a great overflow of the Tigris, which swept away part of the wall of the city. Through the breach the besiegers entered, on the subsiding of the flood, and captured the city. The last king of Assyria, finding his city was taken, made a pile of all his valuables in the palace, and, setting fire to it, perished himself in the flames. The city was now plundered and at once destroyed; it did not gradually decay, like Babylon, but from the time of its capture it ceased to have any political importance, and its site became almost forgotten."¹ This was about B. C. 607, as the reign of the last king of Nineveh, as given by Smith, is B. C. 620-607.²

As the date of the prophecy cannot be later than B. C. 607, it cannot be earlier than about B. C. 665. It is clear from Nahum iii, 8-11 that Thebes (No) was already led away captive. In Smith's translation³ of the history of Assurbanipal from the columns of Nineveh, this monarch states that in his second expedition to Egypt and Ethiopia "the spoil, great and unnumbered, I carried off from the midst of Thebes." His history is recorded from B. C. 671 to

¹ Assyrian Discoveries, 1873, 1874, pp. 93, 94.

² Ibid., p. 447.

³ Ibid., p. 329.

B. C. 645; and as he made many expeditions to different nations, this second expedition to Egypt and Ethiopia was in all probability about five years, or something more, from the beginning of his reign.

THE PROPHETIC STYLE OF THE BOOK.

It is distinguished for beauty, originality, regularity and purity of diction, and belongs to the very best class of the prophetic writings.

THE PROPHET HABAKKUK.¹

The title of the book is, "The Oracle which Habakkuk the Prophet saw." Nothing is known of the personal history of this prophet, and his name nowhere occurs in Jewish history² outside of his book. In his prophecy he gives us no information respecting himself.

The book consists of two parts—a prophecy, and a prayer, or psalm. The prophetic part is in the form of a dialogue between Jehovah and the prophet, in which the wickedness of men and the holiness of God are discussed. In this prophecy the Jews are threatened with destruction from the Chaldeans (chaps. i, ii). The prayer or psalm is a sublime description of the exhibition of divine power in the exodus of the Israelites (chap. iii). In its grandeur and beauty it is surpassed by nothing in the Old Testament.

THE DATE OF THE DELIVERY OF THE PROPHECY.

As Habakkuk announces that the Chaldeans are to be raised up against the Jewish people—an event which was so strange as to be incredible—it is clear that at the time of this announcement the Chaldean power was not at all threatening, and that Babylon was a secondary power in the Assyrian dominion. Since the Chaldeans were to be raised up in the lifetime³ of the prophet's contemporaries, the prophecy was probably written twenty or thirty years before the captivity of Jehoiachin, about B. C. 620 or 630. Fürst remarks that the Talmudic tradition placed the beginning of the

¹ חֲבַקּוּק, *Embrace.*

² In the superscription to the Apocryphal story of Bel and the Dragon, in the Codex Chisi of the LXX, and in the Syrian-hexapla version made from it, it is stated that Habakkuk was of the tribe of Levi. In this Apocryphal story an angel is represented as taking Habakkuk by the hair of his head, and transporting him to Babylon, to aid Daniel. All of these statements are equally unfounded.

³ This must be the meaning of the expression, "I will work a work in your days."

prophecies of Habakkuk in the latter part of Manasseh's reign (B. C. 645-641).¹ Bleek² refers the prophecy to the reign of Jehoiakim (B. C. 610-599). He thinks the last chapter may have been written somewhat later than the prophecy. De Wette³ thinks that chapter i, 5, etc., points certainly to the reign of Jehoiakim, and that chapter iii does not demand a later date. We see no good reason for supposing that chapter iii was written at a later period than chapters i and ii.

THE PROPHET ZEPHANIAH.⁴

This prophet delivered his oracles, as he himself informs us, in the days of Josiah, son of Ammon, king of Judah, whose reign falls B. C. 641-610. He was the great-grandson of Amariah, who was the son of Hezekiah (chap. i, 1). According to a Jewish⁵ tradition this Hezekiah was no other than the distinguished Jewish king. And this would seem probable from the fact that the name stands back as far as the fourth generation. There is no reason for this except the hypothesis that this ancestor was a man of distinction. Certainly he belonged to the tribe of Judah, and most probably lived in Jerusalem.

The prophecy opens with the denunciation of terrible judgments from God upon Judah and Jerusalem for idolatry and universal wickedness (chaps. i, ii, 3). Severe judgments are next denounced upon the Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, Ethiopians, and Assyria and Nineveh (chap. ii, 4-15). After this the prophet returns to Jerusalem, and describes the wickedness of the people, prophets and priests and closes with promises of happiness to Israel in the future, in which he evidently refers to Messianic times (chap. iii).

THE DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE PROPHECY.

According to a tradition of the Jews,⁶ Zephaniah prophesied in the time between B. C. 627, before the reform of divine worship had been made by Josiah, when the book of the law was discovered in the temple, and B. C. 621, when that reformation of worship was completed. De Wette⁷ refers the prophecy to the first years of Josiah's reign. Bleek thinks that it was composed probably before the eighteenth year of that monarch's reign, as there is no mention in it of the reforms instituted by him.⁸

¹ Ueber den Kanon, p. 30.

² In De Wette—Schrader, p. 470.

³ In Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 38.

⁷ Page 472.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 545.

⁵ צִפְנִיָּה, *Whom Jehovah protects.*

⁶ Fürst, p. 38.

⁸ Page 548.

According to 2 Chron. xxxiv, 3, Josiah began his reforms in his twelfth year. And it would seem from chap. i, 4, where it is stated, "I will cut off the remnant of Baal from this place," that Josiah had already begun his reforms. In chap. i, 8 it is said, "I will punish the king's children." This, in all probability, refers to the sons of the reigning monarch, and to them as already born. But as Josiah was only eight years old when he began to reign, it is not probable that he had sons before he was more than twenty years of age. Upon the whole, we think the prophecy was written some time before the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, or about B. C. 630. It is evident from the prophecy of the destruction of Nineveh that that city was still standing. But Nineveh was destroyed B. C. 607.¹

CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.

It is by no means distinguished for boldness and originality. In the prophecy of the desolation of Nineveh Nahum had already led the way. Some of Zephaniah's descriptions, as chapters ii, 14, 15, iii, 16, 17, are borrowed from, or based on, Isaiah. It occasionally contains paronomasias. Its language, however, is pure. Bleek remarks that the prophecy is remarkable for containing a prediction of the conversion of the heathen nations, even of those who execute the divine judgments upon Israel.²

THE PROPHET HAGGAI.³

This prophet states very definitely that the word of the Lord came to him on the first day of the sixth month of the second year of the reign of Darius (Hystaspes), B. C. 520. All the other dates which he gives for the divine communications belong also to the second year of the reign of Darius. Apart from this book, our prophet is mentioned in Ezra v, 1, 2 as prophesying to the Jews while they were rebuilding the temple after the return from Babylon in the second year of Darius, and as helping Zerubbabel and Joshua in their work.

The book consists of four communications made by the prophet in the second year of Darius; the first to the people, declaring that the failure of their crops is owing to their having failed to rebuild the house of the Lord, and that the pleasure and presence of Jehovah will attend them in performing this work. The second

¹ The last king of Nineveh. Assurebil-ili, reigned from B. C. 620-607. See Smith's Assyrian Discoveries, 1873, 1874, p. 447.

² Einkitung, p. 549.

³ חַגַּי, *Festive*.

communication, made likewise to the whole people, in which they are assured that this second temple, though inferior in splendour to the first, shall have greater glory than it, and that Jehovah will shake all nations, and the most excellent of the nations¹ shall come (to it), and the house shall be filled with glory. The third communication is addressed to the priests, in which it is declared that the uncleanness of the people is the ground of the failure of their crops. The fourth communication is made to Zerubbabel, in which God declares that he will overthrow the kingdoms of the earth, but promises that Zerubbabel shall be made as a signet, by which the Jewish governor seems to be a type of Christ.

THE PROPHET ZECHARIAH.²

This prophet calls himself the son of Barachiah, the son of Iddo. It is clear from Neh. xii, 16 that he was a priest, and that he went up from Babylon to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel. In Ezra v, 1, 2 he is mentioned as prophesying along with Haggai, and aiding in the rebuilding of the temple. In this passage he is called simply the son of Iddo. This is done either for brevity, or, what is more probable, because his father was already dead when Ezra wrote, and his grandfather was his nearest living ancestor. He states in the beginning of his prophecy that the word of the Lord came unto him in the eighth month of the second year of Darius. Besides this, he gives two other dates of divine communications—the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month, in the same year (chap. i, 7), and the fourth day of the ninth month of the fourth year of Darius (chap. vii, 1). He was a young man (יָשָׁר) when called to the prophetic office (chap. ii, 4).

This book may be appropriately divided into *four* sections. The *first* (chaps. i-vi) contains eight visions, setting forth the providence of God and his special care over Israel. The design here is, to encourage the Jewish people to rebuild the temple and Jerusalem, and to inspire them with hope for the future. The *second* section (chaps. vii, viii) contains no visions, but abounds in exhortations to perform the practical duties of religion, and gives promises of future happiness and prosperity to the Jews. The *third* section (chaps. x-xi) contains prophecies pertaining chiefly to Israel. In chap. ix, 9, 10 the Messiah is promised. The *fourth* section (chap. xii-xiv) con-

¹ The English version of Hag. ii, 7, is not borne out by the Hebrew, which is literally, "And they shall come, the excellent of the nations." There seems to be no direct reference to the Messiah in this passage.

² זְכַרְיָהוּ. *Whom Jehovah remembers.*

tains prophecies respecting Judah and Jerusalem and the Messiah's kingdom, and the judgments that shall overtake the enemies of Jerusalem.

GENUINENESS OF CHAPTERS IX-XIV.

In modern times the genuineness of chapters ix-xiv has been violently assailed, and they have been attributed by the most of their impugnors to two different writers, living at different periods before the Babylonian captivity. Some, indeed, have placed them in the time of Alexander, others in that of the Maccabees.

The first doubt, so far as we know, about the genuineness of chapters ix-xi was expressed by an Englishman, Joseph Mede, in the seventeenth century, on the ground that the passage in chap. xi, 11, 12 is quoted in Matt. xxvii, 9, 10 as the language of Jeremiah, and because the three chapters out of which the quotation is made are closely connected. He accordingly attributed them to Jeremiah. In the next century Whiston and other Englishmen followed him; and they in turn were succeeded by Döderlein, who attributed the six chapters (ix-xiv) to that prophet. Since that time many German scholars, relying upon internal grounds, have refused to attribute these last six chapters to Zechariah. Among these may be named Bertholdt, Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Ewald, Knobel, Bunsen, Bleek, and Schrader. On the other hand, the genuineness of these chapters has been defended by Köster, Jahn, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil, Stähelin, and others. De Wette, in the first three editions of his "Introduction," denied their genuineness, but in the fourth and subsequent editions he acknowledged it. Schrader holds that chaps ix-xi belong to a prophet in the first half of the eighth century B. C., and that chaps. xii-xiv fall in the period immediately preceding the Babylonian captivity. To about the same periods they are assigned by Bleek and others.

Objections of
Mede, Whiston,
and others.

In respect to chaps. ix-xi, it is urged that they must have been composed when both the kingdoms of Judah and Israel still existed in contiguity as parts of the covenant people,¹ and when the people still stood under the dominion of kings; and that chap. xi, 8 seems to refer to times of anarchy following the death of Jeroboam II. in Israel. In chap. ix, 13 it is said, "When I have bent Judah for me, filled the bow with Ephraim," etc.; and in chap. x, 6, 7, "I will strengthen the house of Judah, and I will save the house of Joseph. They of Ephraim shall be like a mighty man," etc.; and in chap. xi, 14, "Then I cut asunder mine other staff, even Bands, that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel." But it

¹ So Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 559.

cannot be shown from these references to Judah and Israel that the prophecy was written before the ten tribes were carried away into captivity (B. C. 721); for there is no reference to these tribes as being in Palestine, or to their capital, Samaria. On the contrary, it would appear from chap. x, 6 that the house of Joseph had already gone into captivity; and the same may be said respecting Ephraim in the following verses (7, 8). In the passage, "I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem" (chap. ix, 10), reference is made to the peaceable reign of the Messiah, whose kingdom shall extend "from the river to the ends of the earth." The other reference to Judah and Ephraim (chap. ix, 13) is also prophetic.

Jeremiah uses the following language: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man," etc. (chap. xxxi, 27); and, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah" (chap. xxxi, 31). But notwithstanding these references to the house of Israel, the ten tribes, had gone into captivity more than a hundred years before this. In Jer. xxxi, 18-20 there is a still clearer illustration of the passages in Zechariah under discussion: "I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself . . . Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child?" In spite of this, he had long since gone into captivity.

In Obadiah 18 it is said: "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame." Notwithstanding this reference to the "house of Joseph," Bleek and Schrader think that Obadiah was written after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. The reference to Judah and Israel, in chap. xi, 14, refers apparently to a historical fact. In chap. ix, 5 it is said, "the king shall perish from Gaza;" but this does not imply a period preceding the Babylonian captivity, for when Alexander the Great laid siege to Gaza, about two hundred years after the time of Zechariah, the city was governed by a eunuch named Batis.¹ The Hebrew word מֶלֶךְ, *king*, often means the ruler of a single city, a satrap, or a petty despot.

Hamath is also mentioned in chap. ix, 2, and although it may have been destroyed centuries before the time of Zechariah (Isa. xxxvi, 19), yet it is evident that it was afterward rebuilt, for it is mentioned by Jeremiah (chap. xlix, 23) as being inhabited in his time. In chap. xi, 8 it is said, "Three shepherds also I cut off in one month" Bleek supposes the reference here to be to three kings: Zachariah, the son of Jeroboam II., who reigned six months; Shallum, who reigned one full month (2 Kings xv, 8-15); and some unknown

¹ Arrian's Expedition of Alexander, lib. ii, 25.

usurper, who may have maintained his authority for only a few weeks. But it could not be well said that *three* were cut off in one month, for Menahem, who succeeded Shallum, reigned *ten* years, and we have no right to interpolate another king without a particle of proof of his existence. The three shepherds may not have been kings at all, but prophets—which Gesenius seems to prefer. Bleek's argument from this passage in favour of the composition of chapters ix-xi in the time of King Menahem¹ is utterly groundless.

Respecting chapters xii-xiv, it is conceded by Bleek and Schrader that they were composed after the death of king Josiah (B. C. 610), to whose death there is a clear reference in chap. xii, 11: "In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon." In illustration of this see 2 Kings xxxiii, 29, 30; 2 Chron. xxxv, 24.

It is clear, then, that we cannot place the last three chapters of the book earlier than about B. C. 600, or near the beginning of the Babylonian captivity. But it is difficult to believe that these chapters were written then, for there is no mention made of the Chaldeans, who were on the point of destroying Jerusalem. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah is full of predictions belonging to that time respecting the destruction of the city by the Chaldeans. It is next to impossible to believe that these chapters synchronize with any of those belonging to Jeremiah. Nor can we suppose that they were written during the Babylonian exile, or that they could have been written long posterior to the captivity. Consequently, the age of Zechariah, or that immediately succeeding, is the only one to which the chapters in question belong.

It is true that we find in the last division certain predictions respecting the captivity of Jerusalem. But the entire description is totally unsuitable to the destruction and captivity of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans; for it refers to times long subsequent to that event, and is closely connected with the advent of the Messiah.

If this last section belongs to Zechariah, it will be difficult to believe that chapters ix-xi belong to an earlier author, and have been interpolated into the book of Zechariah's prophecies. In the disputed sections of these prophecies there is no mention of a king as ruling over Judah; on the contrary, the reference is either to a prince of Judah (chap. ix, 7), or to governors of Judah (chap. xii, 5, 6); from which the probable inference is, that when the prophecies were composed there was no king in Judah.

It has been objected that the style of the second part (chaps. ix-xiv) is different from that of the first (chaps. i-viii). Symbols, it is

¹ Einleitung, p. 559.

true, are used in chaps. i-v, but not in chaps. vi, vii—which shows there is not uniformity in the first part. But from the very nature of the case, we are not to expect the same kind of style in the first part, in which the people are personally addressed, and in the second, which is for the most part prophetic. The prophet was a young man when he wrote the first part (chap. ii, 4), but the latter portion may have been written at a late period in life, when his style had greatly changed.

Difference in style easily accounted for.

There are, indeed, certain peculiarities common to both the acknowledged and the disputed parts of the book. The phrase *בְּעֵבֶר וּבְשִׁבְעַת*, *from passing over and returning*, is found both in chaps vii, 14 and ix, 8. It occurs nowhere else, except in Ezek. xxxv, 7, where it wants the *mem* (כ), *from*. The eye, as the symbol of divine providence, is used in chap. iv, 10 and chap. ix, 1, "*Jehovah's eye is upon men, and upon all the tribes of Israel*" (Gesenius). Not very different is, "I have seen with my eyes" (chap. ix, 8), with reference to Jehovah. In chap. ii, 10, "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion," occurs, and in chap. ix, 9 the very similar language, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! shout, O daughter of Jerusalem!" is found.

The external evidence for the genuineness of the whole book is exceedingly strong. It is attributed to Zechariah in the Septuagint and in the Peshito-Syriac, as well as in the Hebrew Bible; and it is very difficult to see how these chapters (ix-xiv) could have been attributed to Zechariah—as the canon was formed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah—if they had not been written by him; for it is probable that not more than *eighty* years intervened between the time of the composition of chapters i-ix and the formation of the canon; and as Zechariah was a young man when he wrote these chapters (see chap. ii, 4), it is likely that he lived until within forty or fifty years of the time when the collection was made. How, under such circumstances, could prophecies written from one to three centuries earlier than the time of Zechariah have been attributed to him? It would be the patching of a piece of old cloth on a new garment.

Nor does the ancient tradition of the Jews give us the slightest hint that a doubt had been raised respecting the genuineness of the chapters *now* disputed. Respecting them Fürst remarks: "The Talmudic period did not recognise these six chapters as different from the first, although the peculiarity in language and turns of expression, and the absence of visions and symbols, clearly enough pointed to it. On the contrary, the peculiarity of this part was described as a prophecy delivered after the exile, referring to Messianic times. Holding fast the conviction that also this part, in form and contents

so different, had proceeded from our Zechariah, they referred its contents partly to the affairs of the Jews during the first rulers after Alexander, and partly to a still later Messianic time, as the prophetic foresight was never doubted. This Talmudic method of exposition the better national expositors at that time followed."¹

CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.

This prophet, although charged by Schrader² with "a want of originality of thought and freshness and power of diction," has, in fact, a great deal of originality, both in his conceptions and manner of representation. The last six chapters contain many Messianic passages. The ancient rabbies complained of the obscurities of his visions;³ and it must be acknowledged that the complaint is not without ground. "The language," however, "is formed upon good classical models, and is almost free of Chaldaisms."

THE PROPHET MALACHI.

This is the last of the prophets of the Old Testament. Nothing is known of him apart from his book of prophecies. The name מַלְאָכִי, *Malachi*, according to Gesenius, is apocopated from מַלְאָכִיָּה, "Messenger of Jehovah." In the LXX the book bears the title, "Μαλαχίας;" but in the text, instead of "by the hand of Malachi," it is "by the hand of his angel" (or messenger). In the Peshito-Syriac the inscription is, "The prophecy of Malachi the prophet," and the name is retained in the first verse. In the Vulgate it stands, "The prophecy of Malachi," and in the text the proper name is retained, "by the hand of Malachi." In the Targum of Jonathan Ben-Uzziel it is said, "by the hand of Malachi, by which name Ezra the scribe is called." Accordingly, Jerome⁴ remarks: "The Hebrews think that Malachi is Ezra the priest." On this prophet Fürst⁵ remarks: "Tradition had related so little of his personality that at one time he was identified with Mordecai, at another with Ezra; nevertheless, the general judgment was that Malachi was not to be taken as an appellation (or title), but as a proper name, . . . and that he prophesied at the same time with Haggai and Zechariah in the second year of the reign of Darius, B. C. 464."

There is no reason to doubt that Malachi was the real name of the prophet; and this is the view, as Bleek observes, of by far the greater number of expositors. It is true the book gives nothing

¹ Ueber den Kanon, p. 45.

² De Wette—Schrader, p. 476.

³ Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, p. 43.

⁴ Prologue to Malachi.

⁵ Ueber den Kanon, p. 17.

but his bare name. But the same is also true of the prophecies of Obadiah and Habakkuk, whose books give us their names simply. But this is no ground for doubting that they are real names.

The book may be divided into *six*¹ sections. The *first* (chapter i, 2-5) declares God's love of Jacob and hatred of Esau. The *second* (chaps. i, 6-ii, 9) censures the priests for their bad conduct. The *third* (chap. ii, 10-16) rebukes those who separated themselves from their Israelitish wives, and formed matrimonial alliances with heathen women. The *fourth* (chaps. ii, 17-iii, 6) declares that God will send the Messenger of the Covenant to purify the sons of Levi, and that he himself will judge the wicked. The *fifth* (chap. iii, 7-12) rebukes the people for not bringing the tithes appointed by the law, and promises them a blessing if they bring them. The *sixth* (chaps. iii, 13-iv, 6) rebukes the people for asserting that it is useless to serve God, and declares that God will certainly reward the righteous and punish the wicked, and exhorts the people to obey the law of Moses. God promises to send Elijah the prophet to restore affection between parents and children, that the earth may not be cursed.

DATE OF COMPOSITION.

It is evident from various passages (chaps. i, 7, 10; ii, 13; iii, 1, 10) that the temple was already rebuilt and divine worship established when the book was written. It is assigned by Schrader to the interval between the first and second visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, between B. C. 433 and 424. It is placed in the time of Nehemiah's second visit by Vitringa, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, Hävernicks, and Keil. By Davidson it is referred to the interval between B. C. 460 and B. C. 450. Ewald places it shortly after the labours of Ezra.

The ancient common tradition of the Jews related that Malachi was a contemporary of Zechariah and Haggai; but there was also an old tradition that he was the latest of the prophets, and that when he prophesied the temple had been already for a long time restored. With Malachi, Zechariah, and Haggai, it was held that the prophetic spirit departed from Israel.²

Bleek remarks: "It is probable that the book was written during the governorship of a predecessor of Nehemiah. As, in all probability, Nehemiah made the collection of the prophets, our book can in no event fall in a later period; on the contrary, on account

¹ De Wette and Hengstenberg divide it into *six* sections; Bleek into *five*; Ewald, Hävernicks, and Keil into *three*.

² Fürst, Ueber den Kanon, pp. 47, 48.

of its reception into the collection it is probable that it was composed somewhat earlier."¹

The principal reasons for referring the book to the age of Nehemiah are the following: Malachi censures the same abuses that Nehemiah does in his thirteenth chapter, in which he relates his administration of affairs on his second visit to Jerusalem (about B. C. 434). The abuses consisted of neglect of payment of tithes for the support of the priests and Levites (Mal. iii, 8-10; Neh. xiii, 10-12); matrimonial alliances of the Jews, especially of the priests, with foreign women (Mal. ii, 10, 11; Neh. xiii, 23-30), etc. As these abuses were corrected by Nehemiah, B. C. 434, it seems best, upon the whole to refer the composition of the book to about B. C. 440.


CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.

Malachi is distinguished by a practical spirit, that strives to meet the wants of the times and to correct abuses rather than to soar aloft in magnificent descriptions of the Divine Majesty and in glowing pictures of the future. He abounds in dialogue, and is by no means devoid of force. De Wette, notwithstanding his unfavourable remarks, acknowledges that "in delivery, rhythm, and images, Malachi does not quite unsuccessfully emulate the old prophets."²

Einleitung, p. 567.

² De Wette—Schrader, p. 485.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.



CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

THE Old Testament, with its sublime Monotheism, was the possession of the Jewish people alone, whose mission it was to preserve the knowledge of the true God in the midst of pagan darkness, to announce through their prophets the advent of the Messiah, and to prepare the way before him. The fundamental truths of Judaism are eternal, and suited to man in all conditions, in all stages of development, and in every part of the earth, while its civil and ceremonial laws, being, to a large extent, of a local¹ character, cannot be observed among all nations; and on this ground alone Judaism necessarily local. Judaism can never become a universal religion.² For this reason it was necessary that the system of Judaism should be modified, enlarged, and adapted to the wants of all men. This was done by our Lord Jesus Christ, the promised Messiah, who appeared among the Jewish people in the fullness of time, and became the author of a New Covenant, in the provisions of which all nations are embraced. If our Saviour had been a legislator, in the strict sense of the word, it would have been proper, and even necessary, that he, like Moses, should have himself given to men a written system. But our Lord's mission was *to redeem* men rather than to legislate for them; in short, he was the beginning of a new moral creation—the spiritual life of the world.

But, further, the system of Christianity was not completed until Christ rose from the dead and ascended to heaven; and before these events the history could not be fully written. Our Saviour, for the establishing of his divine mission and unfolding his system, selected the apostles as the witnesses of his wondrous life, his death, resur-

¹ The precept in Exodus xxiii, 17, and especially in Deut. xvi, 16, "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose," cannot be observed by all men everywhere.

² Jews are found in almost every part of the world, but it is a well-known fact that there are parts of the Mosaic system which they do not and cannot keep.

rection, and ascension to heaven. He trained them for their special work; filled them with the divine Spirit, which was to bring to their remembrance all things which he had said; and endowed them with miraculous powers to establish the truth of their teaching.

From the very nature of the revelation and history it was not proper, or, humanly speaking, possible, for Christ himself *to write* the system of his religion. Had all his moral precepts been written by himself we would have a rigid form—one possibly more complete in some respects, but one which would impart no more life. In the history and teachings of Christ, as we possess them in the four Gospels, moral precepts are often delivered in connexion with historical incidents, and are thus made clearer and more lifelike.

It is very evident that the account of the teaching and acts of Christ, though at first delivered orally, could not be transmitted to posterity in its integrity without being recorded in the apostolic age or soon afterward. Written documents were necessary to the continued existence of Christianity as a divine revelation, and if we have sufficient proof that the mission of Christ in the world was of divine appointment there is the highest probability, *à priori*, that God in his providence would provide for the transmission of the revelation to future generations.

Written records
necessary for
the perpetua-
tion of Chris-
tianity.

But, independently of these considerations, it is in the highest degree probable that the appearance of such an extraordinary character as Christ, and the wide diffusion of his religion, would call forth writers of his history at a very early period, especially in an age of so much intellectual culture and literary activity.

We would also expect that there would be a history written of the Acts of the Apostles after Christ left the world, and that the apostles would write important letters upon various occasions. Accordingly we are not surprised that we have so much history belonging to the apostolic age, of the founding of Christianity by Christ and his apostles, and so many apostolic epistles; but we rather wonder that *we have not more.*

CHAPTER II.

THE RAPID DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY, AND THE NUMBER AND LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS, AS BEARING UPON THE GENUINENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

IT is very evident that the wider the diffusion of Christianity in the apostolic age, and in the ages immediately succeeding—the greater the number of Christians, and the higher the culture of many of them—the stronger does their testimony become in favour of writings universally admitted by them to be genuine.

The Roman historian Tacitus (born about A. D. 61) bears witness to the fact that Christianity originated with Christ, was widely diffused, and had many converts. In describing the burning of Rome—which was attributed to Nero—in A. D. 64, he remarks that Nero, in order to put an end to the rumour that he had himself set the city on fire, “accused and inflicted the severest punishments upon men whom, hated on account of their crimes, the populace called *Christians*. The author of this name was Christ, who in the reign of Tiberias was put to death by Pontius Pilate, the procurator. The deadly superstition, checked for awhile, again broke forth not only through Judea, the source of this evil, but through the city (Rome) also, where all things wicked or shameful from every quarter meet and are practised. At first, therefore, those were arrested who acknowledged (that they were of that sect); then, through their information, a vast multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of burning (Rome), as of hatred of the human race.”¹

The younger Pliny, who governed Bithynia, A. D. 111–113, a Roman province near the Black Sea, not much less than a thousand miles from Jerusalem, found the Christians in great numbers in his province, concerning whom he gives an account in his ninety-seventh Epistle, addressed to the

¹ Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat: repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocita aut pudenda confluunt, celebranturque. Igitur primo correpti, qui fatebantur, deinde, indicio eorum, multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis, convicti sunt.—Annalium, lib. xv, cap. xliv.

Emperor Trajan. The number of Christians in his province can be inferred from the following language: "Many of every age, of every rank, of both sexes also, are summoned, and will be summoned, to trial. For not only through the cities, but also through the villages and the fields, has the contagion of this superstition spread, which, it seems, can be checked and corrected. It is, indeed, very evident that the temples, which were almost entirely forsaken, begin to be frequented, and the appointed rites, that had for a long time been neglected, to be resumed, and victims everywhere are sold, of which hitherto purchasers were rarely found."¹ The testimony of these two heathen writers certainly shows that even in the apostolic age, and in the time immediately subsequent, Christianity was professed by multitudes in various parts of the Roman Empire.

From the Acts of the Apostles and their epistles it is evident that in their age Christianity was very widely diffused and had many converts. In Acts iv, 4, not long after the crucifixion of Christ, the number of his followers in Jerusalem is stated to be about *five thousand*. In Acts vi, 7 The spread of Christianity as noted in the Acts of the Apostles. it is said that "the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." In Acts xxi, 20 James says to Paul, "Thou seest, brother, how many myriads of the Jews there are who believe." In the apostolic age Churches were established "throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria" (Acts ix, 31). Christians were also found in Damascus, Antioch, the principal cities of Asia Minor, various cities in Macedonia, at Corinth, and in Rome. The history of the planting of the early Church is only partially recorded in the Acts.

Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second century, declares: "There is not, indeed, a single race of men, either of Testimony of Justin Martyr and other fathers. Barbarians or of Greeks, by whatever name they may be called, whether dwellers in wagons, or who have no houses, or who as nomads dwell in tents, among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Creator of the universe in the name of the crucified Jesus."¹ Irenæus, bishop of

¹ Multi enim omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum, et vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est: quæ videtur sisti et corrigi posse. Certe satis constat, prope jam desolata templa cœpisse celebrari, et sacra solennia diu intermissa repeti, passimque venire victimas, quarum adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur.—Lib. x, Epistola xcvi.

² Οὐδὲ ἐν γὰρ ὄλῳ ἐστὶ τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων, εἴτε βαρβάρων, εἴτε Ἑλλήνων, εἴτε ἀπλῶς ψτινοῦν ὀνόματι προσαγορευομένων, ἢ ἀμαξοβίων ἢ αὐίκων καλουμένων, ἢ ἐν σκεναῖς κτηνοτρόφων, οἰκούντων, ἐν δις μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Ἰησοῦ ἐνχαὶ καὶ ἐχαρισταὶ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Πνευτῇ τῶν ὄλων γίνονται.—Dialogus cum Trypho., cap. 117.

Lyons (A. D. 177-202), speaks of Churches founded in Germany, in Spain, among the Celts, in the East, in Egypt, in Libya, and in the middle of the world¹ (Judea).

Tertullian, presbyter of Carthage, about A. D. 200, asks: "In whom else have all nations believed but in Christ, who has already come?" He enumerates Parthians, Medes, Elamites, inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Pamphylia, Egypt, of Africa beyond Cyrene, and Rome. Also various nations of the Getuli, many in the confines of the Moors and the borders of Spain, various tribes of the Gauls, parts of the Britains inaccessible to the Romans, portions of the Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, Scythians, and of many hostile races, and of many provinces and islands unknown to the Romans, which could not be enumerated.² "If," says he, "we wished to act the part of open enemies, not that of concealed avengers only, would we lack numbers and forces?"³ Again he says: "We are of yesterday, and we have filled everything you have, your cities, your islands, citadels, free towns, your courts of justice, your very camps, tribes, decades, the palace, the senate, the forum; we have left you your temples only. We can count your armies; in one province the Christians will outnumber them."⁴

In his book to Scapula, in speaking of the Christians, he asks: "What will you do with so many thousands of human beings, so many men and women, of every age, of every dignity, who present themselves to you? How many fires, how many swords, will you need? What will Carthage herself suffer, decimated by you, when each one will then recognise his own relations and his own companions?"⁵ etc. In this same book he also says: "Although we compose so great a multitude of men, being almost the greater part of each State, we pass our time in quietness and sobriety."⁶ That the Christians were numerous in Northern Africa about A. D. 200 appears from the fact that at the synod held at that time by Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, *seventy bishops* were present from Africa and Numidia.⁷

Bardesanes, a distinguished Christian scholar of Edessa, about A. D. 160-170, exclaims, "What, then, shall we say respecting the new race; of ourselves who are Christians, whom in every country

¹ Contra Hæreses, lib. i, cap. x, sec. 2.

² Apologeticus, cap. xxxvii.

³ Lib. Ad Scapulam, cap. v.

⁴ Cyprian speaks of this council in Epist. lxxi, and in others. The number of the

bishops is given by Augustine, De Unico Baptismo contra Petilianum, lib. unus, cap. 13. The reference in Gieseler's History of the Church is wrong.

⁵ Adversus Judæos, cap. vii.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., cap. ii.

and in every region the Messiah established at his coming?" He speaks of Christians in Judea, Gallia, Parthia, Media, Persia, and among the Geli and Cashani.¹ Christianity was "established at Edessa as early as the middle of the second century."² Christians were quite numerous in Northern Arabia in the middle of the third century, and Churches were, doubtless, there established as early as the second century.³

In the middle of the third century there were in the city of Rome "forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, forty-two acolytes; exorcists, readers, with the janitors, fifty-two; widows, with those in straitened circumstances, more than fifteen hundred, all of whom the grace and goodness of God supports."⁴ The members are represented as "innumerable," and as having wealthy persons among them.⁵ The number of the Churches was probably forty-six, which was the number of the presbyters, as each presbyter, it seems, had charge of one single Church.

Origen, in his work against Celsus, written about A. D. 245, speaks in various places of the great number of Christians in his time. He represents the gospel as "having conquered all Greece, and the greater part of the Barbarians, and as having brought over many myriads of souls to the worship of God in the manner prescribed by it."⁶

The number of the Christians in the Roman empire in the beginning of the fourth century may be inferred from the letter of Jovius Maximinus Augustus to Sabinus, in which he states: "Our emperors Diocletian and Maximian, our fathers, when they saw that almost all men, having abandoned the worship of the gods, had united themselves to the nation of the Christians, rightly ordained that all men who had departed from the worship of the same immortal gods should be recalled to the worship of the gods by manifest chastisement and punishment."⁷ Arnobius, who wrote about A. D. 300, represents *the whole world as filled with the religion of Christ.*⁸

About A. D. 324 Christianity became the State religion under Constantine, and paganism gradually declined, and a hundred years

¹ Cureton's Spicilegium Syriacum, Bardesan, p. 32.

Gieseler's Church History, vol. i, p. 118, Eng. Trans.

² Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, 33-37.

³ In the letter of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, in Eusebius' Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. 43.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Πάσης μὲν Ἑλλάδος ἐπὶ πλεῖον δὲ τῆς βαρβάρου ἐκράτησε, καὶ μετεποίησε μυρίας ὄσας ψυχὰς, κ. τ. λ.—Lib. i, 27.

⁷ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. ix, 9.

⁸ Unde tam brevi tempore totus mundus ista religione completus est. . . ?—Adversus Gentes, lib. i, cap. 55.

Other testimonies to the rapid spread of Christianity.

later had almost disappeared. Gibbon estimates the population of the Roman empire to have been one hundred and twenty millions in the age of Claudius Cæsar.¹ Merivale computes it to have been eighty-five millions in the reign of Augustus.² The fact that paganism was extirpated without any great difficulty after the time of Constantine is a strong proof that great multitudes of Christians must have been found in most parts of the empire; and it is not improbable that the Christian population was nearly *one half* that of the whole empire just before Christianity was made the religion of the State by Constantine.

In respect to the *literary* character of the Christians of the *first three centuries*, it is to be observed that in no age, how-
 Literary profi-
 ciency of the
 early Chris-
 tians.
 ever cultivated, are the masses of the people highly edu-
 cated. But the very fact that very many of the early
 Christians had been brought up in heathenism, and abandoned it for
 the new faith in opposition to all their former prejudices and in the
 very face of so many temporal disadvantages, is a strong proof of
 their intelligence and strength of mind, as well as of their piety.

Merivale well observes that Paul's "converts were among the wise and prudent, as well as among the impulsive and devout. I reject, then, the notion, too hastily assumed, too readily accepted from a mistaken apprehension of the real dignity of the gospel, that the first preaching of the faith was addressed to the lowest, meanest, and least intelligent—the outcasts and proletaries of society. Many reasons, I am convinced, might be alleged for concluding that it was much the reverse. As regards the Christian Church at Rome—at least the direct statements of the apostle himself, the evidence of existing monuments of antiquity, inferences of no little strength from the records of secular history, and inferences not lightly to be rejected from the language and sentiments of contemporary heathen, all tend to assure us that it embraced some devoted members, and attracted many anxious inquirers, amidst the palaces of the nobles, and even in Cæsar's household."³

From the very beginning Christianity made a conquest of a considerable number of learned men and philosophers, who adorned the annals of the early Church by their talents and learning. Quad-
 Literary com-
 petency of the
 early apolo-
 gists.
 ratus and Aristides, learned Christians of Athens, pre-
 sented apologies of their faith to the Emperor Hadri-
 an, A. D. 126. Agrippa Castor, a very learned man,
 wrote an able refutation of Basilides about A. D. 135. In the

¹ Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. i, p. 53.

² History of the Romans under the Empire, vol. iv, p. 343.

³ Conversion of the Roman Empire, Lecture iv, pp. 100, 101.

first part of this century must be placed the remarkable Epistle to Diognetus, one of the finest productions of early Christianity. To the first half of the second century belong the Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord, by Papias, bishop of Hierapolis. Here belongs Justin Martyr, a distinguished writer, who had been a heathen philosopher. He wrote his first Defence of Christianity about A. D. 139; the Second Apology, his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, and other works, at a later period. Hegesippus, about A. D. 170, wrote five books of Ecclesiastical Events. Athenagoras, a Greek philosopher, about A. D. 170, wrote a Defence of the Christians (*πρὸς τὸν Κωνσταντῖνον*), and a work on the Resurrection of the Dead. About the same time Tatian, the Assyrian, a disciple of Justin Martyr, wrote an Oration against the Greeks and a Harmony of the Four Gospels. About 160-170 Bardesanes, a very learned Christian of Edessa, wrote voluminous works.

Melito, bishop of Sardis, and Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, about A. D. 170, were the authors of many works in vindication or explanation of Christianity. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (A. D. 169-181 or 183), was the author of a work in three books addressed to Autolycus, a heathen, in defence of Christianity, "in which," to use the language of Neander, "he displays great erudition and power of thought." He also wrote other works. Philip, bishop of Gortyna, in Crete, and Modestus (161-192) wrote against Marcion. Apollonius, a senator of Rome in the reign of Cominodus (A. D. 180-192), gave the senate an account of his faith in a remarkable volume. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons (A. D. 177-202), was a man of learning and ability. He wrote five books against Haereses, besides other works.

In the last half of the second century we find at Alexandria, in Egypt, Pantænus, a Stoic philosopher, the first eminent teacher of the catechetic school of that city, and the author of many commentaries on the Holy Scriptures; and Titus Flavius Clemens, president of the catechetic school (about A. D. 191-202), the author of several important works on Christianity. In the latter part of the second, and in the first part of the third, century, there flourished at Carthage Tertullian, a voluminous Christian writer, a man of great learning, eloquence, and profundity. In the middle of the third century there lived in the same city the distinguished Christian, Cyprian, who wrote many small works.

In Palestine (about A. D. 230), we find Julius Africanus, the first Christian chronographer. In the latter part of the second, or beginning of the third, century, Minucius Felix, a distinguished Roman advocate, wrote a dialogue between a Christian and a heathen, in

Other early
Christian writ-
ers.

which he defends Christianity with great spirit. In the first half of the third century flourished Hippolytus,¹ the author of many works on Christianity. To this period belongs the greatest philosopher, and one of the greatest scholars, of the ancient Church, the profound Origen, born about A. D. 185, died A. D. 254. He wrote numerous works on the Scriptures and on theology. Among the learned Christian writers of this period may be named Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria about the middle of the third century; Methodius, in the last half of this century, in Western Asia; and Gregory, bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, about the middle of the century.

Arnobius, of Sicca, in Northern Africa about A. D. 300 wrote a work in seven books against the Gentiles, in which he displays great acuteness, elegance, and power. About the same time the eloquent Lactantius wrote, in Nicomedia, his work on Christianity. About the beginning of the fourth century Pamphilus, presbyter of Cæsarea, in Palestine, founded in that city a valuable public library, chiefly of ecclesiastical authors, and was himself a writer. In the first forty years of the fourth century flourished Eusebius, the father of ecclesiastical history, and bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine. He was a man of immense erudition, and the author of numerous works..

It is not necessary to name any of the later fathers of the Church or other writers of the first three centuries, or to mention the distinguished learned men who wrote little or nothing. In every age the number of writers is small in comparison with the number of learned men who publish nothing. They are deterred from writing by diffidence, by the dislike of the manual labor necessary, and by other causes. Who can doubt that there were many learned men in the first three centuries of the Church, of whom we know nothing? Arnobius (about A. D. 300) speaks of men of great genius who had embraced the Christian faith—orators, grammarians, rhetoricians, lawyers, physicians, and philosophers.²

Who can doubt the ability of such men as composed the ancient Church to distinguish and transmit to posterity the genuine writings of the apostles and their companions?

Probably bishop of Portus Romanus, near the mouth of the Tiber.

² Quod tam magnis ingeniis præditi oratores, grammatici, rhetores, consulti juris ac medici, philosophiæ etiam secreta rimantes, magisteria hæc expetunt spretis quibus paulo ante fidebant?—Adversus Gentes lib. ii, cap. v.

CHAPTER III.

THE DIFFUSION OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT THE CHRISTIAN EPOCH.

AS the books of the New Testament are written in the Greek¹ language, it is an interesting question, To what extent was this language used in the Roman empire at the time of Christ?

The wide diffusion of the Greek language as early as B. C. 61, appears from a passage of Cicero's Oration for the Poet Archias, written at that time. "For if any one supposes," says he, "that less fame is derived from verses written in Greek than from those in Latin, he is greatly mistaken; because *Greek literature is read in nearly all nations*—Latin literature is confined within its own limits, certainly narrow." Diffusion of the Greek language in the times of Cicero and Juvenal.

The celebrated Roman satirist, Juvenal, contemporary with the apostles, thus expresses himself respecting the Greek language: "Every thing is done in Greek. In this language they fear; in this they pour forth their wrath, their joys, their sorrows; in this, all the secrets of their breasts."²

Various causes conspired to spread widely the Greek language. Greece at a very early period planted colonies in Southern Italy and in Southern Gaul, in the islands of the Ægean Sea, on the shores of the Black Sea, and in various parts of Asia Minor. At a later period the conquests of Alexander the Great in Asia and in Africa (B. C. 334-323) disseminated widely the Greek language and literature. Plutarch remarks, that "he founded above seventy cities among the barbarous people, and sowed Asia with Greek troops." He also founded Alexandria in Egypt, which became a famous seat of Greek learning. Seleucus, a successor of Alexander, in his extensive empire in Central and Western Asia, followed Alexander's policy in *Hellenizing* his domain. "We find him founding, in almost every province, Greek or Mace-

Means by which the Greek language became widely spread.

¹The Gospel of Matthew has been generally supposed to have been originally written in Hebrew.

²Quod Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane continentur.

³Omnia Græcè.

Hoc sermone pavent, hoc iram, gaudia, causas,
Hoc cuncta affundunt, animi secreta.—Sat. vi, 186-189.

donian colonies, which became so many centres of civilization and refinement." The splendid productions of the Grecian intellect in the ages of Pericles, Plato, and Demosthenes, carried with them the Greek language to the most distant lands. Young men from all sections of the world resorted to Athens to study her literature and her philosophy, and, on returning home, brought with them the language and letters of that intellectual metropolis.

"It is a just though trite observation," says Gibbon, "that victorious Rome was herself subdued by the arts of Greece. Those immortal writers, who still command the admiration of modern Europe, soon became the favourite object of study and imitation in Italy and the western provinces."¹ The prevailing language in Palestine in the time of Christ was Aramæan, sometimes called Syro-Chaldee, but it was in fact Chaldee rather than Syriac,² the Hebrew having ceased to be a living language a century or more before that epoch.

Nevertheless, the Greek language appears to have made considerable progress in some parts, at least, of the Holy Land, about the time of Christ. Josephus speaks of Gaza, Gadara, and Hippus as Greek cities.³ He calls Cæsarea the largest city of Judea, and represents it as inhabited principally by Greeks.⁴ Dora, on the sea-coast south of Carmel, was inhabited chiefly by Greeks.⁵ It appears from Acts vi, 9 that the Libertini, Alexandrians, and other foreigners, had synagogues in Jerusalem; and it is quite certain that they used the Greek language, at least those from Alexandria and Cyrene.

It cannot be inferred from Acts xxi, 39-xxii, 2 that the crowd in Jerusalem could have understood St. Paul if he had addressed them in Greek instead of Hebrew. They had expected an address in Greek, which the larger portion of them would not understand, but when they heard him using the Hebrew tongue, which they could understand, "they kept the more silence." Josephus, in describing the efforts made by Titus to induce the Jews to surrender after he

¹ Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. i, 46.

² The translation of the five books of Moses by Onkelos, and that of the prophets by Jonathan Ben-Uzziel, into Chaldee (Targums), for the use of the Jews in Palestine, about the time of Christ, shows that *this* was the common language. And we find in the New Testament several Chaldee expressions, indicating the general use of that language in Palestine. In the garden of Gethsemane Christ says, *Abba* (אבא, Chaldee, אבא, *abba*), *Father* (Mark xiv, 36). On a different occasion, *Talitha cumi* (Ταλιθα κούμ, Chaldee, or, perhaps, Syriac, טליתא קומי), *Maid, Arise* (Mark v, 41). Again, *Ephphatha* (Aramæan, from פתח), (Mark vii, 34). *Golgotha* (Chaldee, גולגותא), (Matt. xxvii, 33). *Aeldama* (Chaldee, אעלדא), (Acts i, 19). *Mar an-atha* (Chaldee, מר אנתא), (1 Cor. xvi, 22).

³ Antiq., xvii, II, 4.

⁴ Wars, iii, 9, 1.

⁵ Antiq., xix, 6, 3.

had brought the standards into the sacred enclosure belonging to the temple, remarks: "Titus, having stationed the interpreter near him, which (or what), indeed, was a sign of his being victor, first began to speak."¹

As the writings of the New Testament were intended for a world-wide circulation, it was proper that the books should be written in that language which was the most widely diffused, and at the same time was the richest and most philosophical of human tongues. Yet as Christianity was first proposed to the Jewish people, there is nothing improbable in the supposition that one or more of its writings might have been originally composed in their vernacular. Whether or not this was really the case must be determined by evidence, the consideration of which belongs to another part of our subject.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHARACTER OF THE GREEK OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TO obtain a clear view of this subject, it is proper to consider the most important dialects of the Greek language, the countries in which they were spoken, and the elements that entered into the formation of the language in which the New Testament was written. The most ancient dialect of the Greek with which we are acquainted is the *Ionic*, the language of the earlier inhabitants of Attica, who were called *Ionians*. They spread over the northern parts of the Peloponnesus, occupied the Cyclades, and colonized a portion of Asia Minor. Homer and Hesiod are the earliest representatives of this dialect. In the fifth century before Christ Herodotus and Hippocrates wrote in it. The *Doric* dialect was used in the Peloponnesus, and in the Dorian colonies in Asia Minor, Italy, and Sicily. The great lyric poet Pindar wrote in it about B. C. 500. The *Æolic* prevailed in Bœotia, Thesaly, and in the *Æolian* colonies in Asia Minor. In this dialect the lyrical poetess Sappho wrote, about B. C. 600.

As Athens was the great centre of political power and attraction during a great part of the fifth century before Christ, "all the dialects met there, and the Athenians culled from each of them such forms and expressions as were calculated to add strength and elegance to their own Ionic idiom. This confluence of dialects pro-

¹ Τίτος . . . τὸν ἑρμηνεῖα παραστασάμενος, ὅπερ ἦν τεκμήριον τοῦ κρατεῖν πρῶτος ἠρξάσθαι λέγειν.—Wars, lib. vi, 6, 2. This clearly shows that Titus spoke to the Jews by an interpreter, and that the mass did not understand Greek.

duced the *Attic dialect*, technically so called. In point of development and richness of literature this stood at the head of all the Greek dialects. The natural consequence of such pre-eminence was, that Greeks from all the tribes repaired to Athens to obtain a finished education. . . . Now persons from whatever part of Greece, educated at Athens, would by preference use the dialect of Athens. And it is not difficult to understand that their example would naturally be followed by their kinsmen, pupils, friends, and dependents.”¹

In the *Attic* dialect wrote the great philosophers Plato and Aristotle; the historians Thucydides and Xenophon; the tragic writers Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; the comic writer Aristophanes; the orator Demosthenes, and various others, who flourished in the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ, and have made that period of Grecian history forever illustrious. The great writers in this dialect spread it far and wide, and gave it the mastery over the others. “After the freedom of the Greeks had been destroyed by Philip, king of Macedon, the Attic dialect came to be the common written language. As it extended not only over all Greece, but also over the Macedonian provinces of Syria and Egypt, it lost much of its peculiar stamp by the introduction of foreign forms and words, and it then received the name of the common, or Hellenic, language, ἡ κοινὴ, or Ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος. It was used, e. g., by Apollodorus, Diodorus, and Plutarch.”²

It appears that the language of the Athenians could be generally understood by the Macedonians, and as the latter had no literature, the colonies founded by Alexander and his successors naturally received their literature from Athens; and thus the Attic dialect, used so extensively, assumed before the time of Christ the form called “common.”

This *common* Greek, when used by the Jews, assumed the form called *Hellenistic*, from the name *Hellenists*, given to those Jews who spoke that language (Acts vi, 1). It abounds more or less in Hebrew and Aramæan idioms, and in words used in new senses from the fact that they are employed to express new ideas. In this idiom the Septuagint and the apocryphal books of the Old Testament are written, and *it is the vehicle which the writers³ of the New Testament used wherewith to give a permanent form to the great truths revealed in the gospel.*

¹ Sophocles, in the Introduction to his Lexicon of the Greek of the Roman and Byzantine Period. Boston, 1870.

² Kühner, Dialects of the Greek Language, in his Grammar, p. 14.

³ Matthew's Gospel, according to the ancients, was originally written in Hebrew (or, rather, Aramæan). Some have thought that the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in the same language.

As the Greek language was of heathen growth, it sometimes lacked words wherewith to express clearly the ideas of the Christian revelation. Hence the New Testament writers were compelled to give to some of the words of the language novel meanings. It is true that the translators of the Old Testament had already led the way by rendering into Greek the moral and religious truths of the Old Covenant. But their vocabulary was not extensive enough to express clearly and appropriately all the truths of the New.

That the writers of the New Testament should, to a considerable extent, use Hebrew and Aramæan modes of thought and expression was to be expected, from the fact that all of them, except Luke, had had a Hebrew education; and although his education may have been originally Greek, yet his study of the Old Testament, and his intimacy with Hebrews, would be likely to impart something of a Hebrew cast even to his mode of writing.

As examples of Hebraisms or Aramæisms may be named, λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, from the Hebrew נָשָׂא פָּנִים, *to accept one's person*; ζητεῖν ψυχὴν, from בָּקַשׁ נַפְשׁ, *to seek one's life*; ὀφείλημα ἀφιέναι, *to forgive sin (debt)*, from the Aramæan שָׁבַק חֹבָא, *to release, or forgive debt or sin* (so the Targum of Onkelos on Gen. iv, 13); γεύεσθαι θανάτου, *to taste death, to die*, from the Aramæan טַעַם מוֹת, *to taste death, to die* (Targum of Jerusalem on Deut. xxxii, 1); ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετὰ τινος, *to show compassion or kindness to any one*, from the Hebrew עָשָׂה חֶסֶד עִם; ἄρτον φαγεῖν, *to take a meal*, from the Hebrew אָכַל לֶחֶם; αἷμα ἐκχέειν, *to pour forth blood, to kill*, from שָׁפַךְ דָּם, *to shed blood*, etc.

Examples of
New Testament
Hebraisms.

The New Testament writers also imitated the Hebrew in the use of the preposition ἐν, *in*, for ב (beth), *with, in*, etc., in many instances in which the proper rendering is *with*. As the Hebrew language is simpler in its structure than the Greek, co-ordinating rather than subordinating its sentences, and uses but few particles, we find that in these points the sacred writers have also imitated the Hebrew.

CHAPTER V.

ANCIENT GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE autographs of the New Testament writers appear to have perished at quite an early period. Whether any of them reached the *third* century, is very doubtful. Tertullian, indeed (about A. D. 200), appeals against heretics to the autographs of Paul's Epistles as still existing in different Churches.¹ But as Tertullian wrote at Carthage, the value of his testimony respecting autographs in European and Asiatic Churches is not very great; yet there is nothing improbable in the statement.

In the Apostolic Age the most common writing material was the Egyptian papyrus, although parchment was also in use. John, in his Second Epistle, speaks of writing with *paper* (διὰ χάρτου) (ver 12), and Paul directs Timothy to bring with him the books (τὰ βιβλία, properly *paper books*), but especially the *parchments* (τὰς μεμβράνας *skins, parchments*). 2 Tim. iv, 13. It is natural to suppose that short epistles would be written upon papyrus, and large and very important works on parchments. Which of these materials was most used by the New Testament writers cannot be determined. Numerous copies of the original manuscripts were very soon made and spread over the Christian world, and the frequent handling and copying of these manuscripts, especially if they were of papyrus, must have contributed to their destruction.

The Emperor Constantine soon after A. D. 330 gave directions to Eusebius to have *fifty* copies of the Divine Scriptures executed upon skins in the highest style of the calligraphic art for the use of the Churches in Constantinople.² After this period it appears to have been quite common to use parchment in copying the Holy Scriptures.

"In the fourth century," says Tischendorf, "the more durable parchment was preferred to the papyrus, and of such writings [of the New Testament] on parchments, executed in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, we possess, though mostly of small compass, still more than *twenty*, to which some *thirty* belonging to the seventh,

¹"Run over the Apostolic Churches in which still the chairs themselves of the Apostles preside in their places, in which their *very original* letters are read," etc. Lib. De Praescrip., cap xxxvi.

²De Vita Constantini, lib. iv, cap. xxxvi.

eighth, and ninth centuries, are to be added." He also adds: "The entire Greek Literature, which consists of so many hundred works, has not by far the *tenth* part of the manuscripts of the highest antiquity to exhibit, which the Greek New Testament alone possesses."¹

The oldest manuscripts of the new Testament are written in *uncial* letters (from *uncia, an inch*), which for the most part are Greek capitals. There is nothing to indicate the beginning or end of a word.

The *uncial* letters were employed until the *ninth* century, when they were gradually changed into the *cursive* letters which were commonly in use in the *tenth* century. The first manuscript in *cursive* letters with which we are acquainted was written A. D. 890.² Scrivener gives catalogues of sixty-one uncial and six hundred and forty-two cursive MSS. of the Gospels; fourteen uncial and two hundred and fifty-two cursive of the Acts and Catholic Epistles; twenty-two uncial and two hundred and ninety-five cursive of Paul's epistles; five uncial and one hundred and eleven cursive of the Apocalypse; three hundred and thirty-nine Evangelistaria, and eighty-two Lectionaries of the Praxapostolos.³

Dean Burgon sent Scrivener (July, 1883) a catalogue "of about three hundred additional MSS. of the New Testament or portions thereof deposited in European libraries, but hitherto unknown to scholars, which must hereafter be examined and collated by competent persons."⁴ It must be borne in mind that *Latin* versions of the New Testament were almost exclusively used in Western Europe from the early centuries of Christianity, which explains the fact that we have not a still greater number of Greek manuscripts.

Of the **UNCIAL** manuscripts we name, as most important:

CODEX SINAITICUS (א).

This important Codex, containing the *entire New Testament*, a part of the Old, the complete epistle of Barnabas in Greek, and a part of the Hermæ Pastor, was discovered in the convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, in February, 1859, by Tischendorf.

In 1862 Tischendorf published a magnificent *fac-simile* edition of this Codex in four volumes, from type made for the special pur-

¹ Haben Wir den ächten Schrifttext der Evangelisten und Apostel? p. 9. Leipzig, 1873.

² Hug, Einleitung, Erst. Theil., 4te Aufl., p. 212.

³ Intro. Crit. New Test., p. 307, 3d ed., 1883.

⁴ Ibid., pp. ix, x.

pose. The Codex is written on fine parchment with four columns on a page, without division of word, accents, or breathings. It contains the sections of Ammonius and the canons of Eusebius.¹ Tischendorf brings cogent reasons for referring it to *the middle of the fourth century*. And Tregelles remarks: "It appears undoubtedly to belong to the fourth century." It is now in St. Petersburg, the property of the Emperor of Russia.

In 1863 Tischendorf published the New Testament portion of the manuscript, line for line and page for page, and in 1865 there was published in Leipzig, by Brockhaus, "Novum Testamentum Græcæ ex Sinaitico Codice," etc., with Prolegomena by Tischendorf.

As the first letters of the Roman Alphabet had been already appropriated to the oldest codices of the New Testament, Tischendorf designates this Codex by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, Aleph (א).

CODEX ALEXANDRINUS (A).

This celebrated Codex, now found in the British Museum, was once in possession of Cyril Lucar, at one time Patriarch of Alexandria, and afterwards of Constantinople, and was presented by him to Charles I., in 1629.

"The portion containing the New Testament is a volume measuring somewhat more than ten inches wide and fourteen inches high. The material is thin, fine, and very beautiful vellum, often discolored at the edges, which have been injured by time, but more by the ignorance or carelessness of the modern binder, who has not always spared the text, especially at the upper-inner margin. The manuscript is written in a light and elegant hand in uncial letters. These letters at the end of a line are often very small, and much of the writing is very pale and faint; each page contains two columns of text. In the margins, to the left hand, the Eusebian canons are noted throughout the four Gospels, as well as the larger sections into which these books were anciently divided."² There is no regular division of words.

From the commencement of the volume, about twenty leaves are wanting, so that of Matthew's Gospel we have only what follows xxv, 6. In the Gospel of John two leaves are missing, which contained the text from vi, 50 to viii, 52. From the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, three leaves are absent, leaving a hiatus from chap. iv, 13 to xii, 7. All the rest of the New Testament is quite entire. The Codex is referred by Tischendorf to the last part of

¹ Tischendorf is positive that they are not from the original scribe.

² Cowper's edition of the Cod. Alex. Introduction.

the *fifth* century, and by Tregelles to the *middle* of the *fifth* century or a little later.

The New Testament portion of the Codex was published in *facsimile* by C. G. Woide, in 1786, in folio, accompanied with admirable prologomena and notes. In 1860 B. H. Cowper published a beautiful edition of the New Testament from this Codex. The trustees of the British Museum have ordered the publication of a *facsimile* of this Codex, of which two volumes in folio have already appeared.

CODEX VATICANUS (B).

This Codex, so called from the celebrated Vatican Library at Rome, where it is found, contains all the New Testament, with the exception of Heb. ix, 14¹-xiii, the Epistles to Philemon, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Apocalypse. It is a quarto volume of one hundred and forty-six leaves, bound in red morocco, ten and a half inches high, ten broad, and four and a half thick. It is written on fine thin vellum, with three columns on a page. There is no space left between the words, but all the letters in a line have the appearance of forming a single word.

Hug refers the Codex to the first part of the *fourth* century.² Tischendorf refers it to the fourth century, and remarks: "It scarcely differs in age from the Codex Sinaiticus."

Cardinal Mai published an edition of this manuscript in 1857 and in 1859; the second edition is an improvement on the first. In 1867 Tischendorf published, at Leipsic, a new quarto edition of this famous Codex, in which he corrected more than 400 errors of the editions of Cardinal Mai.

CODEX EPHRAEMI RESCRIPTUS (C).

This manuscript, found at present in the Imperial Library of Paris, "is a most valuable palimpsest containing portions of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament on 64 leaves, and fragments of every part of the New on 143 leaves, amounting on the whole to less than two thirds of the volume. . . . The ancient writing is barely legible, having been almost removed about the twelfth century to receive some Greek works of St. Ephraem, the Great Syrian Father."³ It is written on vellum with one column on

¹ The manuscript breaks off in the midst of this verse. The manuscript, however, contains the rest of the New Testament by a later hand.

² Einleitung, Erst. Thiel., 4te Auf., p. 238.

³ Scrivener, pp. 117, 118, 3d ed., 1883.

a page. Tischendorf ascribes it to about the *middle* of the *fifth* century. He published in 1843 a *facsimile* edition of the New Testament portion.

CODEX BEZAE GRAECO-LATINUS (D).

This Codex is now found in the University Library at Cambridge, England. It was presented to the university in 1581 by Theodore Beza. It is a quarto volume, in vellum, 10 inches high by 8 broad, containing 414 leaves, with one column on a page, the Greek text and its Latin version being parallel. There are on every page 33 lines of unequal length called *στίχοι*, being the earliest manuscript thus written.¹

The following is a specimen of its lines (*στίχοι*) translated into English :

Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto
Ten virgins, who, taking
Their lamps,
Went forth to meet the bridegroom
And the bride (Matt. xxv, 1).

This Codex contains² the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. It is assigned by Tischendorf to about the *middle* of the *sixth* century. To this century Tregelles also ascribes it, and remarks, it "is of great value, in spite of its peculiarities and interpolations." It was edited by Kipling in 1793, and more recently with great care by Scrivener.

CODEX CLAROMONTANUS (D).

This Codex is now found in the National Library at Paris. "It belongs," says Tregelles, "apparently to the sixth century: it contains all the fourteen Pauline Epistles in Greek and Latin."

CODEX LAUDIANUS (E).

This Codex contains the Acts of the Apostles in Latin and Greek. It is referred by Tischendorf to the last part of the *sixth* century, and Tregelles thinks it probably belongs to that century. It is found in Oxford.

CODEX ROSSANENSIS.

This Codex contains the Gospel of Matthew entire and that of Mark as far as the middle of the last chapter. It belongs to the *sixth* century. It was discovered at Rossanos, in Calabria, in the spring of 1879 by O. V. Gebhardt and A. Harnack.

CURSIVE MANUSCRIPTS.

Of the numerous manuscripts in the *curtive* characters, we name as most important :

¹ Scrivener, pp. 120, et seq., 3d ed., 1883.

² Not entire.

CODEX BASILIENSIS (1).

This Codex is found at Basel. It contains all the New Testament except the Apocalypse; but is of importance in its text in the Gospels only. It belongs to the *tenth* century.

CODEX COLBERTINUS (33).

This Codex is found in the Imperial Library at Paris. "The most important in its text of the Cursive copies of the New Testament," says Tregelles, "all of which, except the Revelation, it contained; but now it is defective in several places, and throughout is much injured. Of the eleventh century."

CODEX LEICESTRENSIS (69).

This Codex belongs to the Town Council of Leicester. It is of the fourteenth century. It contains nearly all the New Testament.

CODEX TISCHENDORFII ACTORUM (61).

This Codex is now in the British Museum. Collated by Tregelles and Scrivener. It is considered a valuable manuscript.

Many of the Uncial manuscripts contain mere fragments of the New Testament. Tischendorf has especially distinguished himself in collecting and publishing the most valuable of them, in his "Monumenta Sacra Inedita," seven volumes of which appeared in 1855-70.

 CHAPTER VI.

ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE PESHITO SYRIAC.

THE most important of the ancient versions of the New Testament is that called *The Peshito*¹ *Syriac*. Syriac, at the Christian epoch, and for centuries later, was the language of the region north of Palestine, extending from the north-eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea to the river Tigris, embracing, as its chief seat, Northern Mesopotamia, of which the most important city was Edessa.

Now as Christianity was firmly established in this city as early as the middle of the second century, if not earlier, it is extremely probable that, with its introduction, the New Testament would be translated into the language of that city and region. It is a well-

¹The name *Peshito*, from *peshat*, means *simple, plain, correct*; Chaldee, the same.

known fact that our modern missionaries as soon as possible translate the New Testament into the language of the people to be Christianized. Nor was the usage different in ancient times. What strengthens the great probability that a Syriac version of the New Testament was made as early as about A. D. 150, is the fact that we find a flourishing Syriac literature at Edessa soon after that time Bardesanes,¹ a distinguished Christian writer, who flourished at Edessa about A. D. 160-170, in the reign of Abgar Bar Manu, wrote many volumes in Syriac, among them a "Book of the Laws of Countries,"² mentioned by Jerome, and quoted largely by Eusebius as a work on "Fate." He composed also in Syriac "a hundred and fifty Psalms, elegantly versified." Jerome remarks that the followers of Bardesanes translated his works into Greek. "If their power and elegance," says he, "are so great in a translation, how great they must have been in the original!"

It is not easy to believe that Syriac literature, with so much elegance, began with Bardesanes, and we are, therefore, authorized in believing that the Syriac version of the New Testament could have been made at least a fourth of a century before his time. With the foregoing facts before us, we cannot, with any probability, refer the earliest Syriac version to a period later than the middle of the second century.

The strong probability of this early date of the translation is rendered quite certain by the fact that the Old Testament was translated into Syriac about that time, since it is quoted both by Melito³ (A. D. 170) and Origen⁴ (A. D. 200-254); and no one will suppose that Christian scholars would translate the Old Testament into Syriac before the New. Hegesippus (about A. D. 170) appears to have been acquainted with a Syriac version of the Gospel of Matthew. For Eusebius states that this writer "introduces some things both from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and from the

¹ Epiphanius says that "he was skilled in two languages, both the Greek dialect and the language of the Syrians." Haeresis LVI.

² The original work, long lost, was brought from the Syrian convent in the desert of Nitriæ, in Egypt, to England in 1843, and translated into English, and published by Cureton in 1855. In this book it is stated: "But as yesterday the Romans took Arabia, and abrogated all their ancient laws." This occurred in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and fixes the age of the work.

³ In commenting on Gen. xxii, 13, Melito says, instead of "κατεχομενος τῶν κεραιῶν (*caught by the horns*) both THE SYRIAC and the Hebrew read, κρεμάμενος, (*hanging by the horns*). In Routh's Reliquiæ Sacræ, vol. i, p. 118, from two Vat manuscripts.

⁴ In various places in his Hexapla, as 'Ο Σῦρος, (the Syriac;) on Gen. iv, I, 4 I viii, 7, etc.

Syriac (Gospel), and especially from the Hebrew dialect"¹ It seems improbable that by "the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac," one single form or version of the Gospel is intended. Eusebius must have known that there was a Syriac translation of all the universally acknowledged books of the New Testament, and that by his expression the Syriac translation of Matthew's Gospel would be understood.

The Peshito version is quoted by Ephraem, the Syrian († A. D. 378). It was universally circulated among the Syrians in his time, and accordingly he speaks of it as *our version*, which he would scarcely have done had it not then obtained general authority. Besides, it has been shown by Wiseman that many expressions in it were either unintelligible to Ephraem, or at least obscure.² This affords strong proof of its high antiquity. The traditions of the Syrian Church attribute the translation to Achæus, a disciple of the Apostle Thaddeus. The version is one of the best and most valuable that have ever been made, and expresses faithfully the original Greek. It cannot be determined whether it is the work of a single translator, or of several.

The Peshito version contains all the books of the New Testament except the *Second* Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, the *Second* and *Third* of John, and the Apocalypse. It first became known to Europeans in 1552, when Ignatius, Patriarch of Antioch, sent to Pope Julius III., in Rome, Moses of Mardîn to present his confession of faith, and to superintend the printing of the Syriac New Testament in Europe. Accordingly, the version was printed in Vienna, in 1555, from two ancient manuscripts, under the superintendence of the Austrian chancellor, Albert Widmanstadt, and Moses of Mardîn, at the expense of King Ferdinand I. In this edition there are wanting Second Peter, Jude, Second and Third John, and the Apocalypse.³ Subsequently various editions of this version were printed in different parts of Europe.

The Second Epistle of Peter, that of Jude, and Second and Third John were published at Leyden, in 1630, by Edward Pococke from a Syriac manuscript found in the Bodleian Library. The Apocalypse was published by Louis De Dieu, at Leyden, in 1627, from a Syriac manuscript, quite modern, found in the London Library.

¹ Ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίων Ἐυαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆσ' Ἑβραϊδος δαλέκτων τινὰ τίθησιν. Hist. Eccles., iv, c, 22. Hug supposes the reference to be to the Syriac translation of the Gospel. Einleitung, Erst. Theil, p. 317. Vierte Auflage.

² Wiseman's *Horæ Syriacæ*, p. 121.

³ A copy of this first edition, bearing date, Vienna, 1555, lies before me.

In 1708 and in 1717 Leusden and Schaaf's editions of the Peshito were published at Leyden. The second of these editions is especially excellent. Schaff published, in 1708,¹ the best Lexicon of the Peshito that has yet appeared. In these editions Second Peter, Jude, Second and Third John were inserted from the texts of Pococke and Louis De Dieu.

In 1816 the British Bible Society published an edition of the Peshito New Testament, under the supervision of Dr. Buchanan and Professor Lee, with the Eastern Church lessons noted in Syriac. The British Bible Society published another edition of this version in 1826,² a very superior one, with vowel points, 4to., for the Oriental Christians, as it is stated on the title-page, and corrected according to Old Syriac manuscripts. Both of these editions contain in the text of Pococke and L. De Dieu the five books wanting in the Peshito.

In 1828 Samuel Bagster published both in his Polyglot, and also in a small octavo volume, the Peshito, with vowel points. It includes every one of our New Testament books, and in the Syriac preface to the small octavo edition it is stated: "This edition has been printed from the sacred books of the New Testament in Syriac, which were published by Albert Widmanstadt, and Moses of Mardîn, and by Louis De Dieu, and Edward Pococke." So far as we have compared this edition with that published by the British Bible Society in 1826 we find scarcely any difference whatever in the text. Bagster has also published "Gutbir's Lexicon Syriacum," containing all the words, except the proper names, in the Syriac Testament.

The American missionaries in Oroomiah published in 1846 the Peshito New Testament, with a modern Syriac translation standing opposite to it. The Peshito has been translated into English and published in the United States by Dr. Murdock.

Among the oldest manuscripts of the Peshito Syriac Testament may be named two in the British Museum, one bearing the date of A. D. 468;³ the other was written at Bethkoki in A. D. 768. "There is a Syriac manuscript of the Gospels in the Vatican, written at Edessa, in Mesopotamia, bearing the date corresponding to A. D. 548, and one in the Medicean Library, dated A. D. 586."

William Cureton found among the Syriac manuscripts brought

¹ This appears to be the date in the copy before us.

² That is the date it bears; but as we have not that of 1816 we cannot tell whether there is any difference of text.

³ I saw this in the British Museum about ten years ago.

⁴ W. W. Wright's Appendix to Seiler's Bib. Herm

from the Nitrian desert by Archdeacon Tattam, in 1842, for the British Museum, "remains of a very ancient recension of the four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe," which he published, accompanied with an English translation, in 1858. These fragments are written in the Estrangelo characters, and contain nearly three fourths of each of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, about one third of the Gospel of John, and the last four verses of Mark's Gospel. In this recension the order of the gospels is, Matthew, Mark, John, Luke.

Cureton refers the fragments to the *middle of the fifth century*. In comparing some years ago a part of this Syriac text with Bagster's edition of the Peshito, we satisfied ourselves that it is less elegant than the Peshito, and that it is probably an older version. Tischendorf places the Syriac version, of which these fragments form a part, about the middle of the second century, and the Peshito at the end of that century. Tregelles also regards these fragments as belonging to a version older than the Peshito. This is also the opinion of Ewald.

Cureton believes that the Gospel of Matthew in this recension is based on the Syro-Chaldee gospel of that evangelist. But after a careful comparison of Cureton's text with the Peshito and the Greek, we satisfied ourselves that Cureton's text is taken from the Greek Matthew. Prof. Wright, of the University of Cambridge, England, a few years ago, printed for private circulation a hundred copies of other "fragments of the Curetonian (Syriac) gospels" in Estrangelo characters, namely: Luke xv, 22-xvi, 12; xvii, 1-23; John vii, 37-viii, 19. The account of the woman taken in adultery (vii, 53-viii, 12) is wanting in this section.

The Peshito version, as it stands in the most ancient extant manuscripts, is an important witness in settling the text of the New Testament, and a critical edition based upon a collation of its oldest existing manuscripts would be a work of great value, and is much needed.

THE PHILOXENIAN TRANSLATION.

This Syriac version of the New Testament takes its name from Philoxenus, or Xenaias, Bishop of Mabug, (or Hierapolis,) in Syria, (A.D. 488-518,) in whose time the translation forming its basis was made by Polycarp, his country bishop, in A.D. 508. G. H. Bernstein gives substantially as the result of his inquiries respecting the subsequent revision of this version the following statement: Thomas of Charkel lived at the end of the sixth or at the beginning of the seventh century, and was Bishop of Mabug, from which as an

exile he sought Egypt, and while living at Alexandria, in the convent of the Antonians, he devoted himself most assiduously to forming anew and improving the Syriac Philoxenian translation of the New Testament. In carrying out this work he corrected, as accurately as possible, the Philoxenian version upon the authority of the best Greek manuscripts, and restored it to the fidelity of the original Greek. This copy he wrote out with great care, and again revised it and gave it to the public,¹ A.D. 616. Bernstein² thinks that he has found in Codex Angelicus, at Rome, the original Philoxenian version that lay at the foundation of the revision of Thomas of Charkel. Mangold, however, thinks that in this Bernstein is mistaken. This version contains all the books of the New Testament except the Apocalypse.

This so-called Philoxenian translation is extremely literal, and its author has often sacrificed the Syriac idiom to a rigid adherence to the Greek text. But on this very ground it is a valuable testimony to the state of the Greek text A.D. 500-600.

The four gospels of this version, accompanied by a Latin translation, were published in two volumes by Professor White, at Oxford in 1778, the Catholic Epistles in one volume in 1799, the Acts and the Epistles of Paul in one volume in 1803. The last two volumes also contain a Latin translation of the text. G. H. Bernstein published, at Leipsic, in 1853, a beautiful edition of the Gospel of John in the version of Thomas of Charkel, based on White's edition, corrected by two old manuscripts, the Florentine and the Vatican. The text is printed with vowels, and the points kushoi and rucoch from a Vatican manuscript.

THE JERUSALEM SYRIAC.

This is a partial lectionary of the gospels found in the Vatican Library, which Adler discovered, and of which he published specimens. It is written in the Aramæan dialect, similar to that of the Talmud of Jerusalem. The manuscript—the only extant one of the version—according to the superscription, was written in a convent at Antioch in 1030. It was made from the Greek in the fifth or sixth century, though possibly later.

THE LATIN VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE ITALA.

As in the apostolic age, the Latin language was the vernacular of Italy, and was used extensively in Northern Africa, as appears from

¹ De Charklen, N. T. Trans. Syriaca, p. 9.

² Das Heil. Evang. des Johan Syrisch, pp. 25-29.

the fact that Tertullian at Carthage (A.D. 193-220) and Cyprian in the same city (about A.D. 250) both wrote in that language, and as Christianity extensively¹ prevailed in that region as early as the second century, it is very probable that a version of the New Testament would be made into Latin as early as A.D. 150. Accordingly, we find Tertullian in his treatise on "Monogamy," written about A.D. 210 or 215, referring to a Latin version of the New Testament as being already in use: "As it has gone into use either by an ingenious or plain mistranslation of two syllables, *si dormierit vir ejus*, we must know that it is clearly not thus in the original Greek."² Tertullian objects to referring it to the future.

In the time of Augustine (about A.D. 400) this early Latin translation had already exhibited so many variations in its manuscripts as to present the appearance of different versions, of which fact Augustine complains.³ Among the Latin texts of the time, he declares his preference for the *Itala*, as adhering more closely to the words of the original, and as expressing the sense clearly.⁴

The extant Latin manuscripts belonging to the times preceding Jerome's revision of the text, or, indeed, to a later period, unaffected by that version, exhibit great diversity.

"When, however, the several codices," says Scrivener, "of the version or versions antecedent to Jerome's version came to be studied by Sabatier and Blanchini, and through their labors to be placed within the reach of all scholars, it was soon perceived that with many points of difference between them, there were evident traces of a common source from which all originally sprung."⁵

Augustine evidently uses "Itala" to qualify "interpretatio," "the Italian interpretation," and which appears to have been both of the Old and New Testaments. But here the question arises, Was this *Itala* the original Latin version made in the second century, or was it a recension of that translation? It seems at present to be the prevailing opinion of biblical critics that the oldest Latin version of the New Testament was executed in Northern Africa about the middle of the second century. The character of this version is to

¹ About A.D. 200 a synod was held under Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, which consisted of seventy African and Numidian Bishops.

² Sciamus plane non sic esse in Græco authentico, quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem: *si dormierit vir ejus*, etc., cap. XI. The Greek is κοιμηθη, *if he has slept, (died),* 1 Cor. vii, 39.

³ Doct. Christ. Lib. II., cap. XI-XV.

⁴ In ipsis autem interpretationibus, Itala caeteris præferatur nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ. Ibid.

⁵ Intro. to Crit. N. Test., p. 339, 3d ed., 1883.

be determined from the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian at Carthage, who used it.

In proof of its African origin, Scrivener remarks that, "On the ground of internal evidence, Wiseman has made out a case, which all who have followed him, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Davidson, Tregelles, accept as irresistible; indeed, it is not easy to draw any other conclusion from his elaborate comparison of the words, the phrases and grammatical constructions of the Latin version of Holy Scripture, with the parallel instances by which they can be illustrated from African writers, and from them only."¹

Rönsch, who has paid especial attention to the subject, declares it as certain, "That the peculiarities of language of the numerous extant fragments of the Itala belong to the African diction, and must have sprung up upon the soil of (proconsular) Africa."² He supposes that the name Itala was given to this old Latin version because it was not made in the elegant language of the Roman capital, but in the Italian provincial language, the common Latin. He, nevertheless, thinks the conjecture of Wordsworth, that the Itala appears to have been an Italian recension of the old African version, to be worthy of regard.³

The Codex Brixianus of the sixth century is regarded by Tregelles as "specially the *Italian* recension of the old (or African) Latin." In all probability Augustine designates by *Itala* a Latin recension of the old version made in Italy. Bleek regards it as so-called because it was in use in Upper Italy when it received its form.⁴

Among the most important manuscripts of the old Latin version of the New Testament may be named:

Codex Vercellensis, edited by Irici, and also by Tischchini. According to Tischendorf it belongs to century IV. (*a*)

Codex Veronensis, edited by Bianchini. It belongs to century V. (*b*).

Codex Colbertinus, edited by Sabatier. (*c*).

Codex Cantabrigiensis, belonging to the sixth century. (*d*). This is called by Tregelles, Codex Bezae.

Codex Palatinus, edited by Tischendorf. It belongs to century V. (*e*).

Codex Brixianus, a revised Latin text, edited by Bianchini. It belongs to century VI. (*f*).

¹ Introd. to the Criticism of the New Test., p. 341.

² Quoted by Hilgenfeld, Einleitung, p. 798-799.

³ In Hilgenfeld, *ibid*.

⁴ Einleitung, A. T., p. 795.

Codices, formerly Corbeienses, now Petropolitani (*ff.*¹ et *ff.*²), edited by Bianchini and Sabatier; mixed in text.

Codex Claromontanus, now Vaticanus, of century V, edited by Mai; a mixed text. (*h*).

Codex Vindobonensis, of century V or VI, parts of Mark and Luke. (*i*).

Codex Bobbiensis, now Taurinensis, of century V. (*k*).

JEROME'S REVISION.

In the last part of the fourth century the distinguished scholar Jerome made a revision of the Latin translation of the New Testament. In the year 392, in speaking of his work, he says: "I brought the New Testament into accord with the original Greek."¹ In his dedication to Damasus, prefixed to the gospels, Jerome says: "The four gospels have been revised by collating old Greek manuscripts. That they might not depart much from the usage of the Latin reading, we so modified them with our pen that we corrected only those passages which seemed to change the sense, and allowed the rest to remain as they were."² Jerome's translation of the Old Testament and revision of the New are the basis of the Vulgate. The most valuable manuscript of his edition is the Codex Amiatinus, written about A.D. 541. It has been published by Tischendorf. Tregelles has made it the basis of his Latin version printed in parallel columns with his Greek Text.

THE COPTIC VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Coptic language, which sprang from the language of the ancient Egyptians, was used by the Christians in Egypt, from the beginning of the second century after Christ until the seventh, in speaking and writing, and especially in translating the Holy Scriptures. The names *Coptus*, *Copti*, and *Coptitæ*, as well as the *Aiguptos* of the Greeks, take their origin without doubt from the most ancient name of this country, very often found on the hieroglyphic monuments, *Kahi-Ptah* (the land of the God *Ptah*).³ Of the Coptic language there are three dialects: The Theban (or Sahidic), of Upper Egypt, the Memphitic, of Lower Egypt, and the Bashmūric,⁴ which seems to have been used in some part of the Delta.

¹ *Novum Testamentum Græcæ fidei reddidi.* De viris Illus., cap. 135.

² *Quatuor Evangelia Codicum Græcorum emendata collatione, sed veterum Quæ ne multum a lectionis Latine consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo temperavimus ut his tantum, quæ sensum videbantur mutare, correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant.*

³ Uhlemann, *Linguae Copticæ Grammaticæ.*

⁴ Uhlemann derives the name from *Bash—Mareia* (*Μάρεια, Μαρῆωρις*, the name of lakes near Alexandria).

Christianity was introduced into Egypt as early as the last part of the first century. According to an ancient tradition, the evangelist Mark founded the Church in Alexandria, which in the second century was in a most flourishing condition. From this center Christianity must have soon spread to the adjoining regions of Egypt. "But although the Gospel," says Neander, "early found its way into the parts of Lower Egypt inhabited by Græcian and Jewish colonies, yet it would not be so easy for it to penetrate thence into Middle, and particularly into Upper Egypt; for in those parts the foreign Coptic language, the dominion of the priests, and the old Egyptian superstition stood in the way. Yet a persecution of the Christians in Thebais under Septimius Severus (A. D. 193-211) proves that Christianity had already made progress in Upper Egypt as early as the last times of the second century."¹

It is not in the least degree probable that the Egyptian Christians would long remain without versions of the Holy Scriptures, the New Testament especially, in their vernacular dialects. Hence it is highly probable that their principal versions, the Memphitic and Sahidic, were made at the end of the *second* century or in the beginning of the *third*.

That the Christians of Middle Egypt had a version of the New Testament in Coptic in the second half of the *third* century appears from the life of St. Anthony. This hermit, born near Heracleia, in Middle Egypt, A. D. 251, "could not bear to learn letters," as Athanasius informs us, but gave attention when a boy to the reading of the Scriptures in the churches, and at the age of eighteen or twenty he was so affected at hearing read in the church Christ's advice to the rich young man (Matt. xix, 21) that he immediately left the church and disposed of all his real and personal estate for the benefit of others. That this reading of the Scriptures was in Coptic is clear from the fact that St. Anthony made an address to the monks in that language, but spoke to the Greek philosophers through an interpreter. St. Anthony's dialect was probably Memphitic.

THE MEMPHITIC VERSION.

This version takes its name from Memphis, the chief city of the region in which the most polished dialect of the Coptic (or Egyptian) was used. In 1716 David Wilkins, a Prussian, published, at Oxford, the Coptic New Testament in the Memphitic dialect from the Bodleian manuscripts, compared with others at Paris and the Vatican, accompanied with a Latin translation. This Latin version,

¹ History of the Church, vol. i, p. 83.

though highly creditable to Wilkins, as a pioneer in this department has not been highly commended by the best Coptic scholars.

In 1846-47 M. G. Schwartz, Professor of Coptic in the University of Berlin, published at Leipsic the four gospels of the *Memphitic* version, with the title of "QUARTUOR EVANGELIA IN DIALECTO LINGUAE COPTICÆ MEMPHITICA PERSCRIPTA AD CODD. MS. COPTICORUM IN REGIA BIBLIOTHECA BEROLINENSI ADSERVATORUM NEC NON LIBRI A WILKINSIO EMISSI FIDEM," etc., in 2 vols. 4to., with beautiful type. The text is based on six codices, transcribed by Petrus in 1622, from copies of the tenth century and later. Professor Schwartz places below the text a collation of his Memphitic readings from manuscripts and from Wilkins along with the readings of the critical Greek texts of Tischendorf (1841) and Lachman (1842). He also introduces readings from the Sahidic (or Theban) version. Of the Sahidic readings he generally gives a Latin translation, but he translates only portions of the Memphitic text. For critical purposes this edition of Schwartz is the most valuable work yet published on the Egyptian versions of the four Gospels. After Schwartz's death Paulus Boetticher published at Halle, in 1852, the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul in the Memphitic dialect. The text is based on the authority of four codices. No translation or commentary accompanies the text, and the editor satisfies himself with noting at the foot of the page the variations of his manuscripts.¹ The Memphitic version contains a large number of Greek words. It is a faithful translation of the original Greek.

THE THEBAIC (OR SAHIDIC) VERSION.

This version is named after Thebes, the chief city of the region in which it was used. It is of about the same age as the Memphitic (about A. D. 200), and, like that version, it contains numerous Greek words, which we would not have expected in an Upper Egypt version.

Of this version of the New Testament only fragments remain, of which the published portions are found almost exclusively in the following works :

Appendix ad Editionem Novi Testamenti Græci e codice MS. Alexandrino a Carolo Godofredo Woide descripti, in qua continentur fragmenta Novi Testamenti Juxta interpretationem dialecti superioris Ægypti, quæ Thebaidica vel sahidica appellatur, e codd. Oxoniensibus maxima ex parte desumpta cum Dissertatione de

¹ Of Boetticher's edition we have been able to obtain only the Acts of the Apostles.

Versione Bibb. Ægyptica quibus subjicitur codicis Vaticani Collatio. Oxonii, 1799. Fol.

Fr. Münter. Commentatio de indole versionis Sahidicæ Novi Testamenti. Accedunt Fragmenta Epistolarum Pauli ad Timotheum in membranis Sahidicis musei Borgiani Velitris, Havniæ, 1784.

Mingarelli, Ægyptiorum codicum Reliquiæ Venetiis in Bibliotheca Naniana asservatæ. Fasc. I, et II, Bononiæ, 1785.

Georgi. Fragmentum Evangelii St. Johannis Græco-Copto-Thebaicum sæculi IV., etc. Romæ, 1789. This fragment contains portions of John vi, vii, viii, in the Greek and Thebaic in parallel columns. The section containing the account of the woman taken in adultery (vii, 53-viii, 11) is wanting both in the Greek and Thebaic of this old fragment¹ belonging to the fourth or fifth century as viii, 12 joins on to vii, 52.

BASHMURIC VERSION.

This version is based on the Thebaic, and appears to have been made about A.D. 300. It is of but little importance. Only small fragments of this version are extant. They were published by Engelbreth: *Fragmenta Basmurico-Coptica Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, Havniæ, 1811.

THE ÆTHIOPIC VERSION.

Christianity was introduced into Æthiopia (or Abyssinia) in the first half of the fourth century, by Frumentius, who became Bishop of Auxuma² (Axum). It is therefore very probable that the translation of the Bible, at least that of the New Testament, was made soon after this period into the vernacular of the country, the Geez, or Æthiopic, language. Chrysostom, about A.D. 400, speaks of the Æthiopians as possessing a translation of the Gospel of John,³ which naturally implies that they had a translation of other sacred Scripture. This translation is not a valuable one. "In fact," says Scrivener, "the version is so tautological, confused, and unequal in style (that of St. Paul's Epistles in particular often degenerating into a paraphrase), that some have thought our present text to be a compound of two several translations, and even Tregelles supposes that 'there was originally *one version* of the Gospels, afterward

¹ This fragment lies before me.

² Neander's *History of the Church*, vol. ii, pp. 119, 120.

³ The Syrians, Egyptians, Indians, Persians, Æthiopians, and countless other nations have translated into their tongue the doctrines introduced by this one John.—*Hom. in Joan.*

compared with Greek manuscripts of a *different* class; and the manuscripts in general bearing proofs of containing a text *modified* by such comparison; while others contain throughout *conflate* readings.'"¹

The New Testament in this version (with the exception of the thirteen epistles of Paul) was first published at Rome by native editors in 1548, the thirteen epistles of Paul in the following year. 'In Walton's Polyglot the New Testament was reprinted with many faults, and an unusually bad Latin translation by Dudley Loftus, from which Mill and his successors derived their various readings. C. A. Bode published a new or revised version of the Æthiopic New Testament given in the Polyglot (Brunswick, 1753). . . . Lastly, in 1826-30 in London, Th. Pell Platt, A.M., edited for the British and Foreign Bible Society, 'Nov. Testament . . . Æthiopice, ad codicum manusccriptorum fidem.'"²

THE GOTHIC VERSION.

In the *third* century of the Christian era the Goths, belonging to the Germanic family, invaded the Roman Empire. One part of them settled in Moesia—a region along the Danube, now embraced in Servia and Bulgaria—and obtained the name of Moeso-Goths. During some of their incursions they captured many Christians, and among them some persons of the clerical order. These captured Christians remained among them and laboured as zealous missionaries. A Gothic bishop is mentioned as being present at the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325. Ulphilas, who belonged to a Cappadocian family, was consecrated bishop of the Goths at Constantinople in A.D. 348, and became their apostle. "When the Christian Goths were oppressed by a persecution, he led a great multitude of them into the habitation about Nicopolis in Moesia, which Constantius had assigned them (355), where, after inventing the Gothic alphabet, he translated the Bible into Gothic" (Gieseler). Philostorgius, about A.D. 425, says that Ulphilas "translated into their (the Goths) language all the Scriptures except the Books of Kings" (Samuel and Kings).

The Gothic language belongs to the Germanic family of languages, and Bopp remarks: "I believe I am reading Sanscrit when I read the venerable Ulphilas; his language holds, so to speak, the middle ground between Sanscrit and German."³

¹ Introd. to the Text. Critic. of New Test., pp. 409, 410, 3d ed., 1883.

² Ibid., p. 410.

³ Introduction to the Gothic Language in J. P. Migne's edition of Ulphilas's Translation.

The Gothic language flourished but for a short time. In Moesia it was blotted out by the torrent of new people that poured in upon the regions of the Danube; and in the western regions of Europe it disappeared under the influence of the Latin.

The Gothic version was made from the original Greek text, "the authority of which nearly all agree that Ulphilas most scrupulously follows, rendering it word for word."¹ It is, accordingly, a valuable witness to the condition of the Greek text in the middle of the fourth century. The version, however, suffered some corruptions from Latin sources during the occupancy of Italy by the Goths in the fifth century. Of the manuscripts containing fragments of this version, the most important is the Codex Argenteus, written on purple vellum, in letters of gold and silver, near the end of the fifth, or beginning of the sixth, century in Italy, when the Goths dwelt there. It is now in the University of Upsal. It contains fragments of the four Gospels in the order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark.

The *Codex Carolinus*, rescript, was written about A.D. 500. It contains a part of Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

The *Ambrosian Codices*, five in number, are in Milan. They contain fragments of thirteen Epistles of Paul (not Hebrews). They also belong to about A.D. 500.

The best and most complete edition of the Gothic version is that of H. C. De Gabelentz and J. Loebe: *Ulfilae Vet. et Nov. Testamenti versionis Gothicae Fragmenta supersunt*, Leipsic, 1843.

In J. P. Migne's edition of the Christian Fathers, vol. xviii, this edition of Gabelentz and Loebe is found accompanied with a Latin translation, Prolegomena, Gothic Grammar, and Glossary.² It contains about one fourth of Matthew's Gospel, nearly all Mark's, about three fourths of Luke's, and two thirds of John's, parts of all of the thirteen Epistles of Paul, amounting to about two thirds of their contents, but no part of the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the seven Catholic Epistles, or the Apocalypse.

THE ARMENIAN VERSION.

Christianity was introduced into Armenia as early as the second century. In the time of Diocletian, King Tiridates was won over to the Christian cause. "The old religion," says Neander, "notwithstanding this event, still continued to maintain itself in many of the Armenian provinces. In the beginning of the fifth century, Miesrob, who had once been the royal secretary, having devoted

¹ Gabelentz and Loebe's edition, Prolegomena.

² This edition now lies before me from the Dickinson College Library.

himself wholly to the service of religion, disseminated Christianity still more widely in countries to which it had not penetrated, by taking up his abode in those regions as a hermit. Up to this time the Syrian version of the Bible, the authority of which was recognized in the Persian Church, had been used in Armenia; and hence an interpreter was always needed to translate into the vernacular tongue the portions of Scripture read at the public worship. Miesrob gave his people an alphabet, and translated the Bible into their language."¹

The version was accordingly made in the first part of the *fifth* century. In the execution of the version from the original Greek, Miesrob was assisted by Moses Chorenensis and Joseph and Eznak, who brought Greek manuscripts from the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431.

The best edition of this version is that of Zohrab, published in 1789, on the basis of a Cilician Codex, compared with twenty others of the New Testament. His Biblia was published at Venice in 1805. Zohrab does not acknowledge any systematic corruption of the Armenian from the Latin Bible, and remarks that only one of his eighteen copies of the First Epistle of John contains chap. v, ver. 7.² Zohrab's edition of 1805 was used by Tregelles, through the assistance of Dr. Charles Rieu.³

Other versions of the New Testament were made at later periods, but they are of but little value as witnesses to the ancient text of the New Testament.

CHAPTER VII.

EDITIONS OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

AS the originals of the New Testament books must have been often copied, it is highly probable that in some instances the copies taken were not exact, and that slight errors crept into them. These copies in turn were at different times copied, and if faithfully executed, must have perpetuated these errors. But as some slight mistakes were likely made in these second copies, it is easy to see that in less than fifty years after the books of the New Testament were written, various readings must in all probability have arisen.

¹ History of the Church, vol. ii, pp. 113, 114.

² Scrivener, p. 408, 3d ed.

³ Tregelles' Introductory Note to his Crit. Ed. New Testament.

The number of these different readings were naturally increased with the number of the copies and with the lapse of time.

In some instances, a word or sentence written on the margin of a manuscript, as a suggestion or correction, would likely be incorporated into the text by a transcriber. Some transcribers would think that certain words were improperly spelt, and in attempting to correct them, in some cases, they themselves committed errors. This was the natural course of things, and could have been prevented only by a perpetual miracle, for which there was no necessity. The only instances in which no variety of readings exists in ancient writings are those in which *but a single copy* exists, and the text from this very fact is made more or less uncertain.

There can be no doubt that the followers of Mohammed especially venerated the Koran, and yet different readings in it soon presented themselves. "Already in the twelfth year of the Hegira," says Tischendorf, "when Abu Bekr had the different elements of the Koran collected, so many different readings were found, that he divided them into five classes. The consequence was that disputes very soon broke out among the Arabic scholars respecting the genuine text of their prophet. How was the matter decided? Twenty years later the Calif had a standard copy established, and all divergent copies destroyed. This conduct was at least worthy of the sword to which Mohammedanism owed its victories."¹

But what strong testimonies we have to the *integrity* of the New Testament! Versions made from the original Greek in the *second, third, and fourth* centuries in widely distant lands, and which are still in existence. Manuscripts going back to the *fourth, fifth, and sixth* centuries; the extant works of Christian writers who, in all parts of the Roman Empire, from the middle of the *second* century, made the most extensive use of the New Testament, and give us numerous quotations. All these witnesses testify to the same great truths, and their divergences from each other are generally of small moment; and from the comparison and combination of the whole testimony we can, in almost every instance, detect the specific errors of each witness, and fix with a wonderful degree of exactness the contents of the original documents for which they are vouchers. For the integrity of what writing of the Augustine age have we so many witnesses?

That great scholar and critic, Richard Bentley, thus gives his testimony upon the essential agreement of the Greek manuscripts of

¹ Haben Wir den ächten Schrifttext der Evangelisten und Apostel? Leipzig, 1873, p. 13.

the New Testament: "The real text of the sacred writers does not now (since the originals have been so long lost) lie in any manuscript or edition, but is dispersed in them all. 'Tis competently exact, indeed, in the worst manuscript now extant; nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them, choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design out of the whole lump of writings."¹ Bentley's remarks, made more than one hundred and fifty years ago, respecting the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, are true now with our enlarged knowledge of them.

The Greek New Testament was first printed by Cardinal Ximenes in his Polyglot, but as he deferred its publication until the whole of his Polyglot should be finished, the Greek Testament published at Basel, in February, 1516, under the supervision of Erasmus, anticipated it. It was accompanied with a Latin translation. In 1519 he published a second edition, and a third in 1522, in which he introduced 1 John v, 7. Soon after the first edition appeared, the Complutensian Polyglot was published by Cardinal Ximenes. The fourth edition of Erasmus followed in 1527, and his fifth and last in 1535.

"Erasmus's materials," says Tregelles, "were but few in comparison with those which have been since available for purposes of criticism; they were also comparatively modern."²

In the years 1546 and 1549 Robert Stephens printed at Paris two beautiful small editions of the Greek Testament, and in 1550 appeared his folio edition, in the margin of which were given various readings from manuscripts, which had been collated by his son, Henry Stephens. The editions of 1546 and 1549 had contained a text blended from the Complutensian and Erasmian; in the folio Erasmus was almost exclusively followed.³ On the readings in this folio edition Tregelles says: "This was the first *collection* of various readings of any extent; and it was at least suggestive of what might be done by means of manuscripts in emending the text of the Greek Testament."

Theodore Beza succeeded Robert Stephens as an editor of the Greek Testament. He published five editions in 1565, 1576, 1582, 1589, and 1598. He mostly followed the text of Stephens.⁴ Beza's text was during his life in very general use among Protestants; they seemed to feel that enough had been done to establish it, and they relied on it as giving them a firm basis.⁵

¹ Remarks on Free Thinking in Scrivener, p. 7.

² Account of the Printed Text of the New Test., p. 28.

³ Tregelles' Account of the Printed Text, p. 30.

⁴ Tregelles, p. 33.

⁵ Ibid.

The celebrated printers at Leyden, the Elzevirs, issued their first edition of the Greek Testament in 1624. "The editor, if any," says Tregelles, "is wholly unknown; it is probable that the printers took the third edition of Robert Stephens as their basis, introducing merely a few changes, which they considered to be corrections, and using for this purpose a copy of one of Beza's editions." "In 1633 the publishers themselves brought out their own second edition, which is considered their best . . . A high ground is assumed as to the text which is thus presented. The reader is told, 'Thou hast *the text* now received by all, in which we give nothing altered or corrupted' (*Textum, ergo habes, nunc ab Omnibus receptum*, etc.). From this expression in the preface has arisen the phrase, 'Textus Receptus,' as applied to the text of the Greek Testaments in common use, on the supposition that they were accurate reprints of the Elzevir editions.'"¹

In 1707 John Mill published an edition of the Greek Testament, with various readings from manuscript versions and fathers, a work upon which he spent thirty years. He did not form a new text, but simply used the third edition of Stephens, correcting the errata.

Dr. Edward Wells published a Greek Testament, with an English translation, notes, and a paraphrase at Oxford in separate parts, from 1709 to 1719.

The celebrated Richard Bentley made elaborate preparations for issuing a critical edition of the Greek Testament, and in 1720 he "issued his proposals for his Greek and Latin New Testament, accompanied by the last chapter of the Revelation, as a specimen." This contemplated great work was never completed.

John Albert Bengel published at Tübingen, in 1734, his edition of the Greek New Testament. The critical apparatus was, for the most, taken from Mill.

John J. Wetstein published at Amsterdam, in 1751 and 1752, an edition of the Greek Testament in two vols., accompanied by Prolegomena, in which he pointed out the manuscripts, versions, and fathers by whose aid the text of the New Testament may be revised.

J. J. Griesbach issued at Halle, in 1774-75, his edition of the Greek New Testament in three volumes. He afterward combined the first two volumes—embracing the Gospels and Acts—into one, for convenience, and published it at Halle in 1777, to which the edition of the Epistles and Apocalypse of 1775 forms the second part.

Tregelles remarks on Griesbach: "With him, in fact, texts which

¹ Tregelles, p. 35.

might be called really critical begin; so that if any one wished to give the results of critical inquiries, as applied to the common text, he would begin with that formed by Griesbach."¹

C. F. Matthæi published at Riga, in twelve volumes, 1782-88, the New Testament in Greek and Latin. J. M. Scholz published an edition of the Greek Testament at Leipsic, 1830-1836, in two volumes, in the preparation of which he made extensive travels for the collection and collation of manuscripts.

In 1831 Carl Lachmann issued at Berlin a small edition of the Greek Testament. It was the result of close and careful study for five years. He sought to carry out the idea of Bentley, to present the text of the New Testament as it originally stood in the oldest witnesses. Respecting him, Tregelles affirms: "*The first Greek Testament, since the invention of printing, edited wholly on ancient authority, irrespective of modern traditions, is due to Charles Lachmann.*"²

A larger edition of Lachmann's Greek Testament was published, with the aid of P. Buttmann, in two volumes, 1842, 1850, at Berlin.

We now come to the most distinguished of the critical editors of the Greek Testament, CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF. This eminent scholar published the first edition of his Greek Testament at Leipsic, in 1841, a small 8vo. He gives us a text of his own, in which, however, for the most part, he adheres to the text of Lachmann. Tischendorf also superintended three editions of the New Testament, which were published at Paris in 1842. In 1840, and subsequently, he visited the Libraries in Paris, England, Holland, Switzerland, and Italy to collect materials for his critical editions of the Greek Testament.

In 1844 he visited the monasteries of the East in quest of manuscripts of the sacred Scriptures.

In 1849 Tischendorf published at Leipsic his second edition of the Greek Testament, in which he gives the text, as he supposes it ought to stand, the result of the labors of previous collators and of his own. He also at various times issued other editions.

In 1859, the same year in which he discovered the Codex Sinaiticus, he published what he calls his "Seventh larger critical edition."

In 1864 Tischendorf began his eighth and last large critical edition, the first volume of which, containing the four Gospels, was published in 1869 at Leipsic; and the second, containing the rest

¹ The Printed Text of the Greek Testament, p. 82.

² Ibid, p 113.

of the Greek New Testament, appeared in the same city in 1872. As Tischendorf died in 1874, the Prolegomena,¹ which were to form the third volume, were not completed.

Tischendorf lays down the following principles for the formation of his text, which Tregelles quotes with approbation: "The text is only to be sought from ancient evidence, and especially from Greek manuscripts, but without neglecting the testimonies of versions and fathers. Thus the whole conformation of the text should proceed from the evidences themselves, and not from what is called the *received* edition." In the Introduction to his eighth larger critical edition Tischendorf declares his adherence to the idea of Richard Bentley, which was followed by Lachmann, to establish the text from the few oldest manuscripts, confirmed by the authority of some of the oldest versions, especially the Latin, and by the testimonies of the fathers in all cases, and to give a subordinate authority to the codices.

The eighth critical edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament is furnished with extensive critical apparatus in the form of readings from the oldest Greek manuscript versions, and citations from the early fathers, upon the basis of which he rests his critical text.

This edition of Tischendorf's places before us the text of the New Testament in a very accurate form, such as it was known to the fathers of the second and third centuries, and must present to us a very exact copy of the writings of the New Testament as delivered by its different authors.

Tischendorf also rendered great services to the Christian world by publishing various ancient codices of the New Testament, and by thus placing the grounds of the authority of our Greek Testament within the reach of all scholars.

In the same rank with Tischendorf as a critical editor stands the Englishman Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, inferior to him, perhaps, in learning, but not in critical ability and acumen.

This distinguished scholar published, in 1844, a Greek text of the Book of Revelation from ancient authorities, with an English translation, and announced his intention of editing the Greek Testament with various readings. In executing this work he has adopted the following plan:

"I. To give the text of the New Testament on the authority of the ancient witnesses, manuscripts, and versions, with the aid of the earliest citations, so as to present, as far as possible, the text best attested in the earlier centuries.

"II. To follow *certain proofs*, when obtainable, which carry us as near as possible to the Apostolic Age.

¹ Dr. Gregory, of Leipzig, is preparing for publication the Prolegomena.

“III. So to give the various readings as to make it clear what is the evidence on both sides; and always to give the whole of the testimony of the ancient manuscripts (and of some which are later in date but old in text) of the versions as far as the seventh century, and the citations down to Eusebius inclusive.”¹ In carrying out this plan, Tregelles most laboriously collated manuscripts, examined ancient versions, and studied extensively the patristic writings.

The first part, containing Matthew and Mark, was published in 1857; the second part, containing Luke and John, appeared in 1861; the Acts and Catholic Epistles in 1865; the fourth part, embracing Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philip-pians, Colossians, and First and Second Thessalonians, appeared in 1869; the fifth part, containing the Epistle to the Hebrews, First and Second Timothy, Titus, and the Epistle to Philemon, were published in 1870; the sixth part, containing the Apocalypse, appeared in 1872.

Parallel with the Greek text, Tregelles gives the Latin version of Jerome from the Codex Amiatinus, written about A.D. 541.

The protracted illness and the death of Tregelles prevented him from completing his work, and the *seventh* part, containing “Prolegomena and addenda and corrigenda,” was compiled and edited by F. J. A. Hort, D.D., and A. W. Streane, A.M., and published in 1879, after the death of Tregelles. The whole work makes a quarto volume of 1070 pages, besides Prolegomena of xxxii pages, and is published in London by Samuel Bagster & Sons. In every respect this edition of Tregelles is worthy of the highest praise. It is to be regretted, however, that his death prevented his publishing a revised edition of the whole work. Codex Sinaiticus is not used until near the close of John’s Gospel.

A later critical text of the Greek of the highest value has been prepared by Drs. Westcott and Hort, with an Introduction by Dr. Philip Schaff. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1881.

¹ Introductory notice to his critical edition.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE canonical books of the New Testament, as held by all bodies¹ of Christians, with the exception of some individuals, however, are the following: The four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke; fourteen Epistles of Paul—one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians; to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, each one; to the Thessalonians, and to Timothy, each two; one to Titus and one to Philemon, and an Epistle to the Hebrews; the General Epistle of James, two General Epistles of Peter, one General Epistle and two small Epistles of John, the General Epistle of Jude, and the Book of Revelation.

The foregoing is the order of the books in the English version. But Tischendorf and Tregelles, in their critical editions of the Greek, follow another order, the same as that of the Vatican² manuscript, of the fourth century, and the Alexandrian, of the following century. After the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, they arrange the other books thus: The Epistle of James, two Epistles of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, the two to the Thessalonians, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles to Timothy, the one to Titus, that to Philemon, and the Revelation. It must be acknowledged, however, that our present canon of the New Testament was not universally received, in all its parts, in the first three centuries after the apostolic age, as there were doubts about the Epistles of James and Jude, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, and about the authors of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Revelation.

The books that compose our canon of the New Testament were written, in all probability, between A. D. 50 and 90.³ They were called forth on various occasions, to meet the wants of the infant Church. Some were written originally for some particular society, and others for the whole Church.

¹ The ancient Syriac version, the Peshito, however, wants the Second Epistle of Peter, that of Jude, Second and Third John, and the Revelation.

² The Vatican MS., however, does not extend farther than Hebrews ix, 14.

³ It is probable that the so-called Second Epistle of Peter was written late.

Luke dedicates his Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles to Theophilus, though, doubtless, intending them for general circulation. But even the writings which were addressed to special societies would soon be copied and circulated throughout the Christian world. And St. Paul himself, near the close of his Epistle to the Colossians, requests, "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea."

Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, written in the latter part of the *first* century, refers to Paul's first epistle¹ to them, and from the way he speaks of matters mentioned in that epistle it is evident he had a copy of it before him. He also had before him the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, the Epistle to the Hebrews,² and in all probability the Gospels of Matthew³ and Luke.⁴

References to the books in early writers.

In the Epistle of Barnabas, written most probably in the last part of the *first*⁵ century, there is a passage quoted, found in Matt. xxii, 14, with the remark, *as it is written*.⁶ This is the formula with which the Jews quoted the Old Testament Scriptures, and it is probable that the Gospel of Matthew was already arranged along with other sacred books in use in the Christian Church.

The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, written soon after the martyrdom of Ignatius, and therefore somewhere between A. D. 107 and 116, contains references to various books of the New Testament, though not specified by name, except where he speaks of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Besides this reference we find the exact language used in Matt. xxvi, 41 and Mark xiv, 38, and a passage from Acts ii, 24. He introduces a passage from 1 Corinthians with the remark, "As Paul says." We also find a reference to Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Ephesians, First Epistle to Timothy, the First of Peter, and First of John. Besides the passage mentioned as being found in Matthew and Mark, there seems to be an evident quotation from Matthew's report of the sermon on the mount. From this it will appear that Polycarp must have had a collection of New Testament writings consisting of at least *eight* books. There is a clear reference to such a collection where he says, "I trust ye are well exercised in the holy writings, as in these Scriptures it is said, Be ye angry, and sin not, and, Let not the

¹Sec. 47.

²Sec. 36 refers to Heb. i, 3, 4; sec. 17, to Heb. iii, 2 and xi.

³In sec. 46, to Matt. xviii, 6.

⁴In sec. 13 the reference is to Luke vi, 36-38.

⁵Hilgenfeld places it about A. D. 97.

⁶"Many are called, few are chosen." The Greek in Matthew and Barnabas is the same.

sun go down upon your wrath." Here he quotes Eph. iv, 26 as a part of Holy Scripture.

Justin Martyr, about A. D. 139, in his first Apology for the Christians, states that they were accustomed to meet Justin Martyr's citations. "on the day of the sun, so called, when *The Memoirs of the Apostles*, or *the writings of the prophets*, are read as long as time allows."¹ He had just before remarked, "For the apostles, in the *memoirs* composed by them, called *Gospels*, have delivered that Jesus, having taken bread and given thanks, commanded them, saying, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' etc. In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, written soon afterwards, he describes the Gospels more accurately, as "*written by the apostles and their companions.*"² In his first Apology he gives quotations from *all four* of our Gospels—mostly from Matthew and Luke. There is no doubt that the apostolic Epistles had been already collected, but, probably, they were not read as regularly as the Gospels in the public assemblies.

About A. D. 140 Marcion, a noted heretic, made a collection of sacred Scriptures for his own use, embracing an abridged edition of Luke's Gospel, and *ten* Epistles of Paul, some of which he mutilated. These books he took from the canon in use in the Christian Church. Epiphanius³ charges him with arranging the Epistles in a different order from that in which they stood in the Christian collection. In the latter part of the second century it appears that the sacred books formed *two* divisions, *The Gospels* (τὰ εὐαγγελικά) and *The Epistles* (τὰ ἀποστολικά).⁴ Tertullian speaks of *Gospels* (*evangelia*), and *Apostles* (*apostoli*).⁵

CHAPTER IX.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH RESPECTING THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE earliest known catalogue of the books of the New Testament is the fragment in Latin, commonly called the *Canon of Muratori*, from its discoverer, a distinguished Italian antiquarian, who Canon of Muratori. found it in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, and published it in 1740. The fragment itself contains internal evidence that it was written *soon after the middle of the second century*. In speaking of Hermas, the author of the fragment re-

¹ Sec. 67.

² Sec. 103.

³ *Adversus Hæreses*, lib. i. tom. iii, hæres xlii, 373.

⁴ *Irenæus*, lib. i, 3. 6.

⁵ *Adversus Praxeam*, cap. xv.

marks that he wrote the (work called) Pastor *very recently*, in our times (*nuperrime nostris temporibus*), in the city of Rome, while his brother Pius sat as bishop of the Church in the city of Rome. The date of the episcopate of Pius is variously stated, some placing it A. D. 127-142, others 142-157. If we take the latest date, and suppose that Hermas wrote about A. D. 150, the Canon of Muratori was written about A. D. 160; otherwise it could not be said that he wrote *very recently* (*nuperrime*). After the lapse of *ten* years, we can scarcely say that the late civil war in the United States was *very recently* waged. The fragment, though abounding in blunders of transcribers, is sufficiently clear in the most important points, and, as there can be no doubt that it is a genuine document, it has been almost universally deemed to be of great value.

The first part of the Canon—from the destruction of one leaf or more of the MS.—is wanting. It begins with the words, *quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*: “at which he was, nevertheless, present, and thus stated.” These words evidently refer to Mark’s Gospel, for the canon immediately adds: “the third book of the Gospel is according to Luke,” after which it places the fourth Gospel as that of John. The Acts of the Apostles it ascribes to Luke, and states that Paul wrote *two* Epistles to the Corinthians; that next he wrote to the Ephesians, then to the Philippians, Colossians, and Galatians in order, then two Epistles to the Thessalonians, also to the Romans in the seventh place. It names two Epistles to Timothy, one to Titus, and one to Philemon, and ascribes the Apocalypse to John, and also attributes to him the First Epistle which now bears his name, a part of which it quotes, and names two (other) Epistles as his, and ascribes one to Jude. In this list we miss the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, and the two of Peter. It says: “The Apocalypse of John and of Peter only we receive, which some of us are not willing should be read in the Church.” It is doubtful whether this refers to the Revelations both of John and Peter, or to the latter alone. There is an obscure reference to the Wisdom of Solomon, though it is not easy to see why that book should be named. In the imperfect state of this “Canon” no valid objection can be made against the omitted books, as it is well known that the *First* Epistle of Peter was universally received in the early Church. There can be no doubt that the Gospel of Matthew stood first in this “Canon,”¹ as it was always placed first by the ancients.

¹ The Canon of Muratori has been at different times published. The best edition is that of Dr. S. P. Tregelles, who published a facsimile of it in 1867, made from the original in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, which he accompanies with a critical commentary. This edition lies before me.

The Latin version of the New Testament, sometimes called the *Itala*, made about the middle of the second century, most probably in Northern Africa, contained the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of Jude, the First Epistle of Peter, the First of John, and probably the other two, and the Apocalypse. These books were received by Tertullian, who flourished in Northern Africa, A. D. 193-220, and they doubtless were found in the old Latin version to which he refers¹ as being in use in his time. The Epistle to the Hebrews he thinks was written by Barnabas;² the Apocalypse he attributes to the Apostle John.³ He speaks of the First Epistle of John, by which he implies the existence of at least one other.⁴ But we can find in his works no reference to the *Second* Epistle of Peter, and it is probable that it was not received by him. Nor do we find any very probable reference to the Epistle of James. Whether it was received by him or not is difficult to say. In the ancient MSS. of the Old Latin version, preceding that of Jerome, all our Books of the New Testament are found, either entire or in fragments. But we cannot assert with safety that the *earliest* Latin version originally contained the *Second* Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of James. The *earliest* Syriac version of the New Testament, the Peshito, made in all probability about the middle of the second century, contains all our canonical books, with the exception of the *Second* Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, Second and Third of John, and the Apocalypse.

The canon of Titus Flavius Clemens, president of the catechetical school of Alexandria (A. D. 191-202), embraced the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of Paul,⁵ the First Epistle of Peter, the First Epistle of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse, which he attributes to John,⁶ doubtless meaning the apostle. It is evident from his language that he knew, at least, of one other Epistle of John, for he quotes the *First* as his larger epistle.⁷ We can find no certain reference to the Epistle of James. Of the *Second* Epistle of Peter we discover not a vestige. We find no reference to the Epistle to Philemon, but this is not surprising, as he had no occasion to quote it.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (about A. D. 250), uses all our books except Hebrews, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. His canon differs but little, if any, from that of Tertullian.

¹ Liber de Monogamia, cap. xi.

² Liber de Pudicitia, cap. xx.

³ Advers. Marc., lib. iii, cap. xiv.

⁴ De Pudicitia, cap. xix.

⁵ The Epistle to the Hebrews is included in these.

⁶ Stromatum, lib. vi, 13.

⁷ Ibid., ii, 15.

From the works of Irenæus, bishop of Lyons (177-202), it is evident that his canon consisted of the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, twelve Epistles of Paul, First Epistle of Peter, First and Second of John, and the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to "John, the disciple of the Lord."¹ Besides these books, he has a probable reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews.² He makes no reference to the Epistle of Philemon, which is not strange; none that is at all probable to the Second Epistle of Peter, or to the Epistle of Jude, but gives one passage from the Epistle of James.³

In the first half of the *third* century flourished Origen—first at Alexandria, in the catechetical school, and afterwards as presbyter in Cæsarea Palestinæ—one of the greatest and most learned Christians of the earlier centuries. It is interesting to inquire what was his canon of New Testament Scripture? The canon of Origen embraced the four Gospels, of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the Acts of the Apostles,⁴ at least thirteen⁵ Epistles of Paul, the First Epistle of John, the First of Peter, the Epistle of James, and the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to the Apostle John. He speaks of the Second Epistle of Peter as being doubted, as well as the Second and the Third of John;⁶ and although he makes no use of these three Epistles, nor of Jude's, so far as we can see, yet in the seventh Homily on the book of Joshua, he remarks, "Peter also sounds the two trumpets of his Epistles; also James and Jude."⁷

Eusebius, the learned Church historian, bishop of Cæsarea Palestinæ from about A. D. 315 until 340, gives a catalogue of the books of the New Testament in the following language: "First must be placed the holy quaternion of the Gospels, which the book of the Acts of the Apostles follows; after these are to be placed the Epistles of Paul; after which we are confidently to admit the reputed First Epistle of John, and likewise that of Peter. After these are to be placed, if it seem proper, the Apocalypse of John, concerning which we will state the opinions at the proper time. And these are acknowledged. Of the disputed books, yet well known to the most, is the so-called Epistle of James, the Epistle of Jude, and the Second Epistle of Peter, and those which are called the Second and Third of John, whether they belong to the evangelist, or to some one of the same name.

¹ Contra Hæreses, lib. v. cap. xxvi, 1.

² Ibid., lib. ii, cap. xxx, 9.

³ Cap. ii, 23 in Contra Hæreses, lib. iv, cap. xvi, 2.

⁴ Which he ascribes to Luke Hom. vii, in lib. Josh.

⁵ Although Origen at different times quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, yet at other times he doubts its Pauline origin. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi, cap. xxv. We do not find any mention that Origen makes of the Epistle to Philemon.

⁶ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi, xxv.

⁷ In the Latin translation of Rufinus

"Among *spurious* writings are to be reckoned the book of the *Acts of Paul*, and the book called the *Shepherd*, and the *Revelation of Peter*. Besides these, the reputed *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the so-called *Doctrines of the Apostles*. And besides, as I said, the Apocalypse of John, if it seem proper, which, as I said, some reject, but others reckon as genuine among the acknowledged books. Already some have reckoned among these (the spurious) *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, with which those Hebrews who have accepted Christ are greatly pleased. All these might be classed as disputed writings. Nevertheless, we have made the list of these books, as being necessary, distinguishing the Scriptures that are true, genuine, and acknowledged, according to the tradition of the Church, from those writings which are different from these, which are not in the New Testament canon, but are also disputed, yet known to the most of the ecclesiastical writers. In this way we can know both these books themselves, and those which are produced by the heretics in the name of the apostles, whether as containing *Gospels of Peter*, and *Thomas*, and *Matthew*, or of some other apostles, or as containing the *Acts of Andrew and John*, and of the other apostles, none of which has any one in the succession of ecclesiastical writers deigned to mention in his writings. The character of the style also differs widely from apostolic usage, and the purpose and scope of the things contained in them, diverging as widely as possible from true orthodoxy, clearly show that they indeed are the fictions of heretical men. Wherefore they are not to be reckoned among even spurious writings, but are to be rejected as altogether absurd and impious."¹

Such was the state of the canon when Eusebius wrote his Church History, a short time before the Council of Nicæa.

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (A. D. 351 and later), states that the following books compose the canon of the New Testament: The four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, seven Catholic Epistles of James, and Peter, John, and Jude, and fourteen Epistles of Paul. He considers no other books of authority.² He makes no mention of the Apocalypse.

The great theologian, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria (A. D. 328 and later), in his thirty-ninth Festal Epistle, gives the following catalogue of the New Testament books: Four Gospels, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, the seven Epistles called Catholic, of the apostles, viz., one of James, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude. Besides these, fourteen Epistles of Paul, arranged in the following order: the first to the Romans, then two to the Corinthians, after

The canon according to Athanasius.

¹ Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. xxv.

² Catechesis iv, sec. xxxvi.

these (one) to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, the Epistle to the Hebrews, two to Timothy, one to Titus, and, last, one to Philemon, and the Apocalypse of John. "These are the fountains of salvation, so that whoever thirsts may fill himself with the oracles contained in them. In these only is the doctrine of piety taught. Let no one add to them, or take any thing away from them."¹

Gregory Nazianzen, who flourished in Cappadocia in the latter half of the fourth century, gives the canon of the New Testament, in which he enumerates the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, and fourteen Epistles of Paul. He remarks that some assert that the Epistle to the Hebrews is spurious, but that in this they are mistaken. Of the Catholic Epistles, says he, some say that seven, others that only three, viz., one of James, one of Peter, and one of John, ought to be received. Some, says he, accept the Apocalypse of John, but the most assert it to be spurious.²

Didymus († 396), head of the catechetical school of Alexandria, in addition to the books of the canon everywhere recognised, makes use of the Epistle of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, that of Jude, and the Apocalypse.

Rufinus, of Aquileia in Northern Italy, who flourished in the latter half of the fourth century and in the beginning of the fifth, gives the following list of the books of the New Testament: "Four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, which Luke wrote; fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul, two of the Apostle Peter, one of James, the brother of the Lord, and apostle; one of Jude, three of John, and the Apocalypse of John. These are the books which our fathers included in the canon, and from which they wished the principles of our faith to be established."³

The canon of Ambrose, bishop of Milan in the latter part of the fourth century, embraced, as appears from his works, the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, at least thirteen Epistles of Paul, two Epistles of Peter, First John, and the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to John the evangelist.⁴

The canon of
Ambrose and
Chrysostom.

A question has been raised about the genuineness of this epistle, which is mutilated. There are, however, no valid grounds for doubting its genuineness. From examining the works of Athanasius, we find that he uses all the books of our present New Testament canon, except the Second and Third Epistles of John and the Epistle to Philemon, which there was no occasion to quote.

¹ Carminum, lib. ii, lines 290-318. ² Commentaries in Symbol. Apostol., sec 37.

⁴ We have not been able to find any reference in his undoubted works to James's Epistle, or Jude's or Second and Third John, or Philemon. There was no occasion to quote Philemon. It is very probable that the omitted Epistles were received by him.

The Canon of Hilary, bishop of Pictavi (Poitiers), in western Gaul, in the middle of the fourth century, embraced the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, at least thirteen Epistles of Paul (the Hebrews being ascribed to him), two Epistles of Peter, the First Epistle of John, and the Apocalypse. He manifestly regards this last book as belonging to the Apostle John. We do not find any mention of the Epistle to Philemon, nor of Second and Third John, which is not strange, considering their brevity. We have been unable to find any reference to the Epistle of James.

The Canon of Ephraem¹ the Syrian, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century, embraced the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, twelve Epistles of Paul (including the Epistle to the Hebrews), the Epistle of James, two Epistles of Peter, First and Second John, Jude, and the Apocalypse; of this last book he quotes² as John's a part of chap. i, 7. It thus appears that his canon included more books than the Peshito version which omitted Second Peter, Jude, Second and Third John, and the Apocalypse. Though we have not found any quotations from the Epistles to Titus and Philemon, we do not doubt that they formed a part of Ephraem's Canon.

Titus, bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, soon after the middle of the fourth century, in his work against the Manichæans uses our four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostle, the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, the one to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. In his oration on the Palm Branches, he also uses the two Epistles to Timothy, and the Epistle to the Philippians. He doubtless received the other³ books of our canon, which he had no occasion to quote in the two named works, which contain about one hundred pages.

The Canon of Methodius, bishop of Patara in Lycia, and afterward of Tyre (martyred A. D. 311), as appears from his "*Convivium Decem Virginum*," which Neander regards as "the most important and authentic of his extant writings," contained the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Paul's Epistle to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, those to the Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, the two Epistles to Timothy, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. In some other small works, published as his, we find a reference to the Epistle to Titus, First Epistle of Peter, and probably the First of John.

¹ The edition of Ephraem's works, which we consulted, in the Astor Library, New York, is that published in Rome in six volumes, folio, 1732-46. Three of the volumes are in Syriac and Latin, and three in Greek and Latin.

² *Ib.*, vol. iii, p. 146, in the Greek. ³ The Apocalypse might possibly be an exception,

The canon of the celebrated John Chrysostom, first deacon, then presbyter, at Antioch in the latter part of the fourth century, afterwards bishop of Constantinople (398-407), was as follows, in his own language: "The books of the New Testament are, the fourteen Epistles of Paul, the four Gospels, two belonging to the disciples of Christ, John and Matthew, two of Luke and Mark, one of whom was a disciple of Peter, and the other of Paul. For the first two (evangelists) were eye-witnesses of Christ's life, and associated with him. The other two (evangelists) delivered to others what they had received from them (Peter and Paul), the Book of the Acts, belonging to Luke, who related the transactions, and of the Catholic Epistles three."¹ These three are, the Epistle of James, the First of Peter, and First of John, which we find quoted in his works. His canon is the same as that of the Peshito-Syriac version, omitting Second Peter, Second and Third John, Jude, and the Apocalypse.

From the canon of Chrysostom we pass to that of Epiphanius, the learned metropolitan bishop in the island of Cyprus in the last part of the fourth century. His canon, as is seen from his works, certainly contained all our canonical books, with the possible, but not probable, exception of Jude and the Third Epistle of John.²

We pass next to the celebrated Augustine, bishop of Hippo Regius, in Northern Africa, from about 395 until 430. In his work on Christian Doctrine (lib. ii, cap. viii) he gives the following list of the canonical books of the New Testament: "Four Gospels, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; fourteen Epistles of Paul—to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, two to the Thessalonians, to the Colossians, two to Timothy, to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews; two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James; the Acts of the Apostles in one book, and the Apocalypse of John in one book."

From Augustine we turn naturally to Jerome, the greatest biblical scholar in the early Church. Born at Stridon, on the border of Hungary, about A. D. 340, he studied at Rome,

The canon received by Augustine.

The canon of Jerome.

¹ Ἔστι δὲ καὶ τῆς καινῆς (Διαθήκης) βιβλία, αἱ Ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ δεκατέσσαρες Παύλου, τὰ Εὐαγγέλια τὰ τέσσαρα, δύο μὲν τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰωάννου, καὶ Ματθαίου, δύο δὲ Λουκᾶ καὶ Μάρκου. Ὡν ὁ μὲν τοῦ Πέτρου, ὁ δὲ τοῦ Παύλου γεγόνασι μαθηταὶ. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀντόπται ἦσαν γεγεννημένοι, καὶ συγγενόμενοι τῷ Χριστῷ. Οἱ δὲ παρ' ἐκείνων τὰ ἐκείνων διαδεξάμενοι εἰς ἑτέρους ἐξήνεγκαν· καὶ τὸ τῶν Πράξεων δὲ βιβλίον, καὶ αὐτὸ Λουκᾶ ἱστορήσαντος τὰ γενόμενα, καὶ τῶν καθολικῶν Ἐπιστολαὶ τρεῖς.—Synopsis of Holy Scripture, vol. vi, Migne's edition.

² We have one probable reference to Jude in *Adversus Hæres.*, lib. i, tom. iii, xlii Hæres. We find no reference to the Third Epistle of John, which there was no occasion to quote.

and, after spending a considerable number of years in different parts of Gaul and Italy, he left for the East about 385, where he spent the rest of his life, principally at Bethlehem, in Palestine, dying there A. D. 420. The statement of a scholar of such learning and extensive travels respecting the canonical Books of the New Testament must be of great value. In the Introduction to his Commentary on Matthew he gives an account of the origin of the *four* Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, which he regards as the only authentic histories of Jesus Christ. In his work on illustrious men he attributes the Acts of the Apostles to Luke, the companion of Paul. To Paul he ascribes one Epistle to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, and one to Philemon. But the Epistle to the Hebrews is not believed to be his, he says, on account of its difference of style and language, but is supposed to belong either to Barnabas, according to Tertullian, or to the evangelist Luke, according to some, or to Clement, afterwards bishop of the Roman Church, who, they say, arranged and adorned in his own language the thoughts of Paul.

Of James he remarks, that "he wrote one epistle only, which, it is asserted, was published by some one else under the apostle's name, notwithstanding it has gradually obtained authority in the course of time." Respecting Peter, he remarks: "He wrote *two epistles* which are called catholic, the second of which is denied by most persons to be his, on account of its style being different from that of the first epistle." He states that the *Epistle of Jude* is rejected by most persons, because its author makes use of testimony in it from the apocryphal Book of Enoch. He adds: "Nevertheless, it has deserved authority from its antiquity and use, and is reckoned among the sacred Scriptures." He attributes to the Apostle John *one* epistle, "which is approved by all the ecclesiastical writers and learned men," but says that the Second and Third of John are asserted to belong to John the presbyter of Ephesus. To the Apostle John he ascribes the Apocalypse.¹

To these testimonies to the canon of the New Testament may be added that furnished by the Memphitic (or Coptic), Theban (or Sahidic), Æthiopic, and Armenian versions² of the New Testament. The two Egyptian versions, Mem-

The canon in the older versions.

¹ Liber de Viris Illustribus.

² The Gothic version was made in the fourth century by Ulfilas. Of this version fragments of the four Gospels and thirteen Epistles of Paul have been found and published. Whether Ulfilas translated the whole of the New Testament is uncertain.

phitic and Theban, were made about the beginning of the *third century*. The first of these contained all the books of our present canon, and so, doubtless, did the other, though there have been no remains of Titus and Philemon found in it. The Æthiopic and Armenian versions, made in the fourth century, contained all our present canon.

In concluding this part of our subject we may remark, that while the genuineness and authority of some of the less important books of our present canon were at various times called in question by Christian scholars, we have at the same time seen, that from the middle of the second century downwards, the most of our sacred writings, embracing the most important, namely, *the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of Paul, the First Epistle of Peter, and the First of John*, were received everywhere throughout the Christian world without any doubt respecting their genuineness and authority. Such a universal reception, so close to the apostolic age, furnishes an incontrovertible proof of the genuineness of these writings. Numerous passages from these books are interwoven in the discourses and discussions of the fathers of the Church from the last half of the *second century* downwards, forming an integral part of their principles and arguments. Great use was also made of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse; but the Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of James, and that of Jude, were little used in the first three centuries after the apostolic age.¹

¹ The Second Epistle of John is rarely quoted. It consists of but *thirteen verses* and there was hardly any occasion to use it; still less to quote the *Third*.

CHAPTER X.

GENUINENESS OF CANONICAL BOOKS OF NEW TESTAMENT
THE FOUR GOSPELS.

WE have already seen that the four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were everywhere received throughout the whole Christian world, forming a part of all the early versions of the New Testament, from the old Latin version and the Peshito-Syriac of the middle of the second century to the Armenian and Gothic in the fourth; that they were acknowledged to be the works of the authors whose names they bear, and are quoted as containing the authentic history of Jesus Christ by all the Christian writers throughout the world, from Justin Martyr (about A. D. 140) to Jerome and Augustine (about A. D. 400). Such unanimity upon a subject of deepest interest, which attracted a world-wide attention, is of itself a strong ground for belief that we possess in these four Gospels the genuine history of Christ, delivered by two of his apostles and two of their companions. If these four documents contained nothing but ordinary history, this unanimity of testimony would be considered as absolutely conclusive, and no further consideration of the subject would be deemed necessary. But as these books, if genuine, establish the title of Jesus Christ as the Messiah, and his right to the homage and obedience of mankind, men are disposed to ask for stronger testimony to establish their genuineness than they would demand to support the claims of ordinary history. It must be acknowledged, however, that the truth of Christianity does not depend upon the genuineness of the Gospels, and that the universally acknowledged apostolic Epistles would establish the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, especially the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which, in fact, stands independent of even their testimony. But without these Gospels we would have no authentic history of the Founder of Christianity, and the system would be mutilated.¹

In presenting the *external* evidence of the genuineness of the Gospels in a more definite and specific manner, we may begin with the learned Church historian, Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea Palestinæ,

¹ It must, however, be observed that the fact of the reception of our Gospels in the apostolic age, or immediately afterward, would show that they were regarded as containing the authentic history of Christ, and their authority would be of great value, even though not written by those whose names they bear.

who wrote his history of the Church a short time before the Council of Nicæa, which was held A. D. 325. Eusebius had the advantages of the library of ecclesiastical writers which his friend Pamphilus had collected at Cæsarea. Many of these writings are lost, especially many of those belonging to the *first part of the second century*, whose testimony to the genuineness and authority of the four Gospels would be of the greatest value; among these lost writings may be named, The Defense of Christianity, by Quadratus; the Refutation of Basilides, by Agrippa Castor; and Papias's¹ Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord. We cannot for a moment suppose that the testimony of the early writings that have been lost was adverse to the authority of our Gospels. For had this been the case, we should certainly have heard of it from some source, and in all probability from Eusebius himself, whose statements, based upon his thorough knowledge of the history of the early Church, is, to a great extent, a reflection of, if not a substitute for, these early writings that are lost.

In giving a list of the books of Scripture undisputed, Eusebius remarks: "First must be placed the holy quaternion of the Gospels."² He also states: "Of all the apostles of the Lord, Matthew and John alone have left us memoirs; and tradition says, they wrote from necessity: for Matthew, having before preached the gospel to the Hebrews, when he was about to depart to other people, having delivered in his native tongue the Gospel according to him, by this writing he supplied the want of his presence to those whom he was leaving: and Mark and Luke, having already published the Gospels according to them, they say that John, who had the whole time preached the gospel without writing, finally wrote on the following account: The three Gospels that have already been described having been spread abroad among all men, and known to John himself, they say that he bore witness to their truth, but affirming that they lacked only an account of those things done by Christ at the beginning of his ministry. And the statement is true."³ He speaks also of the Gospel of John as being "uncontradicted," and received by the whole Church, and that "it was rightly placed the fourth in order after the other three, by the ancients." The testimony of Eusebius is stronger from the very fact that he expresses doubts concerning some of the other books of our canon.

We next refer to the testimony of Origen, who flourished in the first half of the third century. In his Commentary on Matthew he observes: "As I have learned by tradition

Testimony of Origen.

¹ He, however, in a preserved fragment, as we shall see, speaks of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. ² Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. xxv. ³ Ibid., cap. xxiv. ⁴ Ibid.

respecting *the four Gospels, which also alone are uncontradicted in the Church of God under the heavens*,¹ that the Gospel according to Matthew, once a publican but afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, was written first, being delivered by him to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language. The second is that according to Mark, who composed it according to Peter's instructions. Wherefore, in his Catholic Epistle he acknowledged him to be his son, saying, in these words: 'She who in Babylon is elected with you, saluteth you, and Mark, my son.' The third is, that according to Luke, (the Gospel commended by Paul), which he wrote for those who were of the Gentiles. Lastly, that according to John."² It will be remembered that Origen, also, had doubts respecting some of the other books of the canon, which fact makes his testimony stronger respecting the Gospels.

Tertullian, presbyter of Carthage, who flourished in the latter part of the second century and in the beginning of the third, Testimony of Tertullian. in defending, against Marcion, the Gospel of Luke, which the heretic had abridged and adopted, remarks: "If it is evident that that is more true which was first, that that is first which was from the beginning, that what was from the beginning was from the apostles, certainly, in the same manner, it will be evident that what has been held sacred in the Churches of the apostles was delivered by the apostles. . . . I say, therefore, that not only in those Churches which were founded by the apostles, but in all those which hold communion with them, this Gospel of Luke, which we are especially defending, existed from its first publication. The same authority of the apostolic Churches will defend the other Gospels also, which we accordingly have through these Churches, and according to them—I mean the Gospels of John and Matthew—and it may be also affirmed that what Mark published is Peter's, whose interpreter he was; for also they are accustomed to ascribe to Paul Luke's Digest (Gospel)."³ It is evident from this passage that Tertullian was fully assured that our Gospels had been authorities in the Churches from their first publication, and he could have had no difficulty in ascertaining the facts in the case.

The testimony of Clement of Alexandria. Clement, the learned instructor in the catechetical school of Alexandria, a man of extensive travels, who flourished in the last part of the second century and in the beginning of the third, delivers the following concerning the four

¹ The Greek is, *Περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων Ἐυαγγελίων, ἡ καὶ μόνα ἀναντίρρητά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν Ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

² This passage is preserved in Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vi, cap. xxv, from Origen's Commentary on Matthew. The first part of that work is lost.

³ *Adversus Marcionem*, lib. iv, cap. v.

Gospels: "Those Gospels which contain the genealogies (Matthew and Luke) were written first. The Gospel according to Mark had its origin in the following manner: When Peter had preached the word publicly in Rome, and had proclaimed the Gospel through the influence of the Spirit, many who were present besought Mark, as he had followed Peter for a long time, and remembered the things which he had said, that he would write them down, and accordingly he composed the Gospel, and delivered it to those who wished it. When Peter became aware of this, he attempted neither to prevent him nor to encourage him. Finally, John, perceiving that corporeal things are related in the Gospels, being urged by his friends, and being inspired by the Spirit, he composed a spiritual Gospel." Eusebius prefaces this quotation from Clement's lost work, *ὑποτυπώσεις*, with the remark: "In these same books Clement delivers the tradition of the oldest presbyters respecting the order of the Gospels in this manner."¹

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul (A. D. 177-202), delivers the following testimony respecting the Gospels: "Matthew, Testimony of Irenæus. indeed, among the Hebrews, delivered in their own dialect the writing of the Gospel, while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel at Rome and founding the Church. After their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself wrote and delivered to us the things preached by Peter. And Luke, the follower of Paul, delivered in a book the gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, also himself published his Gospel while he abode in Ephesus of Asia."² He also declares, that "there are but four Gospels, nor can there be fewer than these. For since there are four quarters of the world in which we live, and four universal winds, and the Church is spread over all the earth, and the pillar and support of the Church is the gospel and breath of life, naturally it (the Church) has four pillars, blowing from all quarters immortality, and imparting new life to men."³

This language of Irenæus shows that our four Gospels were alone received, and it entirely excludes all apocryphal Gospels, as having no authority in the Church. It has, indeed, been said⁴ that the idea of four quarters of the world was something so important and fixed with Irenæus that he thought there should be four Gospels to correspond to it. But this would be to reverse the natural order of things, for the number four is in no respect a sacred or peculiar number, and four quarters of the world and four winds suggested

¹ Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. xiv.

² Adversus Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. i.

³ Ibid., lib. iii, cap. xi, 8.

⁴ By Schenkel.

themselves obviously from the fact that there were no more nor less than four Gospels—a reason for which fact he was anxiously seeking. Had there been five Gospels, Irenæus might have found a reason for this in the fact that the Pentateuch, the foundation of the old dispensation, consists of five books. Had there been three Gospels, he might have illustrated it by the fact that God is revealed as a trinity in Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit. Had there been two, it had its analogy in there being two great classes for whom they were intended, Jews and Gentiles. Had there been but one Gospel, he might have explained it as indicating the Divine unity against the paganism of the ancient world!¹

The testimony of Irenæus is the more valuable from the fact that the early part of his life was spent in Asia Minor, and that he was acquainted with Polycarp,² a disciple of the Apostle John, and, doubtless, with others who knew that apostle.

Tatian the Syrian, who had been a disciple of Justin Martyr, left Rome after the death of his master (about A. D. 165), and founded a heretical sect in Mesopotamia. He composed, as Eusebius³ informs us, a combination and collection of the Gospels, he knew not how, which Tatian called The Diatessaron (made of four). It, consequently, must have been composed of our four Gospels. Epiphanius remarks on him, "It is said that 'The Diatessaron was composed by him, which some call (the Gospel) according to the Hebrews.'"⁴ Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus in Syria (about A. D. 423-457), relates, in speaking of Tatian: "He composed the Gospel which is called Diatessaron, by cutting out the genealogies and whatever else shows that the Lord sprang from the seed of David according to the flesh. Not only did those who belong to his party use it, but also those who follow the apostolic doctrine, not knowing the mischievous character of the composition, but in a very simple way using the book as an epitome. I found more than two hundred of these books held in honor in our Churches, all of which I removed, and substituted for them the Gospels of the four evangelists."⁵ Barsalibi, bishop of Amida, in Mesopotamia, in the twelfth century, states that Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr, composed one Gospel from the four, which

¹ Jerome remarks that the four Gospels had been predicted long before. He explains the four faces of the cherubim in Ezekiel i to refer to the four Gospels: the face of a man represents Matthew's Gospel; the face of a lion, Mark's; the face of the ox (or calf), Luke's; the face of an eagle, John's Gospel.—Comment. in Matt.

² Epistle to Florinus.

³ Hist. Eccles., lib. iv, cap. 29.

⁴ Hæreses, lib. i, tom. iii, Hæresis xlvi.

⁵ Hæret. Fabul. Compend., lib. i, cap. xx.

he called Diatessaron. Saint Ephraem wrote comments on this book, and followed the order of the Diatessaron.¹ According to Barsalibi, the Diatessaron began thus: "In the beginning was the word." This Commentary of Ephraem, preserved in the Armenian language, was translated into Latin by J. B. Aucher in 1841. An improved translation of the Commentary was published by Georgius Moesinger, in Venice, 1876.² Tatian shows, by quoting in his *Oratio Ad Graecos*, John i, 3 (sec. 19), and i, 5 (sec. 13), that he acknowledged the fourth Gospel. Further, it is clear that he considered the four Gospels alone as containing the authentic history of Christ.

Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (A. D. 169-180), speaks of the inspiration of the Gospels,³ and quotes Matthew, Luke, and John (by name).

The Canon of Muratori states that the third Gospel is that of Luke, and the fourth is that of John. The first part of the canon is lost, but no one doubts that its first and second Gospels were those of Matthew and Mark.

The next witness for the four Gospels is Justin Martyr, the philosopher, the first of whose extant works, the *Apology*, Justin Martyr addressed to Antoninus Pius, was written about A. D. ^{as a witness.} 138 or 139,⁴ at any rate not later than 147. Justin Martyr in his *Apology* says that Christ was born a hundred and fifty years before; but this may be in round numbers. In speaking of the rebellion of the Jews against the Romans under Barchochebas, an impostor, he remarks: "In the Jewish war that has *just now* (*νῦν*) been made."⁵ This war was fought for three years, and was ended A. D. 135. If Justin wrote A. D. 138 or 139, the expression "just now" (*νῦν*) would be appropriate, being but three or four years after the event, but wholly unsuitable A. D. 147, twelve years after.

He already speaks of the heretic Marcion, but this furnishes no valid proof that Justin wrote later than A. D. 139, as it is well known

¹ Assemani Bib. Or., vol. i, p. 57.

² A copy of this work lies before me. There can be no doubt that it is the genuine Commentary of Ephraem on the Diatessaron. For it corresponds to the ancient description of it. It is an epitome of our four Gospels, and lacks the genealogies, both of which facts Theodoret, who had seen the work, states. It begins, as Barsalibi says: "In the beginning was the word." Like the old Curetonian Syriac, it joins the last part of John i, 3, to verse 4. In the same manner I find Tatian ends John i, 3, in his *Oratio Ad Graecos*.

³ *Ad Autolyceum*, lib. iii, 12.

⁴ Gieseler assigns it to A. D. 138 or 139; Volkmar and Hilgenfeld, to A. D. 147.

⁵ Ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ πολέμῳ.—*Apologia*, sec. 31.

that Marcion appeared about that time, with his heresy, at Rome, at which city Justin in all probability wrote the Apology. Justin, living at such an early age, is an important witness for the genuineness and authority of the Gospels. In speaking of the Lord's supper, he remarks: "The apostles, in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered—that Jesus commanded them, when he had taken bread and given thanks, saying: 'Do this in remembrance of me,'"¹ etc.

In his description of Christian worship he states: "All who dwell in the cities, or in the country, collect together on the day called Sunday, and the Memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read as long as time allows,"² etc.

In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, written a few years later than the first Apology, Justin more accurately describes the Gospels: "In the Memoirs, which, I say, were composed by his (Christ's) apostles and their companions, (it is stated) that sweat, as great drops of blood, fell from him as he prayed, and said, If it be possible, let this cup pass from me."³ After quoting both from Matthew and Luke on the miraculous conception and the birth of Christ, he adds: "As those who have related⁴ all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ teach, whom we believe."

There can be no doubt that the Gospels to which Justin refers as being written by the apostles and their companions, and read on Sunday in the public assemblies of the Christians, were the very Gospels that we now have, bearing the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The first Apology of sixty pages contains about forty passages, or about fifty-five verses, mostly from Matthew and Luke—from Matthew especially—and one from John. Some of them may have been taken from Mark, but it is impossible to determine this with certainty, as none of them are peculiar to that evangelist. But, from the language used by Justin respecting the evangelists, there could not have been less than *two* who were *companions* of the apostles; and as the Gospel of Mark was certainly one of the four in use in the age of Justin, there can be no doubt that it was in his collection. In speaking of baptism and regeneration, he remarks: "For Christ said, If you be not born again, you cannot enter into

¹ Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ κειλεῖται Ἐν-
αγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τον Ἰησοῦν, κ. τ. λ.—Apologia, sec. 66

² Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροῦς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλεξις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεῖματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφη-
τῶν ἀναγιγνώσκειται μέχρις ἔγχωρεῖ.—Apologia, I, sec. 67.

³ Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεῖμασι ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις
ταρακολουθησάντων συντεταχθαι, κ. τ. λ.—Sec. 103.

⁴ Ἀπομνημονεύσαντες.—Apologia, I, sec. 33.

the kingdom of heaven. And that it is impossible for those once born to enter the wombs of their mothers is evident to all.”¹ This passage, from its singularity, was evidently taken from John’s Gospel.² In this first Apology of Justin every other passage respecting the history of Christ is taken from our canonical Gospels, and there is not a trace of any other source for the history of Christ. Hence, apart from the peculiarity of the passage, the probability would be very great that it was taken from some one of our received Gospels.

The quotations of Justin are not always exact, but the sense is the same as that in the evangelists. As several evangelists have often nearly the same passages, he sometimes combines them. His quotations of the Septuagint of the Old Testament are scarcely more exact than those from the New Testament. In most cases he seems to have quoted from memory. But the very fact that his quotations from the Gospels are not always exact, is a proof that these passages are genuine, and have not been tampered with by transcribers, to conform them to the New Testament text.

In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, held at Ephesus shortly after A. D. 135,³ but not written down until some years later, Justin quotes about *thirty* passages from Matthew and Luke, and one from John’s Gospel, in which the Baptist says, “I am not the Christ.” In arguing with a Jew, Justin was led to quote the Old Testament more frequently than the New. In quoting a passage from Matthew he prefaces it with the statement: “And it is written in the Gospel.”⁴ He calls these Gospels “the Memoirs of the apostles;”⁵ “Memoirs written by the apostles and their companions.”⁶ There is a clear reference to Mark’s Gospel in the statement that “Christ changed the names of the two sons of Zebedee, and called them Boanerges, which is, Sons of Thunder.” This, he states, is written “in the Memoirs of him”⁷ (Christ). Mark, it must be remembered, is the only evangelist who relates the giving of this name to the sons of Zebedee. In the account of Christ’s baptism, he remarks: “And a voice at the same time came from heaven, which is also uttered by David when he speaks as of his person (Christ) what the Father was about to say to him: Thou art my Son; this day have I begot-

¹ In sec. 61, from John iii, 3-5.

² Hilgenfeld, in his *Einleitung* (Leipzig, 1875), acknowledges that Justin here uses John’s Gospel.

³ This date is to be inferred from the beginning of the Dialogue, in which Trypho tells Justin that he is a Hebrew of the circumcision who has fled from the war *justorum* (*νῦν*) finished, that is, the war stirred up by Barchochebas, A. D. 132-135.

⁴ Sec. 88.

⁵ Sec. 100.

⁶ Sec. 101.

⁷ Sec. 103.

⁸ Sec. 106.

⁹ Chap. iii, 17.

ten thee.¹ But the language of Matthew is: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." It seems clear that Justin, in arguing with the Jew, wished to bring the language in the Gospel as far as possible into harmony with the declaration of the Psalm.²

Hilgenfeld³ acknowledges that Justin used our four Gospels, and that they were used in divine service, but thinks that he also made use of the older Acts of Pilate and an uncanonical Gospel. But Justin made no use of the Acts of Pilate; he simply states: "And that these things were done you can learn from the Acts that were made (written) in the time of Pontius Pilate."⁴

Strauss acknowledges that Justin made use of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but thinks that he may have also used an edition of the Hebrew Gospel. He denies that Justin used John's Gospel.⁵

The testimony of Justin Martyr to the apostolic origin, the use, and the authority of our four Gospels, is of the highest importance. He was a Platonic philosopher, converted to Christianity in the first part of the second century. He had visited Ephesus and Rome, and was evidently well acquainted with the affairs of the Church. Can we suppose that a man of his character would not inform himself of the origin of the Gospels? His statement that they were written by the apostles and their companions could not have been a mere guess. For how could he determine, *à priori*, whether the apostles or their companions wrote, or some of each class? If he had nothing but conjecture to follow, he would in all probability have ascribed all the Gospels to apostles, the witnesses of the teaching and acts of Christ. We learn from him that our Gospels were read in the Christian assemblies on Sunday, along with the writings of the Jewish prophets. This custom was, doubtless, universal. Hegesippus, a Church teacher of Jewish origin, made a journey to Rome, whither he arrived under Bishop Anicetus (A. D. 157-161). On the way thither he conferred with many bishops, and in his *Memoirs of the Church* (in five books) he states that "in each succession (of bishops) and in every city (the doctrines) are just such as the law and the prophets

¹ Dialogue with Trypho, sec. 88.

² There is no need of resorting to the account of Christ's baptism in the Gospel of the Ebionites, as it stood in the fourth century. For Lactantius (A. D. 314) quotes the passage in the same form (Div. Inst., B. iv, cap. xv, 1) as Justin.

³ Einleitung, pp. 65-67. Leipzig, 1875.

⁴ Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἁκτων.—First Apology, sec. 35.

⁵ Das Leben Jesu, pp. 56-67. Leipzig, 1874.

and *the Lord teach.*"¹ There can be no doubt that by the teaching of the Lord, Hegesippus refers to the reading of the Gospels in the Churches along with the law and the prophets. He thus confirms the statement of Justin, already alluded to, respecting the use of our Gospels.

In speaking of chastity as taught by our Lord, Justin remarks: "There are many men and women, sixty and seventy Value of Justin's testimony. years of age, who became disciples of Christ in early youth (*ἐκ παιδων*), and continue incorrupt. And I declare that among every race of men I can show such persons. For what shall we say of that countless multitude of men who have been converted from a licentious life and have learned these things?"² Justin, then, knew many who had been converted to Christianity in the last part of the first century, when the Apostle John³ was still alive. At Ephesus he must have seen many who had been acquainted with that apostle. If the Gospel of John had not been acknowledged in that Church at that time, can we believe that Justin would have accepted it as an apostolic Memoir of Christ? There were in Justin's time, in all probability, some few Christians who had known Peter and Paul. Certainly there were many who had known those who were acquainted with the apostles, and with Mark and Luke. How could the Christians everywhere, in the time of Justin, be deceived respecting the genuineness of the four Gospels? One thing seems completely certain—that Justin knew that these Gospels had come down from the times of the apostles as writings composed by them and their companions. Had it been otherwise, many of the Christians of his day could have informed him that all the Gospels were introduced into the Church *long after the death of Peter and Paul*, which occurred about seventy years before Justin wrote his first Apology. Would it be a difficult matter now to ascertain, apart from all documents, whether the Methodist Episcopal Church had any book of Discipline in the year 1800? We could ascertain that from living testimony; and although we would be informed by the living voice that the Discipline has been repeatedly changed by the authority of the General Conference, we would also learn that the Articles of Religion in it have always been the same from the organization of the Church.

Before the converts to Christianity were baptized, Justin tells us "they are persuaded and believe that the things taught and said by us are true, and they profess to be able to live according to them."⁴ In the catechetical instructions given to the new converts the origin

¹ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. iv, xxii.

³ The Apostle John died about A. D. 98.

² Apology, sec. 15.

⁴ Apology, sec. 61.

and authority of the Gospels must have been a subject of the deepest importance.

We have already cited the testimony of Tertullian—who flourished at Carthage in the last part of the *second* century and in the beginning of the *third*—to the fact that our Gospels were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and that Luke's Gospel, from its first publication, had been known in all the apostolic Churches, and in the Churches in communion with them, and that the same authority of the apostolic Churches would defend the other Gospels.¹

We have also adduced the testimony of Clement of Alexandria—who flourished in the last part of the *second* century and in the first part of the *third*—that he had made inquiry respecting the origin of the Gospels, and had learned from the oldest presbyters that those Gospels which contain the genealogies were written first; after which he relates the circumstances under which he had learned that Mark and John were written.²

Important, also, is the testimony of Irenæus to the fact that there were but *four* Gospels, those of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, respecting the writing of which he gives some particulars.³ Irenæus spent the early part of his life in Asia Minor, was acquainted with Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, and was bishop of Lyons, A. D. 177–202. He evidently knew many persons who were acquainted with the Apostle John, and his testimony on this account is extremely valuable, especially respecting John's Gospel.

We have also seen that in the Canon of Muratori (about A. D. 160) the third Gospel bears the name of Luke and the fourth that of John; and there is no doubt that the first and second were those of Matthew and Mark. To these we must add the testimony of the Peshito-Syriac, made, doubtless, as early as A. D. 150, in which the four Gospels are attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. All these witnesses, in combination with the testimony of Justin Martyr, living so near the apostolic age, furnish an incontrovertible proof that these Gospels came down from the apostolic age, and that they have the strongest claims to be accepted as the genuine productions of those whose names they bear.

Between the close of the apostolic age (about A. D. 97) and the time of Justin Martyr (A. D. 130–166) flourished several Christian writers, whose works, with the exception of a few fragments, are lost. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis—whom Irenæus and Jerome represent as a hearer of John, though

Testimony of Papias as given in Eusebius.

¹ Adversus Marcionem, lib. iv, cap. ii, v.

² In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. xiv.

³ Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. i.

according to the statement of Eusebius he was but a hearer of John the presbyter, of Ephesus—wrote in five books “Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord.” In a fragment preserved by Eusebius, Papias states that John the presbyter, who was acquainted with the apostles, said “that Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately what things he remembered, not, indeed, in the order in which the things were said or done by Christ; for he neither heard the Lord nor was he his companion, but afterward he was, as I said, an attendant upon Peter, who preached the doctrines of the Gospel as circumstances required, not making, as it were, a systematic arrangement of the Lord’s discourses. Mark, accordingly, committed no mistake in writing some things just as he remembered them.” Respecting Matthew, Papias remarks: “Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew dialect; every one explained them as he could.”

Papias took especial pains to collect facts respecting the teachings of the apostles from those who knew them. “For if any one who had been an associate of the elders met me I inquired of him about the statements of the elders—what Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord’s disciples, said; and what Aristion and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that books benefitted me so much as what I derived from the living voice of surviving men.”¹

The statement made by Papias from John the presbyter, that Mark did not write “in order the things that were said or done by Christ,” has been made a ground of inference by some² that Mark’s Gospel, in its present form, did not proceed from that evangelist, but that it is a reconstruction of the original work. But it is evident that Papias is speaking of Mark’s Gospel as known to him a short time before the middle of the second century, which was demonstrably our present Gospel of Mark. He clearly knew nothing of a remodelling of it. Nor did Eusebius, nor any one else among the ancients. Mark’s Gospel is shorter than any of the others; it contains no genealogy, and begins with the preaching of John the Baptist. It may have been on these grounds that the presbyter John thought Mark had not written the sayings and doings of Christ in order. Mark must have greatly abridged the discourses of Christ, and the accounts of his actions as delivered by Peter. But can we suppose for a moment that Mark, who was a companion of the apostles and a preacher of the gospel, would have written an account of Christ’s sayings and doings without observing any order? Can we imagine a Gospel written by him in which the

A wrong inference from the testimony of Papias.

¹ In Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii, cap. xxxix.

² First inferred by Schleiermacher.

preaching of the Baptist is put at the end, the crucifixion in the middle, and the resurrection in the beginning?

We have seen that Papias states that "Matthew wrote the oracles (*τὰ λόγια*) in the Hebrew dialect." From this Schleiermacher's inference from Papias. Schleiermacher concluded that Matthew's Gospel originally contained only the discourses of Christ. But there is no necessity for limiting *τὰ λόγια* (the oracles) to discourses. In the New Testament *λόγια* (oracles) is used in Acts vii, 38; Rom. iii, 2, Heb. v, 12; 1 Peter iv, 11, in the sense of Scriptures, or divine revelations. In Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians¹ the phrase "oracles (*τὰ λόγια*) of the Lord" is used for New Testament Scriptures without respect to discourses. In the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians² "the oracles (*τὰ λόγια*) of God" are put in apposition with "the holy Scriptures" of the Old Testament. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, uses the phrase *κυριακὰ λόγια* (oracles of the Lord) for the New Testament.³

Sophocles remarks on the passage in Papias respecting Matthew's Gospel, it "implies that when Papias wrote, the Gospel of Matthew was regarded as a sacred book."⁴ It would have been impossible to give the discourses of our Saviour without historical facts, for frequently the discourses grow out of the historical facts.

In the Gospel used by the Ebionites, mentioned by Epiphanius in the last half of the fourth century, historical matter was largely incorporated. Epiphanius calls it Matthew's Gospel adulterated and mutilated, and it is in the highest degree probable, if not completely certain, that this Gospel and our Matthew were originally identical. Epiphanius states that the Gospel of the Ebionites commenced in the following way: "It came to pass in the days of Herod the king of Judea, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan," etc.⁵ Hilgenfeld well remarks that "all Christian antiquity knows nothing of the mere collection of the discourses of Christ. . . . Not a mere collection of discourses, but a complete Gospel, Papias states, to have been written in Hebrew by Matthew."⁶

Eusebius does not state whether Papias made any remarks respecting Luke and John. There may have been no occasion for Papias to refer to them. He does not say that Matthew wrote one Gospel and Mark another; that is taken for granted; and he states

¹Sec. 7.

²Sec. 53; and in the same sense in sec. 19.

³Contra Hæreses, lib. i, cap. viii; the Old Testament may be here included in the phrase.

⁴Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Boston, 1870.

⁵Hæresis, xxx, cap. xiii.

⁶Einleitung, pp. 456, 457.

only the source of Mark's information, and the language in which Matthew wrote.

The testimony of Papias, living just after the apostolic age and acquainted with the companions of some of the apostles, is very valuable.

In the Epistle¹ of Polycarp to the Philippians we find many extracts from the New Testament, and several that appear to be from some of our Gospels. "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak," in section 7, is, in the Greek, the exact language of Matthew xxvi, 41 and Mark xiv, 38.

Quotations
from the Gos-
pels in Poly-
carp and Clem-
ent of Rome.

In section 2 he says, "remembering what the Lord said when he taught: Judge not, that ye may not be judged; Forgive, and it shall be forgiven unto you; Be ye merciful, that mercy may be shown to you; With what measure ye measure, it shall be measured to you again; and that, Blessed are the poor, and those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God." The first of these precepts is the exact language of Matthew vii, 1. The second² is the *sense* of Matthew vi, 14 and Mark xi, 25. The third is the substance of Matthew v, 7. The fourth is the exact language of Luke vi, 38, with the exception that *ἐν* (with) is omitted, and the indicative is used in that Gospel. The last part of Polycarp's extract is, for the most part, the exact language of Matthew v, 3, 11. In sec. 6 he says: "If therefore we pray the Lord to forgive us, we ought also to forgive," which clearly refers to the Lord's prayer, as recorded in Matt. vi, 12, and in Luke xi, 4.

In the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written not later than A. D. 96, we have several extracts from the Gospels. In speaking of dissensions and severing the members of Christ, he says: "Remember the words of our Lord Jesus; for he said, Woe to that man! better would it have been if he had not been born, than that he should offend one of my elect, better would it be for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were drowned in the sea, than to offend one of my little ones."² The former part of these extracts of Clement is from Matthew xxvi, 24, respecting Judas, and the latter part substantially from Matthew xviii, 6. Both Matthew and Clement have *καταποντίζεσθαι* (to be drowned in the sea); Mark and Luke, in the parallel passages, have each a different word. I think there can be no doubt that Clement took the word from Matthew,

¹ This Epistle was written not later than A. D. 115, as Polycarp refers to a letter from Ignatius to him, which he in turn had sent to the Philippians, sec. 13. But the martyrdom of Ignatius did not occur later than A. D. 115.

² Ἀφίεσαι, *to remit*, is used both in Polycarp and in the Gospel.

³ Sec. 46.

as it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament except twice in Matthew.

In another place he says: "Especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, which he spoke when he was teaching clemency and long-suffering; for thus he said: "Be ye merciful, that ye may obtain mercy; Forgive, that it may be forgiven you; As ye do shall it be done to you; As ye give, so shall it be given to you; As ye judge, so shall it be judged for you; As ye show kindness, so shall kindness be shown to you; With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you.'"¹ These precepts are found either literally or substantially in the Gospels, and there can be no doubt that Clement quoted them from memory, blending together what is said by the evangelists.

Clement quotes, in some instances, the Old Testament just as inaccurately as he does the Gospels. Immediately preceding these extracts he quotes Jeremiah, prefacing the extract with, "The Holy Spirit says," "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, nor the strong man in his strength, nor the rich man in his riches; but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord, to seek him and to do judgment and righteousness."² The latter half of this quotation is wrongly given, for Jeremiah's language is: "But let him who glorieth glory in this, to understand and to know that I am the Lord, who doeth (showeth) mercy, and judgment, and justice upon the earth: because in these things is my delight, saith the Lord."³ In quoting Ezekiel, he says, the Almighty declared with an oath: "For as I live, saith the Lord, I do not wish the death of the sinner as (his) repentance."⁴ But the last clause of it in Ezekiel is: "That the wicked turn from his way and live."⁵ The beautiful passage⁶ on the omnipresence of God he spoils by the incorrect way in which he quotes it. In one place he blends together two passages from two different prophets. In the face of these facts, the statement of Renan, that the passages in the Epistle of Clement could not have been taken from our Gospels because they do not exactly agree with them, is utterly unfounded, and could have sprung only from ignorance or the want of candour.

The language of Polycarp and Clement implies that the Churches to which they wrote possessed the same teachings of Christ that they themselves had. How otherwise could these fathers admonish the Churches addressed, by exhorting them to "remember" the words of Christ? But the very supposition that the Churches every-

¹ Sec. 13.

² Ibid.

³ Septuagint, Jer. ix, 23, 24. This version was used by the early Church.

⁴ Sec. 8.

⁵ xxxiii, 11.

⁶ Psa. cxxxix, 7-10, in sec. 28.

where had the same precepts of Christ implies that they were contained in a common written form, i. e., in the Gospels.

In the Epistle of Barnabas, written in all probability in the last part of the first century, we find an evident reference to at least one of our Gospels, in the language that Jesus Christ "came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." In Matt. ix, 13 and Mark ii, 17 this passage is found without the addition of the words "to repentance," which, however, are added in Luke v, 32. But an evident quotation of Matt. xxii, 14 occurs in section 4 of this Epistle. "Let us take heed, therefore, lest by chance we may be found, as it is written, Many are called, but few are chosen."¹ Volkmar, Strauss, and Hilgenfeld contend that the words in Barnabas were not taken from Matthew, but from the apocryphal Fourth Book of Ezra, where it is said, "Many have been created, but few will be saved." In Matthew the declaration, "Many are called, but few are chosen," stands at the close of the parable of the king who made a marriage for his son. The invited guests having rejected the invitation, the king sent and collected a miscellaneous party, among whom was a man without a wedding garment, who was cast out. Here the words are exceedingly appropriate. The language which Barnabas uses immediately preceding the quotation from Matthew indicates that he had that Gospel in his mind: "Let us take heed lest, relying upon the fact that we are called, we may fall asleep in our sins, and the wicked prince, obtaining the mastery over us, may shut us out from the kingdom of the Lord. Still also think of that point, my brethren, when ye see that after such great signs and wonders have been done in Israel they have been thus forsaken." Then follow the words under consideration: "Let us take heed lest we may be found, as it is written, Many (are) called, but few (are) chosen." The whole tenor of the section is, that we must devote ourselves as Christians wholly to God. What has all this to do with the Fourth Book of Ezra?

It cannot be doubted for a moment that the words in Barnabas under discussion came from Matthew. But did the author of the Epistle forget the source of the words, and, thinking that they belonged to

¹ The Greek of Barnabas is, Προσέχωμεν μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὐρεθῶμεν. Matthew has, Πολλοὶ εἰσὶν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, exactly the same as Barnabas, except that the latter omits εἰσὶν (are), which is not quite suitable in the quotation. In section 16 in Barnabas there is a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem: "And still I will speak to you concerning the temple, how the miserable men, being deceived, trusted in the house, and not in their God," etc. Clement of Alexandria in several places quotes the Epistle as that of Barnabas. It must, indeed, have come down from the first century. Hilgenfeld places it about A. D. 97. Einleitung, p. 38.

Testimonies of
Barnabas and
Ignatius.

the Fourth Book of Ezra, did he add, *as it is written?* How could he forget the connection in which the words stand in Matthew? Did the author of the Epistle attribute more authority to the apocryphal Book of Ezra¹ than to the Gospel of Matthew? Why should he not have quoted that Gospel with the formula with which the Scriptures of the Old Testament were quoted? We have already seen that Polycarp, in the beginning of the second century, quotes writings of Paul as "holy Scripture." Barnabas appears also to have been acquainted with the Gospel of John. He speaks of "Abraham's having foreseen in spirit the Son," in reference to John viii, 56: "Abraham rejoiced to see my day," etc. There are some other passages that may have been taken from John; for example, that in which he represents the brazen serpent set up in the wilderness as a type of Christ. The phrase, "the only and true God," seems to be taken from John xvii, 3.

In the Epistles of Ignatius, written (if genuine) not later than A. D. 115, there are several passages evidently taken from the Gospels. But as these Epistles have been thought by many to have been interpolated, we content ourselves with a few references to some of our Gospels found in two of the three undoubtedly genuine and uncorrupted Epistles—to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans—published by Cureton from a very ancient Syriac MS. from the Nitrian desert: "Be wise as the serpent in every thing, and innocent as the dove,"² etc., found only in Matthew x, 16. "The bread of God I seek, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, and his blood I seek, a drink which is love incorruptible."³ With this compare John vi, 54, 55: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; . . . For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."

In the Epistle to Diognetus, one of the finest remains of Christian antiquity, in which the Christian life is described with great truthfulness and beauty, and which must have been written in the last part of the first century or in the beginning of the second, there are several passages which seem to refer to expressions of Christ in some of our Gospels. "The Christians hold together (preserve) the world." With this compare the passage, "Ye are the salt of the earth," found only in Matt. v, 13. The author of the Epistle tells us that Christ has commanded us "not to be anxious about raiment and food." With this compare Matt. vi, 25: "Be not anxious about your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall

¹ The time of the composition of Fourth Ezra is uncertain; it was probably written some years before the Epistle of Barnabas.

² Epistle to Polycarp.

³ Epistle to the Romans.

drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" Similar is Luke xii, 22, 23. In the Epistle and in these two Gospels the same word, *αεριμνᾶν*, is used to express *anxious thought*; *τροφή*, *meat*, is the word here employed in the Epistle in common with these two Gospels. For "raiment," *ἔνδυσις* is used in the Epistle, and *ἔνδυμα* in the Gospels. In section 4 he speaks of the Jews forbidding any thing good to be done on the Sabbath day, evidently with reference to Matt. xii, 12. "To whom he (God) sent his only begotten Son," *τόν υἱόν τὸν μονογενῆ*—here is evidently a reference to the writings of the Apostle John. For he alone of the New Testament writers calls Christ "the only begotten Son of God," and he does this four times in his Gospel and once in his First Epistle."¹ Christians "are not of the world," the exact phrase that is found in John xvii, 16.

In the last two sections of this Epistle Christ is called *the Logos* (or *Word*) who has appeared to men, with evident reference to John. The *Gospels* are also mentioned in the following passage: "The fear of the law is celebrated, and the grace of the prophets is known, and the faith of the *Gospels* is established, and the tradition of the apostles is kept, and the grace of the Church leaps." It must, however, be observed that a doubt has been raised respecting the genuineness of these last two sections.

In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, a small Greek work belonging to the close of the *first* century, or to the very *beginning* of the second, we find a considerable number of references to the Gospel of Matthew, and some to that of Luke. The Lord's prayer is the exact form of that in Matthew, except "debt" for "debts." It contains, however, a doxology wanting in the best texts of Matthew. The phrase, "To compel one to go a mile" (Matt. v, 41), is found in this work. The verb *ἀγγαρεύω*, *to compel*, is found in the New Testament only in this passage and in Matt. xxvii, 32, and in Mark xv. 21, and outside of the New Testament it is exceedingly rare. There are in the work references also to Luke vi, 28, 30. It also refers, manifestly, to a written Gospel: "As the Lord commanded in his Gospel." "As ye have (it) in the Gospel." "As ye have (them) in the Gospel of our Lord."

¹ Whatever establishes the genuineness of the *First* Epistle of John establishes that of the Gospel of John also, for they manifestly had the same author.

CHAPTER XI.

THE TESTIMONY OF CELSUS TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS.

A LITTLE after the middle of the second century,¹ probably between A. D. 160 and 170, Celsus, a heathen philosopher, attacked Christianity with great acuteness and virulence, in a work which he entitled, *Λόγος Αληθῆς* (*A True Discourse*). The celebrated Christian philosopher, Origen, about A. D. 247, wrote a full reply to this work in eight books, from which we derive our knowledge of the work of Celsus, unfortunately lost.

The testimony of such a man respecting the books considered sacred by the Christians is very valuable. And it is highly satisfactory to find that Celsus was acquainted with our Gospels, and regarded them as constituting, in the judgment of the Church, the authentic history of Jesus Christ; he himself says, that they were written by Christ's disciples.

Origen remarks, that Celsus made extracts from the history in the Gospel according to Matthew respecting Jesus' going down into Egypt,² and that he also took from this evangelist, and perhaps from the other Gospels, the statement that a dove descended upon Christ when he was baptized by John.³ Celsus also referred to the star that appeared at the birth of Christ, and the visit of the Magi, as recorded in the Gospel of Matthew.⁴ He commented on the statement, found only in Matthew, that an angel rolled away the stone from the sepulchre of Christ.⁵ He refers to Matt. xxvi, 39 in these words: "O Father, if it be possible that this cup may pass by;"⁶ also to the darkness and earthquake⁷ that occurred at Christ's death, the latter circumstance found in Matthew only (xxvii, 51).

In the following passage he refers to the Gospels of Matthew and

¹The work, as is evident from certain passages, was written during a persecution of the Christians; and, accordingly, it is placed by Neander in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A. D. 161-180); by Lardner, about A. D. 176. Keim, who has attempted a restoration of the work, places it A. D. 178; Gieseler, about A. D. 150. Origen says that Celsus lived in the time of Hadrian (A. D. 117-138), and later. He speaks of him, in the preface to his work, as being long since dead (*ἤδη καὶ πάλαι νεκρός*).

²Contra Celsum, i, 38.

³Ibid., i, 40.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., v, 58.

⁶Ibid., ii, 24.

⁷Ibid., ii 59.

Luke: 'Those who wrote the genealogies dared to assert that Jesus descended from the first man and from the Jewish kings.'¹ It is Luke that carries back the genealogy of Christ to the first man (chap. iii, 38), and Matthew who traces his descent from King David through the Jewish kings (chap. i, 1). Celsus also refers to the miraculous conception of Christ,² related in Matthew and Luke. He notices the precept,³ "Unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other" (Luke vi, 29; Matt. v, 39); also, that "no man can serve two masters," or, as he represents it, "the same man cannot serve several masters,"⁴ in reference to Matt. vi, 24, Luke xvi, 13.

It is also clear that Celsus had before him John's Gospel, as he asks, "What kind of fluid was it that flowed from the body (of Christ) when he was crucified? Was it such as Quotations
from John in
Celsus. flows from the blessed gods?"⁵ in reference to John xix, 34. He also asks of Christ, "What honourable or wonderful thing in deed or word hast thou performed, although they called upon thee in the temple to furnish some clear proof that thou wast the Son of God?"⁶ This obviously refers to John x, 23, 24: "And Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." Origen remarks that Celsus also "quoted from the Gospel, that when he (Christ) had risen from the dead he showed the signs of his punishment, and his hands as they had been pierced."⁷ This manifestly refers to John xx, 25-27. Origen observes that Celsus, quoting the Gospel, reproaches Jesus with the vinegar and gall—"That he was exceedingly eager to drink, and did not endure his thirst as a common man often endures it."⁸ This evidently refers to John xix, 28, where our Saviour says, "I thirst." None of the other evangelists make any mention of his being thirsty. Matthew uses "wine mingled with gall;" the other evangelists have "vinegar." Celsus evidently combined the accounts of several evangelists.

Celsus states, "Some narrate that two angels came to the sepulchre of Jesus; others narrate one."⁹ On which Origen remarks, "He had observed, I think, that one angel is mentioned by Matthew and Mark, but two by Luke and John." It seems very probable from this passage that Celsus had before him all our Gospels. He also commented on the passage, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God"¹⁰ (Matthew xix, 24; Mark x, 25; Luke xviii, 25).

¹ *Contra Celsum*, ii, 32.² *Ibid.*, i, 32.³ *Ibid.*, vii, 25.⁴ *Ibid.*, viii, 2, 3.⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, 36.⁶ *Ibid.*, i, 67.⁷ *Ibid.*, ii, 59.⁸ *Ibid.*, ii, 37.⁹ *Ibid.*, v, 56.¹⁰ *Ibid.*, vi, 16.

It is certain that Celsus was acquainted with Matthew, Luke and John, and it is highly probable from his work that he was acquainted with Mark. As the four Gospels in the age of Celsus were always associated together, there is no doubt that he was familiar with this Gospel.

Celsus not only refers to these Gospels as having authority in the Church, and as the source for the history of Christ, but celsus attributes the Gospels to Christ's disciples. he attributes them to the disciples of Christ. "Being able," says he, "to say many things and true concerning the affairs of Jesus, and not similar to those *written by the disciples of Jesus*, I willingly omit them."¹ It is evident that he means, by "the disciples of Jesus," the apostles and their companions; and, indeed, he seems to have included Mark and Luke under the term disciples, perhaps because it was believed that they wrote under the guidance of Peter and Paul. Celsus nowhere expresses a doubt that the Gospels were written by those whose names they bear. He everywhere supposes that they proceeded from those intimately connected with Christ.

Again, he says that "the disciples of Jesus, having nothing to urge in a very evident matter, hit upon this—the assertion that he foreknew all things."² He here refers to the disciples having abandoned Christ when he was arrested, and the predictions of Christ in the Gospels that they would do this. Celsus here assumes that the accounts in our Gospels came from the disciples. He further says, that "the disciples wrote such things concerning Jesus as an excuse for what happened to him."³

The Jew in Celsus closes his arguments with these words: "These things, then, (we have produced) against you from your own writings, on account of which we need no other witness; for you fall by your own hands."⁴ It is very evident from this that our Gospels were regarded as the fundamental documents of Christianity, the overthrow of which would be the subversion of Christianity itself. If Celsus could have seen any way in which he could attack the apostolic origin of the Gospels he certainly would not have failed to do it, as it would have given him the greatest advantage in attacking the history of Christ, and he shows himself everywhere ready to take any advantage in the discussion of the truth of Christianity. From all this it is evident that the genuineness of our Gospels was so

¹ It is absurd to suppose that, if Celsus could have refuted the apostles on any points, he would have refrained from doing it. Origen regards it as an "oratorical trick" ii, 13). ² ii, 15. ³ ii, 16.

⁴ Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑμῖν ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων συγγραμμάτων, ἐφ' οἷς οὐδενὸς ἄλλου μάρτυρος χροῖσκειν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς περιπίπτετε.—ii, 74.

universally acknowledged, that it would have been considered the greatest folly to question it.

Celsus alleges that some of those who believe in Christ, like those who through a drunken fit lay hands on themselves, have changed the original written form of the Gospels three and four times, and oftener, and moulded it so that they might ward off objections. To which Origen answers: "I do not know of any others who have changed the Gospel except the followers of Marcion, of Valentinus, and, I think, those of Lucan."¹

CHAPTER XII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE HERETICS OF THE SECOND CENTURY TO OUR FOUR GOSPELS.

THE CLEMENTINE HOMILIES.

THIS heretical work, written by a philosophically-educated man, at Rome, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, (A. D. 161-180),² sets forth Ebionistic views of Christ. The author represents himself as Clement, who was bishop of Rome in the last part of the first century. He visits the East, where he makes the acquaintance of the Apostle Peter, by whom he is converted to Christianity. Peter, accordingly, is the hero of the book, and Paul, without being directly named, is depreciated. It consists of twenty homilies. It contains numerous extracts from the Gospel of Matthew, some from that of Luke, several from that of Mark, and some from the Gospel of John.

As a specimen of Matthew, we find: "For he (our Lord) said thus. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law.'"³ From Luke we have the following: "For the Master himself, when he was nailed to the cross, prayed to his Father to forgive his murderers their sin, saying, 'Father, forgive them their sins, for they know not what they do.'"⁴ In the statement that Christ was tempted by the devil forty days,⁵ there is a reference to Luke iv, 2 and Mark i, 13; and in the passage in which Christ said, "Hear, Israel; the Lord thy God is one Lord,"⁶ we have a clear reference to Mark xii, 29. The principal passage from the Gospel of John is the following: "Whence our Master, when they asked him concern-

¹ ii, 27.

² This is the date assigned by Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, p. 43.

³ Epistle of Peter to James ii.

⁴ Clementine Homilies, xi, 20.

⁵ Homily, xix, 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, iii, 57.

ing the man who was blind from his birth and had recovered his sight from him—Did this man sin or his parents, that he was born blind?—he answered, Neither has this one sinned nor his parents, but that through him the power of God might be manifested, healing the sins of ignorance."¹ There is no possibility of mistaking here the reference to the ninth chapter of John's Gospel.

Hilgenfeld² acknowledges that the Clementine Homilies make use of our *four* Gospels, though he thinks that one apocryphal Gospel, at least, is also used, which is very probable, though it is very clear that our four Gospels are the principal sources from which the author derives the teachings of Christ.

THE TESTIMONY OF VALENTINUS AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

This distinguished heretic—a native of Egypt, who, according to Irenæus, made his appearance in Rome in the time of Bishop Hyginus, about A. D. 140—flourished in the time of Pius, and remained till the time of Anicetus³ (about A. D. 157). He died about A. D. 160 in Cyprus. Irenæus⁴ shows how the Valentinians (with whom he doubtless includes the head of the school, Valentinus) attempted to bring the first chapter of John's Gospel into harmony with their system. He represents them beginning as follows: "John, the disciple of the Lord, wishing to speak of the genesis of all things, predicates," etc.

In the *Philosophoumena*, or *Refutation of All Heresies*, a work of Hippolytus, belonging to the first half of the third century, we have an account of the system of Valentinus, in which he says: "Therefore all the prophets and the law spoke from the Demiurgus, a foolish god, themselves fools, knowing nothing; for this reason the Saviour says, All those who came before me are thieves and robbers,"⁵ almost the *exact* words of John x, 8. Tischendorf, in his eighth critical edition of the Greek Testament, adopts the reading: "All who came are thieves and robbers." But Tregelles gives in his critical edition, "All who came before me are thieves and robbers;" and this is supported, among other authorities, substantially by Clement of Alexandria⁶ (about A. D. 200). Valentinus also made use of Luke's Gospel. "Jesus," says he, "was born of the Virgin Mary, according to that which has been said: '*The Holy*

¹ Homily, xix, 22. A complete edition of the Homilies was published by Dressel, Göttingen, 1853. ² Einleitung, p. 43. ³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv, cap. xi.

⁴ *Adversus Hæresis*, lib. i, cap. viii, 5. ⁵ *Philosophoumena*, lib. vi, 35, Paris ed., 1860.

⁶ "All who [were] before the coming of the Lord are thieves and robbers."—*Stromata*, lib. i, cap. xvii. Valentinus in the *Pistis Sophia*, adjudged to him, uses John iv.

Spirit shall come upon thee, [the Spirit is (the) Wisdom,] *'and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee:'* the Highest is the Demiurgus: *'wherefore that which is born of thee shall be called holy.'*"¹ It is very clear that here we have reference to Luke i, 35. Gieseler observes: "It is remarkable that Valentinus not only received the New Testament, but made constant allegorical use of it in his system."² Tertullian remarks:³ "For if Valentinus is seen to use the *entire* instrument (New Testament) with an intellect not less acute than that of Marcion, he did violence to the truth. . . . Marcion made havoc of the Scriptures; but Valentinus spared them."

Respecting the source from which the early Christian writers obtained their knowledge of the system of Valentinus himself, and his expositions of Scripture, it must be borne in mind that this distinguished heretic wrote hymns, discourses, and letters, some of which are quoted by Clement of Alexandria. Irenæus tells us that he met with the memoirs of some of those who called themselves disciples of Valentinus, and with some of these disciples themselves, whose views he learned. Many of these men were taught by Valentinus himself. As he had hardly been dead twenty years when Irenæus wrote, they were fully competent to give the doctrines of their master. Irenæus⁴ seems to have derived his account of the doctrines of Valentinus and his disciples chiefly from Ptolemæus, one of the most distinguished men of the school. This eminent Valentinian⁵ quotes John i, 3: "All things were made by him (the Saviour), and without him nothing was made;" which he refers to an "apostle." He also quotes a part of Matt. xii, 25, with the remark, "the Saviour said."

Sources of our knowledge of Valentinus.

Heracleon, whom Clement of Alexandria calls "the most distinguished man of the school of Valentinus,"⁶ wrote a Commentary on the Gospel of John, fragments of which are introduced into Origen's Commentary on that book. Heracleon was compelled to resort to forced expositions to bring the Gospel into harmony with his system, and nothing but the apostolic origin of that Gospel could have induced him to comment on it. He appears to have attributed the Gospel to the Apostle John; for Origen⁷ remarks, that "he affirmed that the words, 'No man hath

Testimony of Heracleon, a Valentinian.

¹ Philosophoumena, lib. vi, 35.

² Church History, vol. i, p. 134.

³ De Præscrip., cap. xxxviii.

⁴ Videtur (*is seen*) has this meaning in Adversus Marcionem, lib. iv, cap. ii; Adversus Praxeam, cap. xxix; Apologetics, cap. xix, etc.

⁵ See the Prooimion to his First Book against Hæreses.

⁶ Epistle to Flora, in Epiphanius, Hæresis xxxiii, 3. ⁷ Stromata, lib. iv, cap. 9.

⁸ Tom. vi, 2.

seen God at any time,¹ and those which follow, were not spoken by the Disciple but by the Baptist." Clement of Alexandria¹ speaks of Heracleon's Commentary on Luke xii, 11, 12, from which it would appear that he wrote a Commentary on that Gospel also. This eminent Valentinian flourished, it seems, between A. D. 150 and 180: and his Commentary was probably written some time in 160-180: for Origen states² that he was said to be an acquaintance (γνωριμος) of Valentinus (who died about A. D. 160); and Irenæus, in his Second Book³ against Hæreses, written about A. D. 180 or earlier, makes mention of him. It is clear from passages in Irenæus that the Valentinians used *our four Gospels*, along with other books of the New Testament, and Valentinus himself has been seen making use of both Luke and John; and it is clear from the language of the early fathers that he received also the writings of the other two evangelists.

THE TESTIMONY OF MARCION.

Marcion, a native of Sinope, in Pontus, another distinguished heretic of the early Church, made his appearance about A. D. 138 or 140, and inculcated his strange system, of which the fundamental idea was, that the Author of creation, who was also the Author of the Jewish dispensation, is a different Being from that God who is revealed by Christ; that the former is the Author of an evil system, while the God of Christ and Christianity is the Good Being. He, The teaching of Marcion. accordingly, rejected the Old Testament and a large portion of the New. Irenæus remarks of him, that he taught, that "From that Father, who is superior to the God who is the maker of the world, Jesus having come into Judea in the times of Pontius Pilate, the governor, who was procurator of Tiberius Cæsar, he manifested himself in the form of a man to those who were in Judea, abolishing the law and the prophets, and all the works of that God who made the world, whom he also called *Cosmocrator*, (world-ruler). Besides abridging that Gospel which is according to Luke, and removing from it all the passages concerning the generation of the Lord, and removing also much of the doctrine of the Lord's discourses in which Jesus is very clearly described as declaring his Father to be the creator of this universe, Marcion persuaded his disciples that he was more veracious than those apostles who delivered the Gospel. In a similar manner he mutilated the Epistles of the Apostle Paul, taking away whatever was clearly said by the apostle concerning the God who made the world—since he is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—and removing whatever the

¹ Stromata, lib. iv, cap. 9.

² In Joan, tom. ii, 8.

³ Cap. iv, 1.

apostle quoted and taught from the prophecies that predict the coming of the Lord."¹

Marcion cut off the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel, and commenced his Gospel with the words: "In the fifteenth year of Tiberias Cæsar." He did not, however, after this beginning, follow Luke closely, but omitted some things and added others.² This Gospel of Luke (thus abridged), and ten Epistles of Paul (more or less mutilated), constituted his sole canon of Scripture.³ That Marcion's Gospel was an abridgment of that of Luke, and, accordingly, that the latter is the original, is now conceded by rationalistic critics,⁴ though boldly denied by some of them: until a comparatively recent date.

Here the question arises, Did Marcion know any thing of the other Gospels of our canon, and if he did, what was his opinion of them? Tertullian remarks that Marcion, "having found that Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, censures even the apostles themselves because they did not walk uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, and that he at the same time accuses certain false apostles of perverting the truth of the Gospel, he (Marcion) strives to overturn the authority of those Gospels which are theirs (*propria*), and are published under the name of apostles, or also of apostolic men, that he, indeed, may confer upon his own the credit which he takes from them."⁵ From this it appears that Marcion regarded the Gospels of Matthew, Mark,⁶ and John, to which the language of Tertullian applies, as having been written by men under the influence of Jewish prejudice. But since Luke was the companion of Paul, who was the Apostle of the Gentiles, and who would be considered the most free from Jewish prejudice, his Gospel was regarded by Marcion as giving a more correct history of the acts and teachings of Christ than the other three. In accordance with these views he received ten Epistles of Paul; not entire, however. Tertullian addresses Marcion "as having dared to destroy the original documents of Christ's life, and as rejecting what he formerly believed, as Marcion confesses in a certain Epistle, and which his followers do not deny."⁷ "If the Scriptures," says

Marcion's
knowledge of
the four Gos-
pels.

¹ *Contra Hæreses*, lib. i, cap. xxvii.

² See Epiphanius, *Hæresis* xlii; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, iv, cap. ii.

³ Epiphanius, *ibid.*

⁴ Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, p. 49, 1875. Baur, while conceding the priority of Luke's Gospel, nevertheless thinks that the Gospel of Marcion contained some readings more original than those of our Canonical Text. *Die Drei Erst. Jahr.*, p. 75.

⁵ *Adversus Marcionem*, lib. iv, cap. iii.

⁶ It is to be borne in mind that Mark was supposed to have written his Gospel from the preaching of Peter.

⁷ *De Carne Christi*, cap. ii.

Tertullian, "which oppose your opinion, you had not either rejected or corrupted, the Gospel of John would have confounded you." ¹ Epiphanius ² relates of Marcion, that when he went to Rome he asked the presbyters to explain to him the meaning of Matt. ix, 16, 17, which shows his acquaintance with that Gospel. There can be no doubt that Marcion was acquainted with our *four* Gospels, and that he regarded them as written by apostles or their companions. In selecting the Gospel of Luke, along with a part of Paul's Epistles, he shows that he regarded that Gospel as the writing of the companion of Paul.

THE TESTIMONY OF BASILIDES.

This eminent gnostic, the chief seat of whose activity was Alexandria, flourished, according to Clement ³ of Alexandria, in the time of Hadrian (A. D. 117-138), and lived till the time of the elder Antoninus (Pius), A. D. 138. Nearly coinciding with this is the statement of Jerome, ⁴ that his death ⁵ occurred during the war of the Romans with Barchochebas (132-135).

He wrote twenty-four books on the Gospel; an effort, in all probability, to bring the teachings of the Gospel into harmony with his system, which he pretended to have derived from Glaukias, the interpreter of Peter. ⁶ Hippolytus ⁷ states that Basilides and Isodorus, his genuine son and disciple, say that Matthias communicated to them orally secret doctrines which he learned by private instruction from the Saviour. At all events, Basilides claimed an oral tradition from the apostles as the basis of his system, and made use of Scripture to prove it. Basilides wrote his expositions about A. D. 120 or 125, and was refuted by Agrippa Castor about A. D. 135 in an able work which was extant in the time of Eusebius. ⁸ Of this work of Basilides, Clement ⁹ of Alexandria quotes the twenty-third book under the title of "Expositions." It is evident from this title and from the extracts which Clement gives on the punishment of Christians who bear testimony for Christ, that the work was principally an exposition of the New Testament Scriptures in accordance with his

¹ De Carne Christi, cap. iii.

² Hæresis xlix.

³ Stromata, vii, cap. xvii.

⁴ De Viris Illus. Agrippa.

⁵ This depends upon the reading *moritus, died*, instead of *moratus, lingered* or *tardied*, for the MSS. fluctuate between these two readings. But the Greek of the passage, which is probably more ancient than any Latin MS., has "*died*." The sense of the passage requires the reading *moritus, died*, as there would be no propriety in saying that Basilides was *lingering* in the war of Barchochebas.

⁶ So states Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, lib. vii, cap. xvii.

⁷ Philosphoumena, lib. vii, sec. 20.

⁸ Hist. Eccles., lib. iv, cap. vii.

⁹ Stromata, lib. iv, cap. xii.

doctrines, and that it was not a Gospel that he had himself written.¹ Gieseler well observes that these twenty-four-books "may have also been called his Gospel."²

This distinguished Gnostic quotes the *Gospels of Luke and John*. Hippolytus, in describing the system of Basilides, says : Quotations
from Luke and
John by Basilides.
"Since it was impossible for him to say that an emanation from a non-existing God was something not existing, (for Basilides very much shuns and dreads the substances of the things that have been generated by emanation ; for what emanation was necessary, or what matter must be presupposed, that God may form the world as the spider spins its thread, or as mortal man takes and forms brass, wood, or any other material?) but he says, he (God) spoke and it was done ; and this is that which was spoken by Moses, as these men say : ' Let there be light, and there was light.' Whence, says he, did the light originate ? From nothing. For it is not written, he says, whence, but this only, from the voice of the speaker. But he who speaks, he says, was not ; nor was the thing spoken. The seed of the world, says he, was formed from non-existing things, the word that was spoken, ' Let there be light,' and this, says he, is that which is said in the Gospels : ' *That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*'"³ The Greek text here and in John i, 9 is exactly the same, and there is no question that it came from the Gospel of John. But the Tübingen school of rationalists are unwilling to admit that Basilides himself quoted this passage—for that would prove that the Gospel of John was in existence at an earlier period than they concede. They would have us believe that it was likely a disciple of Basilides who makes this quotation. There is, however, no ground for doubt upon the subject. For Hippolytus, when he introduces the passage from John, is giving the fundamental part of the system of Basilides. He is not talking about the theories of the disciples, nor about the school of Basilides, but concerning Basilides' system. With the exception of the son of Basilides, Isodore, who was also his disciple, we know of no eminent man belonging to his party. To guard against any misunderstanding, Hippolytus frequently states, "he (Basilides) says." It is the doctrines of Basilides that he professes to give. What right have we to suppose that he is giving the views of any other person than the one he names ?

¹ Basilides uses the term gospel (*εὐαγγέλιον*) for the Christian revelation : " he preached the gospel to the Archon of the Hebdomas," etc. *Philosophoumena*, vii, sec. 26. When Origen states that " Basilides dared to write a gospel and to put his own name to it" (Homily i, on Luke), it must have been this work ; we know of no other.

² Church History, vol. i, 134.

³ *Philosophoumena*, lib. vii, 22.

There is no doubt that Hippolytus had before him the work of Basilides in twenty-four books, which is quoted by Clement of Alexandria some time after A. D. 192, and Hippolytus lived in the first half of the next century. But even if it had been lost in the time of Hippolytus, there was still in existence the refutation of it by Agrippa Castor, from which he could have learned the real system and arguments of Basilides. How absurd would be the supposition, of Hippolytus leaving the arch heretic, and hunting up some obscure follower of his, and calling a refutation of him a refutation of Basilides. Imagine an eminent theologian writing professedly against the system of Calvin, and quoting some obscure Presbyterian minister, using this language, he (Calvin) says! It is true, Hippolytus sometimes refers to the followers of Basilides as holding the same views as their master, but nowhere does he appear to infer the doctrines of the master from the teachings of the disciples. If a theologian were to attack John Wesley's doctrines of the Witness of the Spirit and Christian Perfection, and after quoting various passages from him should add, and this is what the Methodists assert—who would suppose, for that reason, that he had not quoted Wesley, but had quoted his followers? Baur,¹ in his account of Basilides, gives his system from Hippolytus, whose authority he deems of great value. Hippolytus also gives another passage as quoted by Basilides, which is evidently from John ii, 4: "That every thing, says he (Basilides), has its own time the Saviour shows, saying, 'My hour has not yet come.'"²

Basilides also quotes Luke i, 35: "This is, says he (Basilides), that which has been said, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee,' which, coming from the Sonship through the boundary of the Spirit to the Ogdoads and the Hebdomas unto Mary, 'and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee,' which is the power of separation,"³ etc. Basilides, as it appears from Hippolytus, also made use of several of the Epistles of Paul, so that there is nothing strange in his making use of the Gospels. Baur fully concedes the early age of these distinguished Gnostics. "The most reliable witnesses," says he, "respecting the origin of Gnosticism agree that the founders of the Gnostic heresies appeared in the age of Trajan and Hadrian. Basilides lived about the year 125 in Alexandria. Valentinus, about the year 140, went from Alexandria to Rome. About the same time came thither also Marcion

Die Drei Ersten Jahrhunderte, pp. 205-213.

Philosophoumena, vii. 27.

Ibid., vii. 26. Baur uses this statement in his account of Basilides, evidently regarding it as a genuine doctrine of Basilides.

of Sinope, in Pontus, the period of whose activity in Rome is placed in the years 140-150."¹

The testimony of Basilides to the Gospels of Luke and John is extremely valuable, as during the early part of his life he was a contemporary of the Apostle John, and must have known persons acquainted with some of the apostles. Scarcely less important is that of Valentinus to the Gospels of Luke and John, and the statement of Tertullian that he received the entire New Testament.²

Value of the
testimony of
Basilides.

THE NASSENI OPHITES, OR SERPENT BRETHERN.

This was a very old heretical sect, dating as far back at least as the beginning of the second century. Their system was nearly allied to that of the Valentinians. They were divided into various subjects. "One of them looked for the *sophia* [wisdom] in the serpent of Genesis, and hence the name of the whole party" (Gieseler). A quite full account is given of these heretics in the *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus. Their system is simpler than that of the Valentinians, and is doubtless older.

These heretics, as they are described by Hippolytus, make great use of the Gospel of John; sometimes they give extracts from Matthew, and they perhaps used Luke.³ But the uncertainty, whether Hippolytus is giving the views of the Ophites of his own time (about A. D. 200-250), and their way of quoting Scripture, or the doctrines of the earlier members of the sect, is great; and this uncertainty deprives their testimony of much of its value. Yet the comparatively simple form in which their system presents itself in Hippolytus renders it probable that it belongs to the first half of the second century. The Perates and Sethians,⁴ associated with the Ophites, make references in their principles to Matthew and John.

John used by
the Ophites.

REFLECTIONS ON THE Gnostic TESTIMONY.

What De Groot says respecting the use of the New Testament in general by the Gnostics, holds especially good of their use of the four Gospels. They would never have thought of appealing to these Gospels if they "had not possessed in the universal conviction of Christians a sacred authority. For the Gnostics sought to gain for their peculiar medley of heathenism and Christianity admission into

¹ Die Drei Ersten Jahrhunderte, p. 196.

² That is, as it was received by Tertullian himself.

³ *Philosophoumena*, lib. v, secs. 1-18.

⁴ *Ibid.*, lib. v, secs. 19-22.

the Christian community. This medley they called Gnosis; and, in order to give it a Christian colouring, they pretended to have received it as a secret doctrine of the Lord out of the mouth of the Apostle Matthias, or of a disciple of the apostles—Glaukias, for example, or Marianne, or Theodades. In order to secure for this pretence the appearance of truth, they took writings universally acknowledged and possessing authority, and explained them in such a way that the same doctrine might seem to be found in them that they pretended to have received from an apostle, or the disciple of an apostle.”¹ In leaving the Gnostic testimony to the Gospels, we may use the language of Irenæus: “So great is the certainty respecting the (four) Gospels, that even the heretics themselves testify to them, and each one of them, starting out from these (Gospels), endeavours to establish his own doctrine.”²

CHAPTER XIII.

EVIDENCE OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS FROM THEIR SUPERSCRPTIONS.

ALL the ancient manuscripts of the four Gospels contain superscriptions ascribing them respectively to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. There are said to be five hundred Greek manuscript copies of John, in all of which the superscriptions attribute the Gospel to that apostle. We suppose the number of MSS. of the other Gospels to be about the same.

In the two most ancient MSS. of the Greek New Testament—the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus—both belonging to the middle of the fourth century, the superscriptions to the Gospels stand in the simplest form: *Κατα Ματθαιου* (According to Matthew); *Κατα Μαρκον* (According to Mark); *Κατα Λουκαν* (According to Luke); and *Κατα Ιωαννην* (According to John). Cyprian, a Latin writer and bishop of Carthage (about A. D. 250), uses the phraseology: “Cata Matthaëum;”³ “Cata Lucam;”⁴ “Cata Marcum;”⁵ “and Cata Joannem;”⁶ showing that thus the superscriptions stood in the Greek, or at least in his Latin

¹ Basilides am Ausgang der Ap. Zeit., p. 34.

² Tanta est autem circa Evangelia hæc firmitas, ut et ipsi hæretici testimonium reddant eis, et ex ipsis egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam.—Contra Hæres., lib. iii, cap. xi, 7.

³ Testimon., lib. i, cap. xii.

⁴ Lib. ii, cap. viii.

⁵ Lib. iii, cap. xxii.

⁶ Ibid., cap. xxiv.

version. There can be no doubt that the Greek MSS. of the Gospels in the latter part of the second century bore similar superscriptions. Irenæus (177-202) speaks of the Gospel *according to Matthew*,¹ the Gospel *according to Luke*,² and the Gospel *according to John*.³ In the same way Clement of Alexandria, in the latter part of the second century, speaks of the Gospels *according to Matthew*,⁴ Mark,⁵ and Luke.⁶

That our Gospels had titles prefixed to them in the second century appears from the language of Tertullian (about A. D. 200). In writing against the heretic Marcion, who appeared in Rome about A. D. 140, and abridged Luke's Gospel, he remarks: "Marcion ascribes his Gospel to no author, just as if it was not lawful for him to affix a title to that whose body itself he had considered it no crime to destroy. And I could here take my stand, and contend that a work should not be acknowledged which does not show its face, which exhibits no firmness, that inspires you with no confidence from the fulness of its superscription and the due profession of the author."⁷ From this, it is clear that Tertullian deemed it of great importance that books like our Gospels should present their authors' names on their very faces, to give them authority. He had just before spoken of our four Gospels as belonging to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. As Tertullian used the Latin version of the New Testament, we are authorized in inferring from his language that in this version the names of the evangelists were prefixed to the Gospels. It may be, also, inferred that he knew of no copies of our Gospels in any language without the authors' names attached.

In the Peshito-Syriac version of the second century these Gospels are ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. We have no knowledge of any ancient versions, or any Greek MSS. of the four Gospels, in which they are not ascribed to the evangelists whose names they now bear. But how could such a unanimity of superscriptions, both in MSS. and versions, exist, unless they all had been derived originally from Gospels having the superscriptions of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? If the original manuscript of each Gospel had not been inscribed to a known author, all the copies of these original Gospels would have been destitute of the names of the authors, and the MSS. that have come down to our age would exhibit to a greater or less degree the anonymous character of the ancient copies. The early Christians

The Gospels had superscriptions in the second century.

Superscriptions in the Syriac version.

¹ Hæreses, lib. i, cap. xxvi

² Ibid., cap. xxvii.

³ Lib. iii, cap. ii, sec. 9.

⁴ Stromata, lib. i, cap. xxi.

⁵ In Eusebius's Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. xiv.

⁶ Stromata, lib. i, cap. xxi.

⁷ Adversus Marcionem, lib. iv, cap. ii.

were unable to come to an agreement respecting the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews—which is anonymous in the most ancient Greek MSS.—but no such uncertainty respecting the authors of the Gospels anywhere appears. It cannot be for a moment supposed that the early Christians would have unanimously accepted Gospels the credibility of which depended greatly upon their authors, without knowing that the authors were either apostles, or men of repute who were companions of the apostles.

But the question still remains, Did the evangelists themselves attach their own names to the Gospels, or did the Christian societies to which they were originally addressed, and, in the case of Luke's Gospel, the individual to whom it was sent? It is not necessary to suppose that it was done by the evangelists themselves. Histories of so much importance must have been delivered by Matthew, Mark, and John to the Churches with which they were connected, or in which they especially laboured. These societies, receiving the Gospels from the hands of their authors, would naturally affix the authors' names to them. The Gospel of Luke, delivered in person, or sent to Theophilus, was known to be the writing of Luke; all the copies of that Gospel would have the name of Luke affixed as the authority for the history. Nor could these Gospels ever have been received, either in the apostolic age or in that immediately succeeding it, if their accounts of Christ's acts and doctrines had not corresponded with those delivered by the apostles and other eye-witnesses of Christ's life. How could the Gospel of Matthew have passed for his in the Christian communities which he taught unless its accounts coincided with what Matthew had taught orally? In that case what possible motive could there be to forge a Gospel in his name?

Respecting the Gospel of Mark, there is no good reason why the ancient Church did not attribute it to Peter, a celebrated apostle, directly, instead of attributing it to his associate, except *the fact* that Peter did not write it. The Gospel of Luke rests on grounds peculiar to itself, which we will consider in the proper place. The Gospel of John we will find to be authenticated by the testimony of elders at Ephesus and by strong internal evidence. And it must be observed, that forgeries of writings in the names of the apostles or apostolic men were unknown to the earliest age of the Christian Church. That age was too full of spiritual life, too much absorbed with the realities of the history of Christ and the apostles, too near the events, to think of counterfeiting the sacred oracles. But to put forth Gospels under the assumed names of apostolic men, instead of attributing them to the

Did the evangelists write the superscriptions?

Forgeries unknown to the first age of the Church.

apostles themselves, would be to unite amazing stupidity with wicked fraud.

The most remarkable instance of forgery in the history of Christianity is that of the Clementine Homilies, written in the second half of the second century. This heretical work The Clementine Homilies. professes to be composed by Clement, bishop of Rome, in the first century, in which the pretended author is converted by the preaching of Peter, and by him appointed his successor in the episcopacy. It is dedicated to James, bishop of Jerusalem, who is earnestly charged to reveal its contents to no Gentile, but only to those of his own countrymen after they had been fully tested. In this way the forger guarded against the objection to the genuineness of the book derived from its late appearance. The letter forged in the name of Christ, and which is represented as being sent by him to Abgarus, king of Edessa, is first given by Eusebius¹ in the *fourth* century, and was not fabricated earlier, in all probability, than the last part of the second century. From the consideration of the external testimony to the genuineness of the Gospels collectively, we proceed to consider them individually.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

THE PERSON OF THE EVANGELIST.

THE author of this Gospel, one of the twelve apostles of Christ, was a collector of taxes (*τελώνης*) when summoned to the apostleship. In Matt. ix, 9 he is called Matthew, but in the parallel passages (Mark ii, 14, Luke v, 27) he is called Levi. But there can be no reasonable doubt that Matthew and Levi are the same person; and in the lists of the apostles (Matt. x, 2-4, Mark iii, 16-19, Luke vi, 14-16, Acts i, 13), the name of Matthew appears, but that of Levi is not found. Yet Levi must have been an apostle, as we can hardly suppose that Christ called him (Mark ii, 14, Luke v, 27) for any other purpose. Some of the other apostles had more than one name, as Simon, named also Peter; Lebbeus, surnamed Thaddeus, and in Luke vi, 16, called Judas. Little is known respecting Matthew. Eusebius represents him as labouring among the Hebrews, and writing his Gospel when about to leave them for other people.²

¹ Hist. Eccles., lib. i, cap. xiii.

² Ibid., lib. iii, cap. xxiv.

STATEMENTS OF THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS RESPECTING THIS GOSPEL.

The earliest statement respecting the authorship and original language of this Gospel is that of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in the first half of the second century. He says that Papias on the authorship of Matthew's Gospel. "Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew dialect; every one interpreted them as he could."¹ It is clear from this language that the Gospel was not, in the time of Papias, used in the Hebrew form, but that he speaks of what occurred when the Gospel was first written: "Every man translated the Hebrew as well as he could."

Irenæus states that "Matthew, among the Hebrews, published a Gospel in their own dialect."² Origen states that Matthew published his Gospel, composed in the Hebrew language, for Jewish believers.³ Eusebius affirms that Matthew, having preached the Gospel to the Hebrews, when he was about to depart to other people, delivered them the Gospel according to him in their own dialect, to supply the want of his presence.⁴

Eusebius, in speaking of the Ebionites, some of whom, he says, believed in the miraculous conception of Christ, while others of them denied it, remarks: "They made use of that Gospel only which is called according to the Hebrews, and took little account of the others."⁵ He also observes that Hegesippus quotes some things from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and from the Syriac Gospel.⁶ Whether he means by the Syriac Gospel the Peshito version, or not, cannot be determined. Eusebius relates a report that the Christian philosopher, Pantænus of Alexandria (about A. D. 190), went as a missionary to India, where it was said he found the Gospel according to Matthew written in the Hebrew language (which the Apostle Bartholomew had left with the Christians to whom he had preached), preserved to that time.⁷

Jerome says that Matthew, first in Judea, on account of those of the circumcision who had believed, composed the Gospel of Christ in the Hebrew characters and language. It is not quite certain who afterward translated it into Greek. "Furthermore, the Hebrew text itself is preserved until this day in the library at Cæsarea, which Pamphilus, the martyr, very

¹ Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος.—Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. xxxix.

² Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. i.

³ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. xxv

⁴ Ibid., lib. iii, cap. xxiv.

⁵ Ibid., lib. iii, cap. xxvii.

⁶ Ibid., lib. iv, cap. xxii.

⁷ Ibid., lib. v, cap. x.

industriously formed. An opportunity for copying it was afforded me by the Nazaræans, who make use of this book, in Berœa, a city of Syria: in which it is to be observed, that wherever the evangelist, either in his own person or in that of our Lord and Saviour, uses the testimonies of the ancient Scriptures, he does not follow the authority of the Septuagint, but the Hebrew, of which these are two instances: ‘*Out of Egypt have I called my Son;*’ and, ‘*For he shall be called a Nazaræan.*’”¹ Jerome also remarks, in commenting on Matthew xii, that the Gospel which the Nazaræans and the Ebionites use he had recently translated from the Hebrew language into Greek. He adds that very many call it the original text of Matthew.²

Origen remarks on the Ebionites: “The Jews who have received Christ are called Ebionites,”³ of whom there are two classes, “those who believe that Jesus was born of a virgin as we do, and those who believe that he was not so born, but as the rest of men.”⁴ “They observe,” says he, “the law of their fathers.”⁵ It is clear from this that he includes in the term Ebionites the Nazaræans of Jerome. Irenæus⁶ states that the Ebionites made use of the Gospel according to Matthew only. It is quite certain that he refers to the Hebrew text of that Gospel.

Epiphanius of Cyprus, a master of five languages, including Hebrew, (in the latter half of the fourth century), remarks on the Ebionites: “In the Gospel among them called ‘according to Matthew’ (not entire, but adulterated and mutilated, and this they call the Hebrew Gospel), it is said there was a man by the name of Jesus, and he was about thirty years of age, who chose us. And coming into Capernaum, he entered into the house of Simon, surnamed Peter, and having opened his mouth, he said: Passing along the Sea of Tiberias, I chose John and James, sons of Zebedee, and Simon, and Andrew, and Thaddeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas Iscariot, and I called thee, Matthew, sitting at the custom-house, and thou didst follow me. I therefore wish you to be twelve apostles for a testimony for Israel. And John was baptizing, and there went forth to him the Pharisees and were baptized, and all Jerusalem. And John had a garment of camel’s hair, and a

¹ Liber de Viris Illustribus, Matthæus.

² In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazaræni et Ebionitæ (quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum), etc.

³ Contra Celsum, lib. ii, cap. i. They were so called on account of their poverty, from the Hebrew עִבְיוֹן, *ebyon*, *poor*, or they gave themselves the name from their being *poor in spirit* (Matt. v, 3).

⁴ Contra Celsum, lib. v, cap. lxi.

⁵ Ibid., lib. ii, cap. i.

⁶ Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. xi, sec. 7.

leather girdle about his loins, and his meat was wild honey, the taste of which was that of manna, like a honey-cake baked in oil." On this Epiphanius observes: "That they might forsooth convert the word of truth into a lie, and instead of locusts (*ἀκρίδων*) make it cakes in honey" (*ἐγκρίδας ἐν μέλιτι*.) "The beginning of the Gospel among them is, that 'It came to pass in the days of Herod, king of Judea, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan. He was said to be of the family of Aaron the priest, the son of Zechariah and Elizabeth, and all went forth to him.' And to omit much that it gives, it adds: 'When the people were baptized, Jesus also came and was baptized by John. And when he came up from the water the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a dove descending and entering into him. And a voice came from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased: and again, This day have I begotten thee. And immediately a great light shone around the place, which John having seen, says to him, Who art thou, Lord? And again the voice from heaven says to him, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. Then John, falling down before him, said, I beseech thee, Lord, baptize thou me. But he forbade him, saying, Suffer it, because thus it is proper that every thing should be fulfilled.'"

Epiphanius also remarks, that "Cerinthus and Carpocrates, making use of this same Gospel of Matthew with them, wish to prove from the genealogy in the beginning of the Gospel that Jesus was born from the seed of Joseph and Mary. But the Ebionites aim at the opposite of this. For cutting off the genealogies from Matthew, they begin, as I said before, saying, that, it came to pass in the days of Herod, the king of Judea,"¹ etc. He also states that they call the Gospel according to Matthew, "According to the Hebrews;" "for to speak the truth, Matthew alone, of the New Testament writers, made an exposition of the Gospel in the Hebrew language and characters."² Respecting the Nazareans, he states: "They have the Gospel according to Matthew very complete in Hebrew. For it is certain that among them this is still preserved, as it was written originally, in the Hebrew language. But I do not know whether they took away the genealogies which extend from Abraham until Christ."³

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, in Syria (about A. D. 423-457), speaks of two classes of Ebionites, one of which held that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary, and received the Gospel according to the Hebrews only. To this class belonged Symmachus, who trans-

¹ *Adversus Hæreses*, xxx, 13, 14.

² *Ibid.*, cap. iii.

³ *Ibid.*, xxix, cap. ix.

lated the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek. The other class of Ebionites, he says, affirmed that Christ was born of a virgin they made use of the Gospel according to Matthew only, kept the Sabbath according to the Jewish law, and observed Sunday in like manner as the Christian Church. To these he adds the Nazaræans¹—Jews who honour Christ as a just man, and make use of the Gospel called “according to Peter.”²

From the foregoing extracts from the early Christian writers, it appears evident that they were unanimous in the belief that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Hebrew. As they were using the Greek text of Matthew, their natural tendency would have been to regard that as the original, and the Hebrew Gospel used by Jewish heretics as a Hebrew translation and recension of the Greek. Their unanimity respecting a Hebrew original must, therefore, have been derived from a primitive tradition. Though this Gospel was said to have been composed in Hebrew, it was in fact, as Jerome,³ who translated it, informs us, “written in the Syro-Chaldee⁴ language, but with Hebrew characters.” We have also seen that Jerome in one place declares the Hebrew Gospel to be the original Gospel written by Matthew;⁵ in another, that it is called by most the original text of our Matthew;⁶ and in another, he terms it the Gospel *according to the Hebrews, according to the apostles*, or, as most assert, *according to Matthew*.⁷

Conclusions
from the above
testimonies.

It is clear, from Jerome's account of this Gospel, that it generally coincided with our Matthew. It contained the passages, “Out of Egypt have I called my Son,” and “He shall be called a Nazarene,”⁸ found in the second chapter of our Matthew. And Jerome speaks of the reading *Judæe*, as found “in the Hebrew text itself” (chap. ii, 5), not *Judææ*.⁹ As this Gospel contained the second chapter, it had in all probability the first. Had it lacked this chapter, Jerome could not have failed to

Force of the testimony of Jerome and of Epiphanius.

¹ Hæret. Fabul. Comp., lib. ii, 1, 2.

² The Gospel according to Peter is mentioned by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, about A. D. 200. He read the book, and found most of its contents accorded with the true doctrines of Christ; some things, however, were of a different character. It appears to have been a recension of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Serapion's account of it is given by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. xii.

³ In Evangelio *juxta Hebræos*, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est.—Adversus Pelagianos, lib. iii, 2.

⁴ This was the vernacular language of the Jews in Palestine at the time of Christ. It is called in the New Testament *Ἑβραϊστὶ*, *Hebrew*, because spoken by the Hebrews.

⁵ De Viris Illustribus, cap. iii.

⁶ Comment. in Matt., xii.

⁷ Adversus Pelagianos, lib. iii, 2.

⁸ De Viris Illustribus, cap. iii.

⁹ Comment. in Matt., ii.

notice the fact. We have also seen that Hegesippus¹ quoted the Gospel according to the Hebrews. When Irenæus² states that the Ebionites make use of the Gospel according to Matthew only, we are to understand him as meaning the whole Gospel, in Hebrew, doubtless. And this corresponds with what Epiphanius³ relates, that Cerinthus retained the first two chapters of Matthew's Gospel. We have also seen that Theodoret⁴ speaks of two classes of Ebionites, one of which used the Gospel of Matthew only, and the other the Gospel according to the Hebrews. This last work must have been a modified Gospel of Matthew; another form of it was the Gospel of Peter, used by Nazoræans (Nazaræans).

Epiphanius, in his account of the Nazaræans already given, states that they have the Gospel according to Matthew in Hebrew very complete, but that he does not know whether they removed the first two chapters or not. The ignorance of Epiphanius upon this point arose from the fact that he lived in the Island of Cyprus, while the Nazaræans flourished in Syria. But his want of information upon this point is supplied by Jerome, who gives extracts from the *second* chapter, and knows nothing of the elision of the first.

We have, however, seen that Epiphanius states that the Ebionites had cut off the first two chapters of Matthew. This was, doubtless, done to accommodate that Gospel to their doctrine—that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary. But what number of them did this we cannot determine; yet it is likely that it was but a small portion. The Gospel of Matthew, from which Epiphanius says the Ebionites cut off the first two chapters, was probably a *Greek* recension of Matthew, used by the Ebionites in Cyprus, where he says members of that sect were found,⁵ and from whom there is no doubt that he obtained the copy which he describes.

That his copy was a Greek recension is very likely from the fact that he says the Greek word ἀκρίδας, *locusts*, in Matthew iii, 4, was changed into ἐγκρίδας,⁶ *cakes made with oil and honey*. This is further probable from its being extremely unlikely that the Syro-Chaldee language, in which Jerome's copy was written, was used in Cyprus. And the inference is in the highest degree probable that the two chapters of Matthew were elided only in the Greek recension of the work. To this it must be added that Epiphanius alone among the ancients speaks of the elision of these two chapters by the Ebionites. It also appears, from Epiphanius's account of the mutilated Gospel

¹ In Euseb., Hist. Eccles., iv, 22. He lived about 150–170. ² Lib. iii, cap. xi, sec. 7.

³ Hæresis, xxx, 14.

⁴ Hæret. Fabul., lib. ii, 1, 2.

⁵ Hæresis, xxx, 18.

⁶ These two words sounded nearly alike; written in English characters, they are *akridas*, *locusts*; *enkridas*, *cakes made with oil and honey*.

of Matthew, that it had some passages from Luke's Gospel. It contained additions and explanations.

The substantial agreement of our Greek Gospel of Matthew with the Hebrew Gospel used by the various heretical Christian sects among the Jews, in all probability from the last part of the *first* century, certainly from the middle of the second to the fifth century, shows that they had a common origin. The extracts from the Hebrew Gospel given by the early fathers show that our Matthew, in comparison with it, is the original.

In an ancient translation of a part of Origen's Commentary on Matthew,¹ respecting chap. xix, 16-22 it is stated: "It is written in a certain Gospel which is called according to the Hebrews, if it pleases any one to accept this, not as an authority, but for the illustration of the subject before us: One of the rich men said to him, Master, what good thing must I do that I may live? He said to him: Man, observe the laws and the prophets. He answered him: I have observed them. He said to him: Go sell all which thou hast, and distribute it among the poor, and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him: How dost thou say, I have kept the law and the prophets? since it is written in the law, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, and behold many of thy brethren, the sons of Abraham, are covered with ordure, dying with hunger, and thy house is full of many good things, and nothing goes from it to them," etc. In the account of the appearance of Christ after his resurrection, it is stated in this Gospel: "But when the Lord had given the napkin to the servant of the priest, he went to James, and appeared to him, for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drank the Lord's cup until he should see him rising from among those who sleep,"² etc. It is evident that both of these narratives are an enlargement of our Gospel of Matthew. The passage in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, quoted by Epiphanius,³ "His (John the Baptist's) meat was wild honey, of which the taste was that of manna," is a gloss on the passage in our Matthew. Origen gives the following passage from this same Gospel: "My mother, the Holy Spirit, took me just now by one of my hairs, and carried me away to the great Mount Tabor."⁴

In the account of our Saviour's healing the withered hand of a man in the synagogue, Matt. xii, several particulars are added in the Gospel used by the Nazaræans and Ebionites: "I was a stone mason,

¹ Tomus xv, 14.

² De Viris Illustribus, cap. ii.

³ Hæresis, xxx, 13.

⁴ Comment. in Joannem, tom. ii, 6.

obtaining my living by my hands; I beseech thee, Jesus, to restore me to health, that I may not disgracefully beg my bread."¹ In the account of the baptism of Christ in the Hebrew Gospel, we have already seen that several incidents are added to those we have in the Greek Matthew.

The additions to our Greek Matthew, some of which are probably as old as the middle of the second century, indicate that the original Matthew is at least as ancient as the last part of the first century. But the Gospel according to the Hebrews cannot be put on a par with our Matthew, as is evident from the passages that we have given from it. Strauss² himself concedes that our Greek Matthew is the more original work. It is to be observed that the differences between our Matthew and the Hebrew Gospel are made prominent by the early Christian writers, while there was but little occasion to notice their general agreement, which must have been quite close, otherwise no one could have supposed that the Hebrew Gospel had the same origin as the Greek Matthew.

Hilgenfeld thinks that the basis of our Greek Matthew was a Gospel written originally in Hebrew, before the destruction of Jerusalem, but enlarged and revised soon after that event, and, in its present form, adapted to the Gentile Christians; and that this original Hebrew Gospel was closely allied with that used by the Nazaræans. He refers to a statement of Nicephorus—patriarch of Constantinople in the last part of the eighth and in the first part of the ninth century—that the Gospel of Matthew contains twenty-five hundred lines, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews twenty-two hundred lines, making the matter in the latter three hundred lines less than in our Gospel of Matthew. But this statement is worthless, for Nicephorus also says that the Acts of the Apostles contain twenty-eight hundred lines, three hundred more than Matthew, when in fact they contain only about one hundred and fifteen more. He also states that Mark's Gospel contains two thousand lines, four fifths as much matter as Matthew's, whereas on the basis of Matthew it should have been about fifteen hundred and fifty, about two thirds of Matthew. Nor do we know to what recension of the Hebrew Gospel Nicephorus refers. The recension of the Hebrew Gospel which Epiphanius had lacked the first two chapters, and seems to have been a Greek version. This recension is very likely the one which Nicephorus says contained twenty-two hundred lines.³

¹In Jerome's Comment. in Matt., xii. ²Das Leben Jesu, p. 50. Leipzig, 1874.

³If Nicephorus had before him this Gospel in Hebrew, though containing as much matter as our Matthew, it would have occupied less space in that language.

It is in the highest degree improbable that, if the Greek Gospel of Matthew contained a great deal more matter than the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazaræans, Jerome, who translated it into Greek, would have failed to notice the fact. But would the translator of the Hebrew Gospel have dared to make large additions of his own to the work of an apostle of Christ? Yet, if he was bold and unscrupulous enough to do this, the fraud would have been soon detected, for both before and many years after the destruction of Jerusalem there were many Jewish Christians acquainted with the Hebrew (Syro-Chaldee) language, as well as Greek, holding fellowship with the Gentile Christians. In the many translations made of the New Testament books in the early ages, in no instance did the translator add new matter to the Greek text.

Not likely that additions were made by the translator of Matthew.

Nor could the Greek text of Matthew have been enlarged without the additions becoming known; for the Christian Church in the last part of the first century was widely diffused over the Roman empire, and many copies of the Gospel of Matthew must have been made. No one could alter all these manuscripts, or even a large portion of them; and, besides, the result would have been that we would now have no uniform text of this Gospel. On the contrary, there is a remarkable agreement among the numerous manuscripts and versions, showing that they are all the derivations of a single manuscript.

The reception of the Gospel of Matthew by the various Christian sects among the Jews affords strong proof that it came down from the apostolic age, and was regarded as a work that had apostolic sanction. Epiphanius states that the heretic Cerinthus, in the last part of the first century, made use of the Gospel of Matthew, retaining, also, the first two chapters, and endeavouring from their genealogy to establish his doctrine that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary.¹ We have also seen that Hegesippus, about the middle of the second century, quoted the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and in the account he gives of the testimony of James, bishop of Jerusalem, he attributes to him language almost identical with Matt. xxvi, 64.² James says: "Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus, the Son of man? He is even sitting in heaven on the right hand of great power, and will come in the clouds of heaven."³

Early reception of Matthew's Gospel by Jewish Christian sects.

Here the question arises, Why did the sects of Jewish believers in

¹ Hæresis xxx, 14.

² Similar is Mark xiv, 62. Hegesippus also quotes, "Blessed are your eyes which see, and your ears which hear," etc., Matt. xiii, 16, in Photius, Codex ccxxxii.

³ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii, 23.

the second century, and subsequently, receive the Gospel of Matthew only? The most natural answer to this question is, Because Matthew laboured especially among the Jewish people of Palestine, and wrote his Gospel in their vernacular, Syro-Chaldee, for their instruction. Nor is there any *à priori* improbability that Matthew would write his Gospel in that language, especially since it was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Jews in Palestine were still intact. If Matthew confined his apostolic labors to Palestine, where he must have used the Syro-Chaldee language, it is exceedingly improbable that he could have composed a Gospel in Greek.

Josephus states that he first wrote his History of the Jewish Wars in his vernacular tongue (Syro-Chaldee), and afterward translated it into Greek for the benefit of other nations.¹ Why should not Matthew have written his Gospel in the same language? But though written originally in Hebrew, it would soon be translated into Greek, to insure it a more extended circulation. This version was made so early that the name of the translator, it seems, was unknown to the writers of the second and subsequent centuries.

But it may be asked, Why did not the translator of the Gospel of Matthew in the Peshito-Syriac version, executed about the middle of the second century, make his version from the Hebrew, or, rather, Syro-Chaldee, text of Matthew, instead of making it from the Greek, as he evidently did, especially as the Syro-Chaldee was closely allied to the Syriac? To which we would answer, that at that time the Hebrew Gospel was used only by the sects of the Jewish Christians not recognized by the great body of the Church as orthodox, and it had already received some additions, while the Greek Matthew was everywhere used in the Gentile Church as the authoritative text.²

But, notwithstanding the unanimous testimony of the ancient Church that Matthew wrote originally in Hebrew, some eminent modern critics have decided in favour of a Greek original. Among these are Lardner, Hug, De Wette, Bleek, and Tischendorf. Our Greek Matthew shows an acquaintance with the Septuagint, but does not always follow it; in some instances it adheres to the Hebrew when that version departs from it. It is clear that the author of this Gospel was acquainted with Hebrew.

¹ Bellum Judaicum, Proœmium. This Syro-Chaldee text is lost.

² The following is the subscription to Matthew's Gospel in the Peshito-Syriac version: "The end of the Holy Gospel, the preaching of Matthew which he published in Hebrew, in the land of Palestine."

The manner in which the quotations from the Old Testament are made furnishes, however, no proof that our Greek Matthew is not a translation. In Matt. ii, 15 the translator could not have followed the LXX without destroying the very sense in which the evangelist uses the passage, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son;" for that version has, "I called his children out of Egypt." In quoting Isa. xlii. 1-3 in chap. xii, 18-20, the words of the LXX are but partly used; while chap. xiii, 14, 15 is the exact language of Isaiah vi, 9, 10 in the LXX. It is not easy to explain this.

The Gospel of Matthew bears internal evidence of having been written for the Jewish Christians especially. The main purpose of the author is to show that Jesus Christ is the Messiah promised in the Old Testament; and he accordingly gives the genealogy of Christ as far back as Abraham. In about eleven places he refers to incidents in the history of Christ as being fulfilments of the Old Testament prophecies, besides those passages in which he represents Christ himself as referring to them. In his Sermon on the Mount Christ contrasts his own teaching with that of Moses, which is rarely done in the other evangelists. To the Jews he says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (chap. v, 17, 18). In a Gospel addressed to Jewish Christians these passages in our Lord's discourses are naturally recorded, but in one addressed especially to Gentile Christians they could, with propriety, be omitted, though Luke xvi, 17 has a similar passage to Matthew v, 17, 18. Nor does the evangelist anywhere attempt to explain the customs of the Jews—which is very natural on the supposition that this Gospel was intended for Jewish readers, but quite strange if it was designed for Gentile Christians.

Internal proof that Matthew's Gospel was designed for Jewish Christians.

Utterly untenable is the position of Hilgenfeld,¹ that our Matthew is the Hebrew Gospel of that evangelist, enlarged and adapted to the Gentile Christians. Would such a reviser have allowed such a passage as this to stand:

Hilgenfeld's theory considered.

"Think not that I come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (chap. v, 17, 18). Nor is the command of Christ to his apostles, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (chap. x, 5, 6), adapted to

¹ Einleitung, pp. 457-497. Leipzig, 1875.

Gentile Christians. Wholly unsuitable, also, for these Christians is the language Christ addressed to the Syrophenician woman (chap. xv, 26). The references made to the Old Testament prophecies would not be so appropriate if addressed to Gentile as to Jewish Christians. Nor is there the least probability that all these references were not found¹ in the Hebrew Gospel, for Jerome states that the Gospel of the Nazaræans had the two references in the second chapter to the Old Testament: "Out of Egypt have I called my Son;" and, "He shall be called a Nazarene."

There are, it is true, two parables referring to the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles: that of the vineyard (chap. xxi, 33-43), and that of the marriage of the king's son (chap. xxii, 2-14). Also the declaration, "That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness" (chap. viii, 11, 12), refers to the same events. But it was to be expected that Christ would make declarations of this kind, and the denial of them is a rejection of his foreknowledge. Nor are they inappropriate in a Gospel addressed to Jewish Christians especially. The command given the apostles to preach the Gospel to all nations (chap. xxviii, 19, 20) rises above the particularism of the Jews, and is perfectly in keeping with the great designs of the Founder of Christianity. But such outcroppings of the intended universality of Christianity were to be expected even in a Gospel designed especially for Jewish Christians.

THE DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

The oldest testimony upon this point is that of Irenæus (about A. D. 180), who states that "among the Hebrews Matthew published in their own dialect a written Gospel when Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome and founding the Church."² Respecting the time when Peter arrived in Rome we know nothing, and the time of the arrival of Paul in that city is to be determined from his history in the Acts of the Apostles. This event most critics place in A. D. 60-63, and Paul's death about A. D. 67 or 68. If the statement of Irenæus is correct, the Gospel must have been written during this interval, somewhere between A. D. 60 and 68. Clement³ of Alexandria says that it was the tradition of

¹ Against Hilgenfeld.

² Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ Γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν Ἐυαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτροῦ καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐναγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.—Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. i, sec. 1.

³ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, 14. He was a teacher in the Catechetical School of Alexandria, A. D. 190-202.

the most ancient presbyters that the Gospels containing the genealogies were written first. Eusebius¹ states that Matthew wrote for the Hebrews his Gospel when about to leave for other people. There is nothing very definite in respect to time in these last two statements.

There can be no doubt that the Gospel of Matthew is the oldest of the four. "All considerate inquirers," says the skeptical critic Keim, "agree in the admission that the Gos- views of modern critics. pel of Matthew was written about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. . . . Preponderating are the indications that it originated before this destruction." He fixes upon the year A. D. 68,² about two years before that catastrophe.³ Hug,⁴ De Wette,⁵ and Ewald⁶ place it *before* the destruction of Jerusalem; and Bleek⁷ in the year of the destruction, but before it rather than after it.

Baur supposed that our Matthew is a revision of the Hebrew Gospel, or Gospel of Peter, made during the second Jewish war (A. D. 132-135), and adapted to general circulation by slight modifications, but, upon the whole, reproducing the evangelical history with great fidelity. His latest view substantially was that our Gospel is a revision of the Gospel written in Greek, of a strictly Jewish cast, by the Apostle Matthew between A. D. 50 and 60, but which received small additions, about ten years later, to adapt it to universal circulation.⁸

Strauss⁹ thinks that our Matthew was formed by successive additions, based possibly upon the original Gospel, which may have proceeded from an apostle, and finished at a quite late period.

Renan regards our Matthew as having its origin in "the discourses of Jesus collected by the Apostle Matthew," and seems to think that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem; and that not without reason it bears the title: "The Gospel according to Matth-

¹ Euseb., iii, 24.

² Geschichte Jesu, pp. 24, 25. Zürich, 1873.

³ Keim, however, regards the parable of the marriage of the king's son (chap. xxii, 2-14) as not belonging to the original Matthew, but added about A. D. 100. He thinks that Christ could not have spoken this parable, because it too clearly predicts the overthrow of the Jewish State. But if this addition had been made when the Gospel had already been in circulation forty years, the section would have been wanting in most of the MSS.—which is not the case. He also thinks chapter xxiv, 14 a later addition.

⁴ Einleitung, Zweiter Theil, 8-13.

⁵ Einleitung, p. 200.

⁶ Die Drei Ersten Evangel., u. s. w., p. 89. Göttingen, 1871.

⁷ Einleitung, von Mangold, pp. 318, 319. Berlin, 1875.

⁸ He regards the Gospel of Matthew "as relatively the most genuine and the most reliable source of the Gospel history."—Kirchengeschich. der Drei Erst. Jahr., p. 25

⁹ Das Leben Jesu, p. 50. Leipzig 1874.

ew." He thinks, also, "that beyond doubt at a very early period' the discourses of Jesus were written in the Aramaic language, as, likewise, were his remarkable deeds recorded. He supposes, however, that in the course of time this Gospel received some additions and suffered some changes.¹

It is clear from Matthew xxiv that this Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and has been preserved intact. For the form in which Christ predicts the destruction of that city, connecting *apparently*² the future judgment closely with it, and the highly figurative and indefinite manner in which it is expressed, are conclusive proofs that it was neither made up after the event, nor in the least degree moulded by it.

It seems proper in this place to consider the assertion of Strauss As to alleged and Renan, that this Gospel received considerable additions to its original matter at various times. In proof of this assertion not a particle of evidence is furnished. In the first place, it is contrary to general usage. Who supposes that Xenophon's Memoirs of Socrates received important additions from later hands; or that his Anabasis has been largely interpolated; or the History of Herodotus? To interpolate an author is a fraudulent act; but what shall we say of the frequent interpolation of the writings of an apostle by Christians? We do not charge the Mohammedans with corrupting the Koran.

But even if a few so-called Christians were unscrupulous enough to interpolate the Gospel, it is impossible that such interpolations should escape detection. For immediately after the publication of the Gospel many copies of it would be disseminated among the Christian Churches in all parts of the Roman empire, and but few copies could receive the same interpolations. The result would be that the ancient manuscripts and versions would present a great variety of texts, from which it would have been impossible to fix with any certainty the original text. But we have no such disagreement of manuscripts and versions, but a wonderful harmony.

The very form in which we have the Gospel shows that it has not been made up of heterogeneous elements, but that it is a well arranged history of Christ. Let any one compare it with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, with which it was closely connected and he will see at once in what condition our Matthew would have been had it received additions to its original form.

The Hebraisms of this Gospel show that it must have been written

¹ Vie de Jésus, Introduction. Paris, 1867.

² We say *apparently*, for we do not think that Christ intended that, whatever the apostles may have thought at the time.

by one whose vernacular was Hebrew or Syro-Chaldee, and if interpolations were made in it, they must have come from persons of similar education. But after the close of the first century the Jewish believers in the Church were not numerous. Further, each of our evangelists has his peculiarities stamped upon his Gospel. The foregoing observations are applicable in nearly their whole extent to all four Gospels. We are authorized to conclude that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Syro-Chaldee language in Palestine some time between A. D. 60 and 67—most likely in the earlier part of this period—and that it was soon afterward translated into Greek, and has come down to us in its integrity.

The only known instance in antiquity of the denial of the genuineness of this Gospel is that of Faustus, an African bishop of the Manichæans (about A. D. 400), a man of natural shrewdness, but destitute of culture. Augustine says that this man “published a volume against the true Christian faith and catholic truth.” In promoting his heresy he denied the genuineness of this Gospel, declaring that the use of the third person by the evangelist, when speaking of Matthew (ix, 9), is inconsistent with the author’s being Matthew.¹ Such an argument shows the ignorance of the man or his want of candour.

Faustus a rejecter of Matthew.

THE GENUINENESS AND CHARACTER OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

We have seen the strength of the external evidence showing that this Gospel proceeded from Matthew. Now, the question arises, Is there any thing in the Gospel itself inconsistent with its apostolic origin? It would be a singular, and, we may add, a sad, spectacle if a Gospel, received everywhere throughout the Christian world from its first publication without doubt as the work of the Apostle Matthew, should, after the lapse of eighteen centuries, be discovered to have originated from no apostle at all. What documents belonging to antiquity, either of a sacred or profane character, could we in that case receive with any confidence? The unanimous judgment and testimony of the ancient world respecting matters of fact should command our belief and trust; otherwise, we are driven to universal skepticism.

But the examination of the contents of this Gospel reveals nothing inconsistent with the claim that it is from Matthew, the apostle of Christ. It clearly sets forth the original, sublime, distinctive, and incisive doctrines of Christ, and relates his godlike acts with freshness and simplicity of language, always maintaining the apostolic

¹ In Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, lib. vii, cap. i.

dignity, and avoiding every thing of a trivial character. The Sermon on the Mount bears upon it the stamp of the originality of Christ, and nowhere else in the evangelical history have we such a full and clear statement of Christ's doctrines. But in spite of the high character of this Gospel, and the universal testimony borne to it by antiquity, doubts have been raised by some critics in modern times respecting its having originated from Matthew.

De Wette, who in some respects may be called the chief of sceptics, can find nothing in the account that the evangelist states respecting Matthew (ix, 9) that would lead us to infer that he is the author of the Gospel. It is true that in that passage he speaks simply of his being a tax-gatherer, and being called to follow Christ. Whether he should say more than this was a matter of taste. In the Memoirs of Socrates, written by his disciple, Xenophon, but little is said of the author, and nothing to connect him with the composition of the book; and when he describes himself in the Anabasis,¹ not the least hint is given that he wrote the work. De Wette thinks that an eye-witness

of the life of Christ would not have passed over his ministry in Jerusalem, which is related by John. The passage, "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (Matt. xxiii, 37) clearly shows that our evangelist knew that Christ had exercised his ministry also among the people of Jerusalem. In not describing our Saviour's earlier visits to Jerusalem, and his ministry there, our evangelist does not stand alone. The same omission occurs in Mark and Luke. Luke, however, mentions a visit which our Saviour made to Martha and Mary (chap. x, 38-42); and on another occasion he speaks of our Saviour being in a village of the Samaritans, with his face set as if he was going up to Jerusalem (chap. ix, 53); and of his "journeyings towards Jerusalem" (Luke xiii, 22). He also says: "As he went to Jerusalem" (chap. xvii, 11). Although our Saviour's abode was in Galilee, where he chiefly exercised his ministry, there can be no doubt that, as a Jew, he obeyed the law and went up to Jerusalem to the great festivals, during which he exercised his ministry in that city. But the fact is, that our evangelist devotes about *one third* (the last) of his Gospel to Christ's teachings, acts, and the closing events of his earthly career in Jerusalem. Matthew knowing that the most important events in the life of our Lord occurred at Jerusalem, at the end of his mission, may have deemed it unnecessary to give the visits of Christ to that city, since it was not his design to write a full history of the

¹ Book iii, chap. i, ser. 4, etc.

Redeemer. The same reason may have governed Luke¹ in writing his Gospel; and Mark also, unless we regard him as imitating Matthew.

The only way in which the omission of Christ's earlier visits to Jerusalem could militate against the evangelist being an eyewitness of Christ's life, would be to show that he knew nothing about them. But that supposition is refuted by the Gospel itself, and is utterly incredible when we consider the early period at which it was written. Luke, who assures us that he had "perfect understanding of all things from the very first," as they were delivered by the eyewitnesses of Christ's life (chap. i, 2, 3), also passes over the early visits to Jerusalem. Now, the Gospel of John beautifully supplements the first three, and is confined almost entirely to the narration of Christ's teachings and acts at Jerusalem and in its vicinity. There can be no doubt that John intended it to be the complement of the other Gospels.

De Wette also objects that Matthew does not always follow the order of time in his narration of Christ's discourses. But it is clear that our evangelist *does* generally follow the order of time, and if any incidents seem to be out of natural connexion, that fact can furnish no valid objection to the apostolic origin of the Gospel.² As our Saviour inculcated the same lessons in different places, the evangelist may not in every instance have accurately discriminated the occasions, after the lapse of many years. Christ promised the apostles that the Father would send them the Holy Spirit to bring to their remembrance whatever he had said unto them, but this did not necessarily imply the exact order of time in which each thing was said. In the observance of the chronological order of events Matthew is more accurate than either Luke or Mark. Yet it must be observed that the evangelist may not have cared to observe closely the exact order of time. But we are not sure that Matthew has at all failed in this particular. It is easy to infer from some preconceived theory that certain events and teachings should stand in a different connexion from that in which they appear, but we have no sufficient proof that they are wrongly placed.

It has also been alleged that our evangelist does not describe

¹ It is exceedingly probable that Luke, when he wrote, had not seen Matthew's Gospel. According to Irenæus' statement, when Matthew wrote Luke must have been at Rome, where he wrote about the same time, or soon after. Mark was evidently acquainted with our Matthew.

² Even the most famous of modern biographers do not always observe the order of time.

events with all the clearness and vividness that might be expected from an eyewitness. But the power of describing events in a vivid manner is not possessed by all. Further, some narrators almost invariably go into all the details of a subject, while others are content to touch upon the most important points. It is very evident that, in the limited space to which Matthew confines himself, he could not give a great number of particulars. Yet it is to be observed that in his delineations he is generally more original than Luke.

In his account of the miracle of the feeding of five thousand men with a few loaves and fishes (chap. xiv, 15-21) he states that Christ commanded the multitude to sit down on *the grass*. This language probably indicates an eyewitness. The mention of grass is wanting in Luke.¹ Matthew is more specific than the other evangelists in stating that there were five thousand fed, besides the women and children. In chap. xiii, 1 he gives a very exact statement, wanting in Mark and Luke—"the same day." But it must be observed the greatest part of Matthew's Gospel is occupied with the discourses of Christ, and, consequently, there are not so many occasions on which the evangelist could give particulars.

Bleek does not attribute our Gospel to the Apostle Matthew, nor does he inform us who he thinks wrote it, except that it is not the work of an apostle. He remarks: "It holds a lower position than the Gospel of John, but in general it stands in the same rank with that of Luke, and in its essential contents for the Christian faith it remains permanently a credible and important source."² Undoubtedly the early composition of our Gospel, and its universal authority at the close of the apostolic age and afterward, show that it contains the history of Christ as delivered by the eyewitnesses of his life, whoever may have been the author. But we cannot allow the opinion of Bleek³ to weigh much against the unanimous judgment of antiquity—beginning with that of Papias, in the first part of the second century—that *Matthew the apostle wrote it*; and the testimony of antiquity is accepted by the great mass of modern scholars.

¹ Mark speaks of the green grass; John, of much grass; John was an eyewitness, Mark, if not an eyewitness, may have derived his account from Matthew.

² Einleitung, by Mangold, p. 332.

³ Even Hilgenfeld acknowledges that our Gospel has the genuine writing of the apostle Matthew for its foundation, written A. D. 60-70, which was revised immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem. Einleitung, p. 197. Leipzig, 1875.

CONTENTS OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

THIS Gospel opens with the genealogy of Christ, from Abraham to Joseph the husband of Mary, and gives an account of the miraculous conception and birth of our Lord. This is followed by the visit of the Magi to the infant Saviour; the attempt of Herod to murder him; the flight of Joseph and Mary with the child into Egypt; the slaughter of the infants by Herod; the return of the family from Egypt, and their settlement in Nazareth (chaps. i, ii). John preaches repentance and baptizes the people in the Jordan. Christ is also baptized by him; fasts for forty days in the desert of Judea, and is tempted by the devil, who is vanquished. After this Christ goes into Galilee, preaching everywhere the kingdom of God, and performing all kinds of miracles for the relief of men. He calls Peter, Andrew, James, and John to be his disciples. Great crowds follow him (chaps. iii, iv). He delivers the Sermon on the Mount, in which he sets forth the moral and religious principles of his kingdom, partly in contrast with the Mosaic system (chaps. v-vii). He heals a leper, restores to health by a word the centurion's servant sick of the palsy, cures Peter's mother-in-law, and casts out devils. To a scribe wishing to follow him he declares he has not where to lay his head. He rebukes the winds and the seas. In the country of the Gergesenes he casts out of two men devils, whom he suffers to enter into and destroy a herd of swine (chap. viii). He heals a man sick of the palsy, and declares his power on earth to forgive sins. He calls Matthew to be his disciple, declares that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance, and justifies his disciples in not fasting. He heals a woman who had an issue of blood, restores to life the daughter of a ruler, gives sight to two blind men, and speech to a dumb man possessed of a devil (chap. ix). He instructs and sends forth his twelve apostles to preach to Israel (chap. x). John sends two of his disciples to Christ to ascertain whether he is the Messiah. He tells them to tell John what they have seen and heard. He characterizes John, and upbraids the cities where most of his own mighty works had been done, proclaims the intimate relations existing between himself and his Father, and invites the weary and heavy-laden to come to him and find rest (chap. xi). Christ justifies his disciples in plucking and eating corn on the Sabbath day, then heals the withered hand of a man on the Sabbath, and justifies the action. The Pharisees take counsel to destroy him, and he withdraws. He casts the devil out of a man blind and dumb, who speaks and sees. The Pharisees charge Jesus with casting out devils through the prince of the devils,

whereupon he declares that there is no forgiveness for blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, rebukes the people for their wickedness, describes their miserable condition, and affirms that his disciples are his nearest kindred (chap. xii). The parables of the sower, tares, and hidden treasure are delivered. The people are astonished at Christ's doctrines (chap. xiii).

Herod beheads John, on hearing which Christ departs to a desert place, where he feeds five thousand men with a few loaves and fishes. The disciples in crossing the Sea of Galilee meet a storm, in the midst of which Christ appears walking on the water, and rescues them. On arriving at the west coast of the sea, he heals many. He rebukes the hypocrisy of the Pharisees for laying great stress on minor matters, while they violate the great moral principles of the law. He shows what things defile a man, goes into the region of Tyre and Sidon, heals the daughter of a woman of Canaan, and returns to Galilee, where he heals many that are afflicted, and feeds four thousand men with a few loaves and fishes (chaps. xiv, xv).

Christ rebukes the Pharisees and Sadducees, who demand a sign from heaven, warns the disciples to beware of the leaven of these men, commends Peter, upon his expressing faith in his divine character, and foretells his own death and resurrection at Jerusalem. He also shows how he is to be served, and declares that he will reward every one according to his works (chap. xvi). He is transfigured. He heals a lunatic, and pays tribute (chap. xvii). He teaches humility and the duty of forgiveness, treats of marriage, instructs a rich man how to be made perfect, declares the difficulty of a rich man entering the kingdom of God, and makes large promises to those who have forsaken all for him (chaps. xviii, xix). The parable of the labourers in the vineyard is given. Christ rebukes the mother of Zebedee's children for asking great honour for her two sons, and heals two blind men near Jericho (chap. xx).

Christ makes a triumphal entry into Jerusalem. He drives out of the temple the sellers and buyers, and overthrows the tables of the money changers. He curses a fig tree. In the temple the chief priests and the elders dispute with him respecting his authority. He relates the parables of the householder and of the king's son, silences the Herodians who question him respecting paying tribute to Cæsar, refutes the Sadducees, who deny the resurrection, points out the two great commandments, and tests his disciples respecting their knowledge of himself (chaps. xxi, xxii). Christ warns his disciples against the practices of the Pharisees, upon whom he pronounces woes, and remonstrates pathetically with Jerusalem (chap. xxiii). He foretells the destruction of Jerusalem and the great calamities

that shall precede it, and also his coming to judgment, and exhorts his disciples to be faithful. He delivers the parables of the ten virgins and the talents, and describes the judgment of the world (chaps. xxiv, xxv).

The Jews consult to put Christ to death. He is anointed by a woman at Bethany. Judas agrees with the chief priests to betray him for thirty pieces of silver. Christ eats the passover with his disciples, and afterward goes with them to the garden of Gethsemane. He suffers agony in the garden; he is betrayed by Judas, arrested, and brought before Caiaphas, the high priest, who examines him—he is declared worthy of death, and insulted. Peter denies him (chap. xxvi). He is brought before Pilate, who, though declaring him innocent, delivers him to the Jews to be crucified. A description follows of the crucifixion and the events connected with it.

Christ is buried in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathæa, and a guard of soldiers is stationed at the tomb (chap. xxvii). An account of his resurrection, his appearance to his disciples, and the commission which he gives them to preach the gospel to all the nations (chap. xxviii) closes this Gospel.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK.

THE PERSON OF THE EVANGELIST.

THE author of the second Gospel is the "John, whose surname was Mark," to the house of whose mother Peter went when released from prison (Acts xii, 12). From this it appears that he was a resident of Jerusalem, and that his mother was a Christian. He first appears as the companion of Paul and Barnabas in their missionary journey from Antioch to Seleucia, Cyprus, and Perga in Pamphylia, where he left them, and returned to Jerusalem (Acts xii, 25; xiii, 5, 13; xv, 38). He also accompanied Barnabas to Cyprus (Acts xv, 39). This is the last mention of him in the Acts. In Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, written at Rome about A. D. 62, it is said: "Mark, the cousin (*ἀνεψιός*) of Barnabas, saluteth you" (chap. iv, 10). This relationship, in all probability, explains the partiality of Barnabas for him (Acts xv, 37-39). Also in the Epistle to Philemon, written at Rome about A. D. 62, Mark sends salutations (verse 24). It is, therefore, evident that Mark was at Rome while Paul was a prisoner there. Peter, also, in his First Epistle, speaks of "Mark, my son," by which term he seems to designate

nate our evangelist as his spiritual son. This Epistle was written from Babylon, where, according to Josephus, a multitude of Jews lived.¹ It would seem that our evangelist was at that time with Peter in Babylon. It is not improbable that, after Paul wrote to the Colossians and Philemon, Mark left Rome for the East, and joined Peter in the region of Babylon, and then accompanied him to Rome, where they arrived probably some time during A. D. 64-67. Peter was evidently acquainted with Mark (Acts xii, 12). That Mark probably left Rome for the East appears from Colossians iv, 10, where Paul, speaking of him, says: "Touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him." Eusebius remarks: "They say that Mark first established Churches in Alexandria itself."² He seems to place his death in the eighth year of Nero's reign³ (about A. D. 62), as he says that Annianus succeeded him as bishop at that time. But this date of Eusebius is too early. Epiphanius⁴ says that Mark, after he had written his Gospel, was sent into Egypt by Peter. Jerome calls him the first bishop of the Church in Alexandria.

It appears from Papias that he was not an eye-witness of the life of Christ; it is not improbable, however, that he saw Christ during some of the Lord's visits to Jerusalem. But from the facts that he was living in Jerusalem a few years after the crucifixion of Christ, and that he returned there some years after he had accompanied Paul and Barnabas on their missionary tour to Cyprus (Acts xiii, 5, 13), and that he was intimately associated with the apostles and other eyewitnesses of the life of Christ, he had the finest opportunity to become thoroughly acquainted with the Lord's history and doctrines. Indeed, in the circle in which Mark moved the works and teachings of Christ were subjects of daily discussion among the eyewitnesses of his wonderful history.

CHARACTER OF THIS GOSPEL.

The Gospel of Mark does not contain more than two thirds the amount of matter found in Matthew. The principal omissions are the genealogy and birth of Christ, and the events connected with his infancy, contained in Matthew's first two chapters; the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v-vii);

¹ Πληθος ην Ιουδαίων. Antiq., xv, 22. The time of which he here speaks was about B. C. 40. About A. D. 30 or 40 there were also many Jews in Babylon. Antiq., xviii, cap. ix. This Babylon was on the Euphrates, about the site, it seems, of the ancient city. There is no good reason for supposing Babylon in 1 Pet. v, 13 to be the mystic name for Rome.

² Hist. Eccles., lib. ii, cap. xvi.

³ Ibid., ii, 24.

⁴ Hæresis, li, 6.

the larger portion of Christ's address to the twelve apostles, when he sent them to preach (Matt. x); the parable of the king who took account of all his servants (Matt. xviii, 23-34); the parable of the householder and his vineyard (Matt. xx, 1-16); that of the marriage of the king's son (Matt. xxii, 1-14); nearly all Matthew xxiii, and all xxv. On the other hand, he furnishes us with some particulars not found in Matthew or Luke, among which may be mentioned the account of Christ's restoring sight to a blind man at Bethsaida (chap. viii, 22-26), found in no other Gospel; the mention of hired servants in connexion with Zebedee (chap. i, 20); the uncovering (digging up) of the roof to let down the man sick of the palsy (chap. ii, 4); Christ's grief for the hardness of the hearts of the people (chap. iii, 5); Christ's surnaming Simon, Peter, and calling James and John Boanerges, sons of thunder (chap. iii, 16, 17); the attempt to arrest Christ on the ground that he was not in his right mind (chap. iii, 21); the parable of the seed and the blade (chap. iv, 27, 28); the "shining" of our Saviour's garments when he was transfigured, "so as no fuller on earth can white them" (chap. ix, 3); the displeasure of Christ when his disciples rebuked those who brought young children to him (chap. x, 13, 14); the statement that the rich man came running, and kneeled down to Christ (chap. x, 17); the name of the blind beggar Bartimeus, at Jericho (chap. x, 46); the *names* of the apostles who asked Christ respecting the destruction of the temple (chap. xiii, 3); the definite sum, three hundred pence (chap. xiv, 5); the statement respecting a young man with a "linen cloth cast about his naked body" (chap. xiv, 51, 52). In chap. i, 35, Mark says that Christ rose up a "great while before day," in which he corrects the statement of Luke iv, 42, "When it was day;" of Simon, he adds: "the father of Alexander and Rufus" (chap. xv, 21).

These facts sufficiently show that, although Mark made great use of Matthew, following him, indeed, as an authority, yet he possessed independent sources of his own for the history of Christ.¹ And he is thus a valuable witness to the authority of Matthew's Gospel. Although his connexion with Peter was so intimate, he adheres closely to the truth of history, even when it reflects severely upon that great apostle: "But he began to curse and to swear, I know not this man," etc. (chap. xiv, 71). The passage in Matt. xvi, 18: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church," which tends to glorify Peter, is omitted by Mark, when relating the incidents with which it stands connected (chapter viii, 30, 31), but our Saviour's rebuke of him is recorded (verse 33).

Independent
sources used
by Mark.

¹ Hilgenfeld concedes that he is not a mere abbreviator of Matthew. Einl., p. 516.

It is very probable that Mark had, also, before him the Gospel of Luke, but it does not appear that he made much use of it. It is clear that Mark wrote his Gospel for Gentile Christians, for we find him making explanations that would have been unnecessary in writing for Jewish believers: "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashed hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables" (chap. vii, 2-4); "because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath" (chap. xv, 42).

Ewald's theory of the origin of Mark's Gospel is complex and peculiar. He supposes, first, a brief evangelical history; Ewald's theory of this Gospel. secondly, a collection of the discourses of our Saviour made by Matthew, though not entirely void of narrative matter; third, a Gospel written by Mark. This last Gospel, he supposes, was in some way blended with the two preceding works, soon after it was composed, and thus a complete Gospel of Mark was formed, but by whom is uncertain. This last work still passed for the Gospel of Mark, as the basis of the work was his. The oldest form in which this complete Gospel existed, unknown from history, is that in which it lay before the author of our present Matthew, and which was largely used by him. Luke also possessed it, in a still more complete form than we have it now. In the course of time this Gospel lost considerable portions, so that we do not now possess it complete.¹ For such a theory as this there is not the least probability, nor a particle of historical evidence.²

Mark does not always observe the order of time found in Matthew. Chapter v is placed too late.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK, AND THE DATE OF ITS COMPOSITION.

The first witness we have to the genuineness of Mark's Gospel is Testimony of the fathers. Papias,³ bishop of Hierapolis in the first half of the second century. He informs us that John, the presbyter, a

¹ Die Drei Erst. Evang., pp. 57-78. 1871.

² That Mark's Gospel cannot be a combination of other Gospels is evident from certain peculiarities it has. Πορεύομαι, *to go*, occurs twenty-nine times in Matthew forty-nine times in Luke, and in John sixteen times. But nowhere in Mark except in the spurious addition, chap. xvi, 9-20.

³ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. xxxix.

contemporary of the apostles, stated that Mark wrote from the preaching of Peter, whose interpreter he was. A similar statement is made by Clement ¹ of Alexandria, by Irenæus,² Tertullian,³ Origen,⁴ and the fathers in general. This Gospel was universally ascribed to the Mark mentioned in the Acts and in several apostolic Epistles. Nowhere do we find a single dissenting voice in the ancient Church. In the judgment of antiquity respecting its author, modern critics, with rare exceptions, concur. De Wette ⁵ concedes, without any hesitancy, that its author is Mark. Bleek observes: "There is no sufficient ground for denying it to be the composition of the *John Mark* to whom the universal tradition of the Church ascribes it. Much rather does this supposition find its confirmation in several circumstances."⁶ Renan ⁷ considers our Mark to be based on a collection of anecdotes and personal instructions which Mark wrote from the recollections of Peter. He supposes some additions were afterward made to it.

Respecting the time of its composition the earliest testimony is that of Irenæus (about A. D. 180), who states that after the departure of Peter and Paul, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also himself having written down the things preached by Peter, delivered them to us.⁸ By *departure* (ἐξοδος) he evidently means *death*. These two apostles suffered martyrdom under Nero about 67 or 68, so that, according to Irenæus, this Gospel must have been published some time after A. D. 67 or 68. Clement of Alexandria (about A. D. 190 or 200) states that Mark undertook the writing of his Gospel at Rome at the request of many Christians, with the knowledge of Peter, who in no way interfered with it.⁹ But Clement does not say that it was finished and published during Peter's life; so that there is no real discrepancy of time between him and Irenæus. The statement of Clement, as Eusebius informs us,¹⁰ was derived from the most ancient presbyters. To the statements of Irenæus and Clement respecting the date of the composition of this Gospel De Wette offers no objection.¹¹ According to Clement of Alexandria Mark wrote his Gospel, as he had learned from the most ancient presbyters, after Matthew and Luke.

¹ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi, cap. xiv.

² Lib. iii, cap. i.

³ Advers. Marcionem, iv, cap. v.

⁴ Eusebius, II Hist. Eccles., vi, cap. xxv.

⁵ Einleitung, p. 203.

⁶ Einleitung, pp. 334, 335.

⁷ Vie de Jésus, p. 54

⁸ Lib. iii, cap. i, 1.

⁹ Eusebius, II Hist. Eccles., vi, cap. xiv

¹⁰ Eusebius also states: "They say that Peter gave his authority to this Gospel, and approved of its being read in the Churches." He also states that Clement makes this historical relation, which, he says, is confirmed by Papias, ii, 15. It is possible that, in this statement, he has blended what Clement says with accounts from other sources.

¹¹ Einleitung, p. 206.

Bleek places the composition of Mark after Matthew and Luke, some time after the destruction of Jerusalem, and thinks it probable that it was preceded by the Gospel of John, since Mark in some places seems to have used the Gospel of this apostle.¹ But this is contrary to the testimony of antiquity and to the position the Gospel of John holds in the canon in all the Greek manuscripts and in the Peshito-Syriac version, in all of which it stands after the other three. No one would have thought of placing John after Mark had not the latter preceded it in time of composition.

Hilgenfeld places its composition soon after A. D. 81, in the first part of Domitian's reign, "when Mark, if still alive, must have been very old, so that it is possible that the Gospel was called *according to Mark* from him as its voucher, rather than its real author. But in no event was it, indeed, forged."² But what probability is there that Mark would not write until fifteen or twenty years after Peter's death? But, even if written at about A. D. 85, we have no reason for supposing that Mark was too old then to write it himself. The first mention of him is in Acts xii, 12, 25; in the latter passage it is stated that Paul and Barnabas brought Mark with them from Jerusalem to Antioch. This was about A. D. 44, when he may not have been more than twenty-four years old, so that, in A. D. 85, he would be no more than sixty-five, not too old to write a Gospel.

We have already seen that Mark states that Simon, who bore our Saviour's cross, was "the father of Alexander and Rufus" (chap. xv, 21). It appears that these were Christians well known when Mark wrote. Now we find in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, written about A. D. 58, Rufus mentioned as a Roman Christian: "Salute Rufus chosen in the Lord" (chap. xvi, 13). The reference to Rufus in Mark is quite natural, if he wrote shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, but would not be if he had written long after that event.³

There is nothing in Christ's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem (chap. xiii) to indicate that this catastrophe was already past. On the contrary, as given in Mark, it is strikingly similar to Matt xxiv, which was evidently composed before that event. Upon

¹ Einleitung, p. 333.

² Einleitung, pp. 517, 518. Leipzig, 1875.

³ It is hardly necessary to refute the absurd statement of Keim (Geschichte Jesu. p. 37), that Mark's Gospel was written about A. D. 120! Papias in the first half of the second century, as we have already seen, states that the Presbyter John, a contemporary of the apostles, said that Mark wrote from Peter's preaching. But according to Keim, in the time of the Presbyter John this Gospel had no existence but arose in the next century, in the very time of Papias! This is *free thinking* in the literal sense of the word!

the whole, we may conclude that our Gospel was composed some time in A. D. 65-69.

THE PLACE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THIS GOSPEL.

As we have already seen, Clement states that Mark wrote at Rome, and this is implied in the language of the ancient fathers, that he wrote from the preaching of Peter, as it was the universal tradition that the last part of Peter's life was spent at Rome. And that this Gospel was composed there would seem probable from internal grounds.¹ We find in it several Latin words and phrases, e. g., *σπεκουλάτωρ*, *executioner* (chap. vi, 27); *ποιῆσαι τὸ ἰκανόν*, *to do the sufficient*, Latin, *satisfacere, to satisfy* (ch. xv, 15); *κεντυρίων*, *centurion* (ch. xv, 39, 44, 45). There are other Latin words in this Gospel; but, belonging also to some of the other Gospels, even to Matthew, no special stress is to be laid upon them. Nor do we think those we have adduced have any great weight in proving that the book was written at Rome. The mention of the Roman Christian, Rufus, is most naturally explained by the supposition that the Gospel was written there.

At the end of this Gospel in the Peshito-Syriac version it is written: "The end of the holy Gospel, the preaching of Mark, which he spoke and published in Latin in Rome." But the Gospel was certainly written in Greek; at least, we have no proof that it ever had a Latin original.

De Wette,² Bleek,³ and Hilgenfeld⁴ favour the original appearance of this Gospel in Rome.

THE INTEGRITY OF MARK.

The last twelve verses (chap. xvi, 9-20) of this Gospel offer an inexplicable phenomenon, whether we consider their history, their connexion with the rest of the Gospel, or the peculiar character of the text. We find that they have no place in the two oldest Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus, both written about the middle of the fourth century. These two manuscripts end with the words: "For they were afraid." They are wanting in the Latin Codex Bobbiensis of the fifth century, in old manuscripts of the Armenian version, and in some of the manuscripts of the Æthiopic version.

¹ It is probable that Mark interpreted Peter's preaching into Latin for the Roman people.

² De Wette thinks the passage in Mark respecting a woman putting away her husband (chap. x, 12) presupposes the Roman law of divorce. *Einleitung*, p. 205.

³ P. 335.

⁴ Pp. 516, 517.

Tischendorf observes: "The scholia of very many manuscripts bear witness that the Gospel of Mark ended at verse nine in the more ancient and (as many add) in the more accurate copies."¹

According to Eusebius, "This section is not found in all the copies of Mark's Gospel. For the accurate copies contain the end of the history, according to Mark, with the words of the young man who appeared to the woman and said to them, 'Fear not, ye seek Jesus of Nazareth,' and with the following words which he adds, 'and having heard, they fled, and said nothing to any one, for they were afraid.' *In this way end nearly all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark.*"²

Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, in the latter part of the fourth century, observes: "In the more accurate copies the Gospel according to Mark ends with the words, 'For they were afraid.' In some copies these words are added: 'Having risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.'"³ Of great importance is the testimony of Jerome, who, in speaking of verses 9 and 10 of the last chapter, observes: "Either we do not receive the testimony of Mark, *which is found in few Gospels, nearly all the Greek manuscripts lacking this section at the end of the chapter, . . .* or we must reply," etc.⁴ Also, Victor of Antioch, about A. D. 400, remarks that in most copies the last part of the sixteenth chapter, beginning with the ninth verse, was not found.⁵ Tischendorf remarks that "these last verses are recognized neither in the sections of Ammonius, nor in the canon of Eusebius."

On the other hand, the verses in question are found in the Codex Ephræmi of the fifth century, in the Alexandrian manuscript of the last part of the same century, in twelve uncial manuscripts extending from the sixth to about the tenth century, and "in the cursive copies that have been collected." They are also found in the Peshito-Syriac⁶ version of the second century, in copies of the old Latin, in the Latin Vulgate, and in the Memphitic, Gothic,⁷ and Æthiopic versions, and possibly in the Thebaic. The 19th verse is quoted by Iræneus (about A. D. 180): "In the end of his Gospel Mark says: 'And

¹ Editio Octava Critica Major, Lipsiæ, 1869, p. 404.

² Quæstiones Ad Marinum.

³ In Christi Resurrectionem, Orat. ii.

⁴ Aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur evangeliiis, omnibus Græciæ libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus.—Epistola cxx, ad Hedibam, cap. iii.

⁵ In Tregelles' Printed Text, etc., p. 248.

⁶ In Cureton's Fragments of the Gospels in Syriac belonging to the fifth century verses 17-20 of the last chapter of Mark are found.

⁷ The Gothic is defective on these verses; it contains verses 9-11, and ends with the first part of verse 12, "But after this." It doubtless contained originally the rest of the verses.

indeed the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sits on the right hand of God.'"¹ It is uncertain whether Celsus had the disputed verses in his copy of Mark.²

The next question is, What light does the text of the verses in dispute throw upon the subject? First of all, we are struck with the incongruity between the contents of these verses and the statement in the seventh verse: "Tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you." This refers to Christ's promise: "But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee" (Mark xiv, 28). But in the last verses of Mark there is no account of Christ's appearing to the disciples in Galilee in fulfilment of the promise, or the declaration of the angel, that they should see him in Galilee. This is certainly strange if Mark wrote these last verses. Among the signs, which Christ is represented as promising as the attendants upon believers, are the following: "They shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them." Here great stress is laid upon mere external advantages, as the prerogatives of believers indiscriminately. This language was hardly to be expected from Christ.

The last verses and the preceding context

But is the circle of words used in this section the same that is found in the body of Mark's Gospel? Here the answer is decidedly in the negative. We shall give the results of the investigation we have made with the assistance of Schmidt's Greek Concordance. In Mark xvi, 2, "the first day of the week" is called τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, literally, "the one of the Sabbaths" (weeks), used Hebraistically; but in the section under discussion, it is πρώτη σαββάτου, "first of week." In this section we find ἐκείνη, *that*, used for *she*; ἐκείνοι, *those*, for *they*; ἐκείνοις, for *them*, the word occurring *five* times. But Mark never uses the word thus in his genuine Gospel, but always employs it as a demonstrative³ qualifying a noun expressed. Πορεύεσθαι, *to go*, occurs three times in this section, but in the genuine Gospel never. This is very remarkable, as the word occurs twenty-nine times in Matthew, forty-nine times in Luke's Gospel, and sixteen in John's Gospel. In verse 10 the disciples of Christ are called "Those who were with him," which is contrary to the usage of all the Gospels, as they term them μαθηταί, *learners*: it is rather in the style of Xenophon. Θεάομαι, *to see, to behold*, occurs twice in this section, but nowhere in the genuine Gospel, but four times in Matthew, three in Luke, and seven in John.

The last verses compared with the body of Mark's Gospel.

¹ Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. x, sec. 6. ² See Origen Contra Cel., ii, 59, 70.

one instance, however, Mark, for emphasis, uses ἐκείνο after the neuter article with the participle (chap. vii, 20).

In this section of Mark it is used quite classically. Παρακολουθέω, in the sense *to accompany*, occurs in verse 17 of this section, but is found nowhere in the Gospels except in Luke's preface to his Gospel, *to follow up closely, to give diligent heed to*, a thing. And in this sense it is found in 1 Tim. iv, 6 and 2 Tim. iii, 10. The word is found nowhere else in the New Testament. The word used in the New Testament, *to follow, to accompany*, simply, is ἀκολουθέω, which is found nineteen times in Mark, twenty-five in Matthew, seventeen in Luke, and nineteen in John's Gospel. Κύριος, *Lord*, is *twice* used historically for Jesus in this section, which Mark, in his genuine Gospel, never does. Wherever he employs the word it is the language of some one else that he is relating. In speaking of Christ, Mark always calls him Jesus, using the word nearly ninety times. The other evangelists use it a still greater number of times. Nor does Matthew ever in his own person call Christ Lord. Luke and John, however, do in some instances.

All the foregoing linguistic peculiarities of the section seem to prove conclusively that it was not written by Mark. To these considerations, if we add the fact that it seems incongruous with what precedes, and that it is wanting in the most ancient manuscripts of the Gospel, nothing remains but the conclusion that Mark did not write it. It was most probably added to the Gospel in the first century, upon what authority we do not know. The Gospel terminates abruptly at the 8th verse of chapter xvi, without giving the appearances of Christ already foretold. It is incredible that the evangelist should have left his Gospel intentionally in that condition. Something must have interrupted him before completing it, or the manuscript must have lost the concluding verses of the original. No one would have thought of mutilating the Gospel, and the absence in it of the appearances of Christ led some one to add some of them from reliable sources. The appearance to Mary Magdalene appears to have been taken from John xx, 11-18; that to two persons who went into the country, from Luke xxiv, 13-31; the appearance to the eleven (in Jerusalem), from Luke xxiv, 33, etc.

The two great recent critical editors of the Greek Testament, Tischendorf and Tregelles, leave it out of their texts, as not belonging to the original Gospel of Mark. Tregelles remarks, however: "I thus look on this section as an authentic anonymous addition to what Mark himself wrote down from the narration of St. Peter."¹

Among those who favour the genuineness of the disputed section

¹On the Printed Text of the Greek Testament, p. 259.

are, R. Simon, Mill, Wolf, Storr, Matthæi, Eichhorn, Hug, De Wette, Bleek, Olshausen, Ebrard, and J. P. Lange. Among those opposed to the claim of its genuineness may be mentioned Griesbach, Credner, Wiesler, Norton, Reuss, Neudecker, Ewald, and Mangold.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE.

THE PERSON OF THE EVANGELIST.

OF Luke, the author of the third Gospel, but little of a personal character is known. In Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, written at Rome some time after A. D. 60, he says, "Luke, the beloved physician, greets you" (chap. iv, 14). In the Epistle to Philemon, written about the same time and at the same place, he speaks of Luke as one of his fellow-labourers, greeting Philemon. Writing to Timothy from the same place somewhat later, he says, "Only Luke is with me" (2 Tim. iv, 11). Irenæus speaks of Luke as the constant companion of Paul, and his co-labourer.¹

Eusebius states that Luke was a native of Antioch, and a physician by profession.² The same statement is made by Jerome.³ It appears both from the Epistles of Paul and from the Acts of the Apostles—as he uses the term "we"—that he was a companion and assistant of Paul for a long time. From several of Paul's Epistles, already quoted, it is clear that Luke remained some years in Rome after that apostle arrived there (about A. D. 60 or 62). It is uncertain when and where he died. Jerome⁴ says "that he was buried in Constantinople, to which city his bones were brought along with the remains of the Apostle Andrew in the twentieth year of Constantius" (about the middle of the fourth century). But he does not state where he died, and it is not likely that if he had been originally buried in Rome his bones would have been removed from such a splendid city. He may have left Rome after the death of Paul.

Luke was evidently a man of fine Greek culture, as his writings show. It is probable that he was of heathen extraction, as his name⁵

¹iii, cap. xiv, 1.

²Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. iv.

³De Viris Illustribus, cap. vii. Jerome, however, says he was of Antioch (Antiochenus), but does not state in the passage whether he was born there or not.

⁴Ibid., cap. vii.

⁵Λουκάς, a contraction of the Latin Lucanus.

would indicate, but whether he was a proselyte to Judaism before embracing Christianity cannot be determined.

He was every way qualified to write the history of Christ and his apostles. Brought up in the great literary city of Antioch, led by his very profession to be a close observer and to form scientific habits, an extensive traveller, for years a companion of the Apostle Paul, associating with apostles and others who were eyewitnesses of the life of Christ, and he himself having spent about two years in Jerusalem¹ and in other parts of Palestine, where flourishing Christian Churches had been established, many of whose members had themselves seen and heard Christ less than thirty years before, how was he not fully competent to write the history of the Founder of Christianity and the Acts of his Apostles, especially in Jerusalem and in the chief places of the Roman empire?

THE AUTHOR OF THE THIRD GOSPEL AND OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES EVIDENTLY THE SAME PERSON.

The author of the Gospel sets forth the circumstances under which he writes, and the sources of his information. "Since, indeed," says he, "many have undertaken to arrange a narrative of those things which are most firmly believed among us, as those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word delivered them to us, it seemed good to me also, having traced up every thing accurately from the beginning, to write them for you in regular order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mayest know the certainty of the things in which thou hast been instructed" (chap. i, 1-4). In the beginning of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, the author says: "The first treatise I have made, O Theophilus, concerning all things which Jesus began both to do and to teach until the day in which he was taken up, after he through the Holy Spirit had given commands to the apostles whom he had chosen" (chap. i, 1-2). It is evident from this latter passage that the author of the Acts also wrote the Gospel addressed to Theophilus, who appears to have been a distinguished Gentile Christian. The author states in the preface to his Gospel that he derived his information from the eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, and that he had traced up the history from the beginning. It is clear from this that the preface refers to the sources for the history of Christ, and has no reference to the sources for the history of the apostles. For

¹In Acts xx, 5-xxviii, the writer, by using the plural "we" and "us," shows that he accompanied Paul to Jerusalem and to Rome. Paul and Luke abode in Palestine at least two years. Acts xxiv, 27.

“the eyewitnesses and ministers of the word,” are those who were the eyewitnesses of Christ’s life, and the preachers of his doctrines and acts. The history of the actions of the apostles the author derived partly from those who were themselves the chief actors in the scenes, and partly from his own personal knowledge as a companion of the Apostle Paul.

That the author of the Acts was the companion of Paul appears from Acts xvi, 10–17 and xx, 5–xxi, 18; xxvii, xxviii. The writer uses the first person plural for the first time when Paul is at Troas.¹ After Paul “had seen the vision, immediately *we* endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called *us* for to preach the Gospel unto them” (chapter xvi, 10). The writer accompanies Paul to Philippi, and speaks of the party there in the first person plural: “The same followed Paul and us” (chap. xvi, 17). After the arrest of Paul and Silas at Philippi, the first person plural does not again appear until about six years afterward, when Paul, passing through Macedonia on his way to Jerusalem, is accompanied by several fellow-travellers, who, “going before, tarried for *us* at Troas. And *we* sailed away from Philippi,” etc. (chapter xx, 5, 6). After this we find that the writer continues to use the first person plural until he arrives with Paul in Jerusalem, and they visit James (chap. xxi, 18). In the account of the charges brought against Paul at Jerusalem, and his defence, there is no place for the historian to introduce himself, and, accordingly, the first person plural disappears until Paul has appealed to Cæsar, when he again appears in the history: “And when it was determined that *we* should sail into Italy. . . . *we* launched, . . . *we* touched,” etc. This use of the first person plural is continued until Paul arrives in Rome, in whose company the writer places himself by remarking: “When we came to Rome” (chap. xxviii, 16).

It is to be observed that the first person plural ceases first at Philippi, and that when, six years afterward, this same person in company with Paul leaves Philippi, the use of the “we” is resumed (comp. Acts xvi, 17 with xx, 5, 6). Is it not clear from all this that the author of the Acts was the companion of Paul during a great part of his travels?

Here the question arises, Who is this companion of the apostle, the author of the Book of Acts, and also of the third Gospel? Now we know that Luke was Paul’s fellow-labourer, and it appears from the Epistles of Paul, already quoted, that Luke was with him at Rome

¹ Alexandria-Troas, a city on the coast of the Trojan Plains, about seven miles south-east of Tenedos. See Strabo, lib. xiii, 581–616.

some time after A. D. 60. About this time also the companion of Paul in his travels was in Rome, as appears from the Acts, so that it is clear that Luke may have been that companion. Nor is there any thing in the Epistles of Paul, either of a positive or negative character, inconsistent with the hypothesis that Luke was this fellow-traveller. We have seen that in three Epistles of Paul, written from Rome after his arrival there, he calls "Luke the beloved physician" (Col. iv, 14), his "fellow-labourer" (Phil. 24), and speaks of him as the only person with him (2 Tim. iv, 11). Paul and the writer of the Acts, as appears from his use of the first person plural, first met at Troas, and travelled together as far as Philippi, a distance of about one hundred and fifty miles. After this short acquaintance with Paul he does not meet him again until about six years later, when at Philippi he joins¹ Paul, accompanies him to Jerusalem, and afterward to Rome. During both of these periods, when the writer (Luke) was with the apostle, *the latter addressed no Epistles to the Churches*. Is it, then, strange that he does not mention Luke except in some of the Epistles written from Rome? It is true that Paul wrote 2 Corinthians from Macedonia, after he had become acquainted with Luke, but the apostle does not give the names of any persons who salute the Corinthians, but in a general term he says, "All the saints salute you."

Bleek supposes that Timothy was the writer of the sections in which the first person plural is used, but this is refuted by *Bleek's theory* the history itself, in which the "we" and the "us" exclude him. In chap. xx, 4-6 it is stated: "There accompanied him (Paul) Sopater, son of Pyrrhus, of Berea; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus. These, going before, tarried for us at Troas. And we sailed away from Philippi,"² etc. Here the party to which Timothy belonged stands in contrast with the "us" and "we." After Paul, Silas, and Timothy leave Philippi and pass through Macedonia as far as Berea, Paul leaves his two companions and passes by Athens on his way to Corinth, where they afterward join the apostle, who labours there a year and a half; and in his two Epistles to the Thessalonians, written from Corinth, Silvanus (Silas) and Tim-

¹ It is not improbable, however, that the author of the Acts may have seen Paul in the visit to Macedonia a few months before (Acts xx, 1-3).

² We follow here the eighth critical edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament, which is supported by the Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, the oldest texts. Tregelles, in his critical edition, retains ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας, "as far as Asia," but puts it in brackets. In the fifth verse, "these going before" is, in Tischendorf's edition, οἱ δὲ προελθόντες; in Tregelles, the same, except that he has προσ- instead of προ-ελθόντες.

othy are named with himself as addressing them. But in Acts xvii-xix the writer, in speaking of Paul, Silas, and Timothy, does not use the first person plural; hence Timothy cannot be included in the "we" in other parts of the book. Besides, the account of Paul's labours in connexion with those of Silas and Timothy is, for the apostle's sojourn of eighteen months in Corinth, exceedingly meagre. This is hardly consistent with the supposition that Timothy wrote memoirs of the apostolic labours in those regions which were made the basis of his history by the author of the Acts. We also find the missionary journey of Paul and Timothy through Phrygia and Galatia as far as Troas despatched in a few verses (chapter xvi, 4-8). Of this journey it seems that Timothy wrote no memoirs. But how minute is the history into which the "we" enters! How circumstantially is the voyage to Rome described! No one can doubt that the writer was in the very midst of the scenes. Nor do we find any mention of Timothy as having accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, and yet a less important man, Aristarchus, is named as sailing away with Paul from Cæsarea (chap. xxvii, 2).

It is quite certain, then, that Timothy was not with Paul at Jerusalem, and must be excluded also in this case from the "we."

Equally untenable is Schwanbeck's hypothesis that Silas is the writer who speaks in the first person plural. He is first mentioned in Acts xv, 22, along with Judas, as "chief men among the brethren;" it is not likely that he furnished this statement. In the missionary journeys made by Paul and Silas we can find nothing to indicate that the latter wrote memoirs of them. We find no indications that he was with Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem and voyage to Rome. In none of the Epistles, written from Rome by Paul after his arrival, is there any mention of Silas (or Silvanus). But the idea that the author of the Acts found memoirs of the labours of Paul and his companions, and struck out the first person plural in some places, and allowed "we" and "us" to stand in others, in such a way that readers for more than seventeen centuries have supposed it to be the author of the book who thus speaks, is incredible. All this done, too, in such a manner that after the "we" disappears from the history, after six years, it appears again on the stage! Nor is it to the point to assert that in the Middle Ages writers sometimes incorporated into their books fragments from other authors without adapting them to the rest of their work. The *first* century was far removed in its literary characteristics from the Middle Ages. Where can we find such usage as this in the apostolic age? Who doubts that Herodotus and Strabo, when they say "we" in their histories, actually describe

Silas not included in the "we."

what they themselves heard, saw, or did? Or are we to suppose that they are silently inserting the documents of others?

Hilgenfeld acknowledges that the sections in which 'we' occurs were written by Luke, in which he says Overbeck agrees with him. But then he makes the author of the Acts a different person from Luke. But the most complete refutation of the theory that the author of the sections in which the writer uses the first person plural is another person than the author of the Acts and the third Gospel, is furnished by the unity of the book of Acts and the entire similarity of language in it and the Gospel.¹ As examples of the peculiar use of words in these books may be noticed ἡ ὁδός, *the way*, used for the *Christian religion*, Acts ix, 2; xix, 9, 23; xxii, 4; xxiv, 14, 22. Such a use of the word as this is found nowhere else in the New Testament. Ὀδυνάομαι, *to be in pain*, occurs in Luke ii, 48; xvi, 24, 25, and in Acts xx, 38; nowhere else in the New Testament. Ὀμιλέω, *to converse with*, occurs only in Luke xxiv, 14, 15; Acts xx, 11; xxiv, 26. Ὁμοθυμαδόν, *of one accord*, is found eleven times in the Acts, from chaps. i, 14 to xix, 29; nowhere else except Romans xv, 6. In giving the name of a person, the usage in Acts is to add ὄνόματι, *by name*; this occurs twenty-one times, from chaps. v, 1 to xxviii, 7. In the Gospel of Luke it is used five times. It is a peculiarity of the Acts that an adjective has frequently a negative particle prefixed to assert strongly the opposite: οὐ μετρίως, *not moderately*, chap. xx, 12; οὐκ ὀλίγος, *not a little*, chaps. xii, 18; xiv, 28; xv, 2; xvii, 4, 12; xix, 23, 24; xxvii, 20; οὐ πολλοί, *not many*, Luke xv, 13; Acts i, 5; οὐ πολὺ, *not long*, Acts xxvii, 14; οὐ μακράν, *not far*, Luke vii, 6; Acts xvii, 27; οὐκ ἄσημος, *not undistinguished*, chap. xxi, 39; οὐχ ἡ τυχοῦσα, *not a chance or common thing*, Acts xix, 11; xxviii, 2. After the verb εἶπον, *to say*, the *dative* case is used with scarcely an exception in Matthew and Mark, and in John with but few exceptions, without a preposition, but in the Gospel of Luke and in the Acts a very common usage is to put πρὸς after it with the accusative. Καταγγέλλω, *to announce*, is used ten times in Acts iv, 2-xxvi, 23; but only seven times in all the rest of the New Testament. Εὐλαβής, *pious, devout*, found in Luke ii, 25; Acts ii, 5; viii, 2, xxii, 12; nowhere else in the New Testament. Εὐαγγελίζομαι, *to preach the Gospel*, occurs ten times in Luke and fifteen times in Acts; it is found once in Matthew; nowhere else in the Gospels, though in other books of the New Testament. Τῇ ἐχομένῃ, *on the next day*, Luke xiii, 33; Acts xx, 15; with ἡμέρα expressed, Acts xxi, 26. This

¹ Lekebusch devotes more than forty pages of his work, *Die Composition und Entstehung der Apostel Geschichte*, in illustration of this point

usage is found nowhere else in the New Testament. Ἐνισχύω, *to strengthen*, found only in Luke xxii, 43, and in Acts ix, 19. Μὲν οὖν, occurs twenty-five times in all parts of the Acts, once in Luke, and *five* times only in all the rest of the New Testament.

A peculiarity of the language of Acts and of the Gospel of Luke is the use of the accusative with the infinitive after ἔγενετο, *it came to pass*, e. g., ἔγενετο . . . διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διασπορίμων. Luke vi, 1; vi, 6; xvi, 22; Acts iv, 5; ix, 3, 32, 37, 43; x, 25; xiv, 1; xxi, 1, 5; xxii, 6; xxvii, 44; xxviii, 8, 17. Outside of these two books, this construction seems to be found only in Mark ii, 23. Winer¹ regards this construction as an imitation of the Hebrew יָרַד, *and it came to pass*.

The use of τοῦ with the infinitive to express a purpose, as, εἰσῆλθε τοῦ μένειν σὺν αὐτοῖς, *he came in to remain* with them (Luke xxiv, 29), occurs both in the Gospel of Luke and in the Acts; and Winer² observes, "This construction is especially peculiar to Luke (and Paul)."

The foregoing are but a portion of the linguistic peculiarities of the Gospel of Luke and of all parts of the Acts, running through the sections in which the first person plural "we" and "us" occur. They establish the unity of the authorship of the Acts beyond any doubt, and at the same time show that the author of the Acts was also the author of the Gospel, and that he was a companion of Paul, and spent about two years in Jerusalem and in other parts of Palestine, was acquainted with the Apostle James and many others who had seen and heard Christ, and that his Gospel rests upon the most solid foundation as an authentic history of Jesus Christ.

Lekebusch truly observes that "an unprejudiced critic must be convinced that through the entire Acts of the Apostles, and partly also through the Gospel (of Luke) in general, The opinion of Lekebusch and Ewald. the same kind of language and method of representation

runs, and therefore our book, independent of written sources in general, is an original work that has flowed from a single pen. For when the same expressions everywhere recur, when a great series of words which appear only in the Gospel and in the Acts, or at least comparatively very seldom in the rest of the New Testament writings, uniformly recur in all parts; if definite forms of words, peculiarities of connexion, construction, and phraseology, even entire sentences, recur in the different sections, we can no longer think of a composition of pre-existing written documents belonging to different authors; and it is established 'without doubt that we must consider our writing as the work of one author who has impressed upon it a definite style and literary stamp.'³ (Zeller)."

¹ New Test. Diction., 339, Eng. Trans.

² Ibid., 341.

³ Die Composition und Entstehung der Apostel Geschichte, Gotha, 1854, p. 79.

Ewald¹ also expresses his conviction that Luke was the author of both the third Gospel and the Acts; that he was the companion of Paul, and is included in the "we" and "us" of the writer of the Acts. Similar are the views of Schneckenburger, Meyer, Klostermann, Holtzmann, and Mangold.

Rénan has expressed himself very clearly on the same side. "In THE OPINION OF respect to Luke," says he, "there is little possibility RÉNAN. doubt. The Gospel of Luke is a regular composition based upon previous documents. It is the work of a man who selects, prunes, combines. The author of the Gospel is certainly the same as that of the Acts of the Apostles. Now the author of the Acts appears to be a companion of St. Paul, a title which perfectly suits Luke. I know that more than one objection can be made to this reasoning; but one thing, at least, is beyond doubt, that the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is a man of the second apostolic generation, and that is sufficient for our object."²

In the ancient Church there never was any doubt that Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote the third Gospel. We have already seen the testimonies of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and others, upon this point. We have also seen that Marcion, about A. D. 138 or 140, abridged this Gospel, and made it, along with ten of Paul's Epistles—which he selected and more or less curtailed—his Canon of Scripture. It is very evident that he selected the Gospel of Luke because it was well known that this evangelist was a companion of Paul. No other reason can be assigned for his preference.

In all the ancient manuscripts, in the ancient versions, this Gospel bears the name of Luke. In the Canon of Muratori (about A. D. 160) it is attributed to Luke the companion of Paul. Its genuineness is in every respect entirely unassailable.³

THE DATE OF ITS COMPOSITION.

We have already seen that Clement of Alexandria states that the ANCIENT TESTIMONIES AS TO THE DATE. Gospels which contain the genealogies were written first, which fact he had learned from the most ancient presbyters. Irenæus states that Luke wrote after the departure of Peter and Paul, by which he seems to refer to the death of these apostles. It does not appear that Luke, when he wrote, was acquainted with the Gospel of Matthew, which was written some time after A. D. 61. As Matthew was written in Syro-Chaldee in

¹ Die Drei Erst. Evang. und Apostel Geschichte. Zweite hälfte, pp. 30-47

² Vie de Jésus, p. xlix. Paris, 1867.

³ Even De Wette concedes its genuineness without hesitancy.

Paestine, and Luke was at Rome about that time, it is easy to see how the Gospel of Matthew would be unknown to him if he wrote soon after that apostle.

In his preface Luke speaks of the attempts of many to set forth a regular history of the teachings and actions of Christ. But Matthew in all probability is not included among them. He clearly states that he had derived his materials from the eyewitnesses of Christ's life, and makes no reference to information derived from written documents, of which he stood in no special need.

As the Acts of the Apostles ends with the statement concerning Paul that he "dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him," it was generally inferred that the Acts must have been written at the end of those two years, otherwise no good reason could be assigned for the abrupt termination of the history in that way. The Gospel must, in that case, have been written still earlier. Distinguished modern critics do not generally coincide in that view. De Wette,¹ Bleek,² and Lekebusch,³ place it after the destruction of Jerusalem. Rénan remarks: "The date of this Gospel can be determined with sufficient exactness from considerations drawn from the book itself. The twenty-first chapter of Luke, inseparable from the rest of the work, was certainly written after the siege of Jerusalem, but not very long after."⁴

Ewald⁵ places this Gospel a little after A. D. 75; Baur, some time after A. D. 70.⁶ On the other hand, Tholuck⁷ thinks it was probably written by Luke while with Paul in Jerusalem and Cæsarea (about A. D. 58-60). Ebrard⁸ places it at the end of A. D. 63;⁹ Olshausen, before A. D. 66.

The probabilities seem decidedly in favour of a date preceding the

¹ P. 208.

² Einleitung, p. 320.

³ Apostelges., p. 422.

⁴ Vie de Jésus, pp. xlix, l.

⁵ Die Drei Erst. Evang. Zweite Hälfte, p. 47.

⁶ Die Drei Erst. Jahrhundert., p. 73.

⁷ Glaubwürd. Evang. Geschich., p. 139.

⁸ Wissen. Kritik. der Evang. Geschichte, p. 1,038. 3te Aufg.

⁹ Hilgenfeld places the Gospel near the end of the first century; Keim about 100 or later; Zeller some time in A. D. 110-130. Hilgenfeld and Zeller—perhaps, also, Keim—thus deny that Luke, the companion of Paul in the Acts, wrote this Gospel. But we have already shown that the uniformity of language in the Gospel, and in all parts of the Acts, demonstrate that the author of the Gospel was this companion. How could Marcion, about A. D. 138 or 140, have selected this Gospel as containing the most authentic teachings of Christ, if it had not come into existence until 100-130 in his own lifetime? About the same time it was used by Justin Martyr as having been written by a companion of the apostles.

Written before the fall of Jerusalem. destruction of Jerusalem, most likely during the imprisonment of Paul in Rome about A. D. 63. It is very probable that Luke collected materials for his Gospel and the first part of the Acts while he was with Paul in Jerusalem and Cæsarea (about 58-60).

Luke must have written down the incidents when they occurred, and the speeches when made, as recorded in Acts xx, 5-xxviii; especially the incidents in chaps. xxvii and xxviii. And this was done, in all probability, with the intention of writing the Acts of the Apostles in connexion with the history of Christ. Now what motive could there be for the postponement of the publication of the history of the Apostles, especially as he had already written a large portion of it? And no reason can be assigned why Luke should conclude the history of Paul at the end of his two years' imprisonment without stating whether he was released, or making any reference to the result of his appeal to Cæsar. Of course, the composition of the Gospel preceded that of the Acts. Nor is there any thing in the Gospel of Luke that requires it to be placed after the destruction of Jerusalem. Luke speaks in his preface of many persons having attempted to write the history of our Lord; but this does not necessarily imply that more than thirty years had elapsed since the manifestation of Christ. It would be strange, indeed, if a considerable number of persons had not within that period written of these wonderful events which had occurred within their own time, especially in an age of so much literary activity.

In Christ's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, it is said the Jews "shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (chap. xxi, 24). But this is scarcely more definite than what is found in Matt. xxii, 7, in the parable of the marriage of the king's son: "He (the king) sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city." Similar also is Matt. xxi, 41. Luke also represents Christ as weeping over Jerusalem when he drew near and beheld the city, and as uttering the prediction that Jerusalem would be utterly destroyed by her enemies (chap. xix, 41-44). Are these tears and this prophecy Luke's own manufacture?

Matthew also states that Christ foretold, "There shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down" (chap. xxiv, 2). But there is nothing in Luke respecting the Romans, no allusion to the city's having been already taken; but, on the contrary, there are passages in Christ's teachings, as recorded by him, which would have required an explanation from the evangelist, if he had

written only a few years after the destruction of Jerusalem—passages, indeed, that he would never then have written unless constrained by the force of truth. For after Christ predicts his own coming in glory, with its attendant circumstances, he adds: "Verily I say unto you. *This generation* shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled" (chap. xxi, 32). It is to no purpose that Hilgenfeld tells us that a generation may be seventy¹ years; for Christ says, *this generation, the people now living*. Parallel with this, and explanatory, is Luke ix, 27: "But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." And we find that the evangelists do give explanations of Christ's sayings that were misunderstood or needed explanation. As examples, may be cited John ii, 21; xxi, 22, 23; Mark iii, 30.

The Gospel of Luke was most probably written at Rome. Jerome,² however, says that he composed it in the regions of Achaia and Bœotia. But the lateness of this testimony destroys much of its value.³

CONTENTS OF LUKE COMPARED WITH THOSE OF MATTHEW.

The Gospel of Luke is about a hundred verses longer than that of Matthew. The chief additions to what we have in the latter evangelist are the following: An account of the Matter in Luke not in Matthew. birth of John the Baptist; several particulars respecting the birth of Christ and his circumcision in the temple; incidents that occurred when he was twelve years of age; the date at which John the Baptist commenced his ministry; the age of Christ at his baptism; his descent from Adam (chaps. i, 5—iii, 2, 23—38); the indignation of the people in the synagogue of Nazareth against Christ, and their attempt to destroy him; his casting a devil out of a man in the synagogue (chap. iv, 23—30, 33—36); the raising of the widow's son at Nain (chap. vii, 11—17); several particulars respecting the anointing of Christ by a woman (chap. vii, 36—50); the casting of seven devils out of Mary Magdalene (chap. viii, 2); Christ's rebuke of James and John, who wished him to call down fire from heaven upon the Samaritans who would not receive him on his way to Jerusalem (chap. ix 52—56); the sending of seventy disciples to

¹ Herodotus says: "Three generations of men are a hundred years" (ii, 142). Thucydides seems to have held the same view (i, 14). Matthew reckons not greatly different, the step from father to son, fourteen generations from the Babylonian captivity to Christ (i, 17).

² Comment. in Mat. Prologus.

³ The superscription to this Gospel in the Peshito-Syriac version is, "The Holy Gospel, the preaching of Luke, the evangelist, which he spoke and published in Greek in great Alexandria."

preach (chap. x, 1-20); the parable of the good Samaritan (chap. x, 30-37); the account of Martha and Mary (verses 38-42); the description of the foolish rich man (chap. xi, 16-21); the statement respecting the slaughtering of the Galileans by Pilate, and the killing of eighteen men by the falling of the tower at Siloam, and the inferences to be drawn from the occurrences (chap. xiii, 1-5); the parable of the barren fig tree; the releasing of a woman from an infirmity of eighteen years' standing (chap. xiii, 6-17); Christ's advice to men when bidden to a festival to take the lowest seats, and when making a feast to call in the poor, the maimed, and the blind; the parable of the builder and the war-making king (chap. xiv, 7-14; 28-33); the parable of the lost pieces of silver; of the prodigal son (chap. xv, 8-32); the parable of the unjust steward (chap. xvi, 1-12); the rich man and Lazarus (chap. xvi, 19-31); the healing of ten lepers by Christ on his way to Jerusalem (chap. xvii, 11-19); the importunate widow, the Pharisee and Publican (chap. xviii, 1-14); Zaccheus the publican; the lamentation of Christ over Jerusalem when he comes within sight of the city, and his prediction of its utter destruction (chap. xix, 2-9, 41-44); the widow's mite (chap. xxi, 2); the strife of the apostles at the last supper respecting the pre-eminence, and Christ's rebuke of them (chap. xxii, 24-32); Christ's address to the women while he was on the cross (ch. xxiii, 28-31); the penitent thief (chap. xxiii, 40-43); several particulars respecting the resurrection of Christ, especially his appearance to two of the disciples on their way to and at Emmaus, and to the eleven at Jerusalem, and his ascension to heaven (chap. xxiv).

The principal *omissions* in Luke of what is found in Matthew are the following: The visit of the Magi; the flight of Joseph and Mary with the infant Saviour into Egypt; the slaughter of the infants (chap. ii); the sermon on the mount (chaps. v-vii), though the greatest part of this is found scattered through Luke, and a large portion is contained in chapter vi, 20-49; the parable of the tares; the treasure hid in a field; the net cast into the sea (Matt. xiii, 24-30, 36-50); the storm at sea in which the disciples are in great danger, and in the midst of which Christ comes to them walking upon the water (Matt. xiv, 20-33); the complaint made against the disciples for eating with unwashed hands, and Christ's rebuke of the hypocrisy of the Jews; the healing of the daughter of the woman of Canaan (chap. xv, 1-28); Christ's promise to Peter, "Upon this rock I will build my church," etc. (chap. xvi, 18, 19); the tribute money paid by Christ (chap. xvii, 24, 27); the parable of the king and his servants (chap. xviii, 23-35); nearly all Christ's remarks on marriage (chap. xix, 3-12); the parable of the

Matter not in Luke, but in Matthew.

vineyard (chap. xx, 1-16); the parable of the ten virgins (chap. xxv 1-13); the description of the last judgment (chap. xxv, 31-46); the watch placed at the sepulchre of Christ (chap. xxvii, 62-66); the report of the Jews that the disciples stole away Christ's body while the guards slept; the appearance of Christ to the eleven disciples in Galilee (chap. xxviii, 11-18).

THE DESIGN OF LUKE'S GOSPEL.

Luke himself, in the preface, states his purpose in writing the Gospel, that Theophilus might know the certainty of the things in which he had been instructed. At the same time it cannot be doubted that Luke intended his Gospel for general circulation as an authentic history of Christ.

The early fathers regarded Luke as writing the Gospel preached by Paul. But whatever influence this apostle had over him, and however intimate they were, Luke did not derive the material of his narrative from Paul, although he doubtless obtained from him many facts for the Book of Acts. Paul's account of the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's supper (1 Cor. xi, 24, 25) corresponds more closely with the account in Luke (chap. xxii, 19, 20) than either with that of Matthew or Mark.

In Luke xxi, 24, in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, it is said that it "shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Quite similar to the latter part of this is Romans xi, 25: "Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in."

Baur, in accordance with his theory of irreconcilable differences between Peter and Paul respecting the law of Moses, asserts that Luke's Gospel shows "its Pauline character," in knowing nothing of the identity of the doctrine of Jesus with the law and with the Old Testament, as it is maintained in the Gospel of Matthew.¹ But in the sermon on the mount in Matthew, Christ revokes the teachings of Moses in various passages. Also in Matt. viii, 11, 12, it is declared that "many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." The parables in Matt. xxi, 33-43, and in xxii, 1-14, refer to the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles. Christ, in Matt. xi, 13, says: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John," which clearly indicates a change of dispensation. But the most complete refutation of Baur and his followers is Luke xvi, 17: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass

Considered by the fathers to be a Pauline Gospel.

Baur's theory refuted.

¹ Die Drei Erst. Jahr., p. 74. Dritte Ausgabe. Tübingen, 1863.

than one tittle of the law to fail."¹ How closely does this resemble Matt. v, 17, 18!

Baur also represents Luke as depreciating the other apostles, especially Peter, to make Paul more prominent. But this charge is utterly groundless. Luke, it is true, omits the declaration of Christ to Peter, "Upon this rock I will build my church," etc. (Matthew xvi, 18, 19). But Mark, the intimate friend and companion of Peter, also omits this passage. Did he do this to depreciate Peter? Luke, however, gives Peter's confession of faith in Christ, and omits a passage which is depreciatory of Peter, but which is found both in Matthew and Mark: "Get thee behind me, Satan," says Christ to Peter. Both Matthew and Mark state that Peter, when he denied Christ, "began to curse and to swear." Luke omits this, but hardly to detract from Peter. He also omits what is recorded by Matthew (xiv, 28-31), Peter's beginning to sink into the sea for want of faith. Nothing but the most obstinate prejudice can charge Luke with an intention of detracting from Peter.

THE STATEMENT OF LUKE RESPECTING THE TAXING UNDER CYRENIUS (CHAP. II, 1, 2).

"And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled. And this enrolment was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria."

It appears from Tacitus that Augustus Cæsar had written with his own hand in a book "the number of citizens and allies in arms, how many fleets he had, how many kingdoms, provinces, tribute, or revenues,"² etc. Cassiodorus,³ in the sixth century, states that "in the times of Augustus the Roman world was divided into domains, and described by a census." Suidas states that "Augustus Cæsar, the emperor, selected twenty of the best men, and of the best character, and sent them over all the land of his subjects, by whom he made a census, both of men and property,"⁴ etc. Dion Cassius, who wrote of Roman affairs in

¹ This is the reading of the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian Codices, of the Peshito-Syriac version, old Latin MSS. of fourth and fifth centuries, Memphitic about A. D. 200, and also of the Gothic, and it appears to be found in all the manuscripts and versions. How futile it is, then, for Baur and Hilgenfeld to prefer a reading which, instead of "the law," substitutes "my words," referring them to Christ, which, they say, Marcion had. But as Marcion rejected the Old Testament, he could not allow the text in Luke to stand, but must have altered it, or dropped it, as he did other parts of Luke which did not suit him.

² Cum proferrî libellum recitarique jussit . . . quantum civium sociorumque in armis: quot classes, regna, provinciæ, tributa, aut neccigalia, etc.—Annal., lib. i, cap. xi.

³ Variarum, liber iii, epistola lii.

⁴ Article, Ἀπογραφή.

first part of the third century, states that Augustus, for the purpose of raising revenue, "sent men to take a census (*ἀπογραφομένους*) of the property of individuals and of the cities."¹ There can, then, be no doubt that Augustus Cæsar took a census of the empire, and it is very probable, independent of Luke's authority, that a census of Judea was taken in the latter part of the reign of Herod the Great, about the time that Christ was born. Herod, having marched an army into Arabia to redress injuries he had received from plunderers, was so misrepresented to Augustus that, Josephus says, the emperor wrote him a bitter letter, the substance of which was that "he had formerly treated him as a friend, but now he will treat him as a subject."² After this Herod sent splendid gifts to Augustus, which he sent back to Herod without taking any notice of them,³ "and he was compelled to submit to all the injuries which he (the emperor) offered him." Sometime after this, and about the date when Christ was born, we find Josephus stating, "that *the whole Jewish nation took an oath* that they would assuredly bear good-will to Cæsar, and to the king's estate, but these men (the Pharisees) did not take the oath, being over six thousand, and they were fined by the king."⁴

Two points, then, seem clearly established, that Augustus took a census of the empire, and that about the time Christ was born there was a registration of the Jewish people proceeding from him.

The next point to be considered is, in what way Cyrenius (Quirinius) was related to it? After the banishment of Archelaus, ethnarch of Judea, Samaria and Idumea (about A. D. 6), Judea became a Roman province, and was annexed to Syria, and Cyrenius was sent as governor of Syria, and took a census of the whole province. This census was made, according to Josephus, in the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium⁵ (B. C. 31), consequently A. D. 6 or 7. It is to this census that Luke refers in Acts v, 37: "After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing" (census). To this man, also, Josephus refers as attempting to raise a sedition among the Jews during the census of Cyrenius. He calls him Judas the Galilean, and Gaulanite.⁶

It is very evident, then, that Luke was acquainted with this census, and it is also clear that he does not refer to it in his Gospel (chap. ii, 2). The most natural rendering of the passage is: "This census was the first of Cyrenius, the

The relation of Cyrenius to the census.

Proper rendering of chapter ii, 2.

¹ Lib. lvi, cap. 28.

² Antiq., xvi, 9.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Παντός γοῖν τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βεβαιώσαντος δι' ὄρκων ἢ μὴν εὐνοῆσαι Καίσαρι, καὶ τοῖς βασιλέως πράγμασι, ἵδτε οἱ ἄνδρες οὐκ ὤμοσαν, ὄντες ἕπερ ἑξακισχίλιοι· καὶ αὐτοῦ, βασιλέως ζημιώσαντος χρήμασιν.—Antiquities, lib. xvii, cap. ii, 4.

⁵ Antiq., xviii, cap. ii, 1.

⁶ Ibid., xviii, cap. i, 1, 6.

governor of Syria.”¹ From this it is evident that Luke regards the census made at the birth of Christ as being earlier than that made after the banishment of Archelaus. But was Cyrenius governor of Syria at the birth of Christ? Augustus Zumpt, in his list of the governors of Syria, which Merivale adopts in his History of the Romans under the Empire,² makes Cyrenius (Quirinius) proconsul of Syria *twice*; first, from B. C. 4 to 1, and from A. D. 6 to 11. He was thus proconsul or governor of Syria for the first time about the time of Christ's birth. At all events there is nothing improbable in Cyrenius having been associated with Saturninus, or some other proconsul, in enrolling the Jewish people at the time of the birth of Christ, although he may not have been governor at that time, just as we might speak of *President Grant's* capture of Vicksburg.

Tholuck³ proposed to translate the *πρώτη*, first, *before*, and render the passage: “This census was made *before* Cyrenius was governor of Syria.” This use of *πρώτη* for *πρότερα*, is not without examples. So translated it would distinguish the census at the birth of Christ from the well-known one that occurred about ten years later. But this rendering of the passage is not to be favoured, since it is not quite natural, though it is adopted by so great a scholar as Ewald.⁴

The chief point in the history is the fact of the census at the time of Christ's birth. Less important is the officer who had charge of it. But there is no reason to question the accuracy of Luke upon this point. The accurate knowledge which he shows every-where in the Acts respecting Greek and Roman history and geography is very remarkable, and should inspire us with confidence in his statements, though unconfirmed by other testimonies.

THE STATEMENT OF LUKE RESPECTING LYSANIAS.

In Luke iii, 1, in a statement of the different rulers who held office in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, when John the Baptist began to preach, it is added: “And Lysanias being the tetrarch of Abilene.” Josephus mentions a Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene, put to death about B. C. 36 by Antony to gratify Cleopatra.⁵ But he names no Lysanias as tetrarch about the time that Christ began his ministry, and Strauss has regarded this *second* Lysanias of Luke as a fiction. A few years ago, however, an inscription was found near Baalbec, “containing a dedication of a memorial tablet or statue

¹ The Greek is, “Αυτὴ ἀπογραφὴ ἐγένετο πρώτη ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου.

² Vol. vi, 261. ³ Glaubwürdig. der Evan. Gesch., pp. 178–188. Zweite Auflage

⁴ He translates, “This census took place much earlier than the time when Quirinius was governor”—Geschich. Christus und sein. Zeit., p. 205.

⁵ Antiq., xv, cap. iv, 1

to ' Zenodorus, son of the tetrarch Lysanias, and to Lysanias, her children ' by (apparently)," says Rawlinson, "the widow of the first and the mother of the second Lysanias. Zenodorus was already known as having succeeded the first Lysanias in his government. It is thus clear that there were, as previously suspected, two persons of the name, a father and a son, and there is not the slightest reason for doubting St. Luke's statement, that the latter was tetrarch of Abilene in the fifteenth of Tiberius."¹ Renan,² while remarking that the mention of Lysanias by Luke may be an error, yet says, "The accuracy of the evangelist on this point can be defended." The Lysanias of Luke is, doubtless, the ruler of that name mentioned by Josephus, who states that Claudius Cæsar "bestowed upon Agrippa the tetrarchy of Philip, and Batanæa, and gave him also Trachonitis with Abila (Abilene). This had been the tetrarchy of Lysanias."³



CHAPTER XVII.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN.

THE APOSTLE JOHN.

JOHN the beloved disciple was a son of Zebedee, and, it would seem, a younger brother of James, as he is, with scarcely an exception, named after James.⁴ It appears from a comparison of Matthew xxvii, 56 with Mark xv, 40, that his mother was Salome. When called by Christ at the beginning of his ministry to follow him, John was engaged in fishing in the sea of Galilee, with his brother James and his father Zebedee (Matt. iv, 21; Mark i, 19). As mention is made of their hired servants (Mark i, 20), it appears that they conducted the fishing business on quite a large scale, and they may have possessed considerable property. Our Saviour gave him and his brother James the name of Boanerges—*Sons of Thunder*—on account, it is to be supposed, of their demonstrative power and impetuosity.⁵ He was one of the three

Notices of John
in the New
Testament.

¹ Prof Rawlinson's Lecture on Modern Scepticism, pp. 301, 302. He refers to Kraft's Topografie Jerusalems. Inscript. 29.

² Vie de Jésus, lxxxiv. He refers to Mission de Phénicie, p. 317, etc.

³ Antiq., xx, cap. vii, 1.

⁴ This James was put to death by Herod Agrippa about A. D. 45. Acts xii, 2.

⁵ Their wish to have fire called down from heaven upon the unkind Samaritans (Luke ix, 52) may be cited as an instance of this.

disciples who enjoyed the greatest intimacy with Christ. In company with Peter and James he witnessed his transfiguration; in his agony in the garden of Gethsemane Jesus had with him Peter, James, and John only. It is very probable that John was one of the two disciples mentioned in John i, 40. He sat next to Christ at table, and was said to lean upon his bosom or breast (John xiii, 23, 25; xxi, 20), and is called the disciple whom Jesus loved (John xiii, 23; xix, 26; xx, 2; xxi, 7, 20). He is, doubtless, the disciple who followed Jesus after his arrest, and went into the palace of the high priest, and brought in Peter (chap. xviii, 15, 16). He was at the cross when Christ was crucified (chap. xix, 35), and took the mother of Jesus thence to his own home (chap. xix, 27). After the resurrection of Jesus he appears in the Acts of the Apostles in the account of the healing of the lame man by Peter and himself (chaps. iii, iv), and in the mission to Samaria, to which Peter and himself were sent. After preaching the Gospel to a large portion of the Samaritans, they both returned to Jerusalem (chap. viii, 14-25). After this John disappears from the Acts. From Paul's Epistle to the Galatians it is seen that when that apostle visited Jerusalem about A. D. 52 John was still there, and he is classed with Peter and James "as being considered pillars" (chapter ii, 9) in the Church. When Paul went to Jerusalem about A. D. 58, in company with Luke, they went in unto James (Acts xxi, 18), but no mention is made of John. This, however, does not prove that he was not in Jerusalem—still less that he was not in Palestine.

John probably left Palestine and took up his abode in Ephesus a short time before the Jewish war. For it is not at all likely that he was in Ephesus while Paul abode there (A. D. 54-57). It is the unanimous testimony of the early Church that John spent the last part of his life at Ephesus, and this testimony is of such a character that there can be no doubt respecting the fact.

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons (A. D. 177-202), born, in all probability, about A. D. 130, in Asia Minor, speaks of the testimony of the "presbyters in Asia who had associated with John, the disciple of the Lord," and states that John remained in the Church at Ephesus until the times of Trajan as a true witness of the tradition of the apostles.¹ This emperor began to reign A. D. 98. In his Epistle to Florinus, Irenæus states: "When I was yet a boy I saw thee in Lower Asia with Polycarp, behaving splendidly in the royal court, and endeavouring to gain his approbation. For I remember the things that happened then better than those which have occurred recently. For what we

¹ *Contra Hæreses*, lib. ii, cap. xxii, 5; iii, cap. iii, 4.

learn in boyhood, growing up along with the soul, becomes one with it, so that I can name both the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and discoursed; his going out and his coming in; the character of his life, and the form of his person, and the addresses which he made to the people; how he related his intercourse with John and with others who had seen the Lord, how he repeated their words, and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord, both concerning his miracles and his doctrine, as Polycarp had received them from the eyewitnesses of the word of life—all these things he related in harmony with the Scriptures.”¹ Irenæus also states that Polycarp was appointed bishop of Smyrna by the apostles.² Also in his letter to Victor, the Roman bishop, he says that Polycarp had lived in intimacy with John the disciple of our Lord.³ Irenæus further states: “There are some who heard from him (Polycarp) that John the disciple of the Lord, having gone to bathe in Ephesus, and seeing Cerinthus within, he leaped forth from the bath without bathing, but exclaimed, Let us fly, lest the bathing-room fall upon us, since Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within.”⁴ Even if the incident never occurred, it shows at least that as early as the middle of the *second* century it was notorious that the Apostle John had lived at Ephesus.

Another most important witness to the fact that the Apostle John spent the latter part of his life in Ephesus is Polycrates, An account of John by Polycrates. bishop of that city in the last part of the second century. In a letter which he wrote to Victor, bishop of Rome, (about A. D. 190 or 195), on the celebration of the passover, he says: “For in Asia great lights have gone out. . . . Also John, who leaned upon the breast of the Lord, who was a priest wearing the mitre, a martyr and a teacher—this one sleeps in Ephesus.”⁵ Polycrates, in this epistle, says, “I have been in the Lord sixty-five years.” By this we are probably to understand that he was made a disciple in infancy, and the number expresses his age at the time of writing. He must, accordingly, have been born about A. D. 125 or 130. He also states that seven of his relatives had been bishops, some of whom he had succeeded. It seems quite clear from this that he must have known persons who were acquainted with John, and, as the apostle’s grave was in the city, there could be no mistake about the matter, nor could John the presbyter be confounded with the Apostle John by a bishop at Ephesus in the second century.

Clement of Alexandria, who flourished in the latter part of the

¹In Euseb., Hist. Eccl., lib. v, cap. xx.

²Contra Hær., lib. iii, cap. 3.

³In Euseb., Hist. Eccl., lib. v, cap. xxiv.

⁴Contra Hær., lib. iii, cap. 3, sec. 4.

⁵In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. v, cap. xxiv.

second century and in the beginning of the third, states that "John the apostle returned from the isle of Patmos to Ephesus after the death of the tyrant,"¹ and he relates an incident in the life of the apostle which occurred in a town near Ephesus, and was carefully transmitted.

Origen also states that John abode in Asia, and died in Ephesus.² At the end of the Gospel of John, in the Peshito-Syriac version, is the superscription: "The end of the holy Gospel, the preaching of John the evangelist which he published in Greek in Ephesus." This testimony is valuable as coming from a version of the second century used in Northern Syria and Mesopotamia, regions not remote from Ephesus.

Lützelberger, in 1840, in his attack on John's Gospel, denied that this apostle spent the latter part of his life in Asia Minor, basing the denial upon the silence of Ignatius in epistles in which a reference to John was to be expected, if he had lived there, especially in Ephesus. But the argument *a silentio* is often a very delusive one, and avails nothing in opposition to strong positive testimony. The Epistles of Ignatius have themselves been a subject of much controversy, and they exist in a shorter and in a longer text in Greek. Cureton translated and published, from an ancient Syriac text brought from the Nitrian desert in Egypt, three Epistles of Ignatius—to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans—in a form still shorter than the shortest Greek text. These three epistles, in their shortest text, as they appear in the Syriac, Cureton thinks are the only genuine Epistles of Ignatius, and in this judgment he is most probably correct.

The only one of these Epistles from which any reference to the Apostle John could be expected is that to the Ephesians, as this apostle had died there fifteen or twenty years before the epistle was written. But there is no reference in it to any apostle,³ though Paul labored there for three years. But why, in an epistle of two or three pages, hastily written, should he refer to the Apostle John? It was hardly to be expected in an epistle to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who had been a hearer of John, that he should allude to this fact.

In the epistle to the Romans Ignatius says: "I do not charge you, like Peter and Paul, who are apostles." But this does not indicate that Paul had been in Rome, for the language could be explained very naturally as referring to Paul's Epistle to the Romans. But as Peter addressed no epistle to the Romans, the inference

¹ Τις ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος, *What rich man is saved?* xlii.

² In Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, iii, i.

³ The Greek text, however, refers to Paul.

would be that he preached to them. There is in the epistle of Ignatius nothing to indicate that these two apostles had suffered martyrdom at Rome. Yet how natural for him would be the language: "I am coming to Rome to die for the name of Jesus Christ, as Peter and Paul did." Does the absence of all reference to their martyrdom in Rome prove that it never occurred?

GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN.

We have already seen that Eusebius and Origen knew of no opposition to the Gospel of John, and with the exception of the small party of Alogians at Thyatira about A. D. 180, it was received by the whole Church throughout the ancient world as the undoubted writing of that apostle, the beloved disciple who leaned upon the bosom of the Lord.

No doubt was expressed respecting the genuineness of this Gospel until the year 1792, when an English deist by the name of Evanson attacked it with feeble arguments. About the same time doubts respecting it arose in Germany. But the first systematic and able attack was made by Bretschneider, a German theologian, in Latin¹ in 1820. He was answered by several German scholars, whose vindication of the genuineness of this Gospel seemed entirely satisfactory. On this point Tholuck remarks: "The conviction of the genuineness of the Gospel of John in the consciousness of all German theologians took only the so much deeper root, after Bretschneider left the field with the confession that he was vanquished; and nowhere, perhaps, except in the Introduction of Dr. De Wette, was there still heard an echo of doubt."²

Modern attacks on the genuineness of John's Gospel — Bretschneider.

In 1835 Strauss, in his *Life of Jesus*, resumed and sharpened the arguments that had been used by Bretschneider, and assailed this Gospel. But in the third edition of his *Life of Jesus* he acknowledged that through the many replies that had been given, especially by Neander and De Wette, "he had again become doubtful respecting his doubts of the genuineness of this Gospel." In the fourth edition, however, he retracted this confession, and returned resolutely to his doubts, principally as he himself confesses, because "without them one could not escape from believing the miracles of Christ." In his *Life of Jesus* for the German people, published in 1864, he still denies the genuineness of this Gospel, and greatly approves of Baur's views. Strauss' attack was followed by that of Lützelberger in 1840, who asserted that this

Strauss, Lützelberger, etc., on John's Gospel.

¹ Probabilia de Evang. et Epp. Joannis Apos., etc.

² Glaubwürdigkei. Evang. Geschichte, Zweite Aufl., 1838, pp. 267, 268.

Gospel was written at Edessa A. D. 130-135. In the following year Schwegler assailed it, and referred its composition to about 150. In 1844 it was assailed by Baur, who places its origin in Asia Minor or in Alexandria, perhaps, about 170. In the following year Zeller published his views, in which he declared his agreement with Baur.

Hilgenfeld¹ also denies its genuineness, and assigns it to 130-140. So does Volkmar, who places it about 155, and Scholten² about 150. Keim³ supposes that it was composed probably about 130. A few German scholars adopted what Bleek calls the *Hypothesis of Separation* (Theilung's hypothese), that is, they distinguish in this Gospel a genuine historical element which they separate from the un-historical. To this class belong Weisse, Schweizer, Schenkel, and Rénan.

It must be observed that the opponents of the Gospel of John belong chiefly to the Tübingen school, at the head of which stood Baur. But this Gospel has not lacked able defenders not only among the evangelical theologians, but also among those of the sceptical school. Of those who have written in defence of this Gospel since the attack of Bretschneider in 1820, may be named Stein, Calmberg, Hemsén, Crome, Hauff, Hug, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Schott, Credner, Lücke, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bunsen, Bleek, Ewald, Mayer, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Norton, Baumgarten, Schleiermacher, Neander, Hase, Tischendorf, Riggenbach, De Groot, Oosterzee, Fisher, and Beyschlag.

De Wette, in the preface to the fifth edition of his Introduction to the New Testament, written in 1847, about two years before his death, remarks: "It will be found that in respect to the Gospel of John I have placed myself still more than formerly upon the side of its defenders, although I am still far from the confidence of my friend Bleek."⁴ This is a valuable testimony from so able and sceptical a critic, who was by no means inclined toward orthodoxy.

In speaking of the attacks that have been made upon the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, De Wette remarks: "They have been especially directed against the external testimony in its favour. On the one hand, the witnesses have been regarded with sceptical eyes, and spitefully criticised; on the other, there have been demanded older and more definite witnesses than could be justly expected. In this respect our Gospel does not stand worse, indeed better, than the first three, and than the writings of Paul."⁵

¹ Einl., p. 738. Leipzig, 1875. ² Die ält. Zeugnisse, u. s. w., by Manchot, p. 186

³ Geschich. Jesu, p. 41. 1873. ⁴ Einl., besorgt von Messner und Lünemann. 1860

⁵ Einleitung, p. 223.

The Gospel of John is especially obnoxious to a certain class of critics on account of its profound spiritual character, and because it sets forth so clearly the divinity of Christ. To others, it is offensive because, if genuine, it establishes the miracles of Christ—since they are related in that case by an eyewitness—and overthrows their pantheistic conceptions of the universe.

The theory of the assailants of John's Gospel, that it was written sometime during A. D. 125-170, is, in view of the facts of the case, the most preposterous that has ever been advanced in the annals of historical criticism. For it is an indisputable fact, that in the last quarter of the *second* century this Gospel was received throughout the whole Christian world as the undoubted writing of the Apostle John. How could this have come to pass had it not come down from the last part of the first century? Could a Gospel written within the lifetime of many in the Church in the last quarter of the second century be everywhere regarded as the work of the Apostle John who had been dead for three fourths of a century or more? When three Gospels had already been in use in the Church, and read every Sunday in the Christian assemblies, how could a fourth one have been added long after the death of its supposed author, and a Gospel, too, that seemed to be at variance with the others? Could the intellectual and the learned men of the Church thus be imposed upon, and would the illiterate have submitted to the innovation? We all know what opposition the masses now make to even a few changes in the translation of the Bible.

The Alogians, a small party at Thyatira toward the end of the second century, in rejecting this Gospel, assigned it to the heretic Cerinthus,¹ who lived in the first century, and was a contemporary of the Apostle John. How easily they would have triumphed if they could have shown that this Gospel came into existence after the death of John! Had it been written in the second century they could have easily known it. Celsus, the learned and bitter opponent of Christianity, who wrote about A. D. 160-170, was, as we have already seen, acquainted with our Gospel, which then bore already the name of John. Now, if this Gospel had made its appearance even in the earliest part of the second century, there must have been many who knew the fact, and from whom he could have learned it. In this case how he would have triumphed over the Christians, and told them that one of the chief Gospels, so far from giving apostolic testimony to Christ, was not written till its supposed author had been dead twenty-five or fifty years! Yet he

Untenableness
of the sceptical
theory.

The account of
this Gospel given
by the Alogians.

¹ Epiphanius, Hæresis li, 3.

speaks of the Gospels as written by the disciples of Christ, by which term he meant apostles.

Even Rénan remarks, respecting the date of this Gospel: "One thing, at least, I regard as very probable—that the book was written before the year 100; that is, at an epoch when the synoptic Gospels had not yet a full canonical authority. If written after this date, it is inconceivable that the author on this point should have broken loose from the outline of the Memoirs of the Apostles. For Justin, and it seems for Papias, the synoptical outline constitutes the true and only outline of the Life of Jesus. A forger, writing toward the year 120 or 130 a fancy Gospel, would have satisfied himself with treating the received version in his own way, as do the apocryphal Gospels, and he would not have so completely destroyed what were regarded as the essential lines of the life of Jesus."¹ Truly the forger of this book, if a forgery, in the second century, pursued a most astonishing course, and it is more astonishing that he should succeed in it!

Heracleon, a celebrated Valentinian, who was said to have been an acquaintance of Valentinus, wrote a Commentary on John's Gospel about A. D. 170, which is quoted in several places by Origen in his Commentary on that Gospel, as we have already seen. It appears from an expression of Heracleon's that he attributed the Gospel to a disciple of Christ. Now what could have induced this eminent heretic to write a Commentary on this Gospel, and to attempt to explain it so as to bring it into harmony with his system (a process often requiring a forced construction), except its apostolic origin and its authority in the Church? He must have known that it was written in the first century, and that it was considered the undoubted work of an apostle of Christ. Not only did Heracleon, but the Valentinians in general, use this Gospel in the second half of the second century.

Theophilus, who became bishop of Antioch in A. D. 169, wrote three books to Autolycus on the resurrection of the dead, about 180. Speaking of the Word (*Λόγος*) he says: "Which the holy Scriptures, and all those who are inspired by the Spirit, teach us, among whom John says, '*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God. . . and the Word was God; all things were made by him,*'"² etc. This Theophilus, bishop of the great city of Antioch, was a man of great learning and profound thought, and he must have known whether the Gospel of John was genuine or not. It is very probable that he was born as early as A. D. 110 or 120. He had been converted from heathenism, and must

¹ Vie de Jésus, lxxv-vi.

² Lib. ii, 22.

have examined carefully the Gospels which he places along with the prophets.¹ He calls John's Gospel inspired. Can we believe that the great Christian Church at Antioch, which must have been in communion with that of Ephesus and with other important Christian Churches, and its learned bishop, were all, in the middle of the second century, when John had been dead only about fifty years, deceived in their belief of the genuineness of this Gospel? Further, when Theophilus became bishop of Antioch (A. D. 169) there were doubtless some whose memory reached back to the year 100; quite a large number, whose parents were the contemporaries of St. John in the latter part of his life, and knew when he wrote the Gospel.

From Theophilus we pass to a witness still more important, Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, A. D. 177-202. What makes the testimony of this able and learned man so valuable is the fact that the early part of his life was spent in Asia Minor, and that he had been taught in his youth by Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John. Of the teachings of Polycarp he retained in after life the most distinct recollection, especially what Polycarp had heard from John and others who had seen the Lord respecting his miracles and doctrines, "all of which Polycarp related agreeable to the Scriptures."²

Irenæus states: "John the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, he himself also published his Gospel while he abode in Ephesus in Asia."³ Now it is evident that Irenæus had the best opportunity to ascertain the fact, if such, that John wrote the Gospel which bears his name. He was a hearer of Polycarp, as we have seen, and there were many others in Asia Minor, with whom Irenæus was acquainted, who had associated with John. This appears clear from the nature of the case, and from his remark, "And all the elders who in Asia had associated with John the disciple of the Lord testify,"⁴ etc. There can be no doubt that when Irenæus states that John published his Gospel in Ephesus, he bears witness to what he had learned from Polycarp and the elders who had known John. Suppose Irenæus had asserted that the fourth Gospel was not written by John, or had expressed doubts about it, would not the adversaries of this Gospel have declared that this was conclusive proof against its genuineness? Must not, then, his testimony in its favour, and the confidence with which he uses it as the production of the beloved disciple of Christ, be the strongest proof of its genuineness?

Polycarp remained bishop of Smyrna until he died a martyr's death about A. D. 167. About 160 he visited Rome and had a conference

¹iii, 12.

²In the Epistle to Florinus before quoted.

³Contra Hæreses, iii, 1.

⁴Ibid., ii, cap. xxii, 5.

with the bishop Anicetus of that city respecting the passover. Now if Polycarp had not acknowledged the fourth Gospel as that of John the Churches in Asia, that of Rome, and of other cities, must have known the fact, and the authority of this Gospel being rejected by this eminent disciple of John, it could not have been received as the undoubted work of the beloved disciple. But the fact that Irenæus, who was taught by Polycarp, received this Gospel, is a proof that it was acknowledged by Polycarp.

In the letter addressed by the Churches of Lyons and Vienna in Gaul to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia (A. D. 177), describing the martyrdom of their members, they say: "That was fulfilled which was spoken by our Lord, that 'The time will come in which every one that killeth you will think that he doeth God service.'"¹ This is an evident quotation of John xvi, 2. Pothinus, their bishop, ninety years of age, had died in the persecution, and Irenæus had been their presbyter.

Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, in an epistle on the observance of the passover, addressed to Victor, bishop of Rome, and to the Church of that city, written about A. D. 190 or 195, speaks of keeping "the day of the passover on the 14th, according to the Gospel," and of "having perused all holy Scripture." In speaking of John he says: "And John, who leaned on the breast of the Lord." It is in the highest degree probable that this phraseology was taken from the Gospel of John: "who also leaned upon his breast" (chap. xxi, 20); "that one thus leaning upon the breast of Jesus" (chap. xiii, 25). Except in John's Gospel, this phraseology is found nowhere in the New Testament. When Polycrates wrote this letter he tells us that he had been a Christian sixty-five years, so that his memory of Christian affairs must have extended back as far as A. D. 140. Seven of his relations had been bishops, some of whom he says he succeeded in Ephesus. Now he must have known some in the Ephesian Church who were acquainted with the Apostle John, and a few, probably, whose memories went back to the time when the Gospel was written. He speaks also of many bishops whom he had called together and met.² Is it possible that the canon of Polycrates, which must have been that of the Ephesian Church of which he was bishop, did not include John's Gospel? Polycrates says he had read *all the holy Scripture*, and speaks of what is in accordance with the Gospel, probably that of John. If the Church of Ephesus in the second century received the fourth Gospel as the work of the Apostle John, it must be genuine. If the Church of Ephesus did not receive

Other ancient testimonies to the genuineness of John's Gospel.

¹In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., v, cap. 1.

²Ibid., v, cap. xxiv.

it in the second century, they in all probability would not have received it in the third, for the tradition that it was not written by John could not easily have been obliterated.

Irenæus speaks of the *whole* Church as refreshed by four Gospels, and Origen (186-254) says the four Gospels are received by the Church under heaven; and there is not a vestige of proof that the great Church of Ephesus did not receive the fourth Gospel as the work of John. Had the Ephesian Church rejected this Gospel, or attributed it to any other than John, the Christian writers of the second and two following centuries could not have failed to notice the rejection, just as Epiphanius did in the case of the Alogians in the comparatively obscure town of Thyatira; and Polycrates and others, in discussing the passover, would, in all probability, have brought out the fact.¹ If this Gospel had not been received in the Ephesian Church immediately after the death of John, if not before, it could not have been received by the neighbouring Churches of Asia Minor. Irenæus, as we have already seen, states that John published his Gospel at Ephesus, and as he spent the early part of his life in the region of Ephesus, he must have known that the Ephesian Christians received this Gospel as John's, otherwise he could not have stated that this apostle had delivered it to them.

In the Canon of Muratori (written at Rome about A. D. 160) it is stated: "The fourth Gospel is that of John, one of the disciples. When his fellow-disciples and his bishops urged him to write, he said to them, Fast with me to-day until the third day, and whatever shall be revealed to each, we will relate to each other. In the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should write every thing in his own name in the presence of all of them as witnesses."² In this canon it is also said: "Why therefore is it strange if John so confidently ad-

Testimony of
the Canon of
Muratori.

¹ Since writing the above we have found positive proof for what we have argued in the text, that may be thus shown: Polycrates names along with himself, as followers of the Apostle John in keeping the 14th Nisan, Polycarp of Smyrna, Thræseas, bishop of Eumonia in Phrygia, Bishop Sagaris, Melito of Sardis, and Papirius (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. v, cap. xxiv). Hippolytus (A. D. 200-250) says the observers of the 14th Nisan "agree in other matters with all those things which have been delivered to the Church by the apostles" (Philosoph., lib. viii, sec. 18). Epiphanius (A. D. 367-402) says of this same sect, "These hold everything as the Church (holds); they receive the prophets, apostles, and evangelists" (Hæresis l). Of course, then they received John's Gospel. Theodoret remarks on them: "They say that the Evangelist John, when preaching in Asia, taught them to observe the 14th day" (Hæret. Fab. Comp., lib. iii, cap. iv).

² QUARTI EVANGELIORUM IOHANNIS EX DECIPOLIS. cohortantibus condiscipulis et eps suis dixit conieciunate mihi. Odie triduo et quid cuique fuerit reuelatum

duces the particulars even in his epistles, saying in respect to himself, What we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things we have written to you. For he not only professes to be an eyewitness, but also a hearer and a writer in order of all the wonderful things of the Lord."¹

The particulars thus given respecting the origin of John's Gospel are valuable as coming from such an early writer, and one likely to obtain accurate information, as Rome was a place much visited from all parts of the world. As mention is made of the Apostle Andrew in the account of John's writing, it would seem that the Gospel was written probably twenty years before the close of John's life, as it is not likely that Andrew was alive long after that time.

The particulars given in the canon concerning John's Gospel do not indicate that it had already enemies against whom it was to be defended as has been asserted.² For the canon gives particulars about Luke's Gospel also, and states that he had not seen the Lord in the flesh. Doubtless many particulars were given respecting the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, of which all is lost except a few closing words on the latter.

When this canon was written there were in the Roman Church, beyond all doubt, some whose membership and memory dated as far back as the last part of the first century. The testimony borne by this canon to the First Epistle of John, and perhaps to his others, is also very valuable in connexion with the genuineness of the Gospel.

Clement of Alexandria states that "John, last of all, perceiving that physical things were related in the Gospels, and being urged by his acquaintances and inspired by the Spirit, wrote a spiritual Gospel."³ Jerome gives an account of the writing of John's Gospel quite similar to that in the Canon of Muratori, which he remarks "ecclesiastical history relates."⁴

Apollinaris, in the second passover controversy, about A. D. 170, remarks respecting his opponents: "They say that the Lord ate the paschal lamb with his disciples on the fourteenth day of the month, but that he suffered on the great day of the feast of unleavened bread, and explain Matthew as so saying as they think, but their alterutrum nobis eunarremus eadem nocte reuelatum Andreæ ex apostolis ut recognis centibus cunctis Iohannis suo nomine cuncta describeret. Et ideo licit uariis singulis euangeliorum libris principia doceantur.

¹ Quid ergo mirum si Iohannes tam constanter singula etiam in epistulis suis proferat dicens in seme ipse Quæ vidimus oculis nostris et auribus audiuimus et manus nostræ palpauerunt hæc scripsimus uobis sic enim non solum uisurum sed auditorem sed et scriptorem omnium mirabilium domini per ordinem profetetur.

² By Mangold and Hilgenfeld.

³ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi, 14.

⁴ Pref. Comment. in Mat.

view is not in accordance with the law, and the Gospels, according to them, appear to be at variance with each other."¹ He manifestly refers to John, as compared with the other Gospels, which shows that his opponents as well as himself must have received that Gospel. He also speaks of Christ's side having been pierced, out of which flowed water and blood, in reference to John xix, 34, and it is, therefore, evident that he received it as authentic history.

We have already seen that the Clementine Homilies (about A. D. 160 or 170) make use of John's Gospel, and that about the same time Tatian, who had been the disciple of Justin Martyr, not only makes use of this Gospel, but he formed a Harmony or Combination of this Gospel and the other three. It was evidently used by Athanasius² (about A. D. 177), who speaks of all things having been created by the Logos (or Word), and of the Father's being in the Son, and the Son in the Father (in reference to John i, 1-3; xvii, 21-23). About the same time, or rather earlier, it was quoted as an apostolic document by Celsus, the bitter writer against Christianity. It was known to the heretic Marcion (about A. D. 140), was quoted by Valentinus (about 140), and by Basilides (about 120 or 125) as one of the Gospels.

About the middle of the second century arose in Phrygia, in Asia Minor, a fanatical sect of Christians that made pretensions to extraordinary spiritual gifts. They were called Montanists, from Montanus of Pepuza, who "in an ecstatic state began to announce that the *Paraclete* [Comforter] had imparted itself to him for the purpose of giving the Church its manly perfection" (Gieseler). It is very evident that the term *Paraclete* (which Montanus professed to be) was derived from John's Gospel, in which Christ promises to send the *Paraclete* (Comforter) (chaps. xiv, 16, 26; xv, 26; xvi, 7). This shows that in Phrygia, about 150 or 160, the Gospel of John was most probably regarded as an authentic record of Christ's teaching.

Justin Martyr, in his First Apology,³ addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius about A. D. 138 or 139, uses John's Gos-
Quotations of Justin Martyr from John's Gospel.
 pel. In speaking of baptism and regeneration, he says: "For Christ said, Unless you are born again, you cannot enter the kingdom of heaven; because it is evident to all that it is impossible for those once born to enter the wombs of their mothers." Here the reference to John iii, 3, 4 is obvious, and shows that Justin regarded this Gospel as an authentic source for the history of Christ. Justin says of Christ: "And the Logos (Word) is the Son, who in a certain way being made flesh, became man."⁴ The Logos (Word) is

¹Chron. Pascn., in Migne's ed. Pat., tom. 5, pp. 1297-1300.

²Legatio Pro Christianis, sec. 10.

³Sec. 61.

⁴Sec. 32.

the first begotten of God."¹ It is clear that these passages are based on John i, 1, 14.

In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, written about A. D. 150, he also uses John's Gospel. In speaking of John the Baptist, he represents him as confessing, "I am not the Christ,"² which is found only in John i, 20. Hilgenfeld does not deny that Justin used John along with the other three Gospels. We have already seen Justin stating that the Gospels, or Memoirs of the Apostles, "written by the Apostles and their companions," were read every Sunday, along with the prophets, in the Christian assemblies. From this language it is clear that two of the evangelists were apostles, of whom the author of the fourth Gospel must have been one. But it may be asked, Why did not Justin make greater use of John's Gospel? To which it may be answered, It did not suit his purpose as well as the other Gospels. He says to the authorities he addresses: "That we may not appear to deceive you, we thought it proper to mention some of the doctrines delivered by Christ himself. . . . The discourses made by him are short and concise, for he was no sophist, but his word was the power of God."³ After this he gives many of Christ's precepts, taken mostly from Matthew and Luke, for John was not suitable to his purpose, as it contains longer discourses of a philosophical nature. He uses John, however, when speaking of the incarnation of the Logos, of baptism, and regeneration. In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew he quotes the Old Testament chiefly, but he has also some passages from the first three Gospels, especially Matthew, and one from John, giving the confession of the Baptist to which we have referred. The Gospel of John was not adapted to his purpose in this discussion. Nevertheless, Justin has many passages, as Professor Semisch shows, which are formed on the basis of John's Gospel.

Justin was of Neapolis (Nablûs) in Palestine; he visited Rome, as appears from a passage in his Apology, and Ephesus, where he held his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. We are unable to say when he attached himself to the Church; he had formerly been a heathen philosopher. It is not improbable that he united with the Church as early as A. D. 130. When he was at Ephesus, about A. D. 135 or 140, there must have been a considerable number of Christians who had been acquainted with John (John died there about forty years before), some, doubtless, whose recollection went as far back as A. D. 80, about the probable date of the composition of this Gospel. When he visited Rome, about A. D. 140 or earlier, there must have been some Christians there whose recollection went back as far as

¹ Sec. 21.² Sec. 88.³ First Apol., sec. 14.

A. D. 70 or 80. Justin had the best opportunity to know whether the Gospel of John was genuine or not.

In the ancient Syrian Church, whose chief seat was Edessa, in Mesopotamia, we have a most valuable testimony to John's Gospel in the Peshito version of the New Testament, executed as early as the middle of the second century in all probability, if not earlier. The superscription to the fourth Gospel in this version is: "The holy Gospel, the preaching of John the evangelist, which he spoke and published in Greek in Ephesus." Testimony of the ancient versions.

The most ancient Latin version of the New Testament, made about the middle of the second century, and used in Northern Africa especially, contained the fourth Gospel, which it attributed to John, and placed immediately after that of Matthew, as being an apostolic work.

Tertullian, at Carthage, in the last part of the second century and in the first part of the third, is also a witness to the authority of John's Gospel in the North African Church. He observes that the authority of the apostolic Churches will defend Matthew and John, as well as Luke. It is clear from his remarks that he had no doubt that the Gospel of John had been in the Church ever since the death of that apostle.

We have already referred to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, who flourished in the last part of the second and in the beginning of the third century, to John's having written his Gospel at the request of his friends. His information was derived from the oldest presbyters, as Eusebius states in giving the passage. He was instructed by Pantænus, who was said to have heard some who had seen the apostles. On Clement, Theander remarks: "He convinced himself of the truth of Christianity by free inquiry, after he had acquired an extensive knowledge of the systems of religion and the philosophy of divine things known at his time in the cultivated world. This free spirit of inquiry, which had conducted him to Christianity, led him, moreover, after he had become a Christian, to seek the society of eminent Christian teachers of different tendencies of mind in different countries. He informs us that he had had various distinguished men as his teachers: one Ionian in Greece; one from Cœle-Syria; one in Magna Græcia (Lower Italy), who came originally from Egypt; an Assyrian in Eastern Asia (doubtless Syria); and one of Jewish descent in Palestine."¹ All this was before he was instructed by Pantænus. As Pantænus left Alexandria for India about A. D. 180, Clement must

¹ Church Hist., vol. i, 691. Torrey's translation.

have received instructions from him some time before that period. He was instructed in Southern Italy, Greece, Eastern Asia (Syria), and Palestine, before he came to Egypt. These travels may be placed about A. D. 170, or earlier. The testimony of such a man respecting John's Gospel is very valuable, for he must have met with some whose membership in the Church dated back to the time of John's death.

In the Epistle to Diognetus, written probably in the beginning of the second century, there are some passages, as we have already seen, taken from John's Gospel. One, at least, in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans, published from the Syriac by Cureton, written about 115. Likewise in the Epistle of Barnabas, belonging probably to the last part of the first century, are also expressions that appear to have been taken from John's Gospel.

In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, a work written by a Other ancient testimonies. Christian in the last part of the first century, or in the beginning of the second, are several references to John's Gospel. In the Testament of Benjamin (chap. iii) Christ is called "the Lamb of God and the Saviour of the world," from John i, 29; iv, 42. In Levi xiv Christ is "the light of the world given to enlighten every man," a reference to John viii, 12; i, 9. "Then Abraham shall rejoice," Levi xviii, in reference to John viii, 56.¹ "The Spirit of truth bears witness to all things and accuses all," Judah xx, in reference to John xv, 26; xvi, 8. "Until the Most High send us salvation in the visitation of the only begotten Son," Benjamin ix, in reference to the writings of John, especially the Gospel.

At the end of the works of Clement of Alexandria there are about twenty-two pages of Greek, entitled, "Extracts from the writings of Theodotus and from the doctrine called Oriental belonging to the times of Valentinus." Neander calls this epitome: "A document of the highest authority in relation to the Gnostic systems. It is, perhaps, the fragment of a critical collection, which Clement had drawn up for his own use during his residence in Syria"² (about A. D. 170). In this work there are about twenty-five passages from John's Gospel; sometimes they are quoted with the remark—the Saviour, the Lord, or the apostle says. The various sects of the serpent worshippers also made great use of this Gospel in the last half of the second century, and probably in the first half.

We have thus seen that the Gospel of John was universally received in the Christian Church throughout the world, in the last half of the second century, as the work of the Apostle John, and was

¹ The same verb (*αγαλλιάομαι*) is used both in John and in this Testament.

² Church Hist., vol. i, 693.

very generally received by the heretics themselves as an authority. Now, how could this reception of the Gospel as the work of the beloved disciple of Christ have been unanimous¹ within fifty years of his death, if it had not been really written by him? But, further, the testimonies to this Gospel go back to the beginning of the second, if not to the close of the first, century, so that it certainly made its appearance very soon after the death of John, though in all probability before that event.

To the external proofs of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel already given, we add the following: Apelles, a heretic of the last half of the second century, a disciple of Marcion, taught that "Christ, having risen after three days, showed himself to his disciples, and exhibited *the prints of the nails and of his side*" (Philosophoumena, lib. vii, sec. 38), from which it is evident that he used John's Gospel as an authority. The sect of Montanists, which arose in Phrygia about the middle of the second century, received the same Gospels with the rest of the Christians (Philosophoumena, lib. viii, sec. 19; Epiphanius, lib. ii; Hæresis xlvi). Praxeas, who came from Phrygia to Rome in the last part of the second century, received John's Gospel, as is evident from the manner in which Tertullian replies to him (Adversus Praxeam). Noetus of Smyrna, a Partripassian (about A. D. 230), evidently received John's Gospel, as appears from the answer given him by Hippolytus. Callistus of Rome (about A. D. 200) quotes John xiv, 10 as an authority.² Urban, bishop of Rome (about A. D. 225), quotes John xx, 22, 23. The learned Hippolytus (about A. D. 200-250) received John's Gospel. Novatian, presbyter of Rome (A. D. 250-275), in his work on the Trinity, makes extensive use of John's Gospel. Victorinus, bishop of Petavio (Pettau) in Upper Pannonia (Hungary) in the last part of the third century, quotes the fourth Gospel as John's. Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in his Epistle to Cyprian (about A. D. 255), quotes John xvii, 24; xx, 23, 25. Methodius, a man of great learning, bishop of Patara and Olympus in Lycia (in Asia Minor), and afterward of Tyre in Phœnicia, in the last half of the third century, uses John's Gospel. Lactantius, the celebrated Christian writer in Nicomedia (in Asia Minor) (about A. D. 314), quotes as John's, John i, 1-3.³ Gelasius, of Cyzicus, states that the Nicene Council (which was held A. D. 325) expressed through Hosius, bishop of Cordova in Spain, its views respecting the divinity of Christ, beginning with the first verse of John's Gospel, and that a philosopher, in replying,

¹ Of course we except the obscure sect of Alogians at Thyatira about A. D. 170-200, of whom we shall speak in the future.

² Philosophoumena, lib. ix, sec. 12.

³ Divin. Instit., lib. iv, cap viii

also quoted John's Gospel.¹ Athanasius, who was present at the Council, states that the bishops quoted for the divinity of Christ John x, 30. This great theologian asks his opponents whether they believe the Son when he says, "I and my Father are one" (John x, 30); and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John xiv, 9)? Certainly, they would say, we believe him, since thus it is written.² There appears to have been no doubt expressed in the Council respecting the apostolic origin and authority of John's Gospel. Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia (about A. D. 330), quotes John i, 1, with the remark: "John, the holy apostle and disciple of the Lord."³ In the council held at Sardica, A. D. 347, we find that the bishops in their confession of faith quote John i, 3; x, 30; xiv, 10.⁴ The Council of Ancyra, in Galatia (semi-Arian), collected from seven provinces (A. D. 358), quotes, in its decrees, the first part of John's Gospel as what the Apostle John delivered.⁵ Basil of Ancyra, and Georgius of Laodicea, members of this Council, and their associates, in their confession of faith, in various passages use John's Gospel as an authority.⁶ In the decree of the Council held A. D. 359, at Seleucia in Asia Minor, it is stated: "We also believe in the Holy Spirit, which our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ called the Paraclete (Comforter), having promised that after his departure he would send this to the apostles." This passage manifestly refers to John xiv, 26 as an authentic declaration of Christ. This document is signed by *forty-three* bishops, and among them we find bishops of Phrygia, Lycia, Lydia (including the bishop of Philadelphia), and Mytilene, places lying in the region of Ephesus.⁷ In the decrees of the Oriental Council, held (about A. D. 363) at Laodicea, about a hundred miles from Ephesus, the Gospel of John forms a part of the canon of Scripture.⁸ The reception of John's Gospel by all parties in the general Council of Nicæa, in which the divinity of Christ was discussed and adopted as an article of faith—a doctrine that finds such strong support in this Gospel—shows the deep conviction of its apostolic authority in the whole Church. The recognition of this Gospel as John's in all the regions about Ephesus, where the apostle spent the last part of his life and died, gives the assurance that it really proceeded from him. For how, otherwise, could its genuineness have been universally acknowledged in the first half of the fourth century through all these regions? The

¹ *Historia Concilii Nicæni*, lib. ii, cap. xii, xvii.

² Athanasius, *Epistola ad Afros Episcopos*, secs. 6 and 7.

³ In Eusebius, *Hist. Theol.*, lib. ii, cap. xi.

⁴ In Theodoret, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. ii

⁵ Epiphanius, *Hæresis liii*, cap. ii-xi.

⁶ *Ibid.*, cap. xii-xxii.

⁷ In Epiphanius, *Hæresis liii*, cap. xxv, xxvi.

⁸ Photius, *Syntag. Can.*, tit. iii.

Alogians of Thyatira, who rejected this Gospel and the Apocalypse, were very obscure; the name of not a single member of the sect has come down to us. In the councils of the Church no representative of the Alogians appears. It is difficult to say how long the sect lasted. Nothing more clearly shows the ignorance or the recklessness of the sect than their attributing this Gospel to the heretic Cerinthus, whose doctrine concerning the person of Christ was so entirely different from that set forth in the Gospel of John.

THE UNITY OF AUTHORSHIP OF THE GOSPEL AND FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

That the fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John had the same author is entirely certain. In comparing the two works, the identity of authorship strikes us like a sensation; and a minute examination of their contents indelibly fixes conviction. That able but sceptical critic, De Wette, remarks upon this subject: "So much is certain, that both writings, this Epistle [of John] and the fourth Gospel, proceed from the same author; for both bear the most definite stamp of relationship, as well in style as in conceptions; both impress upon the reader the same charm of a kind nature."² He gives the following instances of similarity of style in both: *ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, to do the truth, 1 John i, 6; John iii, 21: *οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐν τινι*, the truth is not in any one, 1 John i, 8; ii, 4; John viii, 44: *ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι*, to be of the truth, 1 John ii, 21; John xviii, 37: *ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου εἶναι*, to be of the devil, 1 John iii, 8; John viii, 44: *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι*, to be of God, 1 John iii, 10; iv, 1; John vii, 17; viii, 47; *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι*, to be of the world, 1 John iv, 5; John viii, 23; *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλεῖν*, to speak of the world, 1 John iv, 5, is similar to John iii, 31, *ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖν*, to speak of the earth: *ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν*, we remain in him, and he in us, 1 John iv, 13, the same phraseology as John vi, 56; xv, 4: *ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατεῖν*, in the darkness, in the light to walk, 1 John ii, 11; i, 6, 7; John viii, 12; xii, 35: *γινώσκειν τὸν θεόν, ἢ χριστόν*, to know God, or Christ, 1 John ii, 3, 4, 13, 14; iv, 6-8; v, 20; John xvi, 3; xvii, 25: *τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ τιθέναι*, to lay down his life, 1 John iii, 16; John x, 11, 17, 18; xv, 13: *ἁμαρτίαν ἔχειν*, to have sin, 1 John i, 8; John ix, 41; xv, 22, 24; xix, 11: *ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἢ τὴν ζωὴν*, to have eternal life, or life, 1 John iii, 15; v, 12; John iii, 15, 36; v, 24, 39, 40; vi, 40, 47, 54: *μεταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*, to pass from death unto life, 1 John iii, 14; John v, 24: *νικᾶν τὸν κόσμον*, to overcome the world, 1 John

The similarity between fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John.

² Einleitung, p. 390.

v, 4; John xvi, 33: *μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνειν*, to receive testimony, 1 John v, 9; John iii, 11, 32; v, 34: *αἶρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*, to take away sin, 1 John iii, 5; John i, 29. There is a peculiarity in John's writings which De Wette notices, *the union of an affirmative and a negative*: "We lie, and do not the truth," 1 John i, 6; "He confessed, and did not deny," John i, 20. Compare also 1 John i, 5, 8; ii, 4, 10, 27, 28, with John i, 3; iii, 20; v, 24; vii, 18; xvi, 29, 30.

These are only a portion of the similar passages found in the Epistle and Gospel, which De Wette¹ gives in proof of identity of authorship of the two writings. Nothing more clearly shows the value of the testimony furnished by the Epistle to the genuineness of the Gospel, and the desperate straits of the impugners of this Gospel, than the denial of their unity by some of the ablest opponents of the former, including Strauss and Hilgenfeld.

Nowhere in the ancient Church do we find a single doubt respecting this Epistle; it was never attributed to any other than the beloved disciple who wrote the Gospel.² It was used by Polycarp³—a disciple of John about A. D. 115. Eusebius states that Papias, who lived in Asia Minor in the first half of the second century, and is called by Irenæus a hearer of John, "made use of testimonies from the First Epistle of John."⁴ Nor could Eusebius be mistaken in this matter, for he had before him the work of Papias; and the peculiar style of John's Epistle, even though unnamed, is easily recognized wherever quoted.

This Epistle in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in the Canon of Muratori, is attributed to the Apostle John, and it formed a part of the earliest Latin version. It is quoted by Irenæus as the writing of John the disciple of the Lord;⁵ also by Clement⁶ of Alexandria, and Tertullian⁷ of Carthage, as John's. It is attributed to John by Origen,⁸ and Eusebius;⁹ and Jerome remarks that it "is approved of by all ecclesiastics and learned men."¹⁰

¹ Einleitung, p. 396.

² It is well known that the Alogians rejected both the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse. But Epiphanius was uncertain whether or not they rejected the Epistles of John. "Perhaps," says he, "also the Epistles they rejected (*τάχα δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς παρεκβάλλειν*), for these also agree with the Gospel and with the Apocalypse."—Hæresis li, cap. xxxiv.

³ Polycarp's words are: *Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι ἀντίχριστός ἐστι*, "For every one who does not acknowledge that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is antichrist."—Epist. to Philippians, 7. This is almost the exact language of 1 John iv, 2, 3.

⁴ Contra Hæreses, iii, cap. xvi, sec. 5.

⁵ Lib. de Præscrip., cap. xxxiii.

⁶ iii, 25.

⁷ Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, xxxix.

⁸ Stromata, iii, cap. vi, etc.

⁹ In Euseb., Hist. Eccles., vi, 25.

¹⁰ Lib. de Viris Illus., cap. ix.

That the author of this Epistle was an eyewitness of the life of Christ is stated in the clearest manner in the beginning: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life; for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." The writer characterizes himself as bearing witness to his contemporaries of what he saw and heard. If this language does not imply an eyewitness, what would?

The author of the Epistle being an eyewitness of Christ's life, and the unity of authorship of the Gospel and Epistle resting upon the clearest evidence, it follows that the author of the fourth Gospel was an eyewitness of the life of Christ; and all antiquity, as we have already seen, attributed both the Gospel and the Epistle to the Apostle John, the last surviving apostle of Christ. All the ancient Greek MSS. of this Gospel (about five hundred in number) attribute it to John, which shows that this was the superscription of the earliest manuscripts.

The adversaries of this Gospel, being hard pressed by the external evidence in its favour, take refuge in the supposed silence of Papias respecting it. But we do not know that Papias was silent as his work is lost. It is true that Eusebius adduces no quotation from him on John's Gospel, but the fact that Papias made use of testimonies from the First Epistle of John gives indirect evidence for the Gospel. We do not know that Papias was discussing the Gospels in general at all. Eusebius states that he remarked that Matthew wrote originally in Hebrew, and Mark from the instructions of Peter. There was no reason why he should have given any particulars about John's Gospel, for that evangelist spent the last part of his life not more than a hundred miles from the town of which Papias was bishop, and the facts pertaining to that Gospel were well known in the region of Papias. Eusebius does not tell us whether Papias made any statement about Luke, nor was it necessary that Papias should, as Luke himself, in the preface to his Gospel, gives the source of his information. Eusebius does not state whether Papias used the Epistles of Paul; is that an argument against their genuineness?

Tischendorf,¹ however, is of the opinion that we have proof that Papias did bear testimony to John's Gospel. He finds this proof in the Prologue to the Gospel of John in a Latin manuscript of the Vatican, which is very ancient: "The Gospel of John was published

¹ Origin of the Four Gospels, p. 199.

and given to the Churches by John while still living in the body, as Papias, of Hierapolis, a dear disciple of John, related in the last of his five books."¹ We confess our inability to determine what value should be given to this document.

Irenæus remarks, that the presbyters, in speaking of different conditions of the redeemed in heaven, say that "on this account the Lord said: 'In my Father's (house) are many mansions.'"² Here is a clear reference to John's Gospel (chap. xiv, 2), with which these presbyters were acquainted, and which they acknowledged as an authentic history of Christ. But who were these presbyters that thus used John? Irenæus answers that by calling them "the disciples of the apostles" (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί*). In this class he may have included Papias, though it is not improbable that Irenæus may have derived his information from the work of Papias.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE THAT THE FOURTH GOSPEL PROCEEDED FROM THE APOSTLE JOHN.

If the fourth Gospel is the work of the Apostle John several things must accord with that fact. 1. The author must show his acquaintance with the Hebrew, or with the Aramaic language; at least, he must give no proof of his ignorance of it. 2. He must not betray any ignorance of the topography of the regions of Christ's ministry, or of the customs of the Jews at that period. 3. There should be some indications in the narrative that the author was, or may have been, an eyewitness of the life of Christ.

Now these conditions are fully satisfied in this Gospel. But, further, we find some particulars in the narrative of such a peculiar nature that it is clear the author of the Gospel was an eyewitness of the scenes described.

The author shows his knowledge of Hebrew by the translation he has given of Zechariah xii, 10 (in part) in chapter xix, 37: "They shall look on him whom they pierced," which could not have been taken from the Septuagint, nor from the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel, in neither of which is there any thing to correspond to the Hebrew קָרַע, *to pierce*. He ap-

¹ Evangelium Iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab Iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut Papias nomine Hierapolitanus, discipulus Iohannis carus, in exotericis id est in extremis quinque libris retulit.—Patrum Apostol. Opera. Leipzig, 1875. The editors of this work think the passage spurious.

² The Greek in Irenæus (lib. v, xxxvi, sec. 2) is, *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναῖς εἶναι πολλὰς*, in those of my Father are many mansions. The Greek in John xiv, 2 is, *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἰσιν*, in the house of my Father are many mansions. The word *μοναὶ* (mansions), occurs nowhere in the New Testament except in John's Gospel, and was rarely used in this sense outside of it.

pears also to have based the passage (chap. xii, 15) upon the Hebrew text of Zechariah ix, 9. In other passages he follows the LXX. He also shows his knowledge of Hebrew or Aramaic by giving the original and its translation into Greek: *Rabbi, master* (chap. i, 38); *Messias, Christ* (ver. 41); *Cephas, a rock* (ver. 42); *Siloam, sent* (chap. ix, 7). He gives the Hebrew or Aramaic word for λιθόστρωτον (*Pavement*), *Gabbatha* (chap. xix, 13), and the meaning of the Hebrew *Rabbouni, master* (chap. xx, 16). *Bethesda*, the name he gives a pool with five porches in Jerusalem (chap. v, 2), meaning *House of Mercy*, is a regular Aramaic name. As Aramaic expressions, we may name γεύσθαι θανάτου, *to taste death*, (chap. viii, 52); the use of σκανδαλίζω in a moral sense, *to give offense* (chaps. vi, 61; xvi, 1); σφραγίζειν, in the sense *to confirm, approve* (chaps. iii, 33; vi, 27). Εντεῦθεν καὶ εντεῦθεν, *hence and hence* (chap. xix, 18), for *on this side* and *on that*, is in imitation of the Hebrew הַיְמִינִי הַצְּפוֹנִי. The phrase ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, *the prince of this world*, for Satan (chap. xii, 31), is Rabbinical.¹

The sense in which the author uses φῶς, *light*, σκοτία, *darkness*, σὰρξ, *flesh*, πνεῦμα, *spirit*, is decidedly Jewish. The illustrations drawn from a shepherd and his flock (chap. x, 1-29), and from living waters (chaps. iv, 10; vii, 37, 38), are also Jewish. The author's references to the Old Testament, especially to the prophecies pertaining to the Messiah and his times, are what was to be expected from a Christian who had been brought up in Judaism. He uses the word *law* in several places (chaps. x, 34; xii, 34; xv, 25) for the Old Testament in general, which no one but a Jew would have done.

The author is well acquainted with the customs of the Jews. He speaks of the passover (chap. ii, 13, etc.); the feast of tabernacles (chap. vii, 2); the feast of dedication in winter (chap. x, 22); and the day of preparation (before the sabbath) (chap. xix, 14, 31, 42); their purifications (chaps. ii, 6; iii, 25; xviii, 28); and the penalty of excommunication from the synagogue (chap. ix, 34). He knows in what period of time the temple was built (forty-six years) (chap. ii, 20); and that Annas was the father-in-law of Caiaphas² (chap. xviii, 13).

The author also shows an exact acquaintance with the Samaritans. In the account of the interview of Christ with the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well, she says: "I know that Messiah cometh. When he

¹ Lightfoot, in commenting on John xii, 31, adduces a considerable number of passages from the ancient Rabbies in illustration of this usage.

² In John xi, 51 it is stated that Caiaphas was *high priest that year*—that is, the year in which Christ was crucified. This does not imply that the high priest was changed every year, but simply that Caiaphas was high priest at that time.

is come, he will tell us all things" (chap. iv, 25). There can be no doubt that the Samaritans of that age expected a Messiah, for the high priest of that people at Nablûs, about six years ago, stated to me that he expected a Messiah.¹ He based his expectation chiefly upon Deuteronomy xviii, 18. This was, doubtless, a traditional doctrine, and it is not to be supposed that if the ancient Samaritans had held no such view the moderns would have taken it up. The Samaritan woman also said to Christ: "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship" (chap. iv, 20). Here the woman refers to the controversy between the Jews and Samaritans respecting the proper place of divine worship. The Samaritans, in rejecting all the Old Testament except the Pentateuch, deprived the Jews of every proof that Jerusalem was the place where worship should be offered. They also changed "Ebal" to "Gerizim" in their Pentateuch, so as to make the latter the place in which Moses commanded that an altar should be built and offerings made (Deut. xxvii, 4-8). On Gerizim—to which the Samaritan woman refers, "in this mountain," close to Jacob's well—the Samaritans had a temple built in the time of Alexander the Great, which was destroyed by John Hyrcanus² (B. C. 129). The high priest of the Samaritans told me that he regarded Gerizim (Nablûs) as the place where worship should be rendered, and that he considered the modern Jews as a species of heretics, acting in many things contrary to the law. How accurate, then, is the account of this people and their relations to the Jews, given by the author of the fourth Gospel!

In the controversy between the Jews and Samaritans Christ decides in favour of the Jews, and declares: "Ye (Samaritans) worship ye know not what: we (the Jews) know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews" (chap. iv, 22). It is very clear that Christ recognizes the authority of the Jewish dispensation in using "we," and that he has no reference to a small portion of the Jews who were spiritual. In short, there is not the slightest trace of Gnosticism in the passage.³ When Christ says, "Salvation is of the Jews," the context requires the meaning to be: "Salvation pertains to and proceeds from the Jews."

The author of the fourth Gospel *shows an accurate knowledge of the country in which Christ exercised his ministry.* The statement in chap. iv respecting Jacob's well, close to Mount Gerizim, and close by

¹ See my interview with the high priest of the Samaritans at Nablûs, in my *Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land*, pp. 183-186.

² Josephus, *Antiq.*, b. xiii, chap. ix, sec. 1.

³ Hilgenfeld's exposition of the passage is very arbitrary.

Sychar,¹ or Shechem, near a parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph, and on the way from Judea into Galilee, is very accurate. The answer of the Samaritan woman, “the well is deep,” is also accurate, for it is not less than seventy-five feet² in depth. East of the well, close to it, and lying but little lower than it, is a valley running north and south, which was set in wheat when the writer was there, and from time immemorial has been, doubtless, sowed with this grain. This very field may have suggested the beautiful language of Christ: “Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest” (chap. iv, 35).

Topog apical
accuracy of the
fourth Gospel

In chap. ix, 7 our Saviour says to the blind man, “Go, wash in the pool of Siloam.” Of this pool Josephus speaks: “The valley called that of the Cheesemakers, which, we said, separates the ridge of the upper city from the lower ridge, extends down to Siloam,³ for thus we called the fountain, which was large and sweet.”⁴ We found this fountain just where Josephus locates it, at the end of the valley dividing Jerusalem.

In chap. xi, 18 it is said: “Now Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem about fifteen furlongs off.” When in Palestine we made an estimate of the distance of this village from Jerusalem, and found it about one mile and three fourths to St. Stephen’s gate in the east wall.⁵ In chapter xviii, 1 it is stated that “Jesus with his disciples went out beyond the brook Cedron⁶ (Kidron), where was a garden.” In speaking of the Mount of Olives, Josephus remarks: “It lies east of Jerusalem, from which it is separated by a deep ravine, which

¹This form of the name, instead of Συχεμ, Sychem (in Acts and often in LXX), Σικιμα, Sikima, as it was sometimes called, may have been a provincialism with the Jews of Galilee, or it may have been derived from שֶׁקֶר, *sheker*, *falsehood*, given the place in contempt. Beelzebub was changed into Beelzebul, for example. It is, however, possible that the village *Askar*, not far from the well, on the shoulder of Ebal, may be intended.

²As we found by trial.

³John and Josephus in this passage use exactly the same word Σιλωάμ.

⁴Bel. Jud., lib. v, cap. iv, 1.

⁵Fifteen Greek furlongs make three thousand and thirty yards.

The reading in chap. xviii, 1 is not uniform in the MSS. Tischendorf adopts τοῦ Κέδρον, from the Codex Sinaiticus, and Tregelles τῶν Κέδρων, from Codex Vaticanus. We would prefer the Alexandrian Codex, which gives τοῦ Κέδρων. The variations in the MSS. arose from the copyists’ ignorance of the Hebrew name of the brook, קִדְרֹן, *qidrōn* (*turbid*), which they mistook for the plural of the Greek κέδρος, a cedar, and, consequently, they sometimes inserted a plural article before it, as it is also written in 1 Kings xv, 13. Josephus writes it in the singular, Κέδρων, Κεδρώνος. There is no proof that the author of the fourth Gospel supposed the brook was named after cedar trees.

is called Cedron¹ (Κεδρών).” In one place he calls it a brook (χείμαρρος), just as in John. Cedron occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. Just east of the dry bed of the Kidron, at the foot of the Mount of Olives, the garden (Gethsemane) into which our Saviour went is still pointed out.

In chap. iii, 23 we have the statement: “And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water (ὕδατα πολλά, *many waters* or *fountains*) there.” Enon is a Chaldee word, ܢܘܢ, meaning fountains. To this Enon (or, rather, Ænon) Jerome refers: “Ænon, near Salim, where John baptized, as it is written in the Gospel according to John (chap. iii, 23); and, until the present time, the place is shown, eight miles to the south of Scythopolis, near Salim and the Jordan.”²

In chapter vi, 19, in speaking of the disciples crossing the north end of the Sea of Galilee, from the eastern shore to Bethsaida on the western, it is stated: “When they had rowed about twenty-five or thirty furlongs”—that is, about three miles, or three and a half—“they see Jesus walking on the sea.” When he enters the ship, “immediately the ship was at the land whither they went” (verse 21). The Sea of Galilee is not more than six or seven miles in width in its widest part, and the whole distance that the disciples rowed in crossing could not have been more than four miles. It is clear from this that the author of the fourth Gospel was well acquainted with this sea.

It is a remarkable fact that nowhere in this Gospel does Tiberias, on the Sea of Galilee, occupy any prominence, being John's notice of Tiberias. mentioned only once (chap. vi, 23) as the place from which boats had come. The natural explanation is, that during the ministry of Christ it was a place of no importance, as it was founded by Herod Antipas, who was banished A. D. 39. Tiberias was, however, a place of great importance during the Jewish war, and for several centuries subsequently. How natural it would have been for a forger in the second century to make Tiberias prominent in Christ's history! In several places in this Gospel mention is made of Cana of Galilee (chaps. ii, 1, 11; iv, 46; xxi, 2). This is to be identified with the modern village, Kefr Kenna, containing about six hundred inhabitants, situated about five miles north-east of Nazareth, on the road to Tiberias, and to other points on the coast of the Sea of Galilee. We passed by this place in 1870 on the way from Tiberias to

¹ Bellum Jud., lib. v, cap. ii, sec. 3.

² Onomasticon. This work was originally written by Eusebius (who was bishop of Cesarea in Palestine,) and was translated into Latin, with additions, by Jerome, who spent a large portion of his life in Bethlehem, in Palestine, where he died.

Nazareth, and found in it the remains of a church. Willibald¹ (A. D. 722) visited it on his way from Nazareth to Mount Tabor, and states: "A large church stands there, and near the altar is still preserved one of the six vessels which our Lord commanded to fill with water to be turned into wine." The village is mentioned by Sæwulf² (A. D. 1102) as the Cana of Galilee, six miles north-east of Nazareth, where Christ turned water into wine. When our Saviour was on the way from Jerusalem to Capernaum, he was found at Cana (chap. iv, 46)—where he was visited by the nobleman whose son was sick—which lies on the way from Nazareth to Capernaum. The Cana suggested by Robinson, eleven miles north of Nazareth, is wholly unsuitable to some statements in this Gospel, as well as to some passages in Josephus.³ "The Greek Christians of Palestine," says Dr. Zeller, "never doubted the identity of Kefr Kenna with the Cana of the Gospel."⁴

In chap. xi, 54 it is said that Jesus departed from the vicinity of Jerusalem, and "went unto a country near to the desert, Christ's visit to Ephraim. into a city called Ephraim." This Ephraim is stated by Jerome⁵ to be five miles east of Bethel, with which place it is connected by Josephus,⁶ who remarks that Vespasian captured "Bethel and Ephraim, small towns." It was about ten miles from Jerusalem, and near the desert. Respecting this small place, then, our evangelist is exact.

In chap. i, 28 the best MSS., supported by the Peshito-Syriac, read: "These things were done in Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." The English version here has Bethabara, but Bethany has been received into the text by both Tischendorf and Tregelles. Nothing is known of this place beyond the Jordan. No one in his right mind can suppose that the evangelist has transferred the Bethany, which he himself tells us is about fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem (chap. xi, 18), to the country beyond the Jordan!

The author of the fourth Gospel, in every instance in which he can be tested, shows a most accurate knowledge of the regions where Christ exercised his ministry; such knowledge as could have been possessed alone by one living in that country, unless we are to suppose that the author, if a forger, went to Palestine purposely to study the country and to mark the distances of places, with a view to deceive! But all his geographical statements are too natural to have been the result of design!

¹ Early Travels in Palestine, Bohn's edition, p. 16.

² Ibid., p. 47.

³ See the discussion of this subject in my Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land, pp. 205-207.

⁴ In Explorations of Palestinian Society.

⁵ Onomasticon.

Bellum Jud., lib. iv, cap. ix sec. 9.

THE EVANGELIST GIVES MANY PARTICULARS THAT COULD HAVE COME ONLY FROM ONE WHO WAS PRESENT AT THE SCENES DESCRIBED.

He names definitely, "the next day" (chap. i, 35); "about the tenth hour" (ver. 39); six water pots and the contents of each (chap. ii, 6); the definite number of years during which the Jews said the temple was building (ver. 20); the hour of the day (about the sixth) when Jesus sat upon the well (chapter iv, 6); the time Jesus staid among the Samaritans (two days) (ver. 49); the hour at which the fever left the nobleman's son (ver. 52); that the pool of Bethesda had five porches¹ (chap. v, 2); that the impotent man had been afflicted thirty-eight years. The account of the man who was born blind, and to whom sight was given by Christ, and the questions of the Pharisees and the answers (chap. ix), could have been written only by an eyewitness. The evangelist gives many particulars respecting the resurrection of Lazarus which indicate an eyewitness. He gives the name of the high priest's servant² whose right ear Peter cut off (chap. xviii, 10). He states the weight of the myrrh and aloes brought by Nicodemus for the burial of Christ (chap. xix, 39). He gives particulars respecting the grave-clothes after Christ's resurrection (chap. xx, 5-7); the distance that the disciples dragged the net (chap. xxi, 8); and the number of fishes that were in it (ver. 11).

We find also other evidence that the author of this Gospel was an eyewitness of the life of Christ. In chap. i, 14 he says: "And *we beheld* his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." In chap. xix, 35, after the statement that one of the soldiers pierced the side of Christ, out of which there immediately came blood and water, the evangelist adds: "And he who has seen it, has borne testimony to it, and his testimony is true, and that one knows that he speaks the truth that ye may believe." This language points out the writer himself as the eyewitness of what he describes. The use of the perfect tense *has seen* (ἑώρακώς) and *has borne testimony* (μεμαρτύρηκε) shows that the witness was still living when the Gospel was written; and the declaration that the one who has seen it, and borne testimony to it, knows that he speaks the truth, is fully conscious of it, implies the writer himself. Nor is this inference weakened by the fact that the witness is called ἐκεῖ-

¹ They were, of course, destroyed with Jerusalem, A. D. 70.

² He says (chap. xviii, 15), in speaking of Peter and himself, "That disciple (himself) was known unto the high priest." How natural, then, that he should know the name of the servant from his having visited the house, in all probability.

νος, *that one*. That ἐκεῖνος, *that one*, can be used by a speaker or writer as referring to himself, is clear from another passage in this Gospel. When our Saviour asked the man to whom he had given sight if he believed on him, and he answered, "Who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him?" Christ said to him: "Thou hast both seen him, and he who is talking with thee is *that one*" (ἐκεῖνος) (chap. ix, 37). Here Christ, who is speaking, calls himself *that one* (ἐκεῖνος); of course, John could do the same.²

In several places in this Gospel mention is made of the disciple whom Jesus loved (chaps. xiii, 23; xix, 26; xx, 2; xxi, 7, 20), and it is stated that "this is the disciple that testified of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true" (chap. xxi, 24). The whole of this twenty-fourth verse, at least the last part of it, "and we know that his testimony is true," was in all probability written by elders of the Church at Ephesus as an attestation to this Gospel, before it was sent abroad into the Churches; and, at the same time, the name of John was, doubtless, prefixed to it. It would have been unsuitable for the evangelist to say of himself: "*We* know that his testimony is true." Certain it is, indeed, that this verse, at all events, testifies to the fact that this Gospel was written by the beloved disciple. And this testimony refers to the entire preceding Gospel, and forbids the idea that the twenty-first chapter is an addition to the original account. Nor has there ever been a copy of John's Gospel found without this chapter.

But there remains the question, Was this beloved disciple John? This must be answered in the affirmative, as no other disciple satisfies all the requirements of the case. Three of our Saviour's disciples—Peter, James, and John—were the most intimate companions of their Master. These he took with him to be the witnesses of his transfiguration (Matt. xvii, 1; Mark ix, 2; Luke ix, 28); and to be his companions while in his agony in the garden of Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi, 37). On another occasion, "he suffered no man to follow him save Peter, James, and John" (Mark v, 37). It was these three disciples who asked

¹ The Greek is, *καὶ ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει, and that one knows that he says the truth.*

² In the clouds of Aristophanes, when Strepsiades, having gone upon the roof of the school of Socrates, is setting fire to it, one of the scholars inquires: "Who is setting fire to our house?" To which Strepsiades answers: "*That one* (ἐκεῖνος) whose cloak you stole." But it was the cloak of Strepsiades himself that had been stolen; so that he calls himself ἐκεῖνος, just as John does. It is to no purpose that Hilgenfeld objects that this is comedy; for it is Greek, and very good Greek, too, expressed in the clearest manner.

The author of the Gospel indicated in ch. xxi, 24.

Was John the beloved disciple?

Christ privately concerning the destruction of the temple (Mark xiii, 3).

The beloved disciple who wrote the fourth Gospel could not be James, for he was killed by Herod about twelve years after the crucifixion of Christ (Acts xii, 12). Nor could it have been Peter, for the beloved disciple is distinguished from him (John xiii, 23, 24); so that John alone is the remaining intimate companion who could have written the fourth Gospel.¹ The ancient Christian Church never doubted that the beloved disciple was John, who leaned upon the breast of Christ. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus in the last part of the second century, and Irenæus and Origen speak of it as a well-known fact.

It has, however, been objected, that it seems improper for John to designate himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved, as this is a reflection on his associates. But even *supposing* that it was not in good taste for him to do so, does that prove that he never did it? How many things have been done in what is called "bad taste" by the greatest and holiest of men! Paul tells us that he withstood Peter "to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal. ii, 11). Why might not John do something for which he could be blamed? How far a writer may speak of the intimate relations existing between himself and eminent men, or even speak in commendation of himself, is a matter of taste. St. Paul declares that he "laboured more abundantly than they (apostles) all" (1 Cor. xv, 10); and "I suppose," says he, "that I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles" (2 Cor. xi, 5).

But it is by no means clear that there is any impropriety in John speaking of himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved. The Gospel and the First Epistle of John reveal to us a deep moral and religious nature, and a most affectionate disposition. Is it not, then, in the highest degree probable that Christ especially loved him? It is clear from the other Gospels, as we have already seen, that he was one of the favourites of Christ. He does not say in his Gospel that Jesus loved him more than the other disciples, though this might be inferred. He makes his statements on this point with a great deal of delicacy. But, further, when John wrote his Gospel, all the other disciples, except Andrew,² it seems, were dead. What impropriety

¹ The hypothesis has been proposed by Lützelberger that Andrew was the beloved disciple. But it is evident from the Gospels that Andrew was not one of the intimate disciples of Christ, and John i, 40 seems to distinguish him from the author of the Gospel, for one of the two disciples named is Andrew, and the other appears to be John.

² According to the Canon of Muratori, Andrew was still alive when John wrote his Gospel.

was there in his speaking, then, of the love his Saviour had for him? To illustrate this from mere human relations: suppose any one in writing his autobiography, when his mother was dead, and all his brothers and sisters, too, in calling to mind the deep affection of his mother for him, should state, "I was a favourite child of my mother," could he be justly censured by any one? Further, John nowhere makes himself prominent in his Gospel. He nowhere gives his name; but Peter here, as well as in the other Gospels, is the prominent disciple, and exhibits the same traits of character as we find in them; and this is a proof of the true historical character of John's narrative.

It is a remarkable fact, and can be explained only on the supposition that the Apostle John is the author of this Gospel, that John the Baptist is everywhere called simply John. In this Gospel his name occurs nineteen times. In Matthew he is seven times called John the Baptist, in Mark four times, and in Luke four times. But it was quite natural in John the evangelist to make no distinction between Johns, as he knew but one of that name, the Baptist.

The chief objection brought against the fourth Gospel is, that the picture it gives of the person of Christ, the method of his teaching, his long discourses and their contents, are different from what we find in the other three Gospels. There is in this objection just truth enough to present an apparent difficulty, which, however, disappears upon careful reflection.

Chief objection to John's Gospel as a delineation of Christ.

In the first place it is to be observed, that there is no reason to suppose that the first three Gospels give an exhaustive view of the person and teachings of Christ, since but one¹ of the authors of them was an eyewitness of the acts of Christ, and heard his discourses. We, indeed, find several events in the Gospel of John which must have occurred, but are not recorded in the other Gospels, especially our Saviour's visits to Jerusalem² at the great festivals. In that city he must have performed miracles, taught, and been drawn into controversies with the Jews, just as is recorded in John's Gospel. The statement of the ancient Church is, no doubt, correct, that John wrote last of the evangelists, and to supply the omissions of the others. It is certain that he was acquainted with the other Gospels, and that his Gospel supplements them.

As the first three Gospels set forth the teachings of Christ chiefly in parables, and his numerous miracles—all of which are easily trans-

Mark also may have been present at some of the scenes he describes.

¹ Christ's teaching in Jerusalem is implied in Matt. xxiii, 37: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together," etc. It seems also, from Luke xi, 51, xiii, 22, and xvii, 11, that Christ sometimes went up to Jerusalem.

mitted to others, and well adapted to the purposes of instruction, but do not enter deeply into Christ's relation to his Father, or to his followers—the Gospel of John, in supplying the omissions of the other three, and in rarely touching the same points, naturally appears different from them. This Gospel, it is true, relates, in common with them, the baptism of Christ, and the incidents connected with his crucifixion and resurrection, which are events that could not be omitted in any history of our Lord.

The relation that John bears to Christ resembles that of Plato to Socrates; he is emphatically the philosophical evangelist. The representations given of Socrates by Xenophon and Plato seem to be different, and Bleek well observes: "Some have held the two to be irreconcilable, and that for the most part Xenophon's representation of Socrates is alone true, and they have deemed the Socrates of Plato to be purely a creature of his imagination. The one-sidedness of this view has been acknowledged in more recent times; for if Socrates had appeared as a teacher merely in the way in which he appears in Xenophon, if the speculative element was not really in him as Plato represents it to be, it would be difficult to comprehend how from him several highly speculative philosophical schools could have proceeded. Rather, each of the two representations gives us Socrates only on definite sides, the union of which affords us a more complete picture of him. But if a human philosopher like Socrates, in his appearance, has exhibited so many traits that two of his intimate disciples could give representations of their master so different, and which, apparently, have so little in common, yet are true, this is still more conceivable of Christ, of *him* who must necessarily present in his person and life a still richer fulness, since he was to be the Redeemer of men of the most varied individualities. It is, therefore, to be taken for granted that we shall naturally find that, even of his more intimate disciples, one has more fully comprehended and appropriated one side of his character and the method of his operation, while another has the other side."¹

We may observe that, as the light of the sun, reflected from different bodies, gives us different kinds of light, all of which exist in the sun, so we have from the different evangelists different reflections of the person of Christ, which, combined, give us a complete image of him.

But there are not wanting in the other Gospels evidences of the same person and character that we find in the Christ of John. How like John is the following passage: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man

Similarities between John and the other evangelists.

¹ Einleitung, by Mangold, pp. 224, 225.

knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matthew xi, 27); similar to this is Luke x, 22. Of like import is the language of Christ to Peter, when the latter acknowledged him as the Christ, the Son of the living God: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. xvi, 17). The language of Christ in Matt. xxviii, 18, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," is quite similar to that in John iii, 35, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." Our Lord's argument in refuting the Sadducees, that because God calls himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and not being the God of the dead but of the living (Matt. xxii, 32; Mark xii, 26; Luke xx, 37, 38), therefore they live unto Him, is of a highly metaphysical character, equal to almost any thing of the kind we find in John. The question our Saviour put to his hearers, "If David call him (Christ) Lord, how is he his son?" (Matt. xxii, 45), is also of a metaphysical character.

The Gospel of John, it is true, sets forth the divinity of Christ clearly and strongly, yet it does not contradict what is taught in the other Gospels, as may be inferred from passages already quoted. The power of forgiving sins that Christ claimed and exercised (Matt. ix, 2-6; Mark ii, 5-10; Luke v, 20-24) implies his divinity. The Tübingen school of critics, the chief opponents of John's Gospel, acknowledge the Apocalypse to be the writing of John, and in this the divinity of Christ is strongly asserted.¹ The Apostle Paul asserts the same doctrine in the undisputed Epistle to the Romans,² to say nothing of his other Epistles. But as Paul was at various times in the company of the apostles, and knew many who were acquainted with Christ, it is not to be supposed that in fundamental principles here was a difference between him and the others. He must have known what Christ said of himself.

The main question, however, in respect to the discourses of Christ as recorded by John is, Are they related as they were delivered by Christ, or did John cast them into his own mould? and is it not possible that after the lapse of many years he may have attributed to Christ, in some instances, what was the result of his own experience and reflection? It must be acknowledged that there is a greater liability in men to forget discourses than to forget remarkable works. What the eyes behold is

Does John report correctly Christ's discourses.

¹ For example, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty" (chap. i, 8; see also chaps. v, 8-14; xvii, 14; xxii, 13).

² "Christ, who is God over all blessed for ever" (chap. ix, 5).

more deeply fixed than what the ears hear. The miracles of Christ must have been indelibly impressed upon John's mind for all time. But as the discourses of Christ grew out of certain miracles or important events, it is not at all likely that his words, in substance at least, faded from the beloved disciple's mind; and it is not necessary to suppose that John has always given the Saviour's exact language as spoken in Aramaic. That John should intentionally make Christ utter merely *his* ideas is inconceivable. Our Saviour promised to send the Holy Spirit to bring to the remembrance of the apostles all that he had said unto them (John xiv, 26).

We have already remarked on the striking similarity of language and conception between the First Epistle of John and his Gospel, which is to be explained, not by supposing that he attributes his ideas to Christ, but that the doctrines of the Saviour, in the form in which they are presented in the Gospel, produced upon John the deepest impression, moulding his thoughts, and, to a certain extent, their form. The Epistle is the reflex of what he learned from Christ. The philosophical and deeply spiritual truths of Christ's teaching found in the nature of this apostle a sympathetic response. We have every reason to believe that the discourses of Christ, as well as his acts, have been related with great fidelity by this evangelist. It is not improbable that, at a very early period, he made notes of our Saviour's discourses, and perhaps, also, of our Saviour's acts.

A proof of the historical character of the remarks of Christ is found in the obscure references which he makes to his crucifixion and resurrection: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (chap. ii, 19). The Jews supposed the reference was to their temple; but the evangelist remarks, "He spake of the temple of his body." "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (chap. xii, 32). "This," remarks the evangelist, "he said, signifying what death he should die." Of an obscure nature, also, without the subsequent history, is the remark: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up" (chap. iii, 14). Christ obscurely refers to his crucifixion and resurrection when he says: "I lay down my life, that I might take it again" (chap. x, 17). He also hints at his resurrection and ascension in these words: "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" (chap. vi, 62). If the passages referring to Christ's crucifixion and resurrection had been invented, or if his genuine expressions on this subject had passed through one or two hands, they would have assumed a more definite form. In the other Gospels Christ is represented as foretelling his death and resurrection with more precision (Matt. xvi, 21; Mark viii, 31; Luke ix, 22)

A proof of the genuineness of the discourses of Christ may be drawn from the fact that the impression made by them is given, and the misunderstanding of them in several instances is stated (chaps. vii, 33-36; viii, 21, 22, etc.). This, however, will appear more clearly from the consideration of the discourses themselves, which will be found to contain nothing unsuitable for Christ to have taught, and, at the same time, to bear internal marks of genuineness. Chapter iii contains a conversation of our Saviour with Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, in which he sets forth the spiritual nature of his kingdom, and teaches the doctrine of the new birth. That a Jewish ruler should come secretly to Christ by night, for fear of the Jews, to learn his doctrines, is not at all incredible. Nicodemus declares his conviction that Christ is a teacher sent from God, and he was doubtless anxious to know what was the nature of the kingdom that Christ was about to set up. In opposition to Jewish expectation, Christ assures him that his kingdom is spiritual, to enter which it is necessary to be born again. The short, pithy form in which Christ teaches regeneration accords with his general method of teaching in the other Gospels. Regeneration is taught by the apostles in the Acts and in the Epistles, and the doctrine must have been derived from Christ himself. In Matt. xviii, 3 Christ says: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."¹

Marks of genuineness in the reports of the discourses of Christ by John.

The conversation of Christ with the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well has in it all the marks of genuineness, and contains the profoundest passage in the New Testament (chap. iv, 24). The controversy with the Jews in chap. v grew out of our Saviour's healing the impotent man on the Sabbath day, to which they took exception; and the whole discussion is perfectly in keeping with the character of Christ, and that of his Jewish adversaries. The profoundly spiritual, and, at the same time, metaphorical, discourse of Christ in chapter vi, grew out of his feeding about five thousand men with a few loaves and fishes, also recorded in the other Gospels. The multitude having been fed, it was natural that some of them would follow Christ for the loaves and fishes. These he rebukes, and exhorts to labor for the meat that perisheth not. This has the genuine stamp of Christ's teaching, as appears from the other Gospels. This is followed by the statement that Christ is the bread of life, etc. How natural and connected the discourse is, and how natural was the ef-

¹ Strauss, to get rid of the testimony of Justin Martyr to John's Gospel, supposes that this father, when he gives John iii, 3, had in mind Matt. xviii, 3. In that case he must have considered Matthew and John to be identical on this point.

fect of his spiritual teaching, which sifted them. "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him" (chap. vi, 66). In Christ's discussion with the Jews in chapter viii it is clear that his words are really given, for in several instances the Jews put upon them a construction different from their true meaning (vers. 22, 33, 57, etc.). The healing of the blind man in chapter ix, and the discussion thereon, has all the marks of reality, and must have been recorded by an eyewitness.

In chap. x Christ puts forth the parable of a shepherd, which the evangelist states "they" did not understand, whereupon Christ declares himself to be the door and shepherd of the sheep. This method of teaching by parable is very similar to what is found in the other Gospels, especially the parable of the sower (Matt. xiii, 3-23; Mark iv, 3-20; Luke viii, 5-15), in which, doubtless, the sower represents Christ himself. In chapters xiii, 31-xvii the evangelist gives us our Saviour's last discourse with his disciples at supper on the night of his betrayal. This address, or rather conversation, did not require more than a half hour for its delivery, at any rate. That such a discourse should be delivered to the disciples was exceedingly appropriate, and quite necessary. This, it is true, presupposes that the Saviour knew that it was his last meal with them—a supposition we are authorized to make from the general statements of the Gospels.

In the very midst of this discourse our Saviour says, "Arise, let us go hence" (chap. xiv, 31); but yet there is no indication that Christ left the room. It appears that he made an attempt to start, but, without really leaving, he continued the discourse. But how unnatural it would have been for any one in making up a speech to insert these apparently useless words in the midst of it!

In two instances the evangelist does not distinguish clearly between the language of the Baptist and his own. In chapter i, 15, in the midst of a description of the glories of Christ, he declares: "John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for he was before me." Here end the words of the Baptist, which are thrown in parenthetically, and the evangelist resumes the interrupted thread: "And of his fulness have we all received, and grace for (upon) grace," etc. Any one examining this and the two following verses will see clearly that the evangelist could never have intended them to be understood as the words of the Baptist. In chapter iii, 27-30, ending it would seem with the words, "He (Christ) must increase, but I must decrease," the evangelist gives another testimony of the Baptist to Christ; but the following verses (31-36), not separated

from the preceding ones, do not suit the Baptist, but appear to be a commentary of the evangelist upon his testimony. In the written language of the moderns the use of quotation marks enables us to distinguish accurately between what the writer says in his own person, and what he introduces as a quotation from another. But as these marks were not in use when the evangelist wrote, the language quoted can be determined from the context only, which, in some cases, it may be difficult to do.

THE LOGOS (WORD) IN JOHN'S GOSPEL.

In the very first verse of his Gospel John tells us that "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God." And in verse 14 he states that "the Logos (Word) was made flesh, and dwelt among us." The question here arises, Is this doctrine consistent with the apostolic origin of the Gospel? This must be answered in the affirmative. Even if the idea of the Logos came originally from the Greeks, and was unknown to the Jews of Palestine, the long abode of John in Ephesus among cultivated Greeks must have made him familiar with it, as it appears in the writings of the Alexandrian Jew, Philo (* about B. C. 20); for it is not at all probable that the Gospel of John was written before A. D. 80. But it is not at all necessary to attribute to Philo the origin of the expression used by the evangelist. A foundation was already laid in the Old Testament for the doctrine of the Logos, or Word, possessing the attributes of divinity. When God promises to send his angel before the Israelites, he warns them not to provoke him, "for my name (divinity) is in him" (Exod. xxiii, 21). In the Book of Proverbs we find wisdom personified (chap. i, 20-33), especially in chapter viii, where she represents herself as being from everlasting, present at the creation; "and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." In the apochryphal writer, Jesus the son of Sirach (chap. xxiv), wisdom is personified, and in the Wisdom of Solomon, wisdom is hypostasized and clothed with attributes (vii, 22).

In the Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, made into Chaldee about the time of Christ for the use of the Jews of Palestine, we find מִיְמְרָא, *Memra* (*Word, Logos*), used for a divine personage, especially to avoid an anthropomorphism, as, "They heard the voice of *The Memra* (*The Word*) of Jehovah God walking in the garden (Gen. iii, 8); or an anthropopathism, as, "Jehovah repented through his *Memra* (*Word*) that he had made man upon the earth" (Gen. vi, 6). Buxtorf remarks on מִיְמְרָא, *Memra*, "The Targumist (Onkelos) is accustomed to use this divine name (Jehovah) by means of *The Memra*

The term "Logos" in John not necessarily from Philo.

of Jehovah, as the evangelist John says, *ὁ λόγος*" (The Word).¹ The second definition given of *Memra* by Rabbi Levy is, "*The Word* considered as a person, especially *מִיְמְרָה דְּ* (*Memra of Jehovah*), *the Word of God, for The Being (Wesen), the Personality of God, ὁ λόγος*" (The Logos).²

In the face of these facts it is not necessary to resort to Philo to explain the Logos of John's Gospel. Further, John's conception of the Logos is entirely different from that of Philo. In Philo the office of the Logos is "to fill up the chasm between the pure Being and the real world, to make possible the creation of the world, and the influence of God upon it; and, at least, where the Greek element in his philosophy prevails, the Logos is regarded as a relatively independent personality, as a second God (*ὁ θεὸς ὁ δεῦτερος*), while the formula of the Gospel (*ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, i. e., *the Word was made man*) can designate only the realization of the divine idea in a man. This difference of the conception of the Logos in the evangelist and in Philo is, in its ultimate ground, the consequence of a profound difference in their conceptions of God."³

De Groot well observes that in the system of Philo the idea of the Logos becoming incarnate would have been as absurd as the conversion of light into darkness, truth into falsehood; and that John set himself in opposition to the spirit of the age in his doctrine of the incarnate Word.⁴ It is evident, then, that Justin Martyr and other fathers of the second century derived their doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos from John, an apostolical authority without which they would not have ventured upon the bold assertion that the Logos became incarnate. Also in the Apocalypse (chap. xix, 13) Christ is called the Word (Logos) of God. It must be observed, in conclusion, that John uses the term Logos only in the introduction, and that he never represents Christ as calling himself by that title.

THE ALLEGED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN JOHN AND THE OTHER
EVANGELISTS RESPECTING THE DAY OF THE MONTH ON WHICH
CHRIST WAS CRUCIFIED.

The evangelists unanimously agree that Christ was crucified on the day before the Jewish Sabbath, but it has been disputed whether this was the 14th or 15th of the month Nisan—the day before, or the first day of, the feast of the Passover. It appears from the first three Gospels that Christ ate the passover on the evening preceding

¹ Rabbinical and Talmudical Lexicon, col. 125.

² Chaldäisches Wörterbuch, Zweiter Band, p. 32.

³ Wittichen, on John's Gospel, pp. 13, 14, (German edition.)

⁴ Basilides, Als Erster Zeuge, u. s. w., p. 125.

the day on which he was crucified (Matt. xxvi, 17-29; Mark xiv 12-25; Luke xxii, 7-20). In the statement made by these evangelists there is no reference to Christ's anticipating the regular day of the eating of the passover—the evening of the 14th day of Nisan—and eating it on the 13th.

John states that "before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.

John xiii, 22
compared with
John xvii, 23.

And during supper, the devil having now put," etc. (chap. xiii, 1, 2). It is very probable that the supper here referred to is the paschal supper, since it stands in close connection with the words "before the passover." If it was one day before the passover, it is very likely that John would have so stated it. As the other evangelists had given an account of the celebration of the passover by Christ and his disciples, John may have thought that it was unnecessary to relate it. In John xviii, 28 it is stated: "And they themselves (the Jews) went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover." If we are to understand by eating the passover eating the paschal lamb, we shall find John in contradiction with the other evangelists, unless we suppose that Christ anticipated that observance by one day. But there is no necessity for so interpreting the language of John, as the passover festival lasted seven days (Exod. xii, 15, 19; Lev. xxiii, 34-36). According to Num. xxviii, 18, 19, on the first day of the passover festival (the fifteenth day of the month) "two young bullocks and one ram, and seven lambs of the first year" were to be offered to Jehovah, in addition to which other offerings were to be made on that day. These offerings of the day following the evening on which the paschal lamb was eaten, and called by the Rabbies *Chagiga*, may be referred to by John in the phrase, "that they might eat the passover." In this way Dr. Lightfoot, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Olshausen, and others understand the passage, in proof of which reference is made to 2 Chron. xxx, 22, where, in speaking of the passover, it is said: "And they did eat throughout the feast seven days, offering peace-offerings," etc. This view can be supported also by Deut. xvi, 2: "'Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd," etc. Here "to sacrifice the passover" means not only the paschal lamb, but the offerings of the subsequent days. Consequently, "to eat the passover" may refer to the eating of the offerings during the festival.

Further, the defilement contracted by entering the judgment hall of Pilate (about the same as entering the house of a heathen) needed

not to have lasted longer than sunset of that day,¹ so that after that time they could have eaten the paschal lamb, if they had not already done so.² In view of this fact, John can scarcely refer to eating the *paschal lamb* on the eve of that day, but the *offerings* on *that day*.

John also states that the day on which our Saviour was crucified "was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour" (chap. xix, 14), in which he carefully states the time of the event. But what is the meaning of the phrase: *παρασκευῆ τοῦ πάσχα*, *preparation of the passover*? *Παρασκευῆ, preparation*, occurs six times in the Gospels, three of which are found in the first three, in which it unquestionably means *the day before the Jewish sabbath* (Friday), (Matt. xxvii, 62; Mark xv, 42; Luke xxiii, 54). It is also clear that John uses the word in chap. xix, 31, "Because it was the preparation," and also in verse 42, "Because of the Jews' preparation," in the sense of Friday, or the day before the sabbath. With these facts before us, it is most natural to interpret John xix, 14, "It was the preparation of the passover," in the same way—the preparation, or Friday, during the passover—which harmonizes completely with the other Gospels. Josephus³ also calls Friday *preparation*, and there is not a particle of proof that the Jews ever called the day before a festival *preparation*. In the spurious epistle of Ignatius to the Philippians⁴ the phrase, *σάββατον τοῦ πάσχα*, *sabbath of the passover*, and in the Ecclesiastical History⁵ of Socrates the phrase, *τὸ σάββατον τῆς ἑορτῆς*, *sabbath of the feast*, are similar in construction to *the preparation of the passover*.

But here arises the question, Would the Jews have condemned Christ to death on the first day of the great festival of the passover? It is difficult to say what bitter hate and a blind zeal for the honour of Jehovah would not do. Many things occur in the world's history which, in themselves, are very improbable, but are made certain by testimony. We cannot conceive how the first three evangelists could have represented Christ as being crucified on the day following the paschal supper, had it not been really so. They were too intimately acquainted with the facts to make a mistake on such a point as this. Even on the supposition that they had no sure evidence to guide them, they were too intimately acquainted with Jewish customs to assign the condemnation and crucifixion of Christ to the first day of the passover, if it had been abhorrent to the custom of their nation to condemn any one to death on that day. It must be espe-

¹ This defilement the Jews term *טבילת ידים*, *an ablution performed in the daytime*
See Lightfoot on John xviii, 28.

² This is clear from Lev. xxii, 6, 7.

³ Antiq., xvi, 6, 2.

⁴ Cap. xiii.

⁵ Lib. v, 22.

Not improbable
that our Lord
should be put to
death on a feast
day.

cially borne in mind that Christ was brought before the high priest Caiaphas early in the morning, and that he was delivered to death and executed by Pilate and the Roman soldiers, who were heathen.

That criminals might be condemned to death and executed on a feast day appears evident from ancient Jewish authorities. Tholuck gives the following passages bearing on this point: "The Sanhedrim assembled in the session-room of the stone chamber from the time of the morning offering to that of the evening, *but on the sabbaths and feast days they assembled themselves within לַחֲצַיִת, which is the lower wall, which surrounded the greater, in the vicinity of the fore court of the women.*"¹ "An elder who does not subject himself to the judgment of the Sanhedrim shall be taken from the place where he lives to Jerusalem, shall be kept there until one of the three feasts, and shall be killed at the time of the feast, for the reason stated Deut. xvii, 13."²

Nor could John be ignorant of the time at which Christ was crucified, whether it was the day after the paschal supper or not; so that it is difficult to see how any *real* discrepancy can exist between him and the other evangelists on this point. And if a writer of the second century, or even in the latter part of the first, without apostolical authority, had written this Gospel, he would have taken especial care to adhere closely to the letter and apparent facts of the other Gospels.

In connection with this subject is the *passover controversy* that arose in the last half of the second century. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and others, kept the 14th of Nisan as the passover festival, while the The passover controversy in the ancient Church. great mass of Christians kept a Friday in commemoration of Christ's death, and the following Sunday in commemoration of his resurrection, without regard to the day of the month. Polycrates states that the Apostle John also kept the 14th Nisan.³ "In the Christian assemblies," says Gieseler,⁴ "the Jewish passover was at first kept up, but observed with reference to Christ, the true passover (1 Cor. v, 7, 8)." On the other hand, Neander thinks that "in the Churches in Asia Minor the Christians who followed the Johannean tradition went on the supposition that the 14th day of Nisan ought to be regarded as the day of Christ's passion."⁵

If we suppose, in opposition to what we have already argued, that John's Gospel indicates that Christ was crucified on the 14th Nisan, which is the view of Neander, Bleek, and others, and that he celebrated the passover a day earlier than the regular time, and that the

¹Gemara Tr. Sanhedrim, chap. x.

²Mischna Sanh., x, 4, in Tholuck's Commentary on John, Krauth's translation.

³In Euseb., Hist. Eccles., lib. v, cap. xxiv. ⁴Church Hist., vol. i, pp. 166, 167.

⁵General Church History, p. 298.

Christians of Asia Minor, with the Apostle John, observed the 14th day, the question arises, How does this affect the genuineness of John's Gospel? To which we answer, It does not affect it at all; for we do not know whether the Christians¹ of Asia Minor kept the 14th in commemoration of Christ's crucifixion, or because on that day he had eaten his last passover with his disciples, or because it was the regular passover day.

The only way in which John's observance of the 14th Nisan as a passover festival would apparently stand in contradiction to the fourth Gospel is by supposing that the latter places the crucifixion of Christ on the 14th Nisan, and that the festival kept by the Apostle John on the 14th was in commemoration of the eating of the paschal lamb by Christ on that day. But neither of these suppositions is established, and if both were true, the practice of John would not be necessarily in conflict with the fourth Gospel. For, on his coming from Palestine to Ephesus, some time after A. D. 60, and finding the Churches in that city and vicinity, founded by Paul and his associates, celebrating the 14th of Nisan as the time of the last paschal supper of Christ, he would naturally unite with them in celebrating the regular passover day. Or are we to suppose that he would have insisted upon their keeping the 13th? It is clear from the New Testament that the apostles laid little stress on festive days.

THE REJECTION OF JOHN'S GOSPEL BY THE ALOGIANS (ALOGI).

Toward the end of the second century there arose in Thyatira, a small town in Asia Minor, a party who distinguished themselves by the rejection of both the Gospel and Apocalypse of John, and are called *Alogi* (*Alogians*) by Epiphanius, in the last part of the fourth century, because they rejected the *Logos* (*Word*) proclaimed by John.²

It is, doubtless, to this same party that Irenæus refers in the following language: "Others—that they may make void the gift of the Spirit, which in the most recent times according to the pleasure of the Father has been shed upon the human race—do not admit that form (of manifestation) which is according to the Gospel of John, in which the Lord promised that he would send the Paraclete (Comforter), but at the same time they reject both the Gospel and the prophetic spirit"³ (Apocalypse).

¹ This party received John's Gospel. See p. 589.

² *Hæresis*, li, cap. iii.

³ Alii, vero ut donum Spiritus frustrentur quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum Patris effusum est in humanum genus, illam speciem non admittunt, quæ est secundum Joannis evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit; sed simul et evangelium et propheticum repellunt Spiritum.—*Contra Hæreses*, lib. iii, cap. xi, 9.

Hippolytus, it seems, wrote against this sect in his work entitled, *Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ Ἀποκαλύψεως*, *A Defense of the Gospel according to John and the Apocalypse*. These Alogians were violent opponents of the Montanists—who laid claim to extraordinary spiritual powers, based chiefly on the gift of the Paraclete promised in John's Gospel—and of the Millenarians, who derived their chief support from the Apocalypse; and it seems that they were led to reject these two important works of John in order to take away the very foundation of the doctrines of their adversaries. The sect was obscure, and neither Origen nor Eusebius makes any mention of it. As far as we know, the Alogians were the only opponents of John's Gospel. They alleged no want of evidence for its apostolic origin, but represented it as being at variance with the other Gospels, and attributed it to Cerinthus, a noted heretic in the last part of the first century, which fact is a strong proof that this Gospel belongs to the first century. Nor can the Tübingen school, the chief modern opponents of John's Gospel, consistently lay any stress on its rejection by the Alogians, as they also rejected the Apocalypse, which these sceptics defend as the writing of the Apostle John.

CONCLUSION.

Réan remarks on this Gospel: "Every one who will undertake to write the life of Jesus without a fixed theory respecting the relative value of the Gospels, allowing himself to be guided only by the feeling of the subject, will be led in many cases to prefer the narrative in the fourth Gospel to that of the synoptics. The last words of the life of Jesus, in particular, are explained only by this Gospel; several facts respecting the Passion, unintelligible in the synoptics, assume in the narrative of the fourth Gospel probability and possibility."¹ Upon the discourses of Christ in this Gospel he does not set much value, and considers them to be, for the most part, the views of the evangelist put into the mouth of Christ. This Gospel, he thinks, was written in the last part of the first century by some one in the circle of John's followers in Asia Minor, who has given in the name of his master a free edition of it.²

Réan's high estimate of the fourth Gospel.

But why should the evangelist profess that he was an apostle, if he was not? If he derived his history of Christ from John, why should he not have so stated it, just as Luke states the sources of his Gospel? Mark, according to the testimony of the ancients, derived the material of his narrative from the preaching of Peter, yet the name of Peter was never prefixed to it. Réan concedes that the Gospel and the First Epistle of John have the same author, and in each the

¹ Vie de Jésus, p. lxxvii.

² Ibid., lxxvii

author professes to be an eyewitness of Christ's life, so that if John, or at least an apostle, was not their author, both works are forgeries. But if any one during the lifetime of John had written a Gospel in the name of that apostle, he would certainly have disclaimed its authorship; and after his death such a work could not have been successfully forged in his name, for it would have been well known that John wrote no Gospel. And in order that such a work should meet with any favour whatever, it would have been necessary that it should set forth the Gospel as preached by John, and in that case what could a forger accomplish by his spurious production? It is, indeed, clear that our Gospel could never have been composed from mere tradition, as its statements are too definite to have proceeded from any one except an eyewitness. Rénan thinks highly of the narrative portion of John, as we have seen, but does not attribute a high value to the discourses. But the discourses are so blended with, and so arise out of, the narrative portion, that it is difficult to separate them. The idea of a Christian in that age making discourses for Christ, especially different in style from what is contained in the other Gospels, is absurd. It is well known that the Apocryphal Gospels adhere closely to the history of Christ as contained in our Gospels, and rarely attribute any saying to him not found in them.

Neander truly remarks on this Gospel: "It could have emanated from none other than that 'beloved disciple' upon whose soul the image of the Saviour had left its deepest impress. So far from this Gospel having been written by a man of the second century (as some assert), we cannot even imagine a man existing in that century so little affected by the contraries of his times and so far exalted above them. Could an age involved in perpetual contradictions, an age of religious materialism, anthropomorphism, and one-sided intellectualism, have given birth to a production like this, which bears the stamp of none of these deformities? How mighty must the man have been who, in *that* age, could produce from his own mind such an image of Christ as this? And this man, too, in a period almost destitute of eminent minds, remained in total obscurity! Was it necessary for the master-spirit, who felt in himself the capacity and the calling to accomplish the greatest achievement of his day, to resort to a pitiful trick to smuggle his ideas into circulation?"¹

Credner, a distinguished German Rationalist, truthfully and beautifully says respecting this Gospel: "If we had been left without any historical testimonies respecting the author of the fourth Gospel, who is not named in the writing

Estimates of
Neander, Cred-
ner and Ewald.

Credner's tes-
timony to the
Gospel of John.

¹ Life of Christ, translated by M'Clintock and Blumenthal, pp. 6, 7.

itself, yet from internal grounds lying in the Gospel itself—from the nature of the language; from the freshness and vividness of the narrative; from the accuracy and definiteness of its statements; from the peculiar manner in which the Baptist and the sons of Zebedee are mentioned; from the enthusiastic love and fervour which the writer shows toward Jesus; from the irresistible charm which is diffused over the whole Gospel history written upon a definite plan; from the philosophical reflections with which he begins the Gospel—we would be led to the result that the author of such a Gospel can be a Palestinian only, can be an immediate eyewitness only, can be an apostle only, can only be a favourite of Jesus, can be that John only whom Jesus held captive by the entire heavenly charm of his doctrine.”¹

It is pleasant to see that great Orientalist and biblical scholar, Ewald, with his strong tendencies to free-thinking, whose criticism on the Old Testament is often so destructive, defending the genuineness and the historical character of this Gospel with so much confidence and earnestness. “That the Apostle John,” says he, “is really the author of this writing, and that no other can have composed it than that one to whom it has ever been attributed, can neither be doubted nor denied; rather, from every direction to which we may look, every ground, every indication, and every mark, conspire to forbid any such doubt (of its genuineness) ever seriously arising.”²

In concluding this part of our subject, we may remark that the combined evidence, external and internal, in favour of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel is well nigh overwhelming. It bears upon its very face the impress of truth and of its apostolic origin, and has ever been regarded as one of the great bulwarks of Christianity. It has commanded the admiration of the profoundest men in all ages of the Church, whose theology it has contributed so much to mould.

THE TIME AND PLACE OF ITS COMPOSITION.

The position of this Gospel in all the ancient Greek manuscripts, and in the early Peshito-Syriac version, shows that it was written after the other three, as no other reason can be assigned for its standing in the fourth place, and this conclusion is confirmed by the testimonies of the second century.³

John's Gospel
written after
the other three.

It would also appear that it was written after the other Gospels, from the fact that it supplements them. But as the Gospels of Mark and Luke were written a short time before the destruction of Jeru-

¹Einleitung in Das Neue Testament. Erster Theil, p. 208. Halle, 1836.

²Die Johannischen Schriften, p. 43. Göttingen, 1861.

³Tertullian, however, places John immediately after Matthew, doubtless because he was an apostle, in which he follows the old Latin version.

salem, it is in the highest degree probable that this Gospel was written after that event.

There is nothing in the Gospel itself to fix its date. The statement, "There *is* (ἔστιν) at Jerusalem . . . a pool . . . having five porches" (chap. v, 2), does not necessarily imply that Jerusalem was still standing, for the pool itself is not likely to have been destroyed with the city, though the porches *were* in all probability. John, indeed, speaks of the pool and porches as he knew them, and it is not at all likely that he visited the city after its destruction. Nor do the passages: "Bethany *was* nigh unto Jerusalem" (chap. xi, 18), and "Where *was* a garden"¹ (chap. xviii, 1), imply that these places no longer existed. In fact, they were not destroyed with Jerusalem as far as we know. The language indicates simply the state of things contemporaneous with the events without reference to the present.

It is clear that John wrote his Gospel after he had left Palestine; for he speaks of the customs of the Jews in such a way as no one would likely do who was living there at the time of writing: "There was a feast of the Jews" (chap. v, 1); "The passover, a feast of the Jews" (chap. vi, 4); "After the manner of the purifying of the Jews" (chap. ii, 6); also the statement about the pool and its porches (ch. v, 2), and the distance of Bethany from Jerusalem (ch. xi, 18). But it is impossible to determine how long after the destruction of Jerusalem this Gospel was written. John, according to Irenæus—a valuable witness on this point—lived till about A. D. 98, and we may suppose that he wrote the Gospel about A. D. 80, when he still enjoyed a vigorous life.

CONTENTS.

This Gospel opens with an introduction on the dignity of the person of Christ, followed by the testimony of John the Baptist, and various particulars respecting the way in which several of Christ's disciples became acquainted with him (chap. i). Then follow the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, and the conversion of water into wine; Christ's visit to Jerusalem, and his conversation with Nicodemus (chaps. ii, iii). His interview with the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well, and his return to Galilee, and his healing of the nobleman's son (chap. iv). He goes up to Jerusalem, where he heals a sick man on the Sabbath, which cure gives rise to a controversy between him and the Jews (chap. v). He crosses the Sea of Galilee, and feeds five thousand men with a few loaves and fishes, and holds a discussion with the Jews on his

¹The garden still remains: it must, however, have been greatly injured in the destruction of Jerusalem.

being the bread of life (chap. vi). Christ goes up to Jerusalem at the feast of Tabernacles, where he disputes with the Jews (chaps. vii, viii). Then come an account of Christ healing a man blind from his birth (chap. ix); the parable of the shepherd and the sheep, and his disputation with the Jews (chap. x); the death and the resurrection of Lazarus, and the effect upon the Jews (chap. xi); the anointing of Christ by Mary at Bethany; his triumphant entrance into Jerusalem. He hints at his death, and utters various moral and divine truths (chap. xii). While at supper, he washes his disciples' feet, to teach them humility, and predicts that one of them shall betray him, indicating by a sign to John that it is Judas, who immediately leaves (chap. xiii, 1-30). Christ utters his last discourses with his disciples (chaps. xiii, 31-xvii). We next have his arrest in the garden, and trial before Annas, Caiaphas, and Pilate; he is condemned to death; a description of the crucifixion (chaps. xviii, xix); his resurrection and appearance to his disciples (chap. xx). He afterward appears to them at the Sea of Galilee, enjoins upon Peter to feed his lambs and sheep, and predicts that apostle's death (chap. xxi). It is thus seen that comparatively few of Christ's miracles are recorded. No account is given of his cleansing the lepers, or casting out devils. On the other hand, John alone records Christ's raising of Lazarus from the dead, which was a most important event in Christ's life, the culmination of his miracles. It brought on the crisis which led to his crucifixion. Its absence from the other Gospels is to be explained by their omission of Christ's ministry at Jerusalem at the time.

Although John wrote, it would seem, to supplement the other Gospels, he had at the same time a higher object; and while stating that Christ performed many other works, he remarks: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name" (ch. xx, 31).

INTEGRITY OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

This Gospel seems appropriately to conclude with the last quoted words. Hence a very large number of critics, including Neander, De Wette, Lücke, and Bleek, regard chap. xxi as added by a later hand. Neander remarks: "The account in this chapter (xxi) was in all probability received from John's own lips, and written down after his death by one of his disciples."¹ Ewald thinks that John wrote his Gospel, ending with chapter xx, about A. D. 80, and in this condition it remained ten years or more. As the report had already spread that Jesus had told John he should

Opinions respecting chapter xxi.

¹Life of Christ, p. 434. M'Clintock and Blumenthal's Translation.

not die, the apostle was anxious before he died to correct the error, and his friends accordingly assisted him in adding chapter xxi as an appendix to the Gospel which had not yet been put into circulation. In this chapter the error was corrected. Ewald thinks it very closely resembles in style the preceding twenty chapters.¹ Hengstenberg believes that chapter xxi was written by John, while Olshausen, Tholuck, Godet, and others attribute to John the whole chapter with the exception of the last two verses (24, 25); and this seems to be the correct view. Chapter xxi, 24 states: "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and *wrote* these things," etc. It is difficult to see how it could be said that "this disciple wrote these things," when they had been written by another hand.

The particulars given in this chapter forbid the supposition that it could have been written by any one but an eyewitness (chap. xxi). It is found in all the ancient manuscripts and in all the ancient versions of this Gospel, which is a conclusive proof that it was originally published in this form. Had the addition been made after the Gospel had been put into circulation, chapter xxi would have been wanting in some ancient manuscripts and versions. The last two verses, however, were probably added by the Ephesian Church as a testimony to the Gospel before it was published.

It is very probable that John intended to close his Gospel with the end of the twentieth chapter; but before publishing it, he concluded to add the last chapter to correct the inference that had been drawn from a remark of Christ to him, that he should never die. In like manner, Paul's Epistle to the Romans finds a suitable close with chapter xv, the next chapter being an appendix.

The section (chaps. vii, 53-viii, 11) containing an account of the woman taken in adultery formed no part of the original Gospel of John. It is wanting in the oldest two Codices, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and also in the Alexandrian;² in the Peshito-Syriac version, as well as the Memphitic,³ Theban, Gothic, and Armenian,⁴ and in Latin MSS. of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. It was unknown to Origen, who, in commenting on John, connects chap. vii, 52 with chap. viii, 12. It appears to have been unknown also to Tertullian.⁵ The critical editors, Tischendorf and Tregelles, omit the section in their editions of the New Testament. In fact, the connexion is broken by this section. Nevertheless, the incidents related in it appear to be real,

¹ Die Joh. Schriften, pp. 54-57.

² It is first found in Codex Bezae.

³ In Memphitic MSS. of Wilkins. Schwartz remarks, "This narrative is wanting in the Memphitic and Sahidic versions.

⁴ Edition of Zohrab.

⁵ De Pudicitia, cap. vi.

and the conduct attributed to Christ bears the stamp of his character. The source of the narrative is uncertain. Eusebius remarks that Papias, in his work, gave an account of a woman who was accused before the Lord of many sins, which the Gospel according to the Hebrews contains.¹ It is not improbable that this was originally the same incident that is now contained in the section under discussion.

The account of an *angel troubling the pool* (ch. v, 3, 4), beginning with the words, "Waiting for the moving of the water," is not found in Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and ^{Angel troubling the pool (chap. v, 3, 4).} in some other very ancient MSS.; in most of the MSS.

of the Memphitic² and Sahidic versions, and in some very ancient Syriac fragments of the Gospels published by Cureton; and the section is accordingly omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles, who have the following text: "There is in Jerusalem at the sheep (gate) a pool which is called in Hebrew Bethesda,³ having five porches. In these were lying a multitude of sick, blind, lame, withered. There was a certain man there who had been sick thirty-eight years. Jesus seeing him lying," etc. The additional words found in manuscripts and versions, including the English, were in all probability written upon the margin of some manuscripts at a very early period as an explanation of the healing properties of the pool. The text is far better without this addition. With the exception of the two sections named, and **xxi, 24, 25**, we have the Gospel as originally delivered by John.

CHAPTER XVIII.

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

IN the ancient Christian Church, from the last part of the second century, there are occasional references to uncanonical Gospels, generally called Apocryphal, containing matters pertaining to the evangelical history. From the Apocryphal Gospels, however, we must exclude the Syro-Chaldee Gospel used by the Nazarenes, very often called the Gospel according to the Hebrews, since, as Jerome testifies, this was nearly the same as our Matthew, probably a mere revision of it. From this was derived the Gospel of Peter.

¹ Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. xxxix. Reference is also made to this narrative in Constituciones Apost., lib. ii, cap. xxiv, written near the end of the third century.

² Schwartze, in his edition of the four Gospels, in the Memphitic dialect, says this passage is wanting in the Memphitic and Sahidic versions. ³ Tischendorf has Βηθζαθα

which is mentioned by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, as being used in the Church at Rhossus, in Cilicia, at the end of the second century. He says that the most of its contents were in accordance with the true doctrines, but some things in it were of a different character.¹

The Protevangel of James, professing to be written by him, contains a description of the grief of Joachim and Anna on account of their being childless, and the subsequent birth of Mary, the mother of Jesus, her early life, her deliverance for safe keeping to Joseph, the birth of Christ in a cave in the region of Bethlehem, the visit of the Magi, and the star that appeared at his birth, Herod's command to slaughter the infants, and its execution, Elizabeth with John (the Baptist) escapes to a mountain, while Zachariah, the father of John, refusing to give Herod any information respecting him, is slain by Herod's servants. The narrative is decked off with miraculous legends. The Greek text, in which it was originally written, has been published by Tischendorf.²

There is no proof that Justin Martyr had any acquaintance with this Protevangel. For the reference which he makes to Christ having been born in a cave in the suburbs of Bethlehem³ was in all probability derived from tradition, as Samaria was his native place. Nor does the Protevangel say that Christ was born in the suburbs of Bethlehem, though it mentions the cave.

It seems probable that Clement⁴ of Alexandria was acquainted with it, as he gives one of its statements respecting Mary, with the remark, "some say," yet it is not at all certain that he refers to this work. Origen also refers to it,⁵ and Epiphanius⁶ has a passage from it, to which he prefixes the remark: "For if both the history of Mary and traditions say that it was announced," etc. Gregory of Nyssa⁷ says: "I have heard of a certain apocryphal history," etc., in which he refers to the narrative concerning Mary, found partly at least in this Protevangel. These seem to be about all the references made to it in the first four centuries. It never had any authority in the Church. It appears to have been written about the middle or near the end of the second century, and is undoubtedly a spurious production.

¹ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, cap. 12, Origen also refers to this Gospel in Comment. in Matt., tom. x, sec. 17.

² In the Evangelia Apocrypha, pp. 1-50, republished since Tischendorf's death Leipzig, 1876.

³ Dialogus cum Tryphone, 78.

⁴ Stromata, vii, cap. xvi.

⁵ Comment. in Matt., tom. x, 17.

⁶ Hæresis lxxix, sec. v.

⁷ Oratio in Diem Natal. Christi.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE EGYPTIANS.

This Gospel is first mentioned by Clement of Alexandria in the last part of the second century. He refers to some sayings of Christ, and remarks: "I think they are found in the Gospel according to the Egyptians. For they say that the Saviour himself said,"¹ etc. after which he gives some expressions not found in our Gospels. In another place, quoting a passage that the heretic, Cassianus, attributes to Christ, he remarks: "In the first place we have not this expression in the four Gospels delivered to us, but in that which is according to the Egyptians."² It is also mentioned by Origen as a Gospel rejected by the Church.³ It was mystical, and in all probability composed in Egypt about the middle of the second century, or perhaps as early as A. D. 125. It never had any authority in the Church.

Among other Apocryphal Gospels may be named that of Thomas in Greek and Latin, treating of the early history of Christ and the flight into Egypt. It was written very probably about the middle of the second century. The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew in Latin, containing matters pertaining to Mary, her parents, and the childhood of Jesus. It was not written till several centuries after Christ. The Gospel concerning the Nativity of Mary in Latin, of uncertain age. The Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, not written until several centuries after Christ. The History of Joseph the Carpenter in Latin, translated from the Arabic, written several centuries after Christ. The Acts of Pilate in Greek (Part I), which gives an account of the proceedings before Pilate respecting Christ, and is a vindication of the Saviour's character. The book was probably written in the fourth century. The Acts of Pilate (Part II) in Greek, treating of Christ's sufferings and resurrection. The Gospel of Nicodemus (Part II), or The Descent of Christ into Hades. This is a continuance of the two preceding books, and was probably written in the fourth or fifth century. To these we may add: The Epistle (in Latin) of Pontius Pilate to the Emperor Tiberias, respecting Christ. The Report of Pontius Pilate concerning our Lord Jesus Christ sent to Augustus Cæsar in Rome (written in Greek). The Report of Pontius Pilate, the Governor of Judea, sent to Tiberias Cæsar in Rome. The Punishment of Pilate (in Greek). The Death of Pilate, who condemned Jesus. The Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea. The Vindication of the Saviour.⁴

It must be observed that these "Apocryphal Gospels" abound in

¹ Stromata, lib. iii, cap. ix.

² Ibid., cap. xiii.

³ Homilia i, in Lucam.

⁴ All the foregoing have been published by Tischendorf.

the most glaring errors, absurdities, and ridiculous legends, and are not to be named with our four Gospels. Bleek truly says respecting them: "No single one of these writings has any historical value. So far as they do not agree with the contents of the canonical writings, they are not derived from historical tradition, but are—at least generally—arbitrary inventions, the unhistorical character of which strikes us at once, partly representing the Redeemer in a manner distorted, and entirely unworthy of him; but they exhibit very clearly to us the value and the historical character of our canonical Gospels."¹

Great liberties have been taken with the MSS. of these Apocryphal Gospels, and the texts differ widely in many instances, and this shows that but little importance was attached to them.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

WE have already seen² that Luke is the author of the Acts, as well as the Gospel which bears his name, and that to him both works were assigned by the unanimous judgment of antiquity. We have also seen that there are peculiarities of language pervading the whole, which establish the unity of the entire Book of Acts, and show it to be the work of one author.

The book may be appropriately divided into *two* sections. The *first*, embracing chapters i–xii, contains an account of the selection of Matthias to take the place of Judas, the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, their ministry, especially that of Peter and John, in Jerusalem (chaps. i–v); the selection of seven deacons, the arrest of Stephen, his Address to the Sanhedrim, and his martyrdom (chaps. vi, vii); the ministry of Philip, Peter, and John in Samaria, the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch (chap. viii); the miraculous conversion of Saul while on his way to Damascus, his preaching in that city and escape from it, his visit to Jerusalem and Tarsus, and the prosperity of the Church (chap. ix, 1–31); Peter's ministry at Lydda and Joppa; his preaching the Gospel at Cesarea to Cornelius the centurion, who is the first convert from the Gentiles. Peter, on returning to Jerusalem, is blamed by those of the circumcision for eating with the uncircumcised. He defends himself by relating his vision at Joppa and the circumstances

¹ Einleitung, pp. 381, 382.

² In discussing Luke's Gospel.

of Cornelius's conversion (chaps. ix, 32-xi, 18); the preaching of the gospel by believers dispersed from Jerusalem, to Jews only, as far as Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch; the bringing of Saul from Tarsus to Antioch by Barnabas; the sending of relief by the disciples in Antioch to the brethren in Judea during the famine; the martyrdom of the Apostle James by Herod, the imprisonment of Peter, his release by an angel, and the miserable death of Herod (chapters xi, 19-xii).

The *second* section, embracing chapters xiii-xxviii, is chiefly occupied with the ministry of the Apostle Paul. This apostle and Barnabas, being sent forth from Antioch, preach the gospel in Cyprus, where Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of the country, is converted. After this they preach the Gospel in Antioch, in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and Perga, and return to Antioch (chaps. xiii, xiv). The question, Whether the Gentile Christians are bound to keep the law of Moses, is discussed by the apostles and brethren in Jerusalem, and decided in the negative (chap. xv, 1-35). Paul and Silas visit the Churches in Syria and Cilicia. Paul visits Derbe and Lystra; at the latter place he finds Timothy, whom he takes with him on a missionary tour through Phrygia and Galatia, and arrives at Troas, from whence Paul sets out for Macedonia, and preaches in Philippi, passes through Amphipolis and Apollonia, and proclaims the gospel in Thessalonica and Berea. He leaves Macedonia for Athens, and preaches at the Areopagus in that city (chaps. xv, 36-xvii.) Paul visits Corinth. Incidents of his ministry in that city (ch. xviii.) Paul's ministry in Ephesus and the uproar made there by the makers of silver shrines for Diana (chap. xix). He passes over into Macedonia, visits Greece, returns through Macedonia, and sails away from Philippi, and lands at Troas, where he preaches. On his way to Jerusalem Paul visits Miletus, where he addresses the elders convened from Ephesus. Sailing from Ephesus, he touches at Tyre, and afterward sails to Cesarea, from whence he goes up to Jerusalem and visits James, who advises him respecting conformity to the law of Moses (chaps. xx-xxi, 25). Chapters xxi, 26-xxvi give a detailed account of the persecutions of Paul by the Jews in Jerusalem, his addresses to them, his imprisonment in Cesarea, his address to Agrippa and Festus, and his appeal to Cæsar to get rid of his Jewish enemies. In the two following chapters (xxvii, xxviii) there is a description of Paul's voyage to Rome, his shipwreck, but safe arrival in the city, and his preaching there.

THE SOURCES OF THIS HISTORY.

Luke possessed ample opportunity to become intimately acquainted with the history he relates. We have already seen that as a companion of Paul in the latter part of the Acts, he describes what he saw and heard. He spent about two years in Jerusalem with Paul,¹ became acquainted with James² and the elders in Jerusalem, many of whom were eyewitnesses of what occurred in the earliest stage of the progress of Christianity. His long intimacy with the apostle to the Gentiles enabled him to ascertain Paul's whole history as a persecutor of the Church, and as its zealous defender. Under these circumstances, written sources were not necessary. It is quite certain, however, that the Epistle addressed by the apostles and the rest of the Christians in Jerusalem to the Gentile Christians (chap. xv, 23-29) has been incorporated substantially in its original form.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE HISTORY IN THE BOOK OF ACTS.

The Acts of the Apostles is one of the most authentic books in ex Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*. It everywhere shows that its author possesses the most exact knowledge respecting the affairs of the Greeks and Romans, the early Christian Church, and the geography of the extensive region over which Paul traveled. A remarkable confirmation of its history is furnished by the Epistles of Paul.

In the last part of the last century Dr. Paley published his celebrated work, *Horæ Paulinæ*, or *The Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul Evincèd*. On this subject he remarks in his evidences of Christianity: "Between the letters which bear the name of St. Paul in our collection, and his history in the Acts of the Apostles, there exist many notes of correspondence. The simple perusal of the writings is sufficient to prove that neither the history was taken from the letters, nor the letters from the history; and the *undesignedness* of the agreements (which undesignedness is gathered from their latency, their minuteness, their obliquity, the suitableness of the circumstances in which they consist to the places in which those circumstances occur, and the circuitous references by which they are traced out) demonstrates that they have not been produced by meditation, or by any fraudulent contrivance. But coincidences, from which these causes are excluded, and which are too close and numerous to be accounted for by accidental concurrences of fiction.

¹ Acts xxi, 17; xxiv, 27; xxvii, 1, etc.

² Chapter xxi, 18. Luke came to Jerusalem with Paul about twenty-seven years after the crucifixion of Christ.

must necessarily have truth for their foundation." Paley's work, referred to above, shows these undesigned coincidences between the Acts and the Epistles of Paul in a most masterly manner, proving the truth of Paul's history with a force almost equal to a mathematical demonstration. Yet the impugners of the Acts, found chiefly in the Tübingen school, so far as we know, take no notice of Paley's work. This perhaps may be explained by a remark of Bunsen (himself a German): "Modern criticism has been left to the Germans, for whom reality has no charm."¹ "What they know how to handle best is thought, the ideal part of history; what is farthest from their grasp is reality."²

Baur, the head of the Tübingen school of extreme rationalists, regards the Acts of the Apostles "not as a purely historical writing, but only a representation following a definite tendency," the peculiar object of which was the solution of the question, In what relation did the Apostle Paul stand to the older apostles? He thinks that the original doctrine of Paul is found in the Acts only in a modified form, that is, it yields too much to the Jewish Christians. Speaking of Paul, Baur remarks: "When we compare the description which the Acts of the Apostles gives of his character and deportment, with the picture with which his personality presents itself to us in his own writings, nothing is more striking than the great contrast in which the Paul of the Acts stands toward the Paul of the Pauline Epistles. And as he, according to the Acts of the Apostles, made concessions to the Jewish Christians, which he, according to the principles proclaimed by himself in the most decided manner, cannot possibly have made, so, on the opposite side, the Acts present Peter in a light in which we can no longer recognize him as one of the chief representatives of Jerusalem Jewish Christianity."³ That is, manifestly, Peter is not Jewish enough.

Baur's theory rests upon the assumption that there was an irreconcilable difference between the doctrines of Paul and Peter respecting the observance of the Jewish law, and the nature of Christ—that early Christianity was of an Ebionitish cast. If we are to believe Baur, the Acts of the Apostles was written to bring into harmony the Churches founded by Peter and those founded by Paul. It is clear, then, that his theory requires that the Acts should have been written a considerable length of time

Baur's estimate of the Acts.

Baur's theory of the purpose of the Acts examined.

¹ In speaking of the Apostolical Constitutions.

² Hippolytus and his Age. Both of these passages I have taken from Tregelles' Canon of Muratori, pp. 66, 67

³ Die Drei Ersten Jahrhunderte, pp. 126, 127, Dritte Ausgabe. Tübingen, 1863

after the death of these apostles. On the contrary, it is probable that the Acts were written in their lifetime.

But Baur can be completely refuted from those very Epistles of Paul that he acknowledges, viz., Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians.

What, then, is the testimony of Paul respecting the relations existing between himself and Peter? "When they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter (for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles); and when James, Cephas [Peter], and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." (Gal. ii, 7-9). Do we see here any indication of hostility between Peter and Paul, or any manifestation of a difference of doctrine? It is true, he afterward states that Peter was to be blamed because, before certain persons had come from James, "he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. . . . I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (chap. ii, 12, 14). It appears evident from this that Peter did associate with the Gentiles, and did not feel himself under obligation to observe the rites of the Mosaic law. But in the present instance, through fear, he did not adhere firmly to his principles. Now, as far as Peter is concerned, we find nothing in the Acts inconsistent with what is here stated respecting him. We find in Acts x, xi, 1-18, that he goes to the heathen, Cornelius, and preaches the Gospel to him and his household. But does Paul mean to say that Peter was accustomed to enjoin upon the Gentiles the observance of the Mosaic law? That is impossible under the circumstances. For it is inconceivable that Peter should think that he, himself a Jew, was free from the rites of the Mosaic law, but that the Gentiles were subject to them! All that can be intended by Paul is that Peter, through fear, did not carry out his principles; and that the example he was setting by his timidity made the impression that it was necessary for the Gentiles to live in accordance with the Mosaic law in order to be in full fellowship with the Jewish Christian Church. Hence there is no discrepancy between what Paul here states of Peter, and what the latter himself says in Acts xv, 10 respecting the enjoining of the law of Moses upon the converts from

Reproof of Peter by Paul explained.

among the Gentiles: "Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" We hear nothing of any dispute between Peter and Paul afterward. Peter's "error," says Olshausen, "was a purely personal one, by which his official character as an apostle is not in the least compromised."¹ Nowhere in the Acts is there any thing inconsistent with what is otherwise known of Peter, or that is at variance with his apostolical character.

Respecting the Apostle Paul, the assertion of Baur is utterly false, that his Epistles present him in a different light from his conduct as set forth in the Book of Acts. In Gal. ii, 3 he says: "But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." The inference to be drawn from this is, that if he had been a Jew it might have been necessary to circumcise him. When, therefore, we are informed in the Acts (xvi, 1-3) that Paul took Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess, and his father a Greek, and circumcised him on account of the Jews, there is no violation of the principles announced by Paul respecting circumcision.

When Paul, on the completion of this missionary tour, returned to Jerusalem, he found a report among the Jews that he taught all of their nation who were "among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." Therefore, on the advice of James and the elders, he took four men who had a vow upon them, and purified himself along with them, being "at charges with them." Is there any thing in his Epistles inconsistent with this conduct? On the contrary, is not the language which he uses indicative of just such a course of conduct? "And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law" (1 Cor. ix, 20). "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some" (1 Cor. ix, 22).

Paul, it is true, in writing to the Galatians, says: "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. v, 2-4). It must be borne in mind that Paul charges the Galatians with departing from the great doctrine of justification by faith, and with seeking salvation through the observance of the Mosaic law. If they therefore relied upon circumcision for salvation, it is evident that Christ was useless

¹Comment. on Galatians.

to them. But the practice of circumcision, without attributing to it any efficacy, could not in the least degree impede their salvation, and Paul was ready to accede to its performance in obedience to custom, when no importance was attached to it by the person circumcised. Paul also tells them that in seeking salvation through circumcision it was necessary also to keep the whole law, of which circumcision is but a part. Just as a man baptized into the Christian faith takes upon him the observance of all the precepts of Christ. In Acts xviii, 18, mention is made of Paul having shorn his head in Cenchrea, as he had a vow. This was in obedience to the Mosaic law.

The passage concerning the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi, 1-3), to which we have already referred, the passage on the purification of Paul in the temple (chap. xxi, 24, 26), already noticed, and the vow and shaving of Paul's head, are the only passages in the Acts in which his conduct in respect to the Mosaic law is at all shown.

Peter preaches the Gospel to the Jews, and first opens to the Improbability of Baur's theory. Gentiles the door of admission into Christianity, and opposes the putting of the yoke of the law upon the necks of Gentile converts. In the council, however, in which Peter speaks, the decision is given by James. The views of Peter and Paul are never brought together. They hold no discussion concerning the obligations of the Mosaic law. We cannot tell from the Acts whether either Peter or Paul favoured the circumcision of Jewish Christians. In the twenty-eight chapters of this book we have only two or three incidental passages which give us any information at all respecting Paul's relation to the law, and but one from Peter respecting the relation of the Gentile Christians to it; and that, too, in a book written, according to Baur, for the express purpose of showing how Paul stood toward the older apostles, and to reconcile the two great parties, Pauline and Petrine, in the Church! Wonderful, indeed, that the Christian Church for nearly eighteen centuries could not discover this fact in the plain narrative of Luke! It required the transcendent genius of Baur to make this brilliant discovery, and even after it is made it requires a peculiar kind of genius to see it. Altogether different in this respect from other discoveries, which strike us at once with so much force that we are surprised that we had never thought of them ourselves.

Even if two or three passages had been found in the Acts in which a dogmatic interest is discernible, the credibility of the great body of the history would be scarcely affected by the fact. But no such passages are found, and everywhere in the history we see truth and candour, and are deeply impressed with the reality of this wonderful

narrative of the founding of Christianity by the apostles after the resurrection and ascension of their Divine Master.

We have already observed that the conduct of Paul toward the Jews in the Acts is in perfect keeping with his own other ^{concl-} declaration: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I ^{dences.} might gain the Jews" (1 Cor. ix, 20). He adds: "To them without law . . . as without law, that I might gain them that are without law" (1 Cor. ix, 21). With this compare his conduct at the Areopagus of Athens, where he begins his discourse with heathenism, and advances by a beautiful gradation to the great principles of Christianity (Acts xvii, 16-34). His whole discussion at the Areopagus, and his remarks to the heathen at Lystra, are in entire accordance with the sentiments which he utters respecting the heathen, in Rom. i, 19, 20.

The great doctrine of justification by faith which Paul sets forth in his Epistles, the Acts also represent him as teaching (chaps. xiii, 39; xvi, 31; xxvi, 18). We have already remarked that the author of the Acts shows a most exact knowledge of Jewish, Greek, and Roman affairs. In the Acts the Sadducees appear as the chief opponents of the apostles, since the doctrine of the resurrection was especially obnoxious to that sect of the Jews. In the Gospels, however, where the resurrection is not so clearly preached, the Pharisees are the chief adversaries of Christ, because he exposed their hypocrisy.

The character Luke attributes to the Athenians, "For all the Athenians, and strangers who were there [in Athens], spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing" (chap. xvii, 21), is confirmed by Demosthenes, who represents them as going about inquiring: "Is there any thing new?"¹ In chap. v, 37 it is stated that Judas of Galilee rose in the days of the taxing, and drew many people after him, and that he perished, and his followers were dispersed. This man is also mentioned by Josephus as Judas the Gaulanite, who resisted the payment of taxes to the Romans in the time² that Cyrenius was governor of Syria. In chapter xi, 28, 29 it is stated that a prophet named Agabus predicted that there would "be great dearth (*λιμός*, *famine*) throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar. Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea." Josephus, in speaking of events which occurred about the sixth or seventh year of Claudius Cæsar (about A. D. 46), says: "It happened that the great famine occurred throughout Judea, during which Queen Helene purchased corn at great expense from Egypt,

¹ Philippic i, 10.

² Antiq., xviii. cap. i, 1.

Historical accuracy of Luke illustrated.

and distributed it among the needy, as I before said.”¹ In chapter xii, 1-3 it is stated that Herod the king killed James the brother of John with the sword, and imprisoned Peter also, with the intention of killing him, since he saw that the murder of James pleased the Jews. About A. D. 37 Herod obtained the provinces, Abilene, Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis. Claudius added Judea and Samaria. These possessions he held for about three years, until his death.² In chapter xii, 21-23 it is stated that in Cæsarea, “upon a set day, Herod, arrayed in royal apparel, sat upon his throne, and made an oration unto them. And the people gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man. And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost.” Josephus’ description is very similar. He states that Herod was celebrating games in honour of Claudius Cæsar in Cæsarea, and that on the second day of the festival, early in the morning, clad in a robe made entirely of silver, of wonderful workmanship, he went into the theater, and the first rays of the sun reflected from the silver dazzled fearfully the beholders. Immediately the flatterers cried out from different sides, calling him a god, adding: “Be thou gracious unto us, even if up to the present time we have feared thee as a man, yet for the future we acknowledge that thou art superior to a mortal nature.” The king did not rebuke them, nor did he refuse the impious flattery. A little after this, looking up, he observed an owl sitting on a cord above his head. He immediately perceived that this was a messenger of evil, and he was seized with heart-piercing pain. Immediately the pain in the bowels that began with violence continued to increase. Looking at his friends, he says: “I, your god, am now summoned to die, my fate immediately refuting the false language in which you just now addressed me,” etc. After five days he died of this pain in the abdomen.³

Luke is here confirmed by Josephus in very remarkable manner in all essential points, and his exact knowledge is shown in the fact that Herod was king over Judea but three years, a reign that might have been easily misplaced.

In chap. xiii, 7 it is stated that Sergius Paulus was *proconsul* of the island of Cyprus. Here is another instance of Luke’s accuracy; for in the distribution of the Roman provinces as made by Augustus, Cyprus was retained by the emperor, and the governor of that province was a *pro-*

Other confirmation of the accuracy of the Acts of the Apostles.

¹ Antiq., xx, cap. v, 2, and xx, cap. ii, 5.

² Josephus states that Herod died in the third year of his reign over all Judea (A. D. 44). Antiq., xix, cap. viii, sec. 2

³ Ibid.

praetor. But Augustus afterward took Dalmatia from the Senate, and gave to it *Cyprus*¹ and Gallia Narbonensis. Cyprus, then, as belonging to the Senate,² was governed by a *proconsul* (*ἀνθύπατος*), as stated by Luke. And on a coin³ struck in the time of Claudius Cæsar, the governor of the island of Cyprus is called *ἀνθύπατος*, the very word used by Luke. In chapter xvi, 14 mention is made of "Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira." "The dyeing trade had flourished from a very early period, as we learn from Homer, in the neighbourhood of Thyatira, and is permanently commemorated in inscriptions which relate to the 'guild of dyers' in that city, and incidentally give a singular confirmation of the veracity of St. Luke in his casual allusions."⁴ In chap. xvi, 12 it is said that "Philippi (is) the first city of this part of Macedonia, a colony." Augustus "presented it with the privileges of a 'Colonia,' with the name 'Col. Jul. Aug. Philip.'"⁵ In chap. xvi, 16 mention is made of a place of prayer (*προσευχή*, *oratory*) on the river side. By the decree of the city of Halicarnassus the Jews were authorized "to build *proseuchæ* (*oratories*) on the sea-shore, according to the custom of their fathers."⁶ The locating of these oratories near the water was for the purpose of ablution.

In chapter xvi, 27 the keeper of the Philippian prison is about to commit suicide under the impression that the prisoners had fled. "By the Roman law the jailer was to undergo the same punishment which the malefactors who had escaped by his negligence were to have suffered."⁷ In verse 35 it is stated: "The magistrates sent the sergeants;" but the latter word in the original is *ῥαβδούχοι*, *lictors*, well known Roman officers. The same word is also used in verse 38, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

In chap. xvii. 23 St. Paul speaks of an altar at Athens with the inscription: "TO THE UNKNOWN GOD." Pausanias, who wrote his Description of Greece in the last half of the second century, in speaking of temples in the vicinity of the Piræus, the chief harbour of Athens, remarks: "There are altars both of the gods that are named and those that are unknown."⁸ The word in Luke and in Pausanias is the same, *ἄγνωστος*, (*unknown*). Paul says, "As I was passing through and beholding the objects of your worship, I found an altar with this inscription," etc. That is, As I was coming up from the Piræus, and passing through the midst of your altars and temples, I found an altar dedicated to the UNKNOWN GOD. It is not neces-

¹ Dion Cassius, lib. liii, 12.

² Strabo, lib. xvii, c. 840.

³ See this inscription in Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of St. Paul.

⁴ Conybeare and Howson.

⁵ Smith's Geographical Dictionary, Art., Philippi.

⁶ Antiq., lib. xiv, cap. x, 23.

⁷ Conybeare and Howson.

⁸ Lib. i, cap. i. 4.

sary to suppose that there was but one such altar, for it did not suit the purpose of Paul to allude to more than one. In chap. xviii, 2 it is remarked, that when Paul came to Corinth, he "found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla, because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome." This banishment of the Jews from Rome is confirmed by Suetonius, who, in speaking of Claudius, says: "He banished from Rome the Jews, who, with Chrestus (Christ) their leader, were constantly creating disturbances."¹

In chap. xvii, 12 it is said that "when Gallio was the deputy (*ἀνθύπατος*, *proconsul*) of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the judgment seat." The statement of Luke that this officer was a *proconsul* is confirmed by Strabo and Dion Cassius. Achaia, embracing the Peloponnesus, and Southern Greece as far as Thessaly, is the seventh in the list of provinces governed by proconsuls, according to the former.² And Dion Cassius³ remarks that Hellas (Achaia) belonged to the people and the Senate, and was, of course, governed by a proconsul. That the proconsul should have resided in Corinth was quite natural, as it was both a splendid city and nearly in the centre of the province. The proconsul Gallio, here mentioned, was probably a brother of the philosopher Seneca, who, in Epistle 104, speaks of Gallio having had a fever in Achaia. In chap. xxi, 39 Paul declares that he is "a Jew of Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city." This was no idle boast of the apostle, for Strabo remarks: "So much zeal is displayed by the men of this place (Tarsus) in the study of philosophy and the whole remaining circle of learning, that they have surpassed both Athens and Alexandria, and every other place that can be named, in which schools and vocations of philosophers have existed."⁴ Antony rewarded it for its attachment to Cæsar "with municipal freedom and exemption from taxes. . . . Augustus subsequently increased the favours previously bestowed upon Tarsus, which on coins is called a '*libera civitas*'"⁵ (a free city). We have no proof, however, that this highly favoured city was endowed with Roman citizenship. Paul's father, or some other ancestor, must have obtained the privilege, which enabled him to declare that he was born in the possession of it.

In chap. xxi, 38 the chief captain asks Paul: "Art thou that Egyptian, which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest

¹ Claudius, cap. xxv.

² Lib. xvii, 840.

³ Lib. liii, 12. Also Tacitus speaks of Achaia and Macedonia being governed by a proconsul. Annal, lib. i, cap. 76.

⁴ Lib. xiv, 673.

⁵ Smith's Dictionary of Classical Geography.

out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?" Josephus, in speaking of deceivers and robbers in the earlier part of the administration of Felix, says: "At this time a man came from Egypt to Jerusalem professing to be a prophet, advising the multitude to go to the Mount of Olives." Josephus further states that he declared that at his command the walls of Jerusalem would fall down, by which they would enter the city, and that Felix with his troops attacked the Egyptian and his party, killed four hundred, and took two hundred alive.¹ In his Jewish Wars² he represents this Egyptian false prophet, as he calls him, leading around from the *desert* to the Mount of Olives thirty thousand men. This number seems to be an exaggeration or a corruption of the original text. The general statements are in remarkable harmony with Luke.

In the last part of the Acts we find Ananias, high priest of the Jews (chaps. xxiii, 2; xxiv, 1). According to Josephus, Still other confirmations of Luke's accuracy. he was the son of Nebedæus, and seems to have been made high priest about A. D. 48,³ and we find him still living about the beginning of the Jewish war,⁴ so it is certain that he was high priest when Paul was on his last visit to Jerusalem (about A. D. 60-62).

At this visit we also find that Felix is the governor, which statement accords with what is related in Josephus. He appears to have been sent from Rome as governor of Judæa, Samaria, Galilee, and Petræa, about A. D. 51. He was succeeded by Porcius Festus⁵ (A. D. 62), who is mentioned in Acts (xxiv, 27; xxv, 1, 4, etc.). Luke states that the wife of Felix was Drusilla, a Jewess. Josephus confirms this, and gives several particulars concerning her.⁶

It is stated that as Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled" (chap. xxiv, 25). The life of this man shows that there were special reasons for trembling, as Drusilla, with whom he was living as his wife, had been induced by him to leave her former husband. Tacitus speaks of him as noted for all kinds of cruelty and lust.⁷ We find also in the last part of his book mention made of King Agrippa (chaps. xxv, 13-xxvi). This Agrippa was the son of the Herod whose death is related in Acts xii, 21-23. He is mentioned in various places by Josephus, and in connexion with Festus, and is called king by him. Josephus states that he built for himself a splendid house in Jerusalem.⁸ In company with Agrippa, Bernice is mentioned (Acts xxv, 13;

¹ Antiq., xx, cap. viii, 6.² Lib. ii, cap. xiii, 5.³ Antiq., xx, cap. v, 2.⁴ Lib. ii, cap. xvii, 6.⁵ Antiq., xx, cap. viii, 9.⁶ Ibid., xx, cap. vii, 1, 2.⁷ Antonius Felix, per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem, jus regium servili ingenio ex-
cruit.—Hist., lib. v, 9.⁸ Antiq., xx, cap. viii, 11.

xxvi, 30). This Bernice was a sister of King Agrippa, and also at a later period visited Jerusalem.¹ After Paul had been shipwrecked at Melita (Malta), he left in a ship of Alexandria and landed in Italy at Puteoli (Acts xxviii, 11, 13). Puteoli was the great port of trade with Alexandria in Egypt.² Here, too, Luke's knowledge is exact.

Of all the numerous statements of Luke in the Book of Acts, there is only one that can be charged with inaccuracy—the remarks of Gamaliel in the Sanhedrim respecting Theudas: "For before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves: who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were dispersed" (chap. v, 36). Josephus mentions a Theudas, a magician, who persuaded the greatest multitude to take up their possessions and follow him to the river Jordan. "For he said that he was a prophet, and that he would divide the river by his command, and give them an easy passage through it. By saying these things he deceived many." He also states that the procurator "sent a squad of horsemen after them, which, falling upon them unexpectedly, slaughtered many of them, and captured many alive. They take Theudas himself alive, cut off his head, and bring it to Jerusalem."³ This occurred while Fadus was procurator of Judea, about A. D. 45, so that it is not possible that Gamaliel, about A. D. 33, can have referred to this man. The only way in which Luke can be charged with error is to suppose that he put into the mouth of Gamaliel this statement, forgetting at the time that Theudas lived about twelve years later. But this is inadmissible, especially as Gamaliel says: "After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people," etc. This occurred A. D. 6-8, and is recorded, as we have already seen, by Josephus. How was it possible for Luke to make such a mistake as to place Theudas forty years or more too early? The Theudas of Josephus played his part about fifteen years before Luke, with Paul, visited Jerusalem, and his acts must have been fresh in the minds of all. It is not at all strange that Josephus should omit the Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel, as he had only four hundred followers, who dispersed after he was slain. But the Theudas of Josephus was a far more important character. Respecting the Theudas of the Acts, Dr. Robinson remarks: "He is probably to be placed during the interregnum immediately after the death of Herod the Great, when Judea was disturbed by frequent seditions. See Josephus.

¹ Antiq., xx, cap. vii, 3; and Wars, ii, cap. xv, 1.

² Strabo, lib. xvii, 793. He calls the town Dicæarchia.

³ Antiq., xx, cap. v, 1.

Antiq., xvii, x, 2-10. . . . Some hold Theudas to have been, under another name, either the Judas or the Simon of Josephus, (Antiq., xvii, x, 5, 6)."¹ Paley observes: "It is proved from Josephus that there were not fewer than four persons of the name of Simon within forty years, and not fewer than three of the name of Judas within ten years, who were all leaders of insurrections."²

Upon the whole, it is far more probable that there were two leaders of insurrections by the name of Theudas, than that Luke should have made a mistake in this matter, as we have seen that he everywhere shows such accurate historical knowledge. Nor does Luke, in fact, need the testimony of Josephus, which we have seen in such a striking manner confirms his statements. The fairness, candour, and accuracy of Luke appear on every page of the Acts. As it is, however, Luke and Josephus strongly corroborate each other.

The statement respecting Stephen, that immediately after his speech before the Sanhedrim he was assaulted, cast out of the city, and stoned to death, without any vote of condemnation by the Sanhedrim, or any sentence from the governor, who alone had the power to inflict the death penalty, has been thought to create a difficulty. But it is not necessary to suppose that the members of the Sanhedrim committed the murder, though they doubtless connived at it. In fact, however, the killing of Stephen was a great deal like a case of lynching in our country, when an enraged mob, thinking that the process of law is too slow, and the punishment of the criminal too uncertain, inflict summary punishment themselves.

Equally accurate are the geography and topography of Luke. He knows the distance of the Mount of Olives from Jerusalem—a Sabbath day's journey (chap. i, 12). He is acquainted with the Beautiful gate of the Temple (chap. iii, 10); knows there is a street in Damascus called *Straight*³ (chap. ix, 11); is familiar with the Areopagus at Athens (chap. xvii, 19-34), and is acquainted even with Appii Forum and the Three Taverns (chap. xxviii, 15). But we have touched upon a few points only, for the whole book teems with accurate geographical and topographical knowledge, and indicates that its author must have been a careful and extensive traveler.

When we add to the foregoing proofs of credibility, the evidence furnished by numerous passages in the Epistles of Paul, many of them undesigned coincidences, the resulting evidence in proof of the historical truth of the Acts is overwhelming. And this same

¹ Greek Lex. of New Testament: Theudas.


² Evidences of Christianity.

³ We traversed the whole length of this street, which extends more than a mile from wall to wall through the old city of Damascus, of which it is the only straight street.

well informed, careful, and conscientious historian wrote also the third Gospel, in which he informs us that he "had perfect understanding of all things from the very first" (chap. i, 3).

Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople about A. D. 400, makes a strange remark in the beginning of his Commentary on the Acts, written in that city: "To many both this book and its author are unknown." He means, probably, many in Constantinople and at that time; yet, even with this limitation, the statement is doubtless an exaggeration. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, A. D. 177-202, makes great use of the Acts, especially in his third book against Heresies. In one instance he quotes it nine times on a single page. It was also used by Clement of Alexandria in the last part of the second century, and about the same time by Tertullian at Carthage. It appears, also, to have been used by Polycarp in the Epistle to the Philippians.¹ In the subsequent centuries it was used everywhere in the Christian world as an undoubted authority. It is true, it was not so much quoted as the Gospels which contain the teachings of Christ himself.

The five books containing the history of Christ and his apostles are the foundations of the Christian faith, and with the acknowledgment of their genuineness the truth of Christianity necessarily follows. The Epistles of the apostles establish the same historical facts respecting Christ and his apostles, and set forth the great doctrines of the Founder of Christianity as developed and explained by his chosen messengers.



CHAPTER XX.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

THE PERSON OF THE APOSTLE.

THIS great apostle to the Gentiles, who wrote at least thirteen Epistles of the New Testament Canon, and who in natural ability and culture was superior to all the other apostles, was born at Tarsus (Acts xxii, 3), the most important city of Cilicia,² highly

¹ "Having loosed the pains [*ᾠδίνας*] of death" (Acts ii, 24). "Having loosed the pains [*ᾠδίνας*] of Hades."—Sec. i. Teaching of the Twelve Apostles alludes to it.

² Jerome says (Com. in Philem.) that he had heard the story (*fabulam*, fable) that the parents of the Apostle Paul were of the region of Giscalis in Judea [in Northern Palestine], and when the whole province was destroyed by the Romans, and the Jews were scattered over the world, they went to Tarsus accompanied by Paul, who was then a young man. This story is manifestly false, as it contradicts the apostle

distinguished for its intellectual culture, and for the freedom and privileges that had been conferred upon it by Mark Antony and Augustus Cæsar.

Paul himself tells us that he was of the tribe of Benjamin, circumcised the eighth day, and of the sect of the Pharisees (Philippians iii, 5). It does not appear by what means his father, or some other ancestor, obtained the rights of Roman citizenship, in the possession of which the apostle was born (Acts xxii, 28). He acquired in his youth the art of tent-making, by which we find him supporting himself while at Corinth (Acts xviii, 3).

The Jews regarded it of high importance that every boy should learn some trade; hence the proverb among them: "Whoever teaches his son no trade, teaches him to steal." He received his training in Jerusalem, having been instructed by Gamaliel, a celebrated rabbi (Acts xxii, 3), grandson of the famous Hillel. It is uncertain how old he was when put under the instructions of Gamaliel. It is said that Jewish boys commenced the study of the law when twelve years of age. But we cannot determine whether Paul was so young when sent from Tarsus to Jerusalem to pursue the study of the law under Gamaliel. Nor do we know when he finished his rabbinical education.

The apostle was well acquainted with Syro-Chaldee, the vernacular language of Palestine, as we find him addressing a crowd at Jerusalem in this tongue, called Hebrew (Acts xxii, 2). He was proficient in Greek, for he addressed at the Areopagus the Athenians there assembled. The Hebrew of the Old Testament he doubtless studied with Gamaliel in connexion with the study of the law. It is impossible to state with any certainty the extent of his Greek culture, though it probably was considerable. At the Areopagus he quotes the Greek poet Aratus (Acts xvii, 28). In 1 Corinthians xv, 33, is a quotation from Menander, and in Titus i, 12 he gives a quotation from Epimenides of Gnossus in Crete. It is not improbable that Paul was in Jerusalem during some part of Christ's ministry there, and that he saw the Redeemer. This seems to be indicated in 2 Corinthians v, 16: "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more."

We first meet with him, under the name of Saul, in the account of the stoning of Stephen, where he is called a young man at whose himself (Acts xxii, 3), and is inconsistent with the facts of history, as Giscala did not surrender to the Romans until a short time before the destruction of Jerusalem, which was A. D. 70. In *De Viris Illustribus* he states that he was of Giscalis, as if he did not regard it as a fable.

feet the witnesses laid down their clothes. Immediately after this he appears as a bitter persecutor of the Church, and sets out for Damascus with letters from the high priest to the synagogues in Damascus authorizing him to bind and bring from that city to Jerusalem the followers of Christ (Acts ix, 1, 2). When he draws near to Damascus Christ appears to him, strikes him to the earth blind, remonstrates with him, and commissions him to preach the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles. After three days' blindness, he receives sight when Ananias lays hands on him, after which he is baptized, and preaches Christ in the synagogues at Damascus (Acts ix, 3-20; xxii, 4-16; xxvi, 10-20; Gal. i, 12-16, etc.). The Jews lying in wait to kill him, he escapes and goes into Arabia, and returns to Damascus. Three years after his conversion (about A. D. 38) he goes up to Jerusalem to see Peter, with whom he remains fifteen days, and sees James also (Gal i, 17-19; Acts ix, 26, 27). While remaining in Jerusalem he preaches the Gospel, and, his life being thereby endangered, he is sent to Tarsus (Acts ix, 29, 30). A few years later Barnabas brings him from Tarsus to Antioch, and he is sent along with Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem with alms for the relief of the necessitous Christians during the famine (about A. D. 45). After returning from this mission, through the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, he is sent by the Church at Antioch, in company with Barnabas, upon a missionary tour, and visits Seleucia and Cyprus. After the conversion of the proconsul of the island, Sergius Paulus, he is called Paul, the name by which he calls himself in all his Epistles. Jerome¹ supposes that he assumed the name of Paul (or Paulus) from the name of this proconsul whom he had brought over to the Christian faith. This may be the real ground of the change, though it admits of no proof. After this he visits Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and returns to Antioch from his mission. When the dispute arose at Antioch respecting the observance of the Mosaic law, he and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and elders. This was Paul's third visit to Jerusalem, to which he refers in Galatians ii, 1: "Then fourteen years after I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas." If we count these fourteen years from the visit he made three years after his conversion, this third visit occurred about A. D. 52. After this mission Paul preaches the gospel at Antioch, and in company with Silas he preaches through Syria and Cilicia, Debe, Lystra, Phrygia, and the region of Galatia; he visits Philippi, where he preaches the gospel, is imprisoned, and miraculously delivered. He passes through Amphipolis and Apollonia, and comes to Thes-

¹ De Viris Illus. Paulus.

salonica, where he preaches, and leaves for Berea, where he also proclaims the gospel, and comes to Athens, where he preaches at the Areopagus. From Athens he passes over to Corinth, where he proclaims the gospel for eighteen months, and writes the two Epistles to the Thessalonians about A. D. 54. He next visits Ephesus, sails for Cæsarea, and goes up to Jerusalem; returns to Antioch, and passes over Galatia and Phrygia, and comes to Ephesus, where he preaches the gospel for two years and three months. While here he writes his First Epistle to the Corinthians. About A. D. 58 he leaves Ephesus for Macedonia, where he writes the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and visits Greece, especially Corinth, in which city he writes the Epistle to the Romans.

On his journey to Jerusalem he calls at Miletus, where he addresses the assembled elders of the Ephesian Church, sails for Cæsarea, and goes up to Jerusalem. Here he is arrested, and detained in custody about two years. He appeals to Cæsar, is shipwrecked on the voyage to Rome, but finally reaches the city about A. D. 61 or 62. Here he preaches the gospel for two years in his own hired house, and writes the Epistles to Philemon, to the Colossians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians.

At this point the history of Paul, as recorded in the Acts, ends, and the question arises, Was he released at the end of the two years? and if so, where did he preach, and where and how did he finish his career? It appears from Philippians ii, 24, "But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly," that Paul was expecting a release at the time of writing, which must have been at the end of two years, from the manner in which he speaks of the effect of his preaching (chap. i, 12-14).

In the Canon of Muratori, written at Rome about A. D. 160, mention is made of "Paul's setting out from the city [Rome] for Spain." This is valuable testimony to the release and departure of Paul. Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, written not later than A. D. 96, in speaking of Paul, says: "He taught the whole world righteousness, and having gone to the bound of the west (*ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*),¹ and having borne witness before rulers, he thus left the world," etc. This comes from the bishop of Rome, who was doubtless acquainted with Paul, and is of the highest value. By "the bound of the west," to which Paul traveled, Spain is in all probability meant. No writer at Rome could call that city "the bound of the west." If Paul preached in Western Europe, he must

Facts reported
of the later his-
tory of Paul.

¹This is the exact Greek of the passage, as published by Tischendorf in the facsimile of the MS. of the Epistle, and it is confirmed by the recently discovered copy of the Epistle in Constantinople, published by Bryennius, sec. 5.

have been released from the confinement in Rome described at the end of the Acts.

In 2 Timothy iv, 16 Paul says: "At my first answer (*ἀπολογία, defence*) no man stood with me, but all men forsook me." It is evident that this arraignment of the apostle, in which he declares, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand" (2 Tim. iv, 16), is different from any appearance of his before Nero during the first imprisonment at Rome, for Timothy was then with him (Philippians i, 1). Also the direction to Timothy, "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments" (2 Tim. iv, 13), indicates in all probability that, not long before, Paul had left these articles there, and that he must have been released from his first imprisonment. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the apostle was released from his first imprisonment, and visited Spain, Macedonia, and Asia Minor. In Romans xv, 24 he speaks of visiting Rome on his way to Spain; and in Philippians ii, 24 he says: "I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly." It would be most natural to suppose that he visited Spain first, and afterward went to Macedonia and Asia Minor. But the order in which he visited these places we cannot determine.

Caius, presbyter of Rome about A. D. 200, says, in writing to Paul's death. Proclus: "I can show the monuments of the apostles [Peter and Paul]. For if you are willing to go out to the Vatican, or take the road to Ostia, you will find the monuments [tombs] of those who founded this Church."¹ Jerome states that Paul was beheaded at Rome in the fourteenth year of Nero's reign (A. D. 68) and buried in the road to Ostia,² situated at the mouth of the Tiber.³ Eusebius also states that Paul was beheaded when brought the second time before Nero.⁴

The oldest and most trustworthy account of St. Paul outside of the New Testament is found in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (written A. D. 93-96), to which we have already referred: "On account of envy Paul received the reward of his patience: seven times was he in bonds, he was an exile, he was stoned, and having been a preacher in the east and in the west, he received the honourable renown of his faith; and having taught the

¹In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii, cap. xxiv.

²De Viris Illus. Paulus.

³About one and a quarter miles from the wall of Rome now stands the splendid Basilica of Paul. Under this Church are said to be the remains of St. Paul, with the exception of the head, which is said to be in the Lateran. We observed on the road to the Basilica an inscription stating that here Peter and Paul, going to martyrdom, separated.

⁴Hist. Eccles., lib. ii, 22, 25.

whole world righteousness, and having gone to the bound of the west, and borne witness before rulers, he thus departed from the world, and went to the holy place, having become the greatest example of patience.”¹ Clement evidently refers to the martyrdom of Paul, since before speaking of him he says: “The greatest and the most faithful pillars have been persecuted, and suffered even unto death.”² It is also very likely that Paul suffered at Rome or in its vicinity, otherwise we should not in all probability have the particulars of his history in Clement. Even the skeptical Baur remarks: “That Paul died there [in Rome] as a martyr can be regarded as an historical fact.”³

The Apostle Paul is distinguished for profundity, for a firm adherence to great principles, for a broad catholicity, for toleration in things non-essential, and for great practical wisdom. His extraordinary natural gifts were all sanctified by the divine Spirit and consecrated to Christ. His writings are distinguished for their variety, depth, and breadth. All the great doctrines of theology, of experimental religion, and our duties to God and man, are set forth in them with great power. Everywhere his Epistles are permeated with the spirit of Christ, exhibiting a richness, a fulness, and at the same time a conciseness, unparalleled except by the great Master himself. We are continually impressed with the deep conviction of his rich experience and earnestness and his universal love.

Characteristics
of Paul and his
writings.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

THE Epistle is addressed “To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints” (chap. i, 7). The Church in that city embraced both Jews and Gentiles. In chap. ii, 17 the writer says: “Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law,” etc.; and in chap. xi, 13 he says: “For I speak to you Gentiles; inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify my office.” And in other parts of the Epistle we find references to both Jews and Gentiles. The Jews at that time appear to have been numerous in Rome.⁴

¹ Sec. 5.

² We have followed here the Constantinople text, as the Alexandrian is defective.

³ Baur's remark we take from Bleek's *Einleitung* by Mangold, from Baur's *Paulus* (2), i, p. 245.

⁴ Horace (*Sat.* i, 9, 70) refers to them as being in Rome and well-known.

Claudius Cæsar banished¹ them from that city; but in the time of Nero, when Paul arrived there, they had evidently returned, for he called together the chief of them."²

It is not known by whom the gospel was first preached in Rome. It is, however, not improbable that some Jews from Rome at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, converted by the preaching of Peter, returning to the Roman metropolis, founded a Christian Church there. In this Epistle the apostle speaks of the Roman Christians as follows: "I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world" (chap. i, 8), and declares that he had often purposed to come unto them (chap. i, 13). The Church there was evidently established at a very early period. Tacitus, in speaking of the Christians when Rome was burnt during the reign of Nero (A. D. 64), says that they were "a vast multitude."³

PLACE AND TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

It is certain that St. Paul wrote this Epistle at Corinth during his second sojourn in that city. He speaks of Gaius as his host (chap. xvi, 23); and we find in 1 Corinthians i, 14 that Gaius was a Corinthian Christian who had been baptized by Paul. He also names Erastus (chap. xvi, 23) as "the chamberlain of the city," that is, Corinth, and with this agrees his statement, "Erastus abode at Corinth" (2 Tim. iv, 20). He commends unto the Roman Christians Phebe, a servant of the Church at Cenchrea (about nine miles from Corinth), and requests them to receive her as becometh saints. These references show that Paul was at Corinth when he wrote. He also states that he is about to set out for Jerusalem to take to the poor saints in that city the contributions from Macedonia and Achaia (chap. xv, 25, 26), which not only shows that the apostle was in the region of Corinth when he wrote, but indicates the time of writing, as we find in the Acts that Paul immediately before starting for Jerusalem spent three months in Corinth, and then passed through Macedonia (Acts xx, 2-6). Now this was Paul's second sojourn in Corinth, and accordingly the Epistle was written about A. D. 58 or 59.

THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

Respecting the *genuineness* of this Epistle there is no dispute. It is one of the Epistles that even the Tübingen school acknowledge

¹ Acts xviii, 2; Suetonius, cap. xxv. ² Acts xxviii, 17. ³ Annal, lib. xv, cap. xliv.

⁴ At the end of the Epistle in the Peshito-Syriac version it is stated that it was written at Corinth.

to have been written by Paul. It was also universally received by the ancient Church as an undoubted writing of that apostle and was evidently used by Clement¹ of Rome in the first century, and by Polycarp,² a disciple of the Apostle John. It is quoted as the divine word, about A. D. 180, by Theophilus, bishop of Antioch,³ and in the Epistles written by the Churches of Lyons and Vienna to the Churches in Asia Minor⁴ (A. D. 177) there is an exact quotation of Romans viii, 18. About the same time Irenæus quotes this Epistle as having been written by Paul to the Romans.⁵

Universal acknowledgment of the genuineness of this Epistle.

Clement of Alexandria, in the last part of the second century, in quoting this Epistle, says: "Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, writes,"⁶ etc. Also Tertullian, at Carthage (about A. D. 200), uses the Epistle as the writing of the Apostle Paul.⁷ It was quoted by the heretic Basilides⁸ about A. D. 125, and formed a part of the canon of Marcion (A. D. 140). The Epistle was written for Paul by Tertius (chap. xvi, 22), and was sent to the Romans no doubt by Phebe, who is commended to the Roman Christians (chap. xvi, 1, 2). We do not perceive any special design in the Epistle, except to set forth the great doctrines of the Gospel to the Roman Christians, and to inform them of the apostle's desire and intention to visit them and preach the Gospel to them.

CONTENTS.

The apostle expresses his earnest desire to see the Christians at Rome, and preach to them the gospel which is able to save all men. He portrays the crimes and vices of the pagan world, and represents the heathen as inexcusable in their sins, as God has manifested himself to them in the works of nature and in conscience, and sets forth the divine retributive justice in rewarding virtue and punishing vice among all men, affirming that both Jews and Gentiles are guilty before him (chaps. i-iii, 20). Sinners can be justified only through the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. In illustration of this the justification of Abraham by faith is cited, and also the language of David (chaps. iii, 21-iv). The blessed results of justification by faith in Christ are peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (chap. v). The neces-

¹ The doctrine of justification by faith and not by works in sec. 32 of Clement's Epistle is based on Rom. iii-v. Sec. 35 refers clearly to Rom. i, 32.

Compare Polycarp's Epistle, sec. 6, with Rom. xiv, 10, 12.

Ad Autolyicum, lib. iii, 14, in which he refers to Rom. xiii, 7, 8; also in i, 14 he refers to Rom. ii, 6, 8.

⁴ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. v, cap. i, *et al.*

⁵ Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. xvi, 3.

⁶ Stromata, lib. iii, cap. xi, etc.

⁷ Adversus Gnosticos Scorpiace, cap. xiii, xiv, and elsewhere.

⁸ In Hippolytus, Ref. Hæres., lib. vii, 25.

sity of leading a holy life, and of not making the doctrine of justification by faith a license for sin, is then set forth (chaps. vi, vii). The happy condition of those who are redeemed through Christ and walk after the Spirit is next described (chap. viii). The rejection of the mass of the Jews for their unbelief has parallels in their ancient history, and God has always had a faithful people among them. The divine sovereignty is illustrated in the history of Pharaoh. The Jews will ultimately embrace Christianity (chapters ix-xi). The previous part of the Epistle is *doctrinal*. This is followed by a summary of our *duties* to God, to our fellow-men in general, and to our rulers (chaps. xii, xiii). Advice is given respecting those who have weak consciences (chaps. xiv, xv, 4).

The apostle offers a prayer, and delivers an exhortation to the Roman Christians, refers to his widely-extended ministry, and declares the intention of visiting them at a future day, but that he is immediately going up to Jerusalem to convey contributions to the poor saints in that city (chap. xv, 5-33). The Epistle closes with an appendix of salutations (chap. xvi).

INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

There can be no doubt that the entire Epistle was written by Paul.

Did the Epistle
end with chap-
ter xiv?

The last two chapters, it seems, were rejected by Marcion, for Origen, in commenting on chapters xvi, 25-27, remarks: "Marcion, by whom the evangelical and apostolical writings have been interpolated, cut off this chapter entirely from this Epistle; and not only did he cut off this, but also from that passage where it is written, *Whatever is not of faith is sin*, he cut off every thing to the end;"¹ that is, he cut off the last two chapters. Baur, also, and Schwegler and Zeller deny the genuineness of these two chapters. But their Pauline origin is acknowledged by Hilgenfeld.² They are found in the oldest extant Greek MSS., the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian; in the Peshito-Syriac, the Memphitic, the Æthiopic, Armenian, and Gothic³ versions. It is evident from an examination of the Epistle that it could not have originally ended with chapter xiv, and the last two chapters bear the Pauline stamp, and contain several undesigned coincidences, which Paley shows in his *Horæ Paulinæ*. We do not know of any critical editor of the New Testament who rejects these two chapters, or has any suspicion of their genuineness. For such suspicion no grounds exist.

¹ This passage we have given from the Latin translation of this Commentary. The Greek is lost.

² Einleitung, 322, 323.

³ Parts only of the two chapters are found in the Gothic, which is but fragmentary

This Epistle is, perhaps, the grandest of all the writings of St. Paul. The First Epistle to the Corinthians can alone be compared with it. It is a great treasury of the sublime doctrines, duties, and privileges of Christianity.

CHAPTER XXII

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

CORINTH, on a narrow isthmus between the Saronic and Corinthian Gulfs, was founded at a very early period, most probably by the Phœnicians. Possessing great facilities for commerce, it became a splendid city, and at the time it was destroyed by the consul Mummius (B. C. 146) was "the richest in Greece, and abounded in statues, paintings, and other works of art." It was called by Cicero "the light of all Greece."¹ After having been thoroughly destroyed, it remained in ruins for about a century, until Julius Cæsar sent thither a colony (B. C. 46), and about a hundred years later, when visited by the Apostle Paul, it had again become an important city. Strabo visited it, and in his description, written about A. D. 20, he represents it as situated at the foot and on the north side of a peak (or hill Acrocorinthus) something more than a third of a mile in height.²

The Church in this city was founded by Saint Paul, who came here from Macedonia and Athens about A. D. 52, and preached the gospel at least a year and a half, assisted by Timothy, Silas, and others (Acts xviii, 1-18). The Christian society was large, and composed almost entirely of Gentiles (Acts xviii, 6, 8).

About three years after the apostle had left the Corinthian disciples he was informed that there were divisions among them, and that various abuses had crept into the Church. In the time intervening between Paul's preaching and the writing of the Epistle, Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew, eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures, having received full instruction on Christian doctrine at Ephesus, went to Corinth and preached the gospel. In the illustration of Christianity he probably drew largely on the Greek philosophy of Alexandria, and highly delighted the intellectual Corinthians. Some of his hearers preferred him to Paul; others, especially such as had come over to Christianity from Judaism, preferred Peter, as being

¹ Pro Loge Manil., sec. iv.

² Lib. viii, 379.

an original apostle of Christ, and denied the apostleship of Paul. The most, however, doubtless adhered to Paul. Still others, attaching no importance to any Christian teacher, satisfied themselves with the doctrines of Christ, which had been delivered to them without any exposition from human authority. This seems to have been the real state of the case. The apostle does not charge them with grave errors in departing from the great doctrines of the Gospel, but with creating divisions in the Church.

It appears from chap. vii, 1 that the Corinthians had already written to Paul concerning certain matters, so that he had reasons of a most urgent character for writing to them.

PLACE AND TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

The Epistle was evidently written at Ephesus, near the close of the apostle's ministry of twenty-seven months in that city (Acts xix), about A. D. 57 or 58. Various references in the Epistle compared with the Acts determine this place and this time. In the Epistle (chap. xvi, 8) the apostle says: "I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost." In harmony with this as the place of writing is: "The Churches of Asia salute you" (chap. xvi, 19). In chapter xvi, 2-6 the apostle gives directions respecting contributions for the poor at Jerusalem, stating that if it is proper he himself will go to Jerusalem along with the persons appointed to take the contributions to that city; and that he will pay the Corinthians a visit when he passes through Macedonia. In chap. iv, 17 he tells the Corinthians that he has sent Timothy unto them; and in chap. xvi, 10 he gives directions, if "Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear." We find in Acts xix, xx that St. Paul, a short time before he left Ephesus, sent Timothy into Macedonia, and then went through it himself to Corinth, where he remained three months, and then returned through Macedonia, and went up to Jerusalem. It appears from Acts xviii, 26 that Aquila and Priscilla were at Ephesus during the apostle's abode in that city; and with this harmonizes the salutation: "Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord" (chap. xvi, 19). It would seem that it was about one year before the beginning of Paul's ministry at Ephesus that Apollos, having come to Ephesus and received full instruction in Christianity, went to Corinth, where he preached the gospel (Acts xviii, 24-xix, 1).

In chapter v, 9 the apostle refers to a former Epistle addressed to the Corinthians, which is no longer extant. It is very probable that the matter discussed was not of a general nature, and that the two subsequent Epistles of Paul, which we now have, so completely cov-

Notices in the Acts of Paul's prolonged stay in Ephesus.

ered the ground that the first Epistle had no further interest, and, of course, would naturally perish.

CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

The apostle reproves the party spirit and dissensions of the Corinthian Christians, and justifies himself in not dealing in Greek wisdom when he preached among them. He affirms that this wisdom cannot lead men to God; but that the gospel he preached was accompanied by the divine Spirit, and by miraculous power; and that, further, the natural man is incapable of understanding spiritual truth (chap. ii). He charges the Corinthians with being carnal, since party spirit prevails among them, and affirms that himself and Apollos are merely ministers of the word, and that it is God who gives success. He shows them that, after all, the various ministers of the gospel are theirs, and vindicates his apostolic authority, and speaks of his persecutions and sufferings for the sake of Christ, and declares that he is their father in the gospel (chaps. iii, iv). From the vindication of his apostolic authority he passes to the correction of abuses in the Church, and censures severely the crime of one's having his father's wife, and states how they should deal with such a member, at the same time exhorting them to be holy in life, and to associate with no bad man professing the religion of Christ (chap. v). He disapproves of Christians going to law with each other. He declares that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God, and warns them against impurity (chap. vi). He discusses marriage, which he declares in some cases is necessary, but in the present state of the Church has many inconveniences (chap. vii). He explains that an idol is nothing, yet it is not advisable to eat meat sacrificed to idols when it would offend weak brethren (chap. viii). He affirms that it is right that the ministers of the gospel should be supported, but that he has not availed himself of that privilege, and that he had laboured solely for the cause of the gospel, becoming all things to all men (chap. ix). He warns them against sin from the examples of Jewish history, and cautions them against taking a part in idolatrous sacrifices, and eating any thing sacrificed to idols when it would give offence (chapter x). He gives directions respecting women keeping their heads covered during divine service, and condemns the way in which they celebrate the communion (chap. xi). He discusses the various offices in the Church, which are constituted for the general good (chap. xii). He gives a description of love, without which he declares every other gift is useless, and while every thing else passes away, faith, hope, and love remain, but the greatest of these is love (chap. xiii). He adds directions respecting the manner

in which the spiritual gifts, especially that of tongues, are to be used (chap. xiv). The apostle enumerates the testimonies to the resurrection of Christ, which he declares to be the vital fact in the religion of Christ, and discusses the resurrection of the dead from natural analogies, and exhorts them to steadfastness (chap. xv). In the concluding chapter (xvi) Paul counsels them concerning collections, and promises to visit them some time after Pentecost; gives directions also about the reception of Timothy, their treatment of the house of Stephanus, and other matters, and sends greetings.

GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

Concerning the genuineness of this Epistle there never has been any doubt. Even the Tübingen school of critics acknowledge it to be Paul's. It is referred to by Clement of Rome in his Epistle to the Corinthians, written A. D. 93-96, *less than forty years* after the apostle wrote it. "Take into your hands," says he, "the Epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle. What did he first write concerning you in the beginning of the gospel? In truth, he wrote to you in a spiritual way respecting himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, on account of your having, even then, shown your partisan feelings,"¹ etc. It is also quoted as Paul's by Polycarp: "Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world? as Paul teaches."² Irenæus frequently quotes it, and in several places attributes it to Paul.³ It is quoted by Athenagoras⁴ (about A. D. 177) as the writing of the apostle. Clement of Alexandria⁵ quotes it as the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. So does Tertullian.⁶ In the Epistle to Diognetus it is cited: "The apostle says."⁷ It is also referred to in several places in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The undoubted genuineness of this Epistle is of the highest importance, as Paul, who had been in the company of the apostles, states the appearances of Christ to the apostles and others after his resurrection⁸ (chap. xv, 4-8).

In importance of doctrine this Epistle stands next to that to the Romans, and the description of *love* (chap. xiii) is the finest passage on that subject in the New Testament.

¹ Sec. 47.

² Sec. 11; compare with this 1 Cor. vi, 2.

³ As in *Contra Hæreses*, lib. iii, cap. xviii, 3; lib. iv, cap. xii, 2; cap. xv, 2.

⁴ *De Resur. Mortuorum*, cap. xviii.

⁵ *Pædag.* i, cap. vi.

⁶ *Præscrip.* xxxiii.

⁷ Sec. xii.

⁸ The skeptical Keim of Zürich, in his *Life of Jesus of Nazareth*, bases the resurrection of Christ upon the testimony of Paul in this chapter (xv).

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

THE PLACE AND TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

THIS Epistle was certainly written from Macedonia. In chapter ii, 13 the apostle speaks of having gone into that country; also in chap. vii, 5. In chapter ix, 2 he says, in speaking of the benevolence of the Achæans, "for which I am boasting of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago." This clearly shows that he wrote in Macedonia. From references which the apostle makes to the First Epistle it is clear that the Second was written not long after the First. It is seen in Acts xix, xx, 1, 2, that after Paul left Ephesus he passed through Macedonia on his way to Corinth. While in Macedonia he writes this Epistle, in which he informs the Corinthians that he is on the point of visiting them (chaps. xii, 14, 20, 21; xiii, 1). He refers to the troubles which he had in Asia (chap. i, 8, 10), alluding to the uproar in Ephesus just before he left the city (Acts xix, 24-41). Thus it is clear that it was written about *nine months* after the First Epistle, about A. D. 58 or 59.

Paul appears to have sent his first Epistle to the Corinthians by Titus (2 Cor. viii, 16-18), who returned to him in Macedonia from them, and reported the condition of the Corinthian Church, and the good effect the First Epistle had had on them (2 Cor. vii, 6-16). Upon the receipt of this information Paul writes this second letter, to console them, and to prepare the way for his coming, and at the same time to urge them to have their contributions ready. Although specially addressed to the Corinthians, it includes "all the saints that are in all Achaia" (chap. i, 1).

CONTENTS.

The apostle rejoices in the consolation he receives from God in trouble, by which he is enabled to comfort others who are in trouble, firming that both his sorrows and joys contribute to their salvation. He also refers to his sufferings in Asia and his deliverance from death. He rejoices in the testimony of a good conscience, and declares that had been his intention to pass through Corinth on his way to Macedonia, but that he had deemed it best for them that he should not come. He describes the sorrow with which he wrote the First

Epistle, and exhorts them to forgive and comfort the excommunicated person. He speaks of his disappointment in not finding Titus at Troas. His preaching, while it saves some, is resisted by others (chaps. i, ii). The apostle declares that he needs no epistles of commendation to them, as they are the Epistles of Christ, written by the Holy Spirit, through the ministration of the apostle, and describes the glorious ministration of the Spirit, by comparing it with the Mosaic dispensation (chap. iii). He gives a description of his preaching and sufferings for the Gospel, and declares his longing after eternal life, and speaks of his faithful discharge of his apostolic duties, and his earnest efforts to bring men to Christ. He describes at length his varied experience, placing in striking contrast its different shades (chaps. iv, v, vi, 1-13). He exhorts them not to be unequally yoked together with unbelievers, but to purify themselves from all sin. He asserts strongly his integrity and his affection for them, and declares how he was comforted when Titus returned from them and informed him of the good effect of his letter (chap. vi, 14-vii). He reminds them of the liberality of the Macedonians, and of the example of Christ, who became poor for us, and exhorts them not to fall short in their contributions in aid of the poor. He informs them that he has sent Titus to conduct the collection, and also another brother, whose praise in the gospel is in all the Churches. He expresses confidence in their liberality, and encourages them to give liberally, as it will redound to their advantage, and cause others to be grateful to God and to pray for them (chaps. viii, ix). He vindicates, against his enemies, his conduct and preaching. He expresses a jealous fear lest they should be corrupted from the simplicity of the Gospel, and enters into a full vindication of his apostolic character, recounts his labours, and declares that he is not a whit behind the chief apostles. He states that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard things not to be uttered; and, that he might not be exalted above measure, a thorn was put into his flesh (chaps. x, xi, xii, 1-12). He declares that he exhibited among them the signs of an apostle; that now he is coming to them for the third time, and that he will not be burdensome to them. He expresses a fear that he will not find them such as he would wish them to be, and exhorts them to examine themselves and prepare for his coming, as he will not spare the guilty (chaps. xii, 13-xiii).

GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

There is no dispute ¹ concerning the genuineness of this Epistle; it is acknowledged even by the Tübingen school. It was everywhere received by the early Church as the writing of Paul. It is called the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians by Irenæus,² by Clement³ of Alexandria, by Tertullian,⁴ by the Peshito-Syriac, and the Canon of Muratori.

The Epistle is full of personal allusions, and bears the undoubted stamp of Paul's character. It is not equal to the first in sublimity and grandness of conception, but is almost wholly occupied with the relations existing between the apostle and the Corinthians.

 CHAPTER XXIV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

GALATIA, called also Gallo-Græcia by Strabo, derived its name from the Gauls,⁵ who settled in that region in the third century before Christ. It was situated near the middle of Asia Minor, having Bithynia and Paphlagonia for its northern boundary; Phrygia for its western; Lycaonia for its southern; and Pontus and Cappadocia for its eastern. Strabo states that of "the Galatians there are three nations, two of them called after the name of their leaders, Trocmi and Tolistobogii; and the third named from the nation among the Celts, Tectosages."⁶ Jerome states in his time: "The Galatians—excepting the Greek, which all the East speaks—have nearly the same language⁷ which the Treviri⁸ have."⁹ There can be no doubt that the most of them understood Greek, so that there could have been no difficulty either in preach-

Character of the population of Galatia.

¹ From this remark Bruno Baur is ever an exception, as he denied the genuineness of all the writings of the New Testament. He must not be confounded with C. F. Baur, a man incomparably his superior.

² Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. vii, i. He quotes it as Paul's, lib. ii, cap. xxx, 7: "For the Apostle says in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians," iv, cap. xxviii, 3.

³ "The Apostle in the Second to the Corinthians."—Stromata, iv, 16.

⁴ De Pudicitia, cap. xiii. ⁵ Gauls were called Galatæ by Strabo. ⁶ Lib. xii, 566.

⁷ Jerome could speak from his own personal knowledge, as he had spent considerable time at Treviri (Trèves), and afterwards traveled through Galatia.

⁸ In Northern Gaul, the chief city of which district in modern times is called Trèves, ⁹ Comment. in Galat., lib. ii, cap. iii.

ing or writing to them in that language. It appears also that "as early as the time of Augustus many Jews lived in Galatia, to whom the emperor granted a letter of protection." These Jews, then, and others who doubtless adhered to them, would naturally be first addressed, and the converts from among them would form the nucleus of the Church, which had already become very powerful in that region in the first part of the second century.¹

Paul and Timothy preached the gospel to the Galatians about A. D. 52 (Acts xvi, 6). About three years later the apostle passes through the country of Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening the disciples (Acts xviii, 23). These are all the references to the Galatians in the Acts. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians (chap. xvi, 1) Paul states that he had "given order to the Churches of Galatia" respecting a collection. The First Epistle to the Corinthians was written about A. D. 58, and Paul refers here to his visitation of the Galatians about three years earlier, which was his second missionary tour through that country.

It seems from chapter iv, 8 that the greatest part of the Galatian Church were converted Gentiles: "When ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods." The Epistle is addressed to no particular society, but in a general way "unto the Churches of Galatia," because, doubtless, the converts were scattered in small towns and villages.

TIME, PLACE, AND OCCASION OF THE WRITING OF THE EPISTLE.

It is altogether probable that Paul wrote this Epistle after his second visit to the Galatians, as he says, "Ye know that through weakness of the flesh I preached the Gospel unto you at the *first*" (chap. iv, 13), which implies that he had preached to them a *second* time. This second visit was made about A. D. 55, beyond which the Epistle must be placed. Paul's language indicates that but a few years had elapsed since they were converted: "I marvel that you are so soon abandoning for another gospel him who called you by the grace of Christ" (chap. i, 6).

In discussing the doctrine of justification by faith the apostle gives some of the same illustrations that he uses in the Epistle to the Romans. In both we find that he dwells upon the justifying faith of Abraham. Now, it is very natural, in writing on the same subject at the same time, to use very similar arguments and illustrations, modified only to meet some specific differences. As the Epistle to the Romans was written during Paul's visit to Corinth (Acts xx, 3), about A. D. 58 or 59, it is probable that the Epistle to the Galatians

¹ As appears from an Epistle of Pliny.

was written at the same place and about the same time. But upon these points there is no certainty nor high probability to be derived from internal or external evidence.

Respecting the occasion upon which it was written, it is evident from the Epistle itself that Judaizing teachers had appeared among the Galatians after the apostle left them, and very positively asserted that it was necessary to salvation to observe the rite of circumcision, and to keep the law of Moses. It would seem that these teachers, at the same time, declared that Paul was not an original apostle, that he was not an eyewitness of the life of Christ, and had received authority from the Church alone to preach, and was merely a subordinate teacher. The Epistle, accordingly, is devoted chiefly to a vindication of his independent apostolic authority, and a defense of the great doctrine of justification by faith.

The occasion of the Epistle the havoc made by the teachers of Judaism.

CONTENTS.

The apostle severely reproveth the Galatians for departing from the gospel which he had preached among them, and he pronounces every one accursed who shall preach a different one. He affirms that he received his gospel immediately from Jesus Christ, and that he did not go up to Jerusalem until three years after his conversion, and saw there of the apostles only Peter and James. He gives an account of another visit to Jerusalem fourteen years later, when he had an interview with James, Cephas, and John, who extended to him the right hand of fellowship, and approved of his labor among the Gentiles. He states that at Antioch he reproveth Peter for inconsistency in his conduct respecting the Jews and Gentiles, and at the same time he sets forth the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ without the works of the law (chaps. i, ii). He remonstrates with the Galatians, and charges them with beginning in the Spirit and finishing with the flesh. He shows that Abraham's justification by faith was prophetic, and typical of the justification of the Gentiles by faith in Christ; that the law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, who hath freed us from the law's curse, and that now we are no longer under a schoolmaster, or under bondage, but are the sons of God, in proof of which God has given us his Holy Spirit. He reminds them of their former ardent affection for him. Under the allegory of the two sons of Abraham, Ishmael by a bondwoman, Agur, and Isaac by a free woman, Sarah, he shows that the children of the Sinaitic covenant (Agur) are in bondage, while the children of the free woman, the faithful in Christ, belonging to the heavenly Jerusalem, are free. He exhorts them to stand fast in this liberty which Christ has given them, and affirms that in relying upon cir-

cumcision for salvation they receive no benefit from Christ, and are bound to keep the whole law. He warns them not to use their liberty for an occasion to serve the flesh. He affirms that "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is the sum of the law. He gives a list of the deeds of the flesh, and of the fruits of the Spirit (chaps. iii, iv, v).

Paul exhorts the spiritual to restore any one overtaken in a fault, and admonishes them to bear each other's burdens, warns them against self-conceit, and exhorts them not to be weary in well-doing. He tells them that those who wish to have them circumcised wish thereby to escape persecution, but do not themselves keep the law. He prays that he may glory in nothing but Christ crucified, affirming that nothing avails but a new creature (chap. vi).

THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

That St. Paul wrote this Epistle is undoubted, and its genuineness is acknowledged by the Tübingen school. It was universally attributed to Paul by the ancient Church. It is quoted by Irenæus¹ as Paul's, by Clément² of Alexandria, and by Tertullian;³ it is found in the Canon of Muratori, and the Peshito-Syriac version, and was used by Marcion. The Epistle everywhere shows the genuine apostolic spirit and the peculiarities of Paul. It is important for its defence of the great doctrine of justification by faith.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

THE Epistle bears the inscription, "To the Ephesians;" and in the most of the MSS. the reading is, "To the saints who are in Ephesus." Tregelles has adopted, "in Ephesus" in his text, and Tischendorf inserts it in brackets (verse 1), and remarks that he concludes it did not come from Paul. In the Codex Vaticanus of the middle of the fourth century the superscription is, "To the Ephesians;" but in the first verse "in Ephesus" is wanting. In the Codex Sinaiticus, of the same age, "in Ephesus" is also wanting in the first verse, though the Epistle has the superscription, "To the Ephesians." The first verse in these two most ancient

¹ Contra Hæreses, lib. iii, cap. vi, 4; cap. vii, 2. He also quotes it in other places.

² Stromata, lib. iii, cap. xv.

³ De Præscrip., cap. vi.

Codices is: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to those who are saints,¹ and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." Origen² says that he found in the Ephesians only the expression, "To the saints who are" (τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι), and he asks, if it is not redundant, what does it mean? From which it is clear that in his MSS. Ephesus was wanting in the first verse of the Epistle.

Basil the Great, of Cappadocia, about the middle of the fourth century, in writing against Eunomius, remarks: "When he (Paul) wrote to the Ephesians as being truly united by knowledge to him who exists (τῷ ὄντι, *the self-existent Being*), in a peculiar way he called *them existing* (ἀντοῦς ὄντας), saying: 'To the saints who are, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.' For thus those who were before us have delivered it, and we have found it in the ancient copies."³ It is evident, then, that while the superscription was, "To the Ephesians," Ephesus was not in the text of the old MSS.; at least, it was wanting in many of them, and we have already seen that it is wanting in our two most ancient Codices⁴ belonging to the age of Basil.

Tertullian says: "The Epistle which we have with the title *To the Ephesians*, the heretics have, *To the Laodiceans*." Again, he remarks: "This Epistle we have through the integrity of the Church—sent *to the Ephesians*, not *to the Laodiceans*; but Marcion preferred to change its title, as if he was also a very industrious investigator in this matter. But titles are of no importance, since, when the apostle wrote to certain persons, he wrote to all."⁵ It is clear, then, that Marcion's Epistles had the inscription: "To the Laodiceans." It is to be observed that Tertullian does not charge Marcion with altering the reading "Ephesus" into "Laodicea" in the first verse. Nor does he say that "in Ephesus" was found in the text of the MSS. in use in the Church. Had Marcion altered "in Ephesus" into "in Laodicea," Tertullian would have said so, and would not have satisfied himself with remarking that "Titles are of no importance."

It is not easy to see, in a matter like this, how Marcion could have aided his heretical doctrines by changing the superscription from "Ephesus" into "Laodicea," and he must therefore have found MSS. with the latter superscription. It accordingly appears that the Greek

The Greek is, τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι, *To the saints who are, or are existing*—very awkward Greek and English without some word indicating place.

¹ Kramer's Catena, in Tregelles' Greek Text.

² Lib. ii, cap. xix.

³ Ephesus is, however, written on the margin by a later hand

⁴ Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam *ad Ephesios* habemus emissam, non *ad Laodicenos*; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes Apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam.—Adversus Marcionem, lib. v, cap. xvii.

MSS. of the second and third centuries, and many of those of the fourth, named in the first verse neither Ephesus nor any other place. On the other hand, as the two most ancient Codices have the superscription "To the Ephesians," and as in the Peshito version and in the Canon of Muratori it is supposed to be addressed to the Ephesians, the mass of the Greek MSS. in the earliest centuries must have had this superscription, and doubtless from the superscription in the course of time Ephesus was inserted in the first verse of the Epistle. It is also quoted by the ancient fathers as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

But the great difficulty in the way of supposing the Epistle to have been written especially to the Ephesians lies in the absence of any reference to Paul's having laboured among them, and in the statements of the writer: "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love to all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you," etc. (chap. i, 15); and "If you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward" (chap. iii, 2). It is difficult to see how this language is consistent with Paul's having preached the gospel among the Ephesians for *more than two years* previous to his writing. In his Epistles addressed to the Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and Thessalonians, he refers to his having preached to them.

But as Marcion's copies had the inscription "To the Laodiceans," and as St. Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians gives a charge not only that the Epistle should be read in the Church of the Laodiceans, but also that the Epistle from the latter should be read by the Colossians, the Epistle to the Laodiceans must be Paul's Epistle addressed to them, and which was to be brought from them. No other explanation seems admissible. Now, this Epistle to the Laodiceans must have been an important one, otherwise the apostle would not have ordered it to be read in the Church of the Colossians. Laodicea was the most important city in that region, and Colossæ was comparatively small, and it is, accordingly, difficult to see how the Epistle to this Church should have been allowed to perish, while that to the unimportant Colossæ should have come down to us. Even Paul's Epistle to Philemon, consisting of a single chapter, has been preserved. We do not know that any Epistle of Paul's to any Church or important individual Christian ever perished, except one written to the Corinthians on some matter which, in all probability, was so completely covered by the two existing Epistles as to render it useless (1 Cor. v, 9).

There is a striking resemblance between this Epistle and that to

the Colossians, and it is very likely that the condition of the Churches in Laodicea and Colossæ was very similar, as they were not more than twelve miles apart, and a quite close connexion seems, from what Paul says in the Epistle to the Colossians, to have existed between them (chaps. ii, 1; iv, 16).

But if the Epistle had been sent especially to the Laodiceans, it is not easy to see how the inscription "To the Ephesians" should have been so general in the ancient Church, and why the apostle did not insert the name "Laodicea" or "Laodiceans" in the text, just as he has inserted the name of the Churches addressed in his other Epistles. Archbishop Usher suggested that the Epistle is encyclical, and that it was directed to several Churches in Asia Minor; that for this reason the place for the name of those addressed was left vacant, to be filled up by the different Churches in which it was read. This is very probable, and implies that Tychicus, with whom the Epistle was sent, had several copies with him, or that copies were made at Ephesus, through which Tychicus would naturally pass on his way to Laodicea and Colossæ. But, then, in speaking of the Epistle, to whom would the early Churches and writers say it was sent? Most naturally, to the chief city of all that region, Ephesus. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians is addressed to "the Church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." Notwithstanding this, the Epistle is always spoken of as addressed to the Corinthians. The Ephesians would naturally put their own name at the head of the Epistle, and from this great city numerous copies would be spread over the Christian world, bearing the inscription "To the Ephesians." As we have already said, the name Ephesus in the course of time passed from the superscription into the text.

We have already seen that the copies of this Epistle which Marcion had were inscribed "To the Laodiceans." Now, as Marcion was of Sinope in Pontus, a city a hundred miles nearer to Laodicea, a large city, than to Ephesus, it is very probable that his copies came originally from the former city, to which a copy had been brought by Tychicus, and in this way they had the inscription *To the Laodiceans*. It also appears that among the heretics in general, as we have seen, the Epistle bore the title, "To the Laodiceans." Hug, Olshausen, Neander, and Bleek, regard the Epistle as *encyclical*. It was not originally intended for a very wide district, as the apostle states that Tychicus, who was sent with this Epistle and that to the Colossians, will give the readers of the Epistle information respecting him. The encyclical character of the Epistle is seen in the fact that no persons in any particular Church

This Epistle
most probably
encyclical.

Probable ori-
gin of Marci-
on's copy.

are mentioned, just as in the general Epistle "To the Churches of Galatia." It is evidently addressed to Gentile Christians.

THE PLACE AND TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

It appears from chaps. iii, 1; vi, 20, that Paul was a prisoner when he wrote this Epistle, and it is highly probable that it was written about the same time as the Epistle to the Colossians, as there is a striking similarity between the two. Neander well observes: "Let us remember that Paul, when he wrote this Epistle, was still full of those thoughts and contemplations which occupied his mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians; thus we can account for those points of resemblance in the second, which was written immediately after the first. And hence it is also evident that of these two, the Epistle to the Colossians was written first, for the apostle's thoughts there exhibit themselves in their original formation and connexion, as they were called forth by his opposition to that sect whose sentiments and practices he combats in that Epistle."¹ Now, it appears from internal evidence that the Epistle to the Colossians was written at Rome during Paul's first imprisonment about A. D. 63, so that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written at the same place and about the same time.

CONTENTS.

The apostle thanks God for the privileges enjoyed in the Gospel through the divine predestination, and declares that he ever gives thanks and prays for those to whom he writes, that God may enable them to see the riches of the Gospel, and the greatness of its power as displayed in God's raising Christ from the dead and exalting him to heaven (chap. i). He reminds them of what they once were, when dead in sins, but now he declares they have been saved by grace through faith in Jesus Christ, who is our peace, and has broken down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, and that they are no longer strangers, but fellow-citizens with the saints. He declares that a dispensation of the gospel has been committed to him, to whom it was revealed that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and partakers of the blessings of the gospel, which it is his mission to preach among the Gentiles. He prays that they may be fully established in grace, and be enabled to know fully the love, and to be filled with the fullness, of God (chaps. ii, iii).

He exhorts them to walk worthy of their high vocation, in humility, love, and unity, and speaks of the various officers in the Church appointed by Christ for its edification and unity. He

¹ Planting and Training of the Christian Church, p. 329, Ryland's Translation.

exhorts them to live not as other Gentiles, in blindness and lust, but to put on the new man of righteousness and holiness; to be truthful, angry without sin, honest, chaste in conversation; to lay aside all bitterness, anger, and evil speaking, and to walk in love, and purity of life, redeeming the time; to be sober, to praise God in sacred songs, and to be thankful. He illustrates the relation existing between husbands and wives by that which exists between Christ and his Church, describes the mutual duties of parents and children, of servants and masters, and exhorts the saints to put on the whole armor of God, which he describes, that they may master their spiritual foes. He asks their prayers for him in his bonds, and informs them that he has sent Tychicus, who will give them information respecting his affairs, and closes by invoking upon them the divine blessing (chaps. iv-vi).

THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

It was never doubted by the Ancient Church that this Epistle was written by Paul. It is used by Polycarp in his Epistle to the Philippians,¹ is quoted as Paul's Epistle by Irenæus,² by Clement of Alexandria,³ by Tertullian,⁴ and is attributed to Paul in the Canon of Muratori, and in the Peshito-Syriac version, and was received by Marcion under the title of the Epistle to the Laodiceans.⁵ It was quoted by Basilides⁶ (about A. D. 125), and by Valentinus⁷ (about A. D. 140). Irenæus affirms that the Valentinians "say: Paul very evidently has often named these Æons, and has also observed their order, speaking as follows: 'Throughout all ages, world without end'"⁸ (Ephesians iii, 21).

But notwithstanding the universal reception of this Epistle as Paul's in the ancient Church as far back as the beginning of the second century at least, its genuineness has been assailed by a few critics in quite recent times. Schleiermacher, in his lectures, first expressed a doubt upon this point, by

¹ "By grace ye are saved" (χαρίτι ἐστε σῶσασμένοι), sec. 1, the exact language of Ephesians ii, 5. In sec. 12 Ephes. iv, 26 is quoted as holy scripture.

² Lib. ii, cap. ii, 6; lib. v, cap. ii, 3.

³ Cohortatio ad Gentes, cap. ix. In Strom., lib. iv, cap. viii, he quotes it as the Epistle to the Ephesians. ⁴ Adversus Marcionem, v, cap. xi, xvii, xviii.

⁵ Ibid., cap. xvii.

⁶ "He (Basilides) says, as it is written: 'By revelation the mystery was made known to me.'"—In Hippolytus, Refut. Omnium Hæc., vii, 26. The exact language in Greek of Ephes. iii, 3.

⁷ Ibid., vi, ii, 34.

⁸ Contra Hæreses, lib. i, cap. iii, 1. They found the Æons in Αἰῶνες, "ages," of the apostle.

conjecturing that a companion of Paul wrote it according to his suggestions. After this De Wette expressed his doubts respecting its genuineness; and in the last edition of his *Introduction to the New Testament* he gives great emphasis to them. First of all, he regards this Epistle as written in imitation of that to the Colossians, and thinks it unworthy of an apostle to copy himself. He remarks: "In comparison with the Epistle to the Colossians and other Epistles of Paul, the style is not Pauline, as it is verbose, poor in thought, and too loose, being overloaded with parentheses and appositions which destroy the connexion. There are also departures from his style in words and expressions, as well as many things in thoughts, dogmas, and method. Strongly, indeed, against these grounds of doubt stands the recognition of this Epistle by the Church, as well as the opposition of most biblical critics. Moreover, though not written by the apostle himself, yet by a gifted disciple of his, it still belongs to the apostolic age."¹ The genuineness of the Epistle is denied by Schwegler, Baur, Ewald, and Hilgenfeld.² Baur and Hilgenfeld place it in the first half of the second century; Ewald supposes it was written by a disciple of Paul upon the basis of the Epistle to the Colossians between A. D. 75 and 80. Mangold observes that, since "it is impossible to withdraw one's self from the full impression of the Pauline spirit which speaks from both Epistles (Ephesians and Colossians), recently on this ground Reuss, Klöpffer, Schenkel, and Hofmann have defended the genuineness of both Epistles."³

There can be no doubt whatever from the very early testimonies Modern doubts considered. to this Epistle that it was written in the first century. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that it was written by the Apostle Paul. Can we believe that a disciple of his could have written such a composition, exhibiting the power, grasp, and peculiarities of this apostle? Or, if he had been able, that he would have so far forgotten his duty to the apostle, to truth, and to God, as to forge it in the name of this great teacher of the Gentiles? And what could be the object of such a forgery? So far as the setting forth of doctrines, or any polemic purpose, is concerned, the Epistle to the Colossians would have answered it. Neander well remarks: "The similarity of the two Epistles (the Epistle to the Colossians and the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians) is of such a kind, that we see in it the work of the same author, and not an imitation by another hand."⁴

¹ *Einleitung*, edited by Messner and Lünemann, Berlin, 1860, pp. 318, 319.

² Hilgenfeld places it not long before A. D. 140. *Einleitung*, p. 680. Leipzig, 1875

³ Additions to Bleek's *Einleitung*, p. 535. Berlin, 1875.

⁴ *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, p. 329, Ryland's translation.

The words which De Wette gives as not Pauline, upon examination, are found void of any special significance, and in some instances his list is absolutely erroneous. On the other hand, we often find words in the Ephesians some of which never, and others rarely, occur except in the recognized writings of Paul. In chap. vi, 20 Paul, speaking of the Gospel, says: "For which I am an ambassador," etc., and in 2 Cor. v, 20, "We are ambassadors for Christ." The word *πρεσβεύω*, *to be an ambassador*, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. In Ephesians v, 8 we have "children of light" (*τέκνα φωτός*); and in 1 Thess. v, 5 "sons of light" (*υἱοὶ φωτός*), and in Rom. xiii, 12 "armour of light" (*τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός*). It is easy to see that such phrases as these show the same writer. The saints are nowhere else called "the children" or "sons of light," with the exception of Luke xvi, 8, and John xii, 36. *Προετοιμάζω*, *to prepare before hand*, is found only in Rom. ix, 23, and in Ephesians ii, 10. *Ἀνεξιχνίαστος*, *unsearchable*, is found only in Romans xi, 33, and in Ephesians iii, 8. *Ἀνακεφαλαίωμαι*, *to sum up, to bring together*, is found only in Romans xiii, 9, and in Ephesians i, 10. *Προσαγωγή*, *access*, occurs only in Romans v, 2, Ephesians ii, 18, and iii, 12. *ὑπερβάλλω*, *to surpass*, is found only in 2 Cor. iii, 10; ix, 14, and in Ephesians i, 19; ii, 7; iii, 19. *Πῶρωσις*, *blindness, hardness of heart*, is found in Rom. xi, 25, and in Ephesians iv, 18; elsewhere in the New Testament only in Mark iii, 5. *Ἀληθεύω*, *to speak the truth*, occurs only in Galatians iv, 16, and in Eph. iv, 15. *Ἀρραβῶν* (Heb. אַרְבָּוֹן), *pledge, earnest*, is found only in 2 Cor. i, 22; v, 5, and in Ephesians i, 14. *Παροργίζω*, *to make angry*, is found only in Rom. x, 19, and in Ephesians vi, 4. *Μεταδίδωμι*, *to impart*, occurs in Rom. i, 11; xii, 8; 1 Thess. ii, 8; and in Eph. iv, 28; nowhere else except in Luke iii, 11. *Ἑπίθεσία*, *adoption*, Ephesians i, 5, is found nowhere else except in Romans and Galatians. *Προορίζω*, *to determine before hand*, is found in Ephesians i, 5, 11; Rom. viii, 29, 30; 1 Cor. ii, 7; elsewhere only in Acts iv, 28. *Μνείαν ποιοῦμαι*, *to make mention of*, occurs only in Rom. i, 9; 1 Thess. i, 2; Phil. 4, and in Ephesians i, 16. *Πεποίθησις*, *confidence*, is found only in 2 Corinthians, Philippians iii, 4, and Ephesians iii, 12. *ὑπερᾶν*, *superabundantly*, found only in 1 Thess. iii, 10; v, 13, and in Ephesians iii, 20. *Εὐωδία*, *sweet smell*, is found only in 2 Corinthians ii, 15; Philippians iv, 18, and in Ephesians v, 2. In Acts xxviii, 20, Paul speaks at Rome of being bound with a single chain (*τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην*, *this chain*); and in Ephesians vi, 20, he says, "I am an ambassador in a chain (*ἐν ἀλύσει*). Everywhere else in the New Testament, except in 2 Tim. i, 16, and in Rev. xx, 1, the plural, *ἀλύσεις*, *chains*, is used. It must be borne in mind that all the circumstances

Striking Pauline words and phrases in this Epistle.

of the case point to the composition of this Epistle during the apostle's first imprisonment at Rome. The examples we have given do not, however, exhaust the subject.

It must also be observed that the Epistle contains Hebraisms, just Hebraisms in this Epistle. as we would expect from Paul. As examples, we have, *τέκνα ὀργῆς*, *children of wrath*, chap. ii, 3; *τέκνα φωτός*, *children of light*, chap. v, 8; *υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας*, *sons of disobedience*, chap. ii, 2; *υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, *sons of men*, chap. iii, 5. We have also seen that *ἀρραβών* (Heb. אַרְבָּוֹן), *pledge*, is used in chap. i, 14.

De Wette notices, as not Pauline, the omission of a verb of command before *ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα*, *that she reverence her husband* (chap. v, 33); but a similar omission occurs before *ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ*, κ. τ. λ., *that ye abound in this grace also* (2 Cor. viii, 7). Also, *ἵνα*, followed by the optative mood, De Wette thinks not Pauline. But there is only one¹ passage of this kind in the Ephesians (chap. i, 17), and in this the optative is properly used after a prayer. "*ἵνα* (*that, in order that*) is followed in every other instance, twenty-two times in Ephesians, by the subjunctive.

In Ephesians iv, 27 and vi, 11, the arch-enemy of mankind is called the Devil, (*Διάβολος*); but in Romans, First and Second Corinthians, First and Second Thessalonians, he is called Satan (*Σατανᾶς*), eight times in all. In First Timothy both words are used, which is the usage of Matthew, Luke, and John. In Second Timothy and Titus, *Diabolos*, devil, alone occurs. Satan is a Hebrew word meaning *adversary*, and was doubtless the word Paul would use in addressing his countrymen; but in addressing Gentiles, he would naturally use *Diabolos*,² a Greek word meaning *slanderer*. Now, as the Epistle to the Ephesians is addressed to Gentiles, it was highly proper that the latter word should be employed.

This Epistle is not simply an elaboration of that to the Colossians; but while most of its ideas and words are such as are found in that and the other Epistles of Paul, they are not slavishly followed, and new thoughts and different words are introduced as occasion demands. All this bespeaks Paul as its author.

Hilgenfeld³ regards the expressions "fulness of time" (*πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν*), and the fulness (*πλήρωμα*) of him who filleth all in all" (i, 10, 23), as belonging to the period of Gnosticism. But how does Hilgenfeld know that Gnosticism had no existence as early as A. D. 63 or 64? But what has the "fulness" (*πλήρωμα*), of which Paul

¹In the other passage noticed by De Wette, both Tischendorf and Tregelles have introduced the subjunctive mood, *ἵνα* (chap. iii, 16), from the best MSS.

²*Diabolos* is the Greek translation of Satan in various passages of the LXX; as Zech. iii, 1, 2; Job i, 6, 7, 12.

³Einleitung, p. 679

speaks, to do with the Pleroma (fulness) of the Gnostics? Paul, in Epistles which Hilgenfeld acknowledges to be his, speaks of the "fulness (pleroma) of time," Gal. iv, 4; "fulness (pleroma) of the Gentiles, (Romans xi, 25); "fulness of the law" (chap. xiii, 10). Why might he not also speak of the fulness of God as he does in Colossians (chap. ii, 9), and as John speaks of the fulness (pleroma) of Christ (John i, 16)?

There is a peculiarity of Paul, noticed by the acute Paley,¹ a species of digression which he calls "*going off at a word*," and which he adduces as an argument for the genuineness of this Epistle. In 2 Corinthians ii, 14 Paul speaks of God's manifesting "the *savour* of his knowledge." This leads him to comment on "savour." In 2 Cor. iii, 1 he asks: "Do we need *epistles* of commendation to you?" He then starts off to discuss "*living epistles*." In 2 Cor. iii, 13 he says, Moses "put a vail over his face." This leads him to a discussion of the blindness of the Israelites. In accordance with this peculiarity, we find the apostle in Ephesians iv, 8 saying: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." This leads him to speak immediately of Christ's ascension and descension. In chap. v, 13, speaking of things "made manifest by the *light*," he starts off at light into a digression. Upon the whole, we may safely rest in the belief of the genuineness of this Epistle.

Characteristic digressions in this Epistle.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

PHILIPPI, an important city of Macedonia, was named after Philip, the father of Alexander the Great. It was anciently called Crenides,² "Place of Fountains," "from the numerous streams in which the Angites has its source." The old city was enlarged by Philip after the capture of Amphipolis, Pydna, and Potidæa, and fortified to protect his frontier against the Thracian mountaineers.³ The haven of the town was Neapolis, situated about ten miles distant, at the mouth of the Angites on the Thracian sea. It was at this place that Paul landed on his way to Philippi (Acts xvi, 11). Augustus presented Philippi with the privileges of a colony, with the name "Col. Jul. Aug. Philip."

¹ In his *Horæ Paulinæ*.

² Strabo, vii, 331.

³ Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.*

About A. D. 52 Paul and Silas visited this place and preached the gospel. Among their converts was Lydia. Paul having cast the spirit of divination out of a Pythoness, and her masters seeing that there was no further hope of gain from her profession, brought the apostle and Silas before the magistrates, as being troublesome persons. At the command of these officers, Paul and Silas were severely beaten, thrust into the inner prison, and their feet made fast in the stocks. An earthquake in the night shook the foundations of the building, and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands loosed. The keeper of the prison was converted and baptized. The officers, learning that Paul and Silas were Romans, became alarmed, and begged them to leave. Soon after this Paul and Silas left the city for Amphipolis (Acts xvi, 12-40). The Philippian Church was composed almost entirely of Gentile Christians. It seems that no synagogue had been established there, as there is mention merely of an *oratory* (*προσευχή*) on the river side (Acts xvi, 13).

Time of Paul's
visit to Philip-
pi.

THE PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION.

It is clear from several passages in the Epistle that it was written by Paul when imprisoned in Rome. In chap. i, 7 he speaks of being in bonds; and in chap. i, 13 he says: "So that my bonds in Christ have become manifest in the whole palace, and all other places." In chap. iv, 22 he says: "All the saints salute you, but especially they who are of Cæsar's household."

Written during
Paul's impris-
onment.

In the Acts of the Apostles we find but two long imprisonments of Paul: the one at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii, 33-xxvi), and the other at Rome (Acts xxviii, 20-30). Now the salutation from "Cæsar's household" clearly shows that he was imprisoned at Rome, and not at Cæsarea, when he wrote the Epistle.

It would appear also from his language (chap. i, 13) that Paul had already been in Rome a considerable time, and from chap. ii, 23, 24, that he wrote near the end of his two years' confinement, as he expects a decision of his case soon, and trusts that he will shortly come to the Philippians. We may, therefore, conclude that the Epistle was written at Rome near the end of his first¹ imprisonment in that city, about A. D. 63.

¹ It does not suit the facts in the case to suppose that the Epistle was written when Paul was brought before Nero the *second* time. Then he was left alone, and when he wrote Second Timothy, expecting to depart from the world soon, only Luke was with him (chap. iv, 11, 16). But when he wrote the Philippians Timothy was with him (Phil. i, 1). Besides, he expected soon to be released (Phil. ii, 24).

CONTENTS.

The apostle expresses his deep affection for the Philippians, his joy in their fellowship, and his confidence that God will complete the work begun in them. He informs them that his imprisonment has contributed to the progress of the gospel, and led others to preach Christ. He prays that Christ may be magnified whether by his life or death, and expresses a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is better for himself, but not expedient for them, and he therefore concludes that he will still live. He exhorts them to live in accordance with the gospel, and teaches them humility by the example of the Saviour, who, though equal with God, assumed the form of a servant, and submitted to the death of the cross. He exhorts them to persevere in the work of their salvation, and to be blameless in their lives. He hopes to be able to send Timothy to them shortly, and himself to come soon. He tells them that he had sent Epaphroditus, who had been dangerously sick, and he exhorts them to receive him with kindness and honour (chaps. i, ii).

He warns them to beware of evil doers and of the concision (circumcision thus disparagingly called), affirming that he himself is a genuine Jew, but counts all his Jewish privileges as naught for the knowledge of Christ, and is pressing forward to the goal of the Christian course, the attainment of a glorified state with Christ. He exhorts them to steadfastness in the Lord, to rejoice, to make their wants known by prayer, and to meditate upon all that is lovely and excellent, and to hold fast what they have received. He expresses his joy that they are again mindful of him in his affliction, although they lacked opportunity to contribute of their means. He states, however, that he has learned to accommodate himself to circumstances. He refers to the fact that more than once when he was in Thessalonica they ministered to his necessities. He acknowledges the receipt of gifts from them through Epaphroditus, and closes with salutations (chaps. iii, iv). The reception of gifts from the Philippians was the occasion of the writing of the Epistle.

GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

This Epistle was universally received by the ancient Church as the writing of Paul. Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, says that Paul, being absent from them, wrote to them.¹ Chap. ii, 6 of Philippians is quoted in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienna to those of

Quotations
from the Epis-
tle by the Fa-
thers and early
Churches.

¹He uses *ἐπιστολαί* (plural); but the plural is sometimes used for the singular, *single Epistle*, sec. 3.

Asia Minor¹ (about A. D. 177). It is quoted as Paul's by Irenæus,² by Clement³ of Alexandria, by Tertullian,⁴ and by the heretic Marcion. It is found in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in the Canon of Muratori. Its genuineness has been assailed by Baur, Schwegler, and Hitzig. De Wette remarks: "The genuineness of this Epistle seems to be raised above all doubt."⁵ Even Hilgenfeld, of the Tübingen school, defends it. "The genuineness of the Epistle to the Philippians," says he, "has therefore not been really refuted. In this Epistle we have the dying song (*schwanengesang*, *swan-song*) of Paul."⁶ It is so fully attested, and bears such strong internal evidence of being the writing of Paul, that it needs no defense. The Epistle was conveyed to the Philippians by Epaphroditus (chap. ii, 28, 29).

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

COLOSSÆ is mentioned by Herodotus⁷ as a large city of Phrygia. The younger Cyrus halted here seven days when on the expedition against his brother Artaxerxes, and it is described by Xenophon as large and prosperous.⁸ It was situated on the Lycus, a branch of the Mæander, about twelve miles east of Laodicea. About the time of Christ it had become an unimportant town.⁹

It appears from chapters i, 4, ii, 1, that Paul had never visited Colossæ; at least, that he did not found the Church there. The Colossians received the Gospel from Epaphras, who is highly commended by Paul (chap. i, 7), and was with him when he wrote the Epistle. The apostle was evidently led to write to them by the report of their condition which he had received from Epaphras. It appears from the Epistle that they were in danger of being led away by false philosophy. The Church in this town was composed, no doubt, almost exclusively of Gentiles.

¹ In Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, v, 2.

² *Pædag.*, i, cap. vi.

³ *Einleitung*, p. 324.

⁷ vii, 30.

⁸ *Anab.*, i, cap. 2.

⁴ *Contra Hæreses*, iv, cap. xviii, 4.

⁵ *De Resurrectione Carnis*, cap. xxiii.

⁶ *Einleitung*, p. 347, Leipzig, 1875.

⁹ *Strabo*, xii, 576-578.

PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION.

It is clear from chapter iv, 3 that the apostle when he wrote was imprisoned, and it seems from various circumstances that it was his first imprisonment in Rome. We find Timothy with him (ch. i, 1), who was not with him at Rome when he was brought a second time before Nero (2 Tim. iv, 16); nor is it likely that Timothy was with him when he was imprisoned at Cæsarea. But he was with Paul in his *first* imprisonment in Rome (Phil. i, 1). When Paul wrote this Epistle Demas was with him (chap. iv, 14); but when he was brought before Nero the second time Demas forsook him (2 Tim. iv, 10). In the Epistle there are also named Onesimus, Aristarchus, Mark, Epaphras, and Luke (chap. iv, 9-14). When Paul wrote the Epistle to Philemon there were with him Onesimus (verse 10), Epaphras, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, and Luke (verses 23, 24). It is evident from the preceding facts that this Epistle was written about the same time as the Epistle to the Philippians and that to Philemon. Now the letter to the Philippians was written in the latter part of Paul's *first* imprisonment in Rome, and the Epistle to Philemon shortly before Paul's liberation from that imprisonment, as appears from his direction to Philemon to prepare him a lodging (verse 22). We may, therefore, conclude that the Epistle to the Colossians was written near the close of Paul's first imprisonment in Rome, about A. D. 63. It was sent to the Colossians by Tychicus (chap. iv, 7).

Written during
Paul's first im-
prisonment.

CONTENTS.

The apostle expresses the deep interest which he feels in the Colossians since he heard of their faith, prays for their progress in the knowledge of God, that they may fully perform his will, and that they may be supported by the power of the gospel. He sets forth the attributes, the prerogatives, and the redeeming work of Christ, and exhorts them to steadfastness. He declares that a dispensation of the gospel is committed to him, and that he is labouring to perform its duties (chap. i). He expresses his deep anxiety for them, and for others who have not seen him, that they may be comforted, united in love, and attain a full understanding of the gospel, and be established in it. He warns them against being deceived by philosophy, and assures them that they are complete in Christ, and have obtained through him the forgiveness of sins. He also warns them against attaching importance to mere outward observances, and against being beguiled into a mere human system of religious worship (chap. ii).

He urges them to set their affections upon things above, to live in purity, to be humble, meek, long-suffering, and to abound in love. He gives directions to wives, husbands, children, fathers, servants, and masters. He exhorts them to continue in prayer, and to pray that he may be successful in preaching the gospel, and to conduct themselves with wisdom toward those without. He tells them that he has sent Tychicus and Onesimus, who will inform them respecting his affairs. He sends salutations, orders this Epistle to be read to the Church of the Laodiceans, and that theirs shall be read to the Colossians, and sends a charge to Aristarchus (chap. iii, iv).

GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

This Epistle was universally received by the ancient Church as a writing of the Apostle Paul. It was received also by the Colossians received by ancient Church. heretic Marcion (about A. D. 138); it is used by Justin Martyr¹ (about A. D. 150), by Theophilus² of Antioch (A. D. 180). It is quoted as Paul's by Irenæus,³ by Clement⁴ of Alexandria, and by Tertullian.⁵ It is ascribed to Paul in the ancient Peshito version and in the Canon of Muratori. "The Epistle," says De Wette, "has always belonged to the universally acknowledged writings. Only in the most recent time has it been doubted, nevertheless, on insufficient grounds."⁶

The genuineness of the Epistle has been attacked by Mayerhoff, Baur, Schwegler, and Hilgenfeld.⁷ The last critic thinks it strange that Paul "should not have personally known the Church at Colossæ as well as that at Laodicea" (Col. i, 4, 8, 9; ii, 1), since he twice passed through Phrygia (Acts xvi, 6; xviii, 23). But Laodicea and Colossæ were in Southern Phrygia, if they were, indeed, included in that country at all. Northern Phrygia was bounded on the east by Galatia, and on the west by Mysia. In Acts xvi, 6, 7 it is stated that Paul and his companions "were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not." Let any one now take Kiepert's map of the Roman empire, and he will find that Paul's route was far away from Laodicea and Colossæ. In his second journey, it seems, he

¹ Justin calls Christ "The firstborn of every creature" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*) (Dial. cum Tryph., cap. 85), the exact language of Col. i, 15. Expressions of a similar kind Justin uses in cap. 84 and 100.

² Ad Autolyicum, lib. ii, 22; he calls Christ "The firstborn of every creature."

³ Contra Hæreses, iii, cap. 14, 1.

⁴ Stromata, vi, cap. viii, etc.

⁵ Adversus Marcionem, lib. v, cap. xix.

⁶ Einleitung, p. 307.

⁷ Einleitung, 659-669, Leipzig, 1875.

followed the same route, for the author of Acts says he was "strengthening the disciples" (Acts xviii, 23). But, according to the New Testament geography, Asia and Phrygia were two separate districts (Acts ii, 9, 10; xvi, 6, 7); and in the Apocalypse—which the Tübingen school acknowledge to be the work of the Apostle John—Laodicea is addressed as one of the Churches of Asia (chap. i, iv; iii, 14), where Paul was forbidden to preach (Acts xvi, 6). Colossæ was about twelve miles east of Laodicea, and an unimportant place; and as the Apostle Paul did not preach in Laodicea it is not likely that he preached at Colossæ. Hence the statement in the Epistle to the Colossians, that the Churches of Laodicea and Colossæ were personally unknown to the apostle (chap. i, 4, 8, 9; ii, 1), is established by independent proof.

Hilgenfeld also objects that the order of the words, "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew" (chap. iii, 11), is not according to the usage of Paul, who puts Jews first. But in some of the instances in which Paul puts the Jews first, the nature of the case demanded it, as the gospel was first offered to the Jews. And in almost any case it was natural for a Jew to put his countrymen first. It must also be borne in mind that in the Churches at Rome and Corinth, to which the Epistles were addressed in which Jews are named before Greeks, there were many Jews, while it is probable that there were but few at Colossæ. But in the same verse (chap. iii, 11) it is added "circumcision nor uncircumcision," the first of which refers to Jews. But further, in the Peshito-Syriac, it is "Jew and Gentile," and in the Armenian and Æthiopic, "Jew nor Greek." It is not, however, improbable that late in life, when the apostle had become accustomed to the Greeks, and Christianity had taken deep hold of them, he may have put them first. Certainly *one* word put in a different order from that in which the apostle had been accustomed to put it, can furnish no proof of the spuriousness of the Epistle.

Hilgenfeld thinks he finds in the Epistle traces of Gnosticism, which indicate a post-apostolic age. But these traces are merely imaginary. The "fulness" of which the apostle speaks (chap. i, 19; ii, 9) is not the fulness (*Pleroma*) of the Gnostics. In various places in his undisputed Epistles, as has already been shown, Paul uses the word fulness (*Pleroma*) in reference to Jews (Rom. xi, 12), to Gentiles (chap. xi, 25), the law (chap. xiii, 10), time (Gal. iv, 4). In our Epistle the "fulness" refers to Christ (chap. i, 19), to the Godhead (chap. ii, 9). In John's Gospel the word is used in reference to Christ (chap. i, 16).

There are personal allusions in the Epistle of such a character

that they are sufficient of themselves to show its Pauline origin. It appears from chap. iv, 12 Epaphras was with Paul, and we find Epaphras also with him when he writes to Philemon (ver. 23). Onesimus is mentioned in chap. iv, 9 as a faithful and beloved brother, and one of the Colossians. Archippus is exhorted to take heed to the ministry which he has received of the Lord (chap. iv, 17). This shows that Archippus was of Colossæ. Accordingly, when the apostle writes to Philemon and Archippus, we clearly see that the former was also of Colossæ, to which city Onesimus also belonged. In chap. iv, 10 we find Aristarchus with Paul; and he is with him also in Philemon 24. And it appears from Acts xxvii, 2 that Aristarchus went with Paul to Rome, where he appears in this Epistle. In chap. iv, 10 Mark is called Barnabas' cousin. Could we expect such intimate knowledge as this of any one after the apostolic age? And does not this explain Barnabas' predilection for Mark (Acts xv, 37-39)? Luke and Demas appear with Paul, both in Colossians iv, 14 and in Philemon 24. Hilgenfeld acknowledges the Epistle to Philemon to be Paul's, and that to the Colossians is so interwoven with it as to show that it must be a genuine apostolical production, the coincidences evidently being undesigned.

In the Epistle it is ordered that it shall be read in the Church of Laodicea after it had been read to the Colossians (chap. iv, 16). What object could a forger have to give such an order as this, unless, forsooth, he wished to hit upon the most certain way of having his forgery detected? for when, on this supposition, the Epistle was produced, forty or fifty years after the death of the Apostle, it must have borne its spurious character upon its very face, inasmuch as it had never been read in those Churches.

The Epistle everywhere bears the genuine Pauline stamp, which commends it to every one whose mind is open to truth.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

THESALONICA was beautifully situated at the head of the Thermaic gulf, in Southern Macedonia. The town was at first called Therme, from the hot springs in that region. According to Strabo, it was rebuilt by Cassander, and called after his

The city of
Thessalonica.

wife, Thessaionica, the daughter of Philip. It is called by him the metropolis of Macedonia.¹

"The present appearance of the city, as seen from the sea, is described by Leake, Holland, and other travelers as very imposing. It rises in the form of a crescent up the declivity, and is surrounded by lofty whitened walls, with towers at intervals. . . . The port is still convenient for large ships, and the anchorage in front of the town is good. These circumstances in the situation of Thessalonica were evidently favorable for commanding the trade of the Macedonian Sea."² The population of the modern city, Salonica, is about 75,000.

Thessaionica was first visited by St. Paul about A. D. 52. At that time it contained many Jews, who had a synagogue, in which Paul for three sabbaths preached Christ as the Messiah with partial success. But though the number of Jewish believers was not large, a great multitude of devout Greeks and many noble women believed. But the unbelieving Jews, moved with envy, created a great disturbance in the city, and the brethren sent away Paul and Silas by night into Berea (Acts xvii, 1-9). It is clear, then, that the mass of the Christians to whom Paul addressed his two Epistles were Greeks.

PLACE AND TIME OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE FIRST EPISTLE.

As the apostle, on account of the uproar in Thessalonica, left the brethren very suddenly, and without imparting to them all the instruction desirable, and fearing that their trials ^{Written from Corinth.} might discourage them, he wrote to them this Epistle soon after his departure, and on his arrival in Corinth. In the address to the Church, Silvanus (Silas) and Timothy are associated with the apostle (chap. i, 1), which fact shows that the Epistle was written after Silas and Timothy had arrived at Corinth from Macedonia (Acts xviii, 5). The manner of discussion and the allusions in the Epistle clearly indicate that it was written soon after Paul's arrival in Corinth, about A. D. 52.

CONTENTS.

The apostle declares that he is grateful to God on their behalf, and that he prays for them, remembering their devotion to Christ. He reminds them of their election, which was shown by the miraculous power that attended his preaching among them, and how they received the word in much affliction, and became an example to others of Christian faith and hope. He reminds them of the shameful treatment he had received at Philippi, of the honest and sincere manner in which he had preached the gospel at Thessalonica, of the

¹vii, 330, Epit. 21

²Smith's Classical Geography.

deep love he bore them, and of the manner in which he had supported himself. He calls to their minds that the sufferings brought upon them by their countrymen are similar to the sufferings of the followers of Christ in Judea from the Jews.

He expresses his anxiety to see them, and states that he had sent Timothy from Athens to visit them, and that he had great joy when he had received from him a favourable report of them. He declares that he ever prays to see them, and that God may cause them to abound in love and establish them in holiness. He exhorts them to cultivate brotherly love, and in every respect to perform their duty; not to grieve immoderately for the dead, since they shall be raised to a glorious resurrection at the coming of Christ, who will appear suddenly. He accordingly exhorts them to be watchful, and also to hold in honour their spiritual teachers, and closes by giving them various admonitions.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

This Epistle was universally received as the writing of Paul by the ancient Church. It is quoted as Paul's by Irenæus,¹ by Clement of Alexandria,² and by Tertullian.³ It was received by the heretic Marcion, and is probably quoted in the Epistles of Clement of Rome and Polycarp, and is contained in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in the Canon of Muratori. Its genuineness was attacked by Baur, but is defended by Hilgenfeld,⁴ and conceded by De Wette.⁵

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

PLACE AND TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

IT appears that the statement in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians respecting the second coming of Christ had produced a great excitement among them, and it is very probable it led to some extravagant conduct, such as we have seen among the Millerites of our time. The apostle writes chiefly to assure them that Christ's coming is remote, and that a great apostasy is first to take place in the Church. Now, as the First Epistle was written during the first part of Paul's sojourn in Corinth, which lasted eighteen months, it is probable that this was written within a

¹ v, cap. vi, 1

² Pædag., i, cap. v, vi.

³ De Resur. Carne, cap. xxiv

⁴ Einleitung, p. 236-247, Leipzig, 1875

⁵ Einleitung pp. 277-279.

year later, at the same place, about A. D. 53, and with this place and time agrees the fact that Silvanus (Silas) and Timothy are associated with Paul in addressing the Church (ch. i, 1). It is certain from Acts xviii 5, and from 1 Thess. i, 1, that Silas and Timothy were with Paul at Corinth, and it seems that these were not found together after Paul left Corinth and went up to Jerusalem (Acts xviii, 18-22).

CONTENTS.

The apostle thanks God and glories in the progress which the Thessalonians are making in the Christian virtues, and in their patient endurance of affliction from the wicked, who shall be punished at the coming of Christ. This event, however, he assures them is not at hand, and that there will be, first, a great apostasy in the Church, and that the man of sin, exhibiting himself as God in the temple of God, shall first be revealed; that this wicked personage, by lying wonders, will deceive those who love not the truth. He expresses confidence in them, and exhorts them to steadfastness. He also asks their prayers, and is confident they will perform what he commands. He reminds them of the manner in which he conducted himself when among them, and gives directions respecting the treatment of the disorderly and disobedient.

THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

This Epistle, equally with the first to the Thessalonians, was universally acknowledged by the ancient Church as the writing of the Apostle Paul. It is quoted as the apostle's by Irenæus,¹ Clement² of Alexandria, and by Tertullian.³ It is in the Peshito-Syriac, and in the Canon of Muratori, and was received by Marcion. Justin Martyr⁴ clearly refers to this Epistle when he speaks of "The man of sin," (*ὁ τῆς ἀνομίας ἀνθρώπος*), and "The man of apostasy," (*ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἀνθρώπος*).

In modern times the genuineness of this Epistle has been almost universally acknowledged. Its genuineness has, indeed, been attacked by Schmidt, Kern, Baur, and very recently by Hilgenfeld,⁵ who thinks that it was written by a conservative of the school of Paul in or near Macedonia in the last time of Trajan (98-117), that is, forty or fifty years after the death of Paul. It is difficult to see how an Epistle forged at that time could have met with universal reception, and especially how it could have imposed upon the large Church in the important city of Thessalonica.

¹ Lib. iv, cap. xxvii; lib. v, cap. xxv, 1.

² Stromata, v, cap. iii.

³ Advers. Marcion., v, xvi; De Resur. Car., xxiv.

⁴ Dial. cum Tryph., 32, 11C

⁵ Einleitung, pp. 642-652, Leipzig, 1875.

Hilgenfeld's doubts of the genuineness of this Epistle.

We have already seen that it was accepted as Paul's by the heretic Marcion of Pontus, who made havoc of the Scriptures. As he appeared in Rome as early as A. D. 138, it is impossible that an Epistle which came into circulation but twenty years earlier could have been received by him as Paul's. Hilgenfeld thinks he finds traces of Gnosticism in the Epistle in the working of "the mystery of iniquity," (ch. ii, 7), and in the idlers and busybodies (ch. iii, 11), whom he regards as "common vagabonds, agents of a heresy!" It certainly indicates a mind of remarkable acuteness and perversity to see in those who would not work the agents of a heresy! Nor is Hilgenfeld less perverse in his judgment when he sees in "the mystery of iniquity," Gnosticism; for this heresy never sat *in the temple of God*, but was scattered abroad *outside*. "The man of sin" is, to some extent, based on the prophecy of Daniel (chap. xi, 36-45), but the apostle goes far into the future. It does not appear that the author of the Epistle was acquainted with the Apocalypse, so that no argument from any such acquaintance can be adduced against its early composition. Hilgenfeld alleges that in 2 Thess. ii, 13; iii, 3, 5, 16, Lord (*κύριος*) is used for God, not for Christ; while in the genuine writings of Paul, *κύριος* (Lord) for God stands only in quotations from the Old Testament. But in 2 Cor. viii, 21, "Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men," Lord appears to refer to God the Father, and probably to him is the reference in the preceding verse. And in Phil. ii, 24, where Paul speaks of trusting in "the Lord," the reference may be to the Father. Perhaps, also, the reference is the same in Philimon 20, and 2 Cor. iii, 17: "Now the Lord is that Spirit." But it is not at all certain that in the passages in 2 Thessalonians to which Hilgenfeld refers, *κύριος* (Lord) is used for the "Father."

Equally unsuccessful is Hilgenfeld in showing that the passage, "That our God would count you worthy of this calling" (*τῆς κλήσεως*) (2 Thess. i, 11), is not Pauline, as the apostle in his genuine writings knows nothing of a calling still in the future for Christians, but only as something that is past. But in what way is the language inconsistent with Paul's usage? He prays that God would count the Thessalonians as having proved themselves, by their conduct, worthy of the high privileges to which they have been called. The apostle in 1 Cor. vii, 20, certainly uses the word *κλήσις* (*calling*) in the sense of vocation: "Let every man abide in the (same) *calling* (*κλήσις*) wherein he was called." It may be used in the sense of vocation in Phil. iii, 14: "The prize of the high calling," etc. Hilgenfeld understands the passage, 2 Thessalonians i, 11, to refer to the call to martyrdom, a usage of the word, he says, not found before the sec-

ond century. But there is certainly no reference in the text to martyrdom. The fact is, there is no well-grounded objection to the genuineness of the Epistle. Its Hebraisms show that it was written by a man whose education must have been largely Jewish. Even the skeptical DeWette admits it to be genuine.¹

In chap. ii, 2, the apostle exhorts the Thessalonians not to be "soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand." By this the apostle means, that no report of remarks by him, or anything purporting to be written by him, shall be accredited if it teaches that the day of Christ is at hand. It is not to be inferred from this that any one had forged an Epistle in the name of Paul, and sent it to the Thessalonians, for that, under the circumstances, is very improbable, and Paul could not have failed to notice it, and brand it as it deserved. They had drawn the inference from Paul's first letter, and, perhaps, from supposed remarks of his, that the coming of Christ was near.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

THE so-called Pastoral Epistles embrace the two of Paul to Timothy, and his Epistle to Titus. The term "Pastoral" has been given them because they treat largely of the qualifications and duties of Christian ministers or pastors. Among the duties of the minister, the inculcation of sound doctrine is enjoined, and the avoidance of "foolish questions and genealogies," and "Jewish fables," and "contentions and strivings about the law," as unprofitable and vain. The apostle lays especial stress upon the practical duties of religion, and the maintenance of a holy life.

These Epistles bear marks of belonging to a late period in the apostle's life, but there is nothing in them that carries us beyond the apostolic age. Baur and Hilgenfeld imagine they see in these Epistles references to heresies that did not exist till near the middle of the second century. Both of these rationalistic critics refer "oppositions of science falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi, 20) to the heresy of Marcion, who set the gospel in opposition to the law. Critics of the stamp of Baur and Hilgenfeld can find almost any difficulty they seek. Marcion taught that the creation and the Jewish dispensation did not proceed from the

Objections of
Baur and Hilgenfeld to their
genuineness.

¹Einleitung, pp. 277-279.

supreme God revealed by Christ, but from an evil being. But the form in which Marcion set forth his doctrine could be scarcely called "*gnosis*," *knowledge, science*, the word used in 1 Timothy vi, 20. On Marcion Neander¹ remarks: "The opposition between *πίστις* [*faith*] and *γνώσις* [knowledge], between an exoteric and an esoteric Christianity, was among the marked peculiarities of the other Gnostic systems; but in Marcion's case, on the contrary, who adhered so closely to the practical Apostle Paul, no such opposition could possibly be allowed to exist."

Use of the term *gnosis* in Paul's Epistles. But the term "*gnosis*," *knowledge*, is used in various places in un-
questioned Epistles of this apostle. "Knowledge," says he (*the gnosis*), "puffeth up," but love buildeth up (1 Cor. viii, 1); again he speaks of the "shining of knowledge" (*the gnosis*) (2 Cor. iv, 6). It is very probable that the passage under discussion refers to the opposition of philosophy to Christianity. The heathen philosophers and other men of culture had systems which they supposed rested on the deductions of the intellect, and these were put in opposition to Christianity, just as in modern times pantheism, and certain cosmical and materialistic systems, are set in opposition to it. In like manner the apostle warns the Colossians against being led astray "by philosophy and vain deceit according to the doctrine of men" (chap. ii. 8). The "genealogies," to which reference is made, were evidently Jewish, and it is clear that the heretical teachers spoken of in 1 Tim. i, 7 were not Marcionites, as they desired to be "teachers of the law." In 1 Timothy iv, 1-3, the apostle says: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, . . . forbidding to marry," etc. It is perfectly gratuitous in Hilgenfeld to refer the heresy which forbids marriage to Saturninus in the second century, and then to draw the inference that the Epistle was not written until after that heresy arose. Now, although the apostle speaks of what is in the future, the germs of the error rejecting marriage were already in existence, and had been developed, outside of the Church at least, in the apostolic age, since it is well known that the Jewish Essenes² in the time of Christ rejected marriage, as did the Therapeutæ in Egypt.³ Nor is it, indeed, strange that some Christians, through incorrect ideas of purity and a rigid asceticism, should have fallen into the error of condemning marriage even as early as the apostolic⁴ age.

¹ General Church History, vol. i, p. 460.

² Josephus, Antiq., xviii, cap. i, 5; Bel. Judic., ii, 8, 2. ³ Philo, ii, 478, 481.

⁴ The declaration in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Marriage is honourable in all" (chap. xiii, 4), would seem to imply that some were doubting it.

The reference in 1 Tim. v to the provision made by the Church for the support of widows does not indicate a post-apostolic age, as we find such provision was made for them in the very infancy of the apostolic Church (Acts vi, 1). Nor do we find any thing in 2 Timothy indicating a post-apostolic age. And in the Epistle to Titus the warning is not to give heed to "Jewish fables" (chapter i, 14), and to "avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law" (chap. iii, 9). Such a warning as this would have been hardly necessary in a more advanced stage of Christianity in the second century. Timothy was in Ephesus when the two Epistles were addressed to him (1 Tim. i, 3; 2 Tim. i, 16-18; iv, 19), and the warning against heretical teachers is in perfect harmony with Paul's address at Miletus to the elders assembled from Ephesus. "For I know this, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (Acts xx, 29).

Other references in agreement with the general practice of the apostolic Church.

But the fact that 1 Timothy and the Epistle to Titus recognize but two orders of ministers, namely, bishops, or presbyters, and deacons, is a strong proof that they belong to the first century.¹ In 1 Timothy iii the qualifications of bishops and deacons are described, but there is not a word about presbyters; but in chap. v we have *ruling* presbyters, who are evidently the same as bishops. Likewise, the bishop in Titus i, 7 is the presbyter of chap. i, 5. This identity of bishop and presbyter corresponds with what we find in Acts xx, 17, 28, where the presbyters of the former verse are called bishops in the latter. But in the early part of the second century, if not earlier, the bishop was distinguished from the presbyter, as we find in the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna (written about A. D. 115), where we have "the bishop, and the presbyters, and the deacons."²

Other proof of an apostolic origin.

That Paul should write Epistles, instructing Timothy and Titus, in matters pertaining to their ministry and Church offices, is not in the least improbable. In 1 Cor. xii, 28 he speaks of various offices in the Church, and in Acts xx, 28 he speaks of bishops or overseers in the Church.

It has been objected to the genuineness of these three Epistles, that their style is different from that of the universally acknowledged Pauline writings. And it must be acknowledged that this is quite true, and there is reason for it; for the apostle is not writing to Christian Churches, but to individ-

Objections to be drawn from the style of the Pastoral Epistles.

¹ In 2 Timothy the orders of ministers are not discussed.

² In Cureton's Syriac text of the Epistles, shorter than the shortest Greek text; it may, therefore, be assumed to be free from interpolations.

uals, upon subjects different from any that had before engaged his pen. In writing upon the same subjects, it is natural to expect the ideas, language, and the author's manner of presentation to be substantially the same. But when the subject is changed, the thoughts, language, and method of discussion are very naturally different. Who would expect a philological dissertation to be similar in thought and style to a biography, or an essay on moral obligation? And how different in style is Paul's Epistle to Philemon, which Hilgenfeld acknowledges to be genuine, from the Epistle to the Romans! In the latter there are about thirty words found in no other Epistle of Paul, waiving that to the Hebrews. What a string of unusual words do we find in Romans i, 26-31, where the apostle is describing the crimes of the Pagan world! The list of new words in 1 Timothy i has its parallel in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

The chief objections to the Pastoral Epistles have been brought against the genuineness of the First Epistle to Timothy. It has been thought strange that Paul, in writing to this intimate companion and friend, should say respecting his apostleship: "I speak the truth,¹ and lie not" (chap. ii, 7). Paul on several other occasions uses the phrase, "I lie not" (Rom. ix, 1; 2 Cor. xi, 31; Gal. i, 20). In the first of these passages he uses the expression in reference to his sincere sorrow for the unbelief of the Jews, where it scarcely seems necessary. But are we competent to determine exactly what Paul would write, and what he would not? In speaking of his apostleship to Timothy, he declares the absolute certainty of his mission, not for Timothy only, but for the teachers of all time.

In chap. iv, 12 the apostle charges Timothy: "Let no man despise thy youth." Now, as Timothy at the time he was thus addressed could not well have been less than thirty-five² years of age, the term "youth" has been thought inapplicable to him. But among both Greeks and Latins the term youth (*νεότης*, *youth*; *νεάνισκος*, *young man*; *juventus*, *youth*; *juvenis*, *a young man*) was applicable to every man between twenty and forty years of age.³ In the same wide application can the phrase "youthful lusts" (*νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας*) in 2 Tim. ii, 22 be taken.

¹ The addition, "in Christ," is wanting in the best MSS.

² The First Epistle to Timothy was, in all probability, written about A. D. 65 or 66 About fourteen or fifteen years previous to this Paul found him at Lystra, and made him his companion in his missionary tour (Acts xvi, 1-3). Now, supposing that at this time he was about twenty or twenty-two years of age, he would be about thirty-five when the apostle wrote to him.

³ See Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon, and Andrews' Latin Lexicon.

In 1 Timothy v, 18 the writer states that the Scripture says, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn; and the labourer is worthy of his reward. The last passage is the exact language of Luke x, 7. But no well founded objection can be urged against the Pauline origin of the Epistle on this ground, as it is most probable that Luke's Gospel was written four or five years before the death of Paul. But even if it was not, the apostle could have derived the passage from Luke himself, if from no other source, just as he gives in 1 Cor. xi, 24, 25 the account of the institution of the sacrament by Christ, substantially in the language of Luke xxii, 19, 20. It is not necessary to extend the quotation following "the Scripture says" (chap. v, 18) beyond the passage from the Old Testament; and our Lord's declaration, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," may be severed from the preceding, and stated independently.

The objection founded on chapter v, 18.

The First Epistle to Timothy was first attacked by Schleiermacher. Its genuineness was doubted by Neander,¹ and denied by Bleek.² These critics, however, acknowledge the genuineness of the Second Epistle to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus. De Wette³ regards the three Epistles as inseparably connected together in language and ideas, and denies the genuineness of all three. They are rejected by Baur, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, and some others. On the other hand, the genuineness of all three has been defended by Bertholdt, Hug, Heydenreich, Baumgarten, Böttger, Wieseler, Wiesinger, Delitzsch, and others. All three Epistles were universally received in the ancient Church, and De Wette admits that, apart from the fact that they were rejected as a whole or in part by the heretics, and that they were not in the collection of Marcion, who probably had a dogmatic interest in the matter, "they are not less attested by external testimonies than the other Epistles of Paul."⁴

If the Epistles contain such marks of unity of authorship as show them to have been written by a single individual—and this appears to be the real state of the case—then the doubts that have been raised on internal grounds respecting the *First* Epistle to Timothy may be dispelled by the internal evidences furnished by the *other two* Epistles in proof of their Pauline origin.

De Wette complains of the difficulty of making the historical incidents, to which reference is made in the Epistles, harmonize with the facts of the apostle's life. And on the supposition that Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome at the end of his two years' imprisonment, described in Acts xxviii, 16-31, there is no suitable place in

¹ Planting and Training of the Church, pp. 338, 339.

² Einleitung, pp 565-578.

³ Einleitung, pp. 337-339.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 340.

the life of the apostle for the insertion of the Epistles, and the events of which they speak. But we have already seen in the sketch of his life that he must have been released from this imprisonment, and have visited Spain, and in all probability Macedonia, Asia Minor, and some other places, in the three or four years intervening between his first imprisonment and his final arrest and martyrdom. We have seen that Clement of Rome in the *first* century, testifies that Paul travelled to the bound of the West, and the Canon of Muratori, written at Rome soon after the middle of the second century, speaks of Paul setting out from the city for Spain. Now, if these Epistles can be brought into harmony with what was most probably the history of Paul after his release from the first imprisonment at Rome, we shall have no slight proof of their genuineness. And here it must be observed, that it is altogether probable that Paul would address Epistles to individuals or Churches during the three or four years subsequent to his release from imprisonment in Rome. In the twelve years preceding his release he wrote *ten*.

In the Epistle to the Philippians, written during his first imprisonment at Rome, the apostle says, "I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly" [to you] (chap. ii, 24); and in writing, during the same imprisonment, to Philemon of Colossæ, he directs him "prepare me also a lodging" (ver. 22). From these passages it is evident that St. Paul expected to be released from his imprisonment, and to visit the Philippians and Colossians. In accordance with this, in his First Epistle to Timothy, he tells him: "As I commanded thee to remain in Ephesus, when I was setting out for Macedonia" (chap. i, 3). This must refer to what took place after his release from imprisonment, for there is no place for it before that time. In 2 Timothy iv, 13 he mentions his having left a cloak at Troas; and in verse 20 he states that he left Trophimus at Miletus, sick. Both of these incidents must have occurred after the release from the first imprisonment. In respect to Trophimus, we find that he accompanied Paul on his last visit to Jerusalem (Acts xx, 4; xxi, 29). It is not at all probable that Trophimus accompanied Paul when he sailed for Rome (Acts xxvii, 2); and, even if he did, Paul could not have left him at Miletus, for the vessel did not touch at that port (Acts xxvii, 4-7). From the preceding facts it is evident that Paul after his release visited Asia Minor and Macedonia, as he had intended. In 2 Tim. iv, 20 he states that Erastus remained at Corinth; and it is probable, from the connection in which Erastus stands with Trophimus, that the apostle *left* him in Corinth. In the Epistle to Titus the apostle states

Incidents noted
in these Epistles
proofs of
their Pauline
origin.

Paul's travels
after his first
imprisonment.

that he left him in Crete, from which it appears that Paul was in that island after his release from imprisonment. He requests Titus to meet him in Nicopolis, where he has determined to winter (chap. iii, 12). This Nicopolis was situated in the southern part of Epirus, on the coast of the Ionian sea, a little north of the entrance to the Ambraciot gulf. Strabo states that it was founded by Augustus Cæsar.¹ Paul's journey to Crete and his wintering in Nicopolis must be referred, also, to a time subsequent to his release from imprisonment. It is, indeed, quite clear that the incidents related in the Epistles occurred subsequent to the apostle's release.

From the foregoing facts, it seems highly probable that Paul after his release visited Crete, and afterward Miletus (and probably Colossæ, and not unlikely Ephesus), Troas, Macedonia, Corinth, and spent the following winter in Nicopolis. It is very probable that, while on his way through Macedonia to Nicopolis, he wrote the First Epistle² to Timothy; that to Titus he may have written in Asia Minor. After his arrival in Rome, and while in bonds (about A. D. 68), a short time before his execution, he wrote the *Second* Epistle to Timothy, as appears from chap. i, 16, 17; iv, 6, 7.

We have already seen that Titus was to meet Paul at Nicopolis; and, accordingly, we find that the apostle, writing from Rome to Timothy, says that Titus has departed unto Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv, 10), which lay along the east coast of the Adriatic Sea, about two hundred and fifty miles northwest of Nicopolis. Now, this latter town is on the way from Crete to Dalmatia.

It is impossible to determine whether Paul, after his release from imprisonment, went first into Spain³ or not. But the remarks of the apostle in his last Epistle, just before his martyrdom, that he had left Trophimus at Miletus sick, and the direction to Timothy to bring the cloak that he had left at Troas with Carpus, would seem to indicate that no great length of time had elapsed since he was in Asia Minor.

In Acts xx, 25 Paul, in addressing the overseers of the Church of Ephesus assembled at Miletus, says: "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom (of God), shall see my face no more." This might be explained by supposing that Paul, though he visited Miletus after his release from imprisonment, did not go to

Bearing of Acts
xx, 25 on this
argument.

¹ Lib. vii, 324.

² In chap. i, 3 he speaks of "setting out for Macedonia" as something past.

³ In Rom. xv, 24 he declares his intention to visit Rome on his way to Spain. And it would seem most natural to suppose he would go there from Rome, and not return to Asia Minor first and go to Spain afterward. But it might be inferred from Phil. ii, 24 and Philem. 22, that he went to Asia Minor first.

Ephesus; but such explanation would not be natural, and there can be no doubt that Paul expected, if he should not be put to death at Jerusalem, to go to Rome (Acts xix, 21), and he felt assured that he would not come back to the region of Ephesus. In the address to the Ephesian elders, he also says: "I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me" (chap. xx, 22, 23). Olshausen well remarks on verse 25: "The apostle here expresses merely a private opinion, and by no means intimates that he was led to it by the unerring Spirit of God."¹ But in the Epistle to the Philippians (ch. ii, 24), he expects to come shortly to them; and in the Epistle to Philemon at Colossæ he tells Philemon to prepare a lodging for him. Now, in going to Colossæ from Rome, the most direct way was through Ephesus. And it must be remembered that both of these Epistles were written at Rome after the address in Acts xx was delivered, and their genuineness is acknowledged even by Hilgenfeld.

Among the passages in these Epistles, which no forger in all probability would ever have written, and which therefore are Passages suggestive of the genuineness of these Epistles. proofs of their genuineness, the following may be mentioned: "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure. Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities. Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment, and some men they follow after," etc. (1 Tim. v, 22-25). The insertion of the passage, "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine," etc., in the very midst of a passage enjoining care in ordaining men to the ministry, seems very odd, and yet we think it can be readily explained. When he exhorts to "lay hands suddenly on no man," Timothy's emaciated frame comes vividly before the apostle, suggested by the "hands," and he straightway throws in the admonition respecting the use of wine, and continues with his reflections on ordination. But what forger would ever have pursued such a course as this?

In 2 Timothy i, 5 the apostle says to Timothy: "When I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which first dwelt in thy grandmother Lois, and in thy mother Eunice," etc. No one could thus have written of the piety of Timothy's mother and grandmother, and have given their names, except some one who, like Paul, had been for a long time intimate with Timothy. Nor is there the slightest reason why a forger should have invented these names. In 2 Tim. iv, 13 he directs Timothy: "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books but

¹ Commentary on Acts.

especially the parchments." What could have induced a forger to write such a passage as this! If he was trying to imitate Paul, he certainly would not have written it, for the apostle in no other Epistle has given any such directions. In this Epistle various particulars are given in respect to Paul's friends, and the air of reality is so impressed upon the whole as to exclude the idea of forgery.

The Epistle to Titus contains specific directions respecting individuals, and bears the stamp of reality. Paul directs Titus to meet him in Nicopolis, as he has determined to winter there. No reason could be assigned for a forger's introducing this town, which is mentioned nowhere else in the New Testament.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

THE PERSON OF TIMOTHY.

WE first meet with this eminent companion of St. Paul in Acts xvi, 1, 2, where he is called a disciple of good repute, the son of a Jewish woman, a believer in Christ, but of a Greek father. He appears to have been dwelling in Lystra when Paul met him. On account of the Jews, Paul circumcised him, and took him with him in his missionary tour through Phrygia and Galatia to Troas, and thence to Philippi, Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Berea, where Paul left him and Silas, and went to Athens (Acts xvii). Here Timothy came to Paul, who sent him back to Thessalonica (1 Thess. iii, 2), from which city he came to Corinth and joined Paul, and was with him when he wrote the two Epistles to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. i, 1; 2 Thess. i, 1). Two or three years later we find him with Paul at Ephesus (Acts xix, 22), from whence he was sent into Macedonia, and to Corinth, it seems, with the First Epistle to the Christians of that city (Acts xix, 22; 1 Cor. xvi, 10). Somewhat later we find him with Paul when he writes the Second Epistle from Macedonia to the Corinthians (2 Cor. i, 1), and it is probable that he was with the apostle when, during his three months' sojourn in Corinth, he wrote the Epistle to the Romans (Acts xvi, 21). He accompanied Paul into Asia (Acts xx, 4, 5), where it is probable that he left¹ the apostle, who went up to Jerusalem. Some time after the

¹It is not probable that Timothy went up to Jerusalem with Paul. At least, it is very improbable that he was with the apostle when he sailed from Cæsarea for Rome, as Luke makes no mention of him, while he names Aristarchus, a man of less note, as sailing with Paul (Acts xxvii, 2).

apostle's arrival in Rome he was joined by Timothy, whose name is associated with Paul's in the Epistles addressed to the Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon. He appears at one time to have been imprisoned, probably at Rome, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of his being set at liberty (chap. xiii, 23). Eusebius¹ says, it is related that Timothy was the first bishop of Ephesus. But little is known of him after he disappears from the Acts.

CONTENTS.

After the salutation, the apostle informs Timothy that he had requested him to abide in Ephesus for the purpose of charging that sound doctrines be taught and heresies avoided. He refers to himself as having been a persecutor, and to his call to the ministry as an example of the divine mercy, for the benefit of others. He exhorts Timothy to perseverance in the faith. He directs that prayers be offered for all men, especially for those in authority, declaring that God wills the salvation of all through the Gospel of Christ, of which he has been made a minister. He gives directions respecting the deportment of women (chaps. i, ii).

He describes the qualifications of bishops and deacons, and the conduct required of their wives. He expects to come shortly to see Timothy, but writes in order that, if he does not come, Timothy may know how to conduct himself; at the same time he speaks of the great mystery that is found in the gospel system (chap. iii). He foretells through the Spirit the coming apostasy and the heresies in the Church, instructs Timothy in the duties of personal religion, in the treatment of elders and widows, and enjoins caution in ordaining men to the ministry (chaps. iv, v). He also describes the duties of servants to their masters, exhorts Timothy to withdraw from those who teach any thing contrary to the doctrines of Christ, points out the fatal consequences of a love of money, exhorts Timothy in the most solemn manner to be faithful to warn the rich against trusting in their riches, but to charge them to trust in God, to be rich in good works, and benevolent, and he concludes by warning Timothy against the pretences of a false science.

ANCIENT TESTIMONIES TO THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, quotes chap. vi, 7: "Knowing therefore that we brought nothing into the world, nor can we carry any thing out."² It is attributed to Paul in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in the Canon

Polycarp, Irre-
nons, and oth-
ers.

¹ Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. iv.

² Sec. 4.

of Muratori. Irenæus gives a part of chap. vi, 20, with the remark, "Paul well says."¹ He also quotes a part of chap. i, 9² and chap. ii, 5.³ It is ascribed to Paul by Clement of Alexandria,⁴ and by Tertullian,⁵ and nowhere do we find a doubt of its Pauline origin in the Church. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, quotes (about A. D. 180) chap. ii, 2, "That we may lead a quiet and peaceable life," which he prefaces with the remark "The divine Scripture commands."⁶ It is well known that the heretic Marcion rejected this Epistle, but on dogmatic grounds in all probability. It is found in all the ancient versions."⁷

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CONTENTS.

THE apostle expresses his ardent affection for Timothy, and his strong desire to see him, and speaks of his sincere faith, which was also in his mother and grandmother. He exhorts him to stir up the gift that is in him, and not to be ashamed of the testimony of the Lord and his prisoner. He refers to the revelation and power of the gospel, of which he is a minister and apostle to the Gentiles, and expresses his confidence in God, exhorts Timothy to fidelity in doctrine, in faith and love, and complains that all those of Asia have turned away from him, with the exception of Onesiphorus, upon whose family he invokes the divine blessing (chap. i). He exhorts Timothy to fidelity in his work by various considerations, and refers to his own sufferings for the sake of the gospel, and at the same time urges him to shun youthful lusts, to attend to the practical duties of religion, avoiding foolish and unlearned questions, and to conduct himself with gentleness toward the enemies of the truth, that they, perchance, may be saved (chap. ii).

He describes the persons who shall appear in the last days, exhorts Timothy to follow the doctrines he has learned from him, commends to him the inspired Scriptures, reminding him of his own afflictions and persecutions at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, and

¹ u, cap. xiv, 7. ² iv, cap. xvi, 3. ³ v, cap. xvii, 1. ⁴ Stromata, ii, cap. vi, xi.

⁵ Adversus Marcionem, v, cap. xxi. Liber de Præscrip., cap. xxv.

⁶ Ad Autolycum, iii, 14. The Greek is exactly the same as is used in 1 Timothy ii, 2, and is quoted by him after reference to prayers for rulers.

⁷ In the Memphitic, Thebaic Gothic, Armenian, and Æthiopic, besides the Peshito-Syriac.

how the Lord had delivered him (chap. iii). In view of the fact that the time will come when sound doctrine will not be endured, he gives Timothy a solemn charge respecting preaching, declares that his departure is at hand, and that he is ready to be offered, that he has been faithful, and that a glorious reward awaits him, and urges Timothy to come shortly to him as only Luke is with him. He gives him various directions, speaks of his first defence (before Nero), and states that the Lord stood by him though men had forsaken him, and is confident respecting the future. He closes with salutations and greetings, and urges Timothy to come to him before winter (chap. iv).

ANCIENT TESTIMONIES TO THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle is found in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in the Canon of Muratori. It is quoted as Paul's by Irenæus,¹ as his Second Epistle to Timothy by Clement² of Alexandria, and is attributed to Paul by Tertullian.³ Origen, in commenting on Matthew xxvii, 9, remarks: "As *Jannes and Jambres resisted Moses* is not found in the public Scriptures, but in an obscure book with the superscription: '*The book Jannes and Jambres*;' from this circumstance some have dared to reject the [Second] Epistle to Timothy as containing matter of a secret character, but they were not successful." With this exception, it does not appear that any doubt was expressed by the ancient Church respecting its Pauline origin. It is found in all the ancient versions.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

THE PERSON OF TITUS.

THE name of this companion of Paul occurs nowhere in the Acts⁴ of the Apostles, and our information respecting him is derived solely from the Epistles of Paul.

It is stated in Galatians ii, 3 that he was a Greek, and therefore

¹ iv, 10, 11, in lib. iii, cap. xiv.

² Stromata, i, cap. xi.

³ Adversus Marcionem, lib. v, cap. xxi. Lib. de Præscrip., cap. xxv.

⁴ In Acts xviii, 7 mention is made of Justus, to which some ancient MSS. prefix *Τίτος* or *Τίτιος*, making it Titus or Titus Justus. Tischendorf has introduced *Τίτιος Ἰουδῆος* (Titus Justus) into the text. There is no reason to suppose, with some, that this is the same person as Titus; for Paul took Titus with him to Jerusalem (Gal. ii, 1) before he preached in Corinth, and made the acquaintance of Justus, who lived there.

there was no necessity for his circumcision. Paul in his Epistle to him calls him his "genuine son after the common faith," from which it is not improbable that he was converted by means of the apostle.¹ We first meet with him as the companion of Paul on his visit to Jerusalem (Gal. ii, 1), which is probably the same visit mentioned in Acts xv, 2. About seven years after this Titus brings to Paul in Macedonia intelligence of the condition of the Church at Corinth, whither Paul appears to have sent him (2 Cor. vii, 5-16; xii, 18). Soon after this the apostle sends him with the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and directs him to assist them in making a collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem (2 Cor. viii, 6-19). From Paul's Epistle, it appears that after the apostle's release from the Roman imprisonment he took Titus with him to Crete, where he was directed by Paul to ordain elders in every city (Titus 1, 5). He was also directed to meet the apostle in Nicopolis (ch. iii, 12). A short time before Paul's martyrdom, he went to Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv, 10). Paul calls him his "partner and fellow helper" (2 Cor. viii, 23).

Eusebius states that "it is related that Titus was bishop of the churches of the island of Crete."²

CONTENTS.

Paul begins the Epistle with a declaration of his apostleship, and, in addressing Titus, states that he left him in Crete to set things in order, and to ordain elders in every city. He describes the qualifications of elders, or bishops, and their duties. He quotes the language of one of the poets of Crete (Epimenides) in attestation of the bad character of the Cretans, and exhorts Titus to rebuke them sharply, and not to give heed to Jewish fables and the commandments of men who turn from the truth. He affirms that, while to the pure all things are pure, to the unbelieving nothing is pure, and while they profess a knowledge of God, in works they deny him (chap. i). He gives directions respecting the conduct of aged men and women, and the duty of the latter to the youth of their sex. He commands him to exhort the young men to be sober-minded, and to show himself a pattern in works, doctrine, and speech, to exhort servants to be faithful to their masters, and to adorn their profession. He reminds Titus that the gospel of Christ teaches us holy living, and that we are to look for the glorious appearance of the Saviour, who gave himself to redeem and purify us unto himself as a pecu-

¹ Paul calls Timothy his "genuine son in the faith," though it does not appear that Timothy was converted through Paul's instrumentality.

² Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. iv.

liar people (chap. ii). He exhorts him to inculcate obedience to rulers, and the performance of religious duties in a spirit of meekness, and to remind his flock that they themselves were once disobedient, living in lusts and malice, but have been redeemed through Christ, not by righteous deeds, but through the divine mercy and the regeneration of the Holy Spirit, that they might be heirs of eternal life. He lays stress on good works, and enjoins Titus to avoid foolish questions, contentions, and strivings about the law, and to reject a heretic after the first and second admonition. He requests Titus to meet him at Nicopolis, and gives him several directions, sends a salutation, and asks him to greet those that love them (chap. iii).

ANCIENT TESTIMONIES TO THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

Clement of Rome, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, appears to have used this Epistle in the phrase, "Ready for every good work."¹ The Epistle is quoted as Paul's by Irenæus,² by Clement of Alexandria,³ and by Tertullian.⁴ It is contained in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in all the other ancient versions, and in the Canon of Muratori. Nowhere in the ancient Church do we hear a doubt of its genuineness. Jerome states that it was received as Paul's by Tatian,⁵ the founder of a heretical school, who had at an earlier period been a disciple of Justin Martyr.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

PHILEMON was a fellow labourer of Paul, living at Colossæ.¹ His slave, Onesimus, having run away and come to Rome, he is there converted to Christ through the instrumentality of Paul. The apostle sent him back to Philemon with this Epistle, in which Paul, with great tact, delicacy, and genuine Christian sympathy, intercedes for Onesimus: "Whom," says he, "I have begotten in my bonds"

¹ Titus iii, 1 in sec. 2 of Clement. The Greek is the same in both, with the exception of *εις* in Clement for *πρός* in Titus. ² Lib. i, cap. xvi, 3; iii, cap. iii, 4.

³ Whom (the Cretan prophet) Paul mentions in his Epistle to Titus, thus saying: A prophet of their own said thus, The Cretans are always liars, etc.—Strom., i, xiv.

⁴ *Adversus Marcionem*, v, cap. xxi; Lib. de Anima, cap. xx.

Prologue to the Epistle to Titus.

⁵ This appears from the fact that Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, sends a message to Archippus (chap. iv, 17); and in this Epistle Archippus is associated with Philemon in the address (chap. i, 2.)

(verse 10). "For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him forever; not now as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved, especially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord? If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself," etc. (15-17).

The Epistle was written during Paul's first imprisonment in Rome (about A. D. 63), as is evident from verse 10, and from a comparison of those who were with Paul at the time (23, 24), and those who were with him when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians (i, 7; iv, 12, 14).

THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

This Epistle is found in the Peshito-Syriac version, and in the Canon of Muratori, and was received by Marcion.¹ It is contained in the ancient Memphitic, Thebaic, Gothic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions. We have not been able to find that it was quoted by Irenæus or Clement of Alexandria, which is not surprising when we consider its brevity, and that it does not contain important doctrine, and is wholly of a private character. It is, however, referred to by Tertullian² as an Epistle of Paul. Jerome remarks that some "affirm that the Epistle to Philemon is either not Paul's, or if it is, it contains nothing which can edify, and that it has been rejected by very many ancients, inasmuch as it is written for the purpose of recommending, not teaching. On the other hand, those who defend its genuineness say that it would never have been received in the whole world by all the Churches, unless it was believed to be the apostle Paul's."³ It is evident that these doubts grew out of the private character of the writing. In modern times the genuineness of the Epistle has been doubted by Baur, but defended by Hilgenfeld.⁴ De Wette well remarks, "Its genuineness is not to be doubted."⁵

CHAPTER XXXV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

IN the most ancient MSS. of the New Testament this Epistle has the simple inscription, "TO HEBREWS," and its contents show that it is addressed to Christians of the Hebrew race, and is intended to set forth the temporary character of the Levitical priesthood, and of the sacrificial institu-
The Epistle not general, but addressed to some Church.

¹ Tertullian remarks that "the shortness of this Epistle enabled it to escape the falsifying hand of Marcion."—*Adversus Marcionem*, lib. v, cap. xxi. ² *Ibid.*

³ *Introd.* to Philemon. ⁴ *Einleitung*, pp. 328-331. ⁵ *Einleitung*, pp. 304, 305

tions of the Mosaic law, and to prove that the ceremonial law was to end with the appearance of Christ, who is made a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. Hence it is clear that the great design of the Epistle is to establish Jewish Christians in the faith of the gospel, and to render them impregnable to the assaults of their unbelieving countrymen. But here the question arises, Is the Epistle addressed to a specific part of the Jewish Christians, or to the believers in general among the Hebrews? To this it must be answered, That while the general contents, being an exposition of the Levitical system, are well suited to all Jewish Christians, there are some passages which indicate that the Epistle was written to Jewish Christians of a particular place. For we find the writer at the conclusion of the Epistle making the following statement: "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." The latter part of this verse forbids the supposition that the Epistle is a general one. Also the statement: "But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions; partly, whilst ye were made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were thus used. For ye had compassion on those in bonds (τοις δεσμοις),¹ and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods," etc. (chap. x, 32-34), seems to refer to a definite community of Christians. But what community was this? Bleek thinks the Epistle was intended for the Jewish Christians of Palestine. But in that case we would expect it to have been written in the Aramaic language, the vernacular of Palestine at that time, and not in elegant Greek. The readers addressed had derived their knowledge of the doctrines of Christ from the apostles, or from others who had heard Christ, for in speaking of salvation the writer says, "Which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him," etc. (chap. ii, 3, 4). Now, as our Saviour lived and taught in Palestine, and as this Epistle was written scarcely more than thirty years after the crucifixion of Christ, there must have been many still living who had seen and heard him, to whom the language of the Epistle was inapplicable. In chap. vi, 10 the readers are addressed as having ministered to the saints, and as still engaged in that work. But nowhere in the New Testament are the Palestinian Christians distinguished for ministering to the saints. On the contrary, they themselves were to a considerable extent the objects of charity, and we find St. Paul making collections for them,

¹ This is the reading which both Tischendorf and Tregelles have adopted in their critical editions of the Greek Testament.

and going up to Jerusalem with the proceeds (Rom. xv, 25). Macedonia and Achaia were distinguished for their liberality (Rom. xv, 26; 1 Cor. xvi, 15; 2 Cor. ix, 2). Further, as the Palestinian Churches were under the immediate direction of the apostles—of whom Matthew and John remained in Palestine until a late period, and James (probably an apostle) presided in Jerusalem—it would have been improper for the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who was not an apostle,¹ to address these Churches. Untenable, too, is the hypothesis of Ebrard, that “the Epistle was intended for a limited circle of neophytes in Jerusalem, who had become timorous lest they should be excluded from the temple worship, threatened to withdraw themselves from Christianity (chap. x, 25), and were therefore taken anew under instruction, for whose instruction the Epistle to the Hebrews was to form a sort of guide.”² There is nothing in the Epistle to authorize this view, and the objections that lie against the hypothesis of its being addressed to Palestinian societies lie with equal or greater force against this.

Wieseler, Köstlein, Hilgenfeld,³ and some others, think the Epistle was addressed to the Jewish Christians of Alexandria, but Bleek is of the opinion that these Christians were in no special danger of relapsing into Judaism from any strong attachment to the Jewish service. He remarks that the Alexandrian Church teachers know nothing of its having being originally written for their society, but suppose it was intended for the Palestinians.⁴

And here it must be observed that we know nothing of the founding of a Christian Church in Alexandria in the first part of the apostolic age, and we have, therefore, no ground for supposing that the Epistle was directed to a Christian society in that city. Various other places have been suggested as the original destination of the Epistle, but without sufficient ground. It is probable that it was originally sent to a community consisting chiefly of Hebrew Christians in the region of Asia Minor, or Greece, but most likely in the former.⁵

THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

Neither in the Epistle itself, nor in the superscriptions of the most ancient Greek copies, is the name of the author found. It is quoted

¹ This will be made highly probable when we discuss the authorship of the Epistle.

² In Olshausen's Comment., Kendrick's translation.

³ Einleitung, pp. 385-387.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 611.

⁵ In chap. xiii, 23 the writer expects, in the company of Timothy, if he come shortly, to see his readers, which would seem to indicate that they lived in the sphere of Timothy's labors.

as Paul's by Clement of Alexandria.¹ He also says that "the Epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's, written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and that Luke eagerly translated it, and gave it to the Greeks; on which account the translation of this Epistle and the Acts show the same style." That the name of the Apostle Paul is not written at the head of it is natural; for he says that "in writing to the Hebrews, who had a prejudice against him and suspected him, he very prudently did not turn them away from it by putting his name to it."²

Eusebius speaks of a book of *Various Discussions* written by Irenæus, "in which he mentions the Epistle to the Hebrews,"³ and gives extracts from it. The expression in Irenæus, "By the word of his power,"⁴ seems borrowed from Heb. i, 3. We can find no other probable reference in him to the Hebrews. This is remarkable, as his quotations of nearly all the recognized Epistles of Paul are very numerous in his great work, *AGAINST HERESIES*, and it is very likely that he did not receive the Epistle as Paul's. Tertullian of Carthage says that this Epistle *bore the superscription* of Barnabas, and "certainly," says he, "it has a better reception among the Churches than the apocryphal book of the Shepherd"⁵ (Hermas). He then proceeds to quote it as the writing of this companion of Paul, and gives what we have in Hebrews vi, 4, 6-8, so that there can be no doubt about the identity of the Epistle. Eusebius remarks that Origen, "in his Homilies on this Epistle, makes the following statement: 'The style of the Epistle to the Hebrews has not the rustic language of the apostle, who acknowledged that he was "rude in speech," that is, in style; but that this Epistle, in the arrangement of its expressions, is purer Greek every one capable of judging of differences of style would acknowledge. But, on the other hand, that the thoughts of the Epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged apostolic writings—this also every one would concede to be true who carefully reads the apostolic writings.' After this he adds: 'In giving my opinion, I would say that the thoughts are the apostle's, but the style and composition are those of some one who has related what the apostle said, and, as it were, has written down, as scholia,

¹ Stromata, vi, cap. viii.

² This account of the Epistle as given by Clement is taken from the last work of Clement (*Ἰστορικὰ Πράξεις*) by Eusebius in his *Hist. Eccles.*, vi, cap. xiv.

³ v, cap. xxvi.

⁴ *Contra Hæreses*, lib. ii, cap. xxx, 9.

⁵ *Exstat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos, adeo satis auctoritatis viro, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiæ tenore. . . . Et utique receptor apud Ecclesias Epistola Barnabæ illo apocrypho Pastore Mæchorum.*—*Lib. de Pudicitia*, cap. xx.

the things said by his instructor. If, then, any Church holds this Epistle as Paul's, let it be honoured also for this. For not thoughtlessly have the ancients handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the Epistle—the truth God (only) knows. The account that has come down to us is that, according to some, Clement, bishop of Rome, wrote the Epistle; according to others, Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts."¹ Eusebius himself says: "There are fourteen Epistles of Paul evident and certain. But it is not right to be ignorant of the fact that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, affirming that it is denied by the Roman Church to be Paul's."²

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria about the middle of the third century, in an Epistle to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, in describing a persecution of the Christians, says: "The brethren got out of the way and retired, and took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, like those to whom Paul bears testimony."³ This passage is found in Heb. x, 34, so that he recognizes Paul as the author of the Epistle. In the writings of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about the middle of the third century, there are numerous quotations from the larger Epistles of Paul, and a considerable number from his smaller Epistles, except Titus and Philemon, but we cannot find a vestige of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of which the only satisfactory explanation is, that Cyprian did not regard it as Paul's. According to Photius,⁴ both Irenæus and Hippolytus affirmed that this Epistle is not Paul's.

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers in Gaul in the middle of the fourth century, makes use of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In commenting on Psalm xiv, he quotes Hebrews xii, 22, as the language of Paul. In other places he gives his quotations from this Epistle as the language of the "apostle." There is no doubt that he recognized the Epistle as Paul's. According to Hilary, the Arians alleged in support of their views "that which Paul said to the Hebrews" (ch. i, 4).⁵ But it is uncertain whether they quoted it as Paul's, though this is probable.

Ambrose, bishop of Milan in the last part of the fourth century, makes use of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he calls "Scripture;"⁶ he quotes xii, 6, with the remark, "The holy apostle says;"⁷ chap. x, 31, with the words, "The holy apostle says"⁸ chap. xii, 11, with, "The blessed apostle says."⁹ There

Citation by
Dionysius of
Alexandria.

Quoted by Am-
brose.

¹ In Hist. Eccles., lib. vi, 25.

² Ibid., iii, 3.

³ Ibid., vi, cap. xli. Photius, in the ninth century, says that Caius, presbyter of Rome (about A. D. 200), they affirm, did not receive this Epistle as Paul's (Codex 48); and he states that Hippolytus (about A. D. 225) did not accept it as Paul's (Codex 121).

⁴ Codex ccxxxii.

⁵ De Trinitate, lib. iv, 11.

⁶ Epistle xlv.

⁷ Sermo xlv.

⁸ Ibid., xxvi.

⁹ Ibid., xli.

is no doubt that by this language he means Paul, for it is in this way that he often quotes Paul's Epistles.

Jerome remarks on the Epistle to the Hebrews, "It is not believed to be his (Paul's) on account of its difference of style and language, but to belong, according to Tertullian, either to Barnabas, or, according to some, to the evangelist Luke, or to Clement, afterward bishop of the Roman Church, who, they say, was Paul's assistant, and that he arranged and ornamented the thoughts of the apostle in his own language; or, indeed, that Paul, because he was writing to the Hebrews, did not prefix his name to the Epistle on account of their dislike of him. As a Hebrew he had written in Hebrew, that is, in his own language, most eloquently, so that those things which had been eloquently written in Hebrew were more eloquently translated into Greek, and this appears to be the cause why it differs from the other Epistles of Paul."¹ Augustine, bishop of Hippo, in northern Africa, attributes the Epistle to Paul.² Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople, received the Epistle as Paul's, and wrote a Commentary on it. The Epistle is found in the ancient Peshito-Syriac version, made about the middle of the second century, and its admission into that version is sufficient proof that it was regarded either as the writing of Paul,³ or of some one that stood in close relations to an apostle. It was also included in the Memphitic, Thebaic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions. In the Canon of Muratori there is no mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁴ But no great importance is to be attached to this omission, as the canon is imperfect. It is evident that the Epistle must have been well known at Rome in the second century, as it is used by Clement of that city in his Epistle to the Corinthians.⁵

From the foregoing history of the Epistle in the first four centuries, it is seen that the weight of evidence is in favor of its having originated, either directly or indirectly, from the Apostle Paul.

CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE AS BEARING UPON ITS AUTHORSHIP.

The name of Paul⁶ is inserted in the very beginning of all his acknowledged Epistles, and if that to the Hebrews is his, he departed from his custom in not inserting his name,

¹ De Viris Illus. Paulus.

² De Doctrina Christiana, lib. ii, cap. viii, § 3.

³ Bagster's edition of the Peshito has Paul's name at the head of this Epistle. But whether the ancient copies contained this superscription is uncertain.

⁴ The Canon mentions an Epistle to the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul, in aid of the heresy of Marcion, and rejected by the Church. But it is clear that this could not be the Epistle to the Hebrews, as some have conjectured.

⁵ Compare sec 36 of the Epistle with Hebrews i, 3, etc.

and that, too, without assigning a reason; for we cannot suppose that the author of it was either unknown, or wished to be, to those to whom he especially wrote, for he says: "Pray for us. . . . But I beseech you the rather to do this that I may be restored to you the sooner" (chap. xiii, 18, 19); and he also says he will see them in company with Timothy if he come shortly (chap. xiii, 23).

The statement in chap. ii, 3, that the doctrine of Christ "was confirmed to us by them that heard him," might possibly, though not certainly, apply to another than Paul, to whom Christ appeared in person, and who was commissioned by Christ to preach the gospel, which he tells us he did not receive "of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i, 12).

Bleek argues against the Pauline origin of the Epistle from supposed inaccuracies in the statements respecting the Jewish tabernacle and temple service in chap. ix. The statement that the holy of holies had a golden altar of incense (chap. ix, 4) (English version, *golden censer*) is not to be understood of an altar standing *within* the most holy place, but, as argued by Ebrard,¹ and explained by Robinson (New Test. Lex.), though standing in the outer sanctuary, it "is here reckoned to the inner sanctuary, as standing directly before, and pertaining to, the ark" (Exod. xl, 5). There is no reason for supposing, with Bleek, that the author of this Epistle appears to assume that the arrangements in the temple rebuilt by Herod were the same as in the original service instituted by Moses. The author refers to the arrangements in the original tabernacle because *they* were of divine appointment.

Respecting the *style* and *language* of the Epistle, it must be acknowledged that the former is more elegant than that of Paul in his other Epistles, and that the Greek is purer.

Nor have we any good ground for supposing it to have been originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, as there is no indication whatever in the Epistle itself that it is a translation; and, as we have already indicated the high probability that it was not addressed to the inhabitants of Palestine, no just reason existed for its composition in any other language than Greek. The writer of the Epistle almost invariably follows the Septuagint in quoting the Old Testament, and in this respect differs from Paul. There is also a marked difference in the manner of quoting the Old Testament in this Epistle from that which is used in the acknowledged Pauline writings. In the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, the standing formula in quoting the Old Testament is: "As it is written,"²

¹ Commentary on Hebrews.

² Used about nineteen times by Paul.

Bleek's objection to the Pauline authorship.

Peculiarities of style.

and sometimes: "For it is written."¹ Nowhere in the Epistle to the Hebrews does its author quote the Old Testament in this way, but he introduces the passages with the remark: "Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith" (chap. iii, 7); or "the Holy Ghost is a witness" (chap. x, 15); or "he saith" (chap. viii, 8); and "one in a certain place testifieth" (chap. ii, 6).

These are some of the points of difference from Paul's usual style which many thoroughly evangelical critics have regarded as sufficient proof that he was not the author of the epistle. Much can be said on either side. Some have suggested Luke, but there is not likeness enough to his style to render that probable; still more improbable is the supposition that the Epistle was written by Clement of Rome, as his style is entirely unlike that of the Hebrews, and the Epistle is used by him. If the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas is genuine, that would exclude him from the number of possible authors, as the same writer could not have written both. It is very probable, however, that Barnabas is not the author of the Epistle attributed to him, and he might have written the Epistle to the Hebrews. Silas (or Silvanus) was an intimate and prominent companion of Paul, and, as far as we know, may have been its author. Apollos was suggested by Luther, and this view is favoured by Tholuck, Credner, Bunsen, Bleek,² Hilgenfeld,³ and others. Apollos is described in Acts xviii, 24 as a "Jew born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures." After becoming fully acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity, "he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ" (Acts xviii, 28). We find that he preached the gospel with great success at Corinth, and a party in the Church in that city called themselves by his name (1 Cor. i, 12; iii, 4-6). It is evident that such a man as this might have written the Epistle, although there is little or nothing in it that shows its author to have been an Alexandrian. It may be doubted, too, whether, if the Epistle had been written by an Alexandrian of the school of Philo, the allegorical method of interpreting the Old Testament would not have been pursued to a greater extent. We find in this Epistle the phrase, "to taste of death," put for "to die" (chap. ii, 9). This is an Aramaic phrase, and occurs once in each of the Gospels, but nowhere else in the New Testament except in this passage. It seems to us very improbable that an Alexandrian Jew would have used it.

Accordingly, we are unable to fix, with certainty, upon the author of the Epistle. He must have been a man who stood high in the Christian Church, otherwise it is not likely he would have addressed

¹ Used about eight times by Paul. ² Einleitung, pp. 603-607. ³ Ibid, pp. 356-388.

such a writing to Hebrew Christians. He was also a friend and acquaintance of Timothy (chap. xiii, 23). No one meets all the conditions of certain authorship; but Paul, despite variations from his usage, makes the nearest approach to it.

THE TIME AND PLACE OF ITS COMPOSITION.

The Epistle was evidently written before the destruction of Jerusalem, as there are clear references to the temple service as still existing. "For if he (Christ) were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law" (chap. viii, 4). This shows the existence of the temple service. In reference to the Jewish sacrifices, the author remarks: "For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year" (chap. x, 2, 3). It is clear from this that when the Epistle was written sacrifices were still offered. Reference to the temple service as still existing are also found in chaps. ix, 6, 7, 25; xiii, 10, 11. Had the Jewish temple been already destroyed¹ when the Epistle was written, the author could not have failed to notice the fact, just as the author of the Epistle of Barnabas does,² and to draw from it an argument in proof of its temporary character.

Written before
the destruction
of Jerusalem.

The antiquity of the Epistle may be also argued from the statement that Timothy has been set at liberty (chap. xiii, 23), and also from its being used by Clement of Rome³ in his Epistle to the Corinthians, written in the last part of the first century.

The composition of the Epistle is placed by Bleek⁴ about A. D. 68, 69; by Wieseler and Hilgenfeld, 64-66; De Wette, 65-67; Tholuck, 63-67; Bunsen, 66 or 67. It is impossible to determine the exact year, but it may be assigned to the interval between A. D. 63 and 68.⁵ Respecting the *place* of its composition, it is difficult to reach any conclusion.

Dates of its
composition
conjectural.

The salutation, "They of Italy greet you" (chap. xiii, 24), furnishes no certain clue to the place. It is probable, however, that the language indicates "those who are in Italy," and thus the writer would appear to have been somewhere in Italy at the time. If Timothy had been imprisoned in Rome, it was very natural that the author, in writing to a Christian community somewhere in Asia

¹ The temple was destroyed in the capture of Jerusalem in the summer of A. D. 70.

² Sec. xvi, 1, 2.

³ In sec. 36.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 616.

⁵ It is ridiculous to find Volkmar placing it A. D. 116-118; and Keim referring it to the first part of the second century.

Minor or in Greece, acquainted with Timothy, should inform them of his release (chap. xiii, 23).

CONTENTS.

The author sets forth the dignity of Christ, the importance of giving heed to his teachings, his incarnation, priesthood, the danger of unbelief, and the grounds of confidence in God through the priesthood of Christ. He argues the perpetual priesthood of Christ from his being a priest after the order of Melchizedek, and affirms the ability of Christ to save for ever all who come to God through him (chaps. i-vii). He shows that the old covenant was to be abolished, and a new one to be substituted in its place, and that the institutions, especially the sacrificial rites of the old covenant, are typical of the new and of the sacrifice of Christ for the sins of men (chaps. viii-x, 18). He exhorts his readers to steadfastness in the faith, and warns them against apostasy. He sets forth the power of faith from examples in the Old Testament, exhorts believers to fidelity, and contrasts the privileges of the new dispensation with those of the old (chaps. x, 19-xii). He closes with an exhortation to the performance of the practical duties of the religion of Christ (chap. xiii).

THE CHARACTER AND VALUE OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle is an able exposition of the symbolical character of
Contains apos-
tolic doctrines. many of the institutions of the Mosaic covenant, their defects and temporary duration, the change of the Mosaic priesthood and the law, the new covenant, the dignity, efficacy, and permanency of the priesthood of Christ.

It contains, too, the genuine apostolic doctrines. It must, therefore, be regarded as a valuable witness to the facts lying at the basis of Christianity, and to its primitive truths. Thus we have Christ's descent from Judah (ch. vii, 14); the holiness and harmlessness of his character (chap. vii, 26); his agony in the garden (chap. v, 7); his suffering outside of Jerusalem (chap. xiii, 12); his resurrection (chap. xiii, 20); his ascension to heaven (chaps. i, 3; iv, 14, etc.); and the performance of miracles by the first teachers of Christ's doctrines who had been his hearers (chap. ii, 4).

CHAPTER XXXVI.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

THE Catholic Epistles,¹ so called from their being general in their character, and not addressed to special communities, are *seven* in number, namely: the Epistle of James, the two Epistles of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, and the three Epistles of John.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES.

THE PERSON OF THE WRITER.

The author styles himself "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" (chap i, 1). And the question arises, Which of the persons of that name, prominent in the New Testament, is the author of this Epistle? We find among the apostles two persons of the name of James; one the son of Zebedee, and brother of John (Matt. x, 2; Mark iii, 17; Luke vi, 14; Acts xii, 2; the other the son of Alpheus (Matt. x, 3; Mark iii, 18; Luke vi, 15), called also "the Less" (Mark xv, 40). The first of these, the son of Zebedee, was put to death by Herod about twelve years after the crucifixion of Christ (Acts xii, 1, 2). It is by no means likely that he was the author of the Epistle. After his death we find, in the history in the Acts, and also in Galatians ii, 9; 1 Cor. xv, 7, a very prominent man among the apostles by the name of James, and it has been greatly disputed whether he is one of the twelve apostles, the son of Alpheus, called also James the Less, or one of the brothers of Christ, called James, mentioned in Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3. In Galatians i, 19 Paul mentions having seen at Jerusalem James, the Lord's brother.

The most satisfactory way to determine who the James is that is so prominent in the Church at Jerusalem after the martyrdom of James, the son of Zebedee (Acts xii, 1, 2), is to trace his continuous history through the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles—the work of one author, Luke, who spent two years in Jerusalem (about A. D. 59–61), and visited James, and must, therefore, have been well acquainted with him.

Now, in his Gospel, Luke mentions only two persons by the name

¹And so called by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., ii, cap. xxiii. The title "Catholic," universal, does not suit Second and Third John

Writer—James
the son of Al-
pheus.

Luke's notices
of "James."

of James, one of whom he puts among the twelve apostles, and associates with John (chap. vi, 14; ix, 28, 54), and whom he calls the son of Zebedee (chap. v, 10); the other, James the son of Alpheus, whom he also mentions as one of the twelve apostles (chap. vi, 15). He names among the apostles Judas the brother of James (chap. vi, 16), and mentions Mary the mother of James (chap. xxiv, 10). This James is, doubtless, the apostle who was the son of Alpheus.

If we now take up the Acts of the Apostles, we shall find in the list of the apostles, who assembled in the upper room in Jerusalem after the ascension of Christ, James associated with Peter and John, and James the son of Alpheus (chap. i, 13). We next find mention of both in Acts xii, where it is stated that Herod killed James the brother of John with the sword, and that when Peter was released from prison, he said, "Go show these things unto James, and to the brethren." This, it seems, must have been the surviving apostle of this name, as the historian before mentions no other to whom the reference can be made.

In the assembly of the apostles and elders in Jerusalem a few years after, when the question whether the laws of Moses were binding upon Gentile Christians was considered and answered, James, after Peter, addresses the assembly, and gives the decision. Can we doubt that this is the same James with whom Luke has already made us acquainted? And who but an apostle would have taken it upon himself to address that assembly, and to deliver that important decision? When Paul visited Jerusalem (about A. D. 38) he tells us: "Other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother" (Gal. i, 19). This language very naturally includes James in the number of the apostles, and the designation, "the Lord's brother," is given to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee, who at that time was still living. But in writing after the death of James the son of Zebedee he mentions James without any other designation (1 Cor. xv, 7; Gal. ii, 9), by which he appears to name an apostle.

According to Hegesippus Clopas was the brother of Joseph.¹ In John xix, 25 Mary, the sister of the mother of Jesus, is called the wife of Clopas; but Clopas and Alpheus are regarded as two different ways of writing in Greek the Hebrew חֲלֵפַי,² *Chalephay*, so that James the son of Alpheus is the

¹ A cousin of Jesus, but called a brother.

¹ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., iii, cap. xi.

² The LXX., in writing Hebrew proper names, either altogether omit the guttural sound of Cheth (ח) initial, as *Ἀγγαῖος* (Haggai) for חַגַּגַּי (Chaggay), or render the Cheth by Chi (χ), as *χεβρών* for חֶבְרוֹן. In two instances, at least, Cheth final is converted into the Greek Kappa (κ), viz.: חַבְּתָא, *ταβέκ* (Gen. xxii, 24); and חַפְּצִי *ασοικ* (Nehemiah iii, 6). In Clopas the Cheth is changed into Kappa in Greek.

son of Clopas, and accordingly a cousin¹ of Christ. That an apostle thus nearly related to Christ should be called his brother is not strange, since Lot is called Abram's brother (Gen xiv, 16), when in fact he was Abram's brother's son (Gen. xi, 27). In Genesis xiii, 8, Abram says to Lot, We are brothers (*ἀδελφοί*, in LXX). Robinson gives us the second definition of *ἀδελφός*, "a kinsman, a relative, in any degree of blood" (Lex. New Test. Greek).

If there had been in the Church a *prominent* uterine brother of Christ named James, the designation, "the Lord's brother," would, in all probability, have referred to him; but in the absence of proof of the existence of such a brother, and as we find an apostle of that name a cousin of Christ, it is not difficult to believe that he may sometimes have been called by the honourable designation, "the Lord's brother."

Hegesippus,² who in the last half of the second century wrote of the affairs of the Church, speaks of James the brother of the Lord, called the Just, who received with the apostles the government of the Church in Jerusalem, and suffered martyrdom before the destruction of the city. He does not state whether this James was an apostle. Also, Josephus³ mentions James the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, and his martyrdom.

In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is of considerable authority in Jewish-Christian affairs, James the Just appears as one of those who sat at the table with the Lord before his crucifixion, and to whom he appeared after his resurrection. From this it seems that he was regarded as an apostle. In a fragment of Papias, Mary, the wife of Cleophas or Alpheus, appears as the mother of James, bishop and apostle.⁴ Clement⁵ of Alexandria regarded James the Just, bishop of Jerusalem, as an apostle. This was also the view of Jerome,⁶ and of Chrysostom, it would seem.⁷ On the other hand, Origen⁸ distinguishes James the brother of the Lord (Matt. xiii, 55), afterward bishop of Jerusalem, from James the Less, an apostle.

Among the moderns, Bleek⁹ regards James the brother of the Lord as no apostle. This view is favoured by Neander¹⁰ and De Wette,¹¹ and adopted by Hilgenfeld.¹² On the other hand, Hug¹³

¹ That the mother of James the Less, or son of Alpheus, was the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, appears from a comparison of John xix, 25; Matt. xxvii, 56 and Mark xv, 40.

² In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii, cap. xxiii.

³ Antiq., xx, cap. ix, 1.

⁴ In Patrum Apostol. Opera, Leipzig, 1875.

⁵ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii, cap. i.

⁶ De Viris Illus. Jacobus.

⁷ Comment. in Gal. i, 19.

⁸ Comment. in Matt. xiii, 55.

⁹ Einleitung, 624-627.

¹⁰ Planting and Training of the Church, pp. 350-354.

¹¹ Einleitung, p. 367.

¹² Einleitung, 520-527.

¹³ Einleitung, vol. ii, 445.

regards James the brother of the Lord and James the son of Alphaeus as one person, who is placed among the brothers of Jesus in Matthew xiii, 55. Schneckenburger has also advocated the hypothesis of one James, while Wieseler distinguishes between James the brother of the Lord and the apostle of that name.

GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The writer styles himself "James, a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ." This modest title for one who was This Epistle found in ancient versions. bishop of Jerusalem, and, in accordance with what we have argued, also an apostle, impresses us at once with the genuineness of the Epistle.

It is contained in the Peshito-Syriac version, where it bears the inscription, "The Epistle of James the Apostle." It is also found in the Memphitic, Thebaic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions, but is wanting in the Canon of Muratori. In the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians there seem to be some references to this Epistle. The allusion to the double-minded man (*διψυχος*) in Clement, and the statement that Abraham was called the friend of God, and the reference to Rahab (secs. 10-12), seem to be based on James i, 8; ii, 23, 25. In Hermas, the Pastor, a work written not later than the middle of the second century, we find a reference to James iv, 7: "It is possible to wrestle with the devil, but it is not possible to conquer him. For if you resist him, he will fly confounded from you."¹ Irenæus² quotes (chap. ii, 23): "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God." In Clement of Alexandria we can find no certain use of this Epistle. Eusebius, however, states, that Clement made short expositions of Jude and the rest of the Catholic Epistles,³ which, of course, includes James. There is no certain reference in Tertullian⁴ to this Epistle, nor can we find a trace of it in Cyprian (about A. D. 250).

Origen, in commenting on John viii, 24, remarks: "For if faith is James cited by Origen. meant, but without works, such a faith is dead, as we read in the Epistle that bears the name of James."⁵ With this exception, we cannot find a trace of this Epistle in the numerous quotations of the New Testament in Origen's Commentary on John, nor do we find a single one from this Epistle in his Commentary on Matthew. But in his Commentary on the Epistle to the

¹ Mandata, xii, cap. v. ² Lib. iv, cap. xvi, 2. ³ In Hist. Eccles., vi, cap. xiv

⁴ "Whence," says he, "was Abraham counted the friend of God," etc. It is probable that Tertullian had in his mind James ii, 23, although in Isaiah xli, 8 God says, "Abraham my friend."

⁵ Tom. xix, 6.

Romans, which exists only in the Latin version of Rufinus, the Epistle of James is twice quoted in chap. v, once as the language of James the brother of the Lord, and in the other instance as that of the Apostle James.¹ But Rufinus does not profess to follow closely the original text of Origen, and states in the preface that the Commentary on the Romans has been interpolated. In this case, the quotations from James prove nothing. Also in the Latin translation of Origen's Homilies on Exodus and Leviticus, by Rufinus, James iv. 7, i, 8, and v, 14 are quoted as the language of the apostle James. But here it is impossible to determine what belongs to Origen himself. It seems very probable that he attached but little importance to the Epistle.

Eusebius, speaking of James, remarks: "The first of the Epistles called Catholic is said to be his. But it must be known that it is spurious (*νοθεύεται*),² since not many of the ancients have mentioned it; nor that called the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the seven called Catholic. Nevertheless, we know that these also, with the rest, are received as canonical³ in most Churches."⁴ In another place he puts it among the disputed writings⁵ (*Ἀντιλεγόμενα*).

Eusebius and Jerome's opinions as to the authenticity of this Epistle.

Jerome, speaking of James, bishop of Jerusalem, whom he considers to be the cousin of Christ, says: "He wrote only one Epistle, which belongs to the seven Catholic Epistles, and which is asserted to have been put forth by some one else under his name, but has gradually obtained authority in the course of time."⁶ It would seem from this that he was not quite sure of its genuineness.

Didymus, who was head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria in the last part of the fourth century, wrote an exposition of this Epistle, which he attributed to the Apostle James. It was received by Athanasius,⁷ Gregory Nazianzen,⁸ Cyril⁹ of Jerusalem, Chrysostom,¹⁰ Augustine,¹¹ and Epiphanius,¹² but was rejected by Theodore¹³ of Mopsuestia. But even those

An exposition of James by Didymus.

¹ He also gives some other passages from James, without naming the source.

² The word has the meaning, *to be spurious* and *to be deemed spurious*. But the context requires the first meaning, since it expresses the judgment of Eusebius.

³ The Greek is *δημοσιευμένας*, *to be of a public character*, and is defined by Sophocles, *canonical*. (Greek Lex., Rom. and Byzant. Periods).

⁴ Hist. Eccles., ii, cap. xxiii. ⁵ Ibid., iii, cap. xxv. ⁶ De Viris Illus. Jacobus.

⁷ In Vita Antonii he quotes James i, 15 20, "As it is written," and chap. v, 13, with the same formula in the Epistle to Marcellinus. ⁸ 1105.

⁹ Catechesis iv, De Decem Dogmatibus, xxxvi. ¹⁰ Synopsis of Sacred Scriptures.

¹¹ De Doctr. Christ., lib. ii, cap. viii, 13.

¹² Hæresis lxxvii, sec. 27.

¹³ Leontius Byzant., Contra Nestor et Eut., iii, 14.

fathers who accepted it made but little use of it. We have found no extracts from it in the works of Ambrose and Hilary, though it is possible that they may have quoted it. At the time of the Reformation Erasmus expressed himself skeptically concerning it, and Luther remarks on it: "This Epistle of St. James, although it was rejected by the ancients [this remark, as we have already seen, is only partially true], I commend, and consider good, for the reason that it lays down no human doctrine, and rigorously follows the law of God. But that I may give my own opinion without injury to any one, I do not regard it as the writing of an apostle; and this is my reason: In the first place, because, in palpable contradiction to St. Paul and all the other Scriptures, it attributes justification to works, and says: Abraham was justified by his works when he offered up his son, whereas St. Paul, on the contrary, teaches (Rom. iv, 2, 3) that Abraham was justified without works. . . . But this James does nothing but adhere to the law and its works, and blends things in such a confused way, that it seems to me he was a truly pious man who composed some sentences from a disciple of the apostles, and put them upon paper. Or perhaps it is an extract from his preaching, written down by some one else." Again, in his Preface to the New Testament he says: "The Epistle of St. James is really an Epistle of Straw (eine rechte stroherne epistel) in comparison with them (in comparison with the writings of John, Paul, Peter), for it contains nothing of an evangelical stamp."¹

This assertion of Luther, that the doctrine of justification by works, as set forth in this Epistle, flatly contradicts Paul, who teaches that we are justified by faith, is not well founded. Paul, in his Epistle, discusses the question of pardon and justification of the sinner before God, and shows that forgiveness is to be obtained only through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. But he clearly implies, as the fruit of this faith, a full compliance with the moral law, a complete surrender of the soul to Christ, and he has not the least reference to a dead, inoperative faith.

The question which James proposes is: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he have faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?" Can any one suppose for a moment that Paul would have answered that a dead faith, followed by no compliance with the moral law, would save a man? Who insists more earnestly than he upon the importance of a full obedience to the moral law?

¹ These passages from Luther's works are quoted by De Wette (Einleitung pp. 374, 375), from whom we have borrowed them.

He declares that God "will render to every man according to his deeds" (Rom. ii, 6), and warns us against the idea of living in sin that grace may abound (Rom. vi). How clearly does he contrast the holy virtues of the spiritual life, the fruits of the Spirit, with the works of the unregenerate man (Gal. v, 19-23), and that, too, after contending in the strongest manner for the doctrine of justification by faith? Now Paul certainly would have assented to the doctrine of this Epistle: "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." James contends that faith is to be proved by works (chap. ii, 18); Abraham was justified by faith at first, and afterward by complying with the divine command to offer up Isaac. His faith, without obedience, would have profited him nothing. Here Paul and James would certainly agree. These two teachers set forth the different sides, or the two opposite poles, of the same great truth. How strongly does Paul exhibit the two apparently opposing doctrines of divine sovereignty and free-will, even in the same verse uttering truths apparently contradictory: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling: for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. ii, 12, 13).

In fact, James does not at all discuss the question how a sinner shall obtain forgiveness, but how a Christian shall live.

The spirit which James condemns is, as Neander well observes, that "which substituted a lifeless, arrogant

Agreement between Paul and James.

acquaintance with the letter for the genuine wisdom inseparable from the divine life—which prided itself in an inoperative knowledge of the law, without paying any attention to the practice of the law—which placed devotion in outward ceremonies, and neglected that devotion which shows itself in works of love," a habit of mind which attached especial importance to faith in Jehovah and in the Messiah, but "which left the disposition unchanged."¹

It is but a small portion of James that touches upon justification, and there is no reason for supposing that the Epistle has any reference to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. In fact, it is intended for another class of persons. His address is "to the twelve tribes who are in the dispersion, greeting," while Paul's Epistles were for the most part directed to Gentile Christians. And this fact, that the Epistle is addressed to Jewish believers only, accounts for its having been but little known among the Gentile Christians in the first two centuries of the Church.

There is nothing in the Epistle inconsistent with the supposition that it was written by James, who confined his labors to Jerusalem.

¹Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles, p. 358, Ryland's Translation.

Indeed, the whole tone indicates a person in the position of James. It is in Greek, but this is not strange when we remember that it was addressed to Jewish believers in Christianity dispersed through the world, many of whom would not have understood the Aramaic, the vernacular of Palestine. The Greek is quite good, better than might have been expected from one in James' position, though it is not improbable that he may have obtained assistance in its composition. It is possible, too, that he may have been brought up in the use of Greek in some part of Palestine.

He uses the phrase, "Lord of Sabaoth," once (chap. v. 4), which no one but a Jew would be likely to use, and which occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in a quotation from the Old (Romans ix, 29). He makes great use of the Old Testament, refers to the early and latter rain (chap. v, 7) characteristic of Palestine, and to the fountains of sweet and of bitter water (chap. iii, 11) peculiar to the same region. All this indicates a Jew of Palestine. He modestly styles himself "the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," which is, however, not inconsistent with his being an apostle, as Paul so styles himself (Phil. i, 1).

There is no good reason for doubting the genuineness of the Epistle, which has been defended by Bleek¹ and Neander² as belonging to James, who is distinguished in the Acts, and appears prominent in the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. De Wette remarks that doubts on dogmatic grounds were raised against the Epistle at the time of the Reformation. But since its [supposed] contradiction of Paul has been removed or softened, "its genuineness is almost universally acknowledged."³ The genuineness of the Epistle is denied by Hilgenfeld, who refers its composition to the time of Domitian⁴ (A. D. 81-96).

But the traces of an age subsequent to the time of James are by no means clear, or even probable. Hilgenfeld follows Zeller in maintaining that James ii, 12, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him," is based on Rev. ii, 10, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life;" and as the Apocalypse was not written earlier than A. D. 68, the Epistle must have been written after the death of James. But it by no means follows that the phrase, "the crown of life," was borrowed

¹ Einleitung, pp. 638-642.

² Planting and Training, pp. 357-367.

³ Einleitung, p. 374.

⁴ Einleitung, pp. 540-542.

Peculiarities of James' language.

No reasonable doubt of the genuineness of James.

Hilgenfeld's objection from internal evidence considered.

from the Apocalypse. Nothing was more common in the ancient world than the bestowal of crowns, of gold¹ and of other material, as marks of honor, both in Athens and in Rome. To this prize of honor we find various references in the apostolic writings. Paul speaks of those who strive "to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible" (crown) (1 Cor. ix, 25). What is this but a crown of life? In 2 Tim. iv, 8 he speaks of "the crown of righteousness." In 1 Peter v, 4 we have "the unfading crown of glory." James has, instead of "righteousness" and "glory," "life" ("the crown of life"), and this, forsooth, he must have borrowed from the Apocalypse, though "crown" is one of the most common words in the New Testament.² Equally unnecessary is it to refer the "firstfruits" in this Epistle (ch. i, 18) to Rev. xiv, 4, where mention is made of "the firstfruits" "unto God and to the Lamb," since Paul in various places speaks of "firstfruits," in the sense of *spiritual ingatherings*; as "the firstfruits of Achaia" (Rom. xvi, 5); "If the firstfruits be holy," etc. (chap. xi, 16). He also calls Christ "the firstfruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv, 20). The Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians were written before A. D. 60, from some of which James might have derived the idea of a "crown of life" and "firstfruits," though it is not likely they were borrowed from any New Testament writer. But if the coincident phrase and word in James and in the Revelation are to be considered original only in one of them, and borrowed in the other, why may not the author of the Revelation have borrowed them from James?

There seems to be a clear indication in the Epistle that it was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, "For the coming of the Lord draweth nigh" (chap. v, 8). Likewise the words, "Ye have condemned, ye have murdered the Just One, and he does not resist you" (ch. v, 6), clearly refers to the condemnation and crucifixion of Christ, for which the Jews had not yet suffered, which shows that Jerusalem had not yet been destroyed; so in Acts xxii, 14 Christ is called "*the Just One*;" also in Acts iii, 14. Nor is there anywhere in the Epistle any indication leading to a date subsequent to the martyrdom of James. The assertion of Hilgenfeld that James ii, 6, 7; v, 6, presupposes that judicial sentences had already been pronounced upon Christians, as

James' Epistle written before the destruction of Jerusalem.

¹ The classical scholar will call to mind the Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown. Among the Romans the mural, civic, obsidional, and triumphal crowns were bestowed.

² In Rev. ii, 10 "the crown of life" is promised by Christ to those who are "faithful unto death;" but in James i, 12 to those who love the Lord, and which may refer to God the Father, as in James v, 10, 11.

such, is destitute of all probability; and equally groundless is his statement, that such sentences were not pronounced upon Christians before the time of Domitian, for Nero punished them as incendiaries. James ii, 6, 7 has reference simply to the oppression of the poor by the rich, especially before courts of justice, as any one may see by referring to the passage. The rich, too, were generally rejecters of Christ, while the believers were mostly from the poor. Chapter v, 6 refers, as we have already stated, to the condemnation and crucifixion of Christ.

Nor did Nero punish Christians only as incendiaries, since Tacitus states respecting their conviction and punishment: "They were convicted not so much on the charge of burning (Rome) as on account of their hatred of the human race."¹ This hatred of the human race was their contempt for the gods of the pagan world, and for the abominable rites connected with pagan worship.

THE TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

We have already referred to the proofs that this Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and as James suffered martyrdom a few years before the destruction of that city, the Epistle was most probably written some time before A. D. 64, but the precise date cannot be determined.

The Epistle would seem to indicate that Christianity had already been in existence for a considerable number of years, and there seems no good reason to refer it, as Neander does, to a "time preceding the separate formation of Gentile Christian Churches, before the relation of Gentiles and Jews to one another in the Christian Church had been brought under discussion,"² that is, before the Jerusalem Council, held about A. D. 50. There is no good ground, however, for placing it with Bleek³ at A. D. 63, 64. The reference made in chap. ii, 7 to blaspheming Christ does not imply that the followers of Christ were already called Christians, as the phrase, "by which ye are called"⁴ is very similar to the construction in Acts xv, 17, "upon whom my name is called."

¹ *Haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis, convicti sunt.*—Annalium, lib. xv, cap. xlv.

² *Planting and Training, etc.*, p. 363.

³ *Einleitung*, p. 632.

⁴ The Greek in James ii, 7 is τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμῶν, *the honorable name which is called upon you*, based on the Hebrew, "שְׁמִי עָלַי, *my name is called upon any thing*, i. e., my name is given to it, it is called *mine*, implying property, relation," etc. (Gesenius, sub voce שְׁמִי). Thus the passage refers to their being the people of Christ, not necessarily implying that they were called Christians (Χριστιανοί).

The place in which the Christians assembled for worship is called in chap. ii, *2 a synagogue*. But this does not imply that the Jewish believers were not yet separated from the unbelievers in worship. James simply calls the Christian assembly by the same name as the Jewish. Just as the Greeks gave to the Christian assembly the name *ecclesia*, which had denoted an assemblage of citizens in Athens for political purposes. The Epistle was probably written between A. D. 50 and 63, undoubtedly at Jerusalem, where James lived at that time, and long before.

CONTENTS.

The author exhorts his readers to rejoice in the midst of divers temptations, insists upon unwavering faith and confidence in God, the Giver of all good, enjoins upon them to bridle the tongue, to be doers of the word, and not hearers only, and shows them in what true religion consists (chap. i). He warns his readers against showing partiality to the rich, urges them to keep the whole moral law, especially the royal law to love one's neighbour as one's self, and shows that men are not justified by faith only (chap. ii). He next discusses the importance of bridling the tongue (chap. iii). He shows that lust is the cause of war, denounces the friendship of the world, recommends humility, submission to God, exhorts them to resist the devil, to draw nigh unto God, and to purify themselves. He warns them against evil speaking, and the sin of presuming upon the future (chap. iv). He describes wicked rich men and their impending punishment, and exhorts the brethren to be patient until the coming of the Lord. He warns them against swearing, dwells upon the efficacy of prayer, and points out the deep importance and glorious result of converting a sinner from the error of his way (chap. v).

CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE.

From the foregoing synopsis, it will be seen that the Epistle is of an eminently practical character, avoiding the discussion of profound theological truths, and insisting upon the necessity of possessing the spirit of the Gospel, and practicing its precepts. It everywhere breathes the spirit of deep piety and resignation to God.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE EPISTLES OF PETER.

THE PERSON OF THE APOSTLE.

IN the Gospels, and in the first part of the Acts, Peter appears as the most prominent apostle. He was of Bethsaida (John i, 44), a town on the west coast of the Sea of Galilee, and a fisherman by occupation (Matt. iv, 18; Mark i, 16; Luke v, 3, 4). He was brought by his brother Andrew to Christ at the very beginning of the Lord's ministry. To his original name of Simon Christ added that of Cephias (כִּפְיָא, *Kēpha*), an Aramaic word meaning *Rock*, of which the Greek is *Petros*, *Peter*.¹ After this introduction to Christ Peter still pursued his former vocation, and we find that when, at the Lord's command, he had cast his net into the sea, and caught a great multitude of fishes—though he had toiled all the previous night and taken nothing—he threw himself down at the knees of Jesus, saying, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." To this Christ replied, "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men." After this he left all and followed him (Luke v, 4-11). He became one of the most intimate disciples of Christ. We find him with James and John on the Mount of Transfiguration, and in the garden of Gethsemane. He showed his zeal for his Master, when arrested in the garden, by drawing his sword and cutting off the right ear of the servant of the high priest (John xviii, 10). He was always ready to proclaim his faith in Christ. When many disciples left Jesus, he put the question to the twelve: "Will ye also go away?" to which Peter promptly answered: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John vi, 67, 68). Upon another occasion, when Christ asked his disciples: "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter answered: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." In the Saviour's reply to this, he declares: "I say also unto

¹כִּפְיָא, *Kēpha*, is used in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel (Chaldee versions of the chief portions of the Old Testament, made about the time of Christ) in the sense of a *rock* or *ledge of rocks* in Num. xx, 8-11; Judges vi 20; 1 Sam. xiv, 4; Jer. xlix, 16, etc.; and in the sense of *sea coast (rock bound)* in Gen. xxii, 17, etc.; but nowhere that we have been able to find does it occur in the sense of a *piece of rock* or a *stone* in these Targums. In translating *Kēpha* into Greek it was necessary to employ the word *Petros* (*Peter*), the masculine form, from the feminine Πέτρα, as the feminine form is unsuitable for the name of a man.

thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." In the vernacular language of Christ (the Aramaic), כֶּפְתָּא, *Kepha*, was used both for Peter and for the rock on which the Church was to be built. "I say also unto thee, That thou art *Kēpha*, and upon this *Kēpha* I will build my Church," etc. It is clear that our Saviour indulges in a *paronomasia*,¹ and affirms he will build his Church upon him, the rock; but not in such a way as to exclude the other apostles, who, if they had not at that time such a strong faith as Peter had, yet afterward attained it, and entered as foundation stones into the Christian edifice. Hence the language of Paul: "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph. ii, 20). Also in the Apocalypse it says: "The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the name of the twelve apostles of the Lamb" (xxi, 14). Christ also promised to give him the "keys of the kingdom of heaven" with plenary powers" (Matt. xvi, 19). Accordingly, we find that he opened the kingdom, that is, first preached the gospel to Jews and Gentiles (Acts ii, 14-36; x).

But notwithstanding his strong faith and ardent zeal, the fear of death so far prevailed over him that in the palace of the high priest, after the arrest of Christ, he thrice denied his knowledge of his Master, and at his third denial he began to curse and to swear (Mark xiv, 66-71). At Christ's appearance to his disciples at the sea of Galilee (John xxi), he charged Peter to feed his lambs and his sheep, and at the same time he predicted his death by crucifixion.²

After the ascension of the Lord, in the first general assembly of believers in Jerusalem, Peter calls attention to the necessity of appointing an eyewitness of the life of Christ to take the apostleship of Judas. On the day of Pentecost he preaches the gospel to the Jews of Jerusalem. Subsequently to this he heals a lame man, and preaches to the assembled crowds; he rebukes the hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira; he is

Peter the leader after Christ's ascension.

¹Paronomasias are not unknown to the Old Testament. In Gen. ix, 27: "God shall enlarge (יִפְתָּהּ, *yaphth*) Japhet" (יִפְתְּחָהּ, *yeptheth*, enlargement). So in Isa. v, 7: "And he waited for יִשְׁדָּחָק (tsedhaqah, righteousness), and behold there was יִשְׁעָהּ (tsé'agah, outcry, violence), etc. Of course, the language of Christ addressed to Peter is figurative. On this rock, not bishops or popes, but the Church, was to be built. A foundation rock is dissimilar from the building, and it stands alone. Peter had no successors. And it must be observed that this language was addressed to Peter in possession of strong faith in Christ.

²This seems to be the import of John xxi, 18.

imprisoned with the other apostles, but is released by an angel. At a later period he and John were sent by the apostles to Samaria, where he came in contact with Simon the Magician. In his travels he comes to Lydda, where he heals Eneas sick of the palsy. At Joppa he raises Dorcas from the dead. Here he has a vision, in which the calling of the Gentiles is foreshadowed, and he is directed by the Spirit to go to Cornelius, a heathen at Cæsarea, and preach the gospel to him, which opens the door of salvation to the Gentiles. Herod arrests and imprisons him, with a view of putting him to death, but an angel sets him at liberty. At the council in Jerusalem he expresses himself decidedly against putting the yoke of the Mosaic law upon the neck of Gentile believers (chap. xv). This is his last appearance in the Acts of the Apostles. He is mentioned by Paul several times in his Epistle to the Galatians, as being either at Jerusalem or Antioch, but the incidents given respecting him do not extend beyond the fifteenth chapter of the Acts.¹ At the close of his First Epistle he sends a salutation from the Church at Babylon, on the Euphrates, from which it appears that he was once there.

Outside of the New Testament, the oldest notice of Peter occurs in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written sometime in A. D. 93-96. After remarking that the most righteous and faithful pillars of the Church had been persecuted and suffered unto death, he says, "Let us place before our eyes the good apostles. Peter, on account of unjust jealousy, endured, not one, nor two, but many sufferings, and thus, having borne testimony, he went to the place of glory that was due him."² From this it is clear that he suffered martyrdom; and as Clement afterward, in the same connection, speaks of the martyrdom of Paul, and names no other apostle, it is not improbable that Peter suffered at Rome, where Paul was martyred, or in its vicinity.

The next reference to the martyrdom of Peter occurs in Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (about A. D. 170), who remarks in his Epistle to the Romans that "Peter and Paul visited Corinth and Italy, taught and suffered as martyrs at the same time." He also speaks of the Roman and Corinthian Churches as having been planted by Peter and Paul.³ Irenæus (about A. D. 180) speaks of Peter and Paul as preaching the gospel in Rome,⁴ and founding a Church there. Caius, a Roman presby-

¹ In Gal. ii, 11, "But when Peter was come to Antioch," etc., refers to what transpired when Paul and Barnabas were in that city (Acts xv, 35). The supposed inconsistency of Peter referred to by Paul (Gal. ii, 13-14) we considered in discussing the Acts of the Apostles.

² Sec. 5, in Const text

³ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., ii, cap. xxv.

⁴ iii, cap. i, 1.

ter (about A. D. 200), is the next witness respecting Peter. In a book written against Proclus, the leader of the sect of the Cataphryges, he says: "I can show you the monuments of the apostles. For if you wish to go out to the Vatican, or to the road to Ostia, you will find the monuments [tombs] of those who founded this Church." Tertullian of Carthage (about A. D. 200) states that Peter and Paul left the Romans the gospel sealed with their own blood,² and that here Peter was made like the Lord in suffering.³

Origen, who flourished in the first half of the third century, remarks: "Peter appears to have preached the gospel in Pontus, Galatia and Bithynia, Cappadocia, and in Asia, to the Jews of the dispersion. Finally, being in Rome, he was crucified head downward, he himself having preferred to suffer in this way."⁴

Jerome states, that after Peter "had been bishop of the Church in Antioch, and had preached the gospel among the dispersed Jews, who had believed, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, he went in the second year of the Emperor Claudius (A. D. 43) to Rome, to vanquish Simon Magus, and he held there the Sacerdotal Chair for twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, that is, the fourteenth (A. D. 68), by whom he was crucified and crowned with martyrdom, his head being downward and his feet upward, declaring that he was unworthy to be crucified in the same way as his Lord. . . . He was buried at Rome in the Vatican, near the Triumphal Way."⁵ But it is impossible to reconcile this episcopacy of twenty-five years at Rome with probabilities and facts.

About A. D. 51, 52 Peter is still at Jerusalem, Antioch, or their vicinity (Acts xv: Gal. ii, 1, 11), so that it is impossible for him to have gone to Rome in the second year of Claudius (A. D. 43). After Peter left Antioch Jerome states that he preached the gospel in Pontus and the adjacent regions before going to Rome. And it appears that the First Epistle of Peter was written at Babylon, or in its vicinity (chap. v, 13); so that he must have visited that region of country before going to Rome. In the Epistles of Paul, written from Rome after his arrival there, about A. D. 62, there is no mention of Peter, nor any in the Epistle to the Church in that city, written about A. D. 58.

Probable date of Peter's arrival at Rome.

Peter probably four years in Rome.

¹ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., ii, cap. xxv.

² Adversus Marcionem, iv, cap. v.

³ Liber de Præscript., cap. xxxvi.

⁴ In vol. iii, Commentary on Genesis in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., iii, cap. i.

⁵ Liber de Viris Illustribus. Petrus. In the Chronicon of Eusebius it is stated that Peter was bishop of the Church at Rome for twenty-five years. but this is in the Latin version, to which the translators made additions.

It seems probable that Peter did not reach Rome until after A. D. 64, and that he was crucified there A. D. 67 or 68. There is no good reason for doubting the fact of his martyrdom at Rome, as the tradition goes back, as we have already seen, to the second century, when the Roman Church had not yet laid claim to her lofty prerogatives; nor would the tradition of his martyrdom in that city have been universal in the earlier centuries if it had not rested upon an historical basis. The truth of the tradition is conceded by Gieseler,¹ is considered most probable by Neander,² deemed an historical fact by Bleek,³ improbable by De Wette,⁴ and, though rejected by Baur,⁵ is accepted by the skeptical Hilgenfeld.⁶

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

THE Epistle is addressed to the "strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God," etc. By "the strangers of the dispersion" (*παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς*) he does not mean Christian believers of the Jewish race especially, as we might suppose, but Christians in general, dispersed strangers, having no country they can call their own. The language was originally applied to the dispersed Jewish people. That the persons addressed were Christians from among the Gentiles chiefly appears from chaps. i, 14, 18; ii, 10, iv, 3, 4.

THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

The writer styles himself "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ." and to him the Epistle was universally attributed by the ancient Church. It was evidently used by Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John, in the following words: "In whom ye believe, not having seen, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." ⁷ It was used by Hermas ⁸ (about A. D. 140) and by Papias of Hierapolis in the first

¹ Church History, vol. i, p. 81.

² Planting and Training, pp. 377-381.

³ Einleitung, p. 654.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 377.

⁵ Die Drei Ersten Jahrhunderte. Dritte Ausgabe, 142.

⁶ Einleitung, p. 624. Clement of Alexandria remarks: "They say, indeed, that when the blessed Peter saw his wife led away to be put to death he was delighted on account of her calling and return home, and, addressing her by name, he earnestly exhorted her, *Remember the Lord* (Strom. vii, cap. xi). From this it appears that Peter at that time was in some place well known to Clement.

⁷ Epistle to the Philipians, sec. 1.

⁸ Vis., iii, 11.

half of the second century.¹ It was contained in the Peshito-Syriac version, made about the middle of the second century. It is quoted as Peter's by Irenæus,² by Clement³ of Alexandria, and Tertullian⁴ of Carthage. Origen remarks that "Peter has left one acknowledged Epistle."⁵ Eusebius, in his Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament, remarks that the "First Epistle of Peter is to be received."⁶ It was received as Peter's by Cyprian⁷ of Carthage, Hilary⁸ of Poitiers in Gaul, by Ambrose⁹ of Milan, by Athanasius,¹⁰ by Gregory Nazianzen,¹¹ Didymus¹² of Alexandria, Chrysostom,¹³ Augustine,¹⁴ Jerome,¹⁵ and Theodoret.¹⁶ It was admitted into all the ancient versions of the New Testament.¹⁷ It is not, however, found in the Canon of Muratori; but no stress is to be laid upon this, as the Canon is imperfect.

This Epistle universally acknowledged in the ancient Church.

Nowhere do we find a single instance in which the Epistle was rejected; for the statement of Leontius of Byzantium, that Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected the Epistle of James, and successively the other Catholic Epistles,¹⁸ does not make it certain that he rejected the First Epistle of Peter, and in itself it is very improbable. It is true that the language most naturally means that he rejected *all seven*. But is it likely that a man of his ability and learning, who certainly received John's Gospel, would have rejected his Epistle, so intimately connected with that Gospel, and concerning which, so far as we know, a doubt had never been raised? If we feel authorized in excepting the First Epistle of John from the general statement, we may except the First Epistle of Peter also. Theodore, doubtless, rejected the Second

Alleged rejection of it by Theodore of Mopsuestia.

¹ According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., iii, cap. xxxix), who had his work before him.

² Lib. iv, cap. ix, xvi; lib. v, cap. vii. ³ Strom., iii, cap. xviii; Pædag., iii, cap. xii.

⁴ Adversus Gnosticos Scorpiace, cap. xii.

⁶ In Eusebius, vi, 25.

⁵ Ibid., iii, cap. xxv.

⁷ Epistola Ad Fortunatum, cap. ix. In his book (De Zelo et Livore) he quotes I Peter v, 8, with the remark, "According to what the Apostle Peter in his Epistle advises," etc.

⁸ Psalm li.

⁹ He quotes I Peter i, 18, 19 with the remark, "Peter in his Epistle says," etc. Comment. in Luc., lib. vii, 117. ¹⁰ Oratio ii, Contra Arianos. ¹¹ Carmina.

¹² Enarratio in I Peter. ¹³ Synopsis Sac. Scrip. ¹⁴ De Doc. Christ., ii, 8.

¹⁵ De Viris Illustribus. Petrus.

¹⁶ Demons. per Syllogismos.

¹⁷ We cannot speak with certainty of the Gothic version, as it has not come down to us entire.

¹⁸ Speaking of the rejection by Theodore of the book of Job, referred to by James, Leontius remarks: Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν αὐτὴν τε οἶμαι, τοῦ μεγάλου Ἰακώβου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ τὰς ἐξῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀποκηρύττει καθολικῶς (Adversus Inccorrupt. et Nestor, lib. iii, 14. De Wette had before him the Latin translation of these words, and he observes on them: "It does not clearly lie in these words that Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected the Epistle." Einleitung, p. 386.

Epistle of Peter, that of Jude, and the Second and Third of John.

Further, Theodoret was the enthusiastic disciple of Theodore, and most probably reflected his master's opinions on the Canon, and he quotes¹ the First Epistle of Peter with the remark: "The divine Peter says in his Catholic [Epistle] that Christ suffered in the flesh" (chap iv, 1). He likewise quotes as his the First Epistle of John, but nowhere does he quote the Epistle of James by name,² nor do we find in him a vestige of Second Peter, the Epistle of Jude, and Second and Third of John.

It must be borne in mind that the charge brought against Theodore, of rejecting the Catholic Epistles, comes from his bitter enemy, who charges him, as another Marcion, with not being satisfied in attacking the Old Testament only, but with making attempts upon the New. It is not likely that he discriminated very nicely in his remarks respecting Theodore. The Second Epistle of Peter, whether genuine or not, bears testimony to the existence and authority of the First (2 Pet. iii, 1).

If we examine the contents of this Epistle, we find that it bears the apostolic stamp, contains nothing unworthy of an apostle, nothing belonging to a later age, and it impresses us at once with its genuineness. With the facts before us it is not easy to see how a doubt respecting it could ever arise. But, in spite of the strong external and internal evidence in its favor, its genuineness has been called in question by some modern critics. Semler first denied its immediate composition by the apostle. He was followed by Cludius, who in the first part of the present century rejected its Petrine authorship, and attributed it to some one belonging to the school of Paul. De Wette, in the various editions of his Introduction, expressed himself with more or less doubt respecting it. Its genuineness is denied by Baur, Schweigler, and Hilgenfeld.

To begin with De Wette: this skeptical critic grants that the Epistle belongs to the apostolic age, on the ground of the expectation expressed in it of the speedy end of all things (chap. iv, 7), and that it was written during Nero's persecution of the Christians. This is, indeed, highly probable, and is fully consistent with its genuineness.

¹ Demons. per Syllogismos.

² There is one passage that looks as if it came from James iv, 8: "I have said, Draw nigh to me, and I will draw nigh to you," though there are passages in the Old Testament in which we are exhorted to draw nigh unto God. The first Epistle of John and First of Peter are quoted by Theodoret in several places.

The following are his objections: "It does not exhibit a definite peculiarity, like the works of John and Paul. Not only ^{De Wette's ob-} are there found reminiscences of passages of the Pauline ^{jections.} Epistles, the reading of which by the author is doubtless to be presupposed, but also his conceptions and language are essentially Pauline. To this is to be added that the writer does not master with freedom and ease, as his own property, the thoughts with which he is occupied, but handles them with some uncertainty. The improbability that the Apostle Peter would put himself into such dependence upon Paul, and especially that he could have been acquainted with Paul's later Epistles, and even the spurious Epistle to the Ephesians, establishes a strong suspicion respecting the genuineness of the Epistle, to which, however, all antiquity bears testimony."¹

We scarcely know how to characterize the foregoing statements of this able but skeptical critic. To say the least, they are mere assumptions. This Epistle has an individual stamp of its own, which scarcely any one can fail to see, and which no one would confound with the Pauline type. Its vigorous, earnest style reflects the character of Peter as he appears in the New Testament history. There is nothing improbable in the supposition that Peter may have seen some of Paul's Epistles, but that he leans upon them is manifestly false. There is nothing inconsistent with the dignity of the apostles in quoting each other's expressions, as it is well known was done by the Hebrew prophets.² But we must say that we are not convinced that Peter has used the writings of Paul. Respecting the Epistle to the Ephesians, De Wette has no sufficient grounds for pronouncing it spurious. But if he insists upon this, why can he not adopt the more sensible hypothesis in that case, that the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians made use of the First Epistle of Peter, which he concedes to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem?

It is, indeed, true, that there are a few thoughts and words in this Epistle of Peter similar to some found in the writings of Paul and James, and this was to be expected; for the germs of the apostolic doctrine are found in the discourses of Christ, which were the common property of them all. Now, it is certainly natural to suppose that the different apostles, in developing the thoughts of Christ, would touch each other at some points. Peter and James had been a long time together discussing the same great principles. Is it strange, then, that there should be something in common with them when

¹ Einleitung, pp. 381-386.

² As an instance of this quoting, compare Isa. ii, 2-4 with Micah iv, 1-3; these prophets were contemporary.

they write? Paul, also, was in the company of the apostles and their companions, and there must have been a community of sentiment and thought, to a considerable extent at least.

Let us, then, consider the passages in this Epistle which De Wette and some others think are based on the Ephesians, because they are the only ones¹ that would create any difficulty. For the other Epistles of Paul (to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians) which might be supposed to have furnished the basis, at least a hint, for some of the thoughts and expressions in this Epistle, were written, in all probability, six or seven years before the First Epistle of Peter, while that to the Ephesians was written, perhaps, not more than one or two years earlier. Still, even in this case, there would be a possibility that the Epistle might have been seen by Peter before he wrote.

In the very beginning Peter declares to the Christians addressed that they "are elected according to the foreknowledge of God," while Paul, in Ephesians, declares that God "has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world" (chap. i, 4). But the same idea occurs in the Epistle to the Romans (chap. viii, 28, 29). Was Peter, indeed, dependent upon Paul for the doctrine of the foreknowledge of God and the election of Jews and Gentiles? This we cannot believe. Peter, in the Acts (ii, 23), represents Christ as having "been delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge² of God." Peter was the apostle who first preached the gospel to the Gentiles; and, after his speech in the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv), James says: "Simon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." What is this but election? And what was more natural than that Peter, in addressing Jewish and Gentile believers, should speak of their election independently of what Paul had written?

Peter has, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (chap. i, 3). Paul has, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. i, 3). Similar is Ephesians i, 3. But the phrase, "Blessed be the Lord God" (*εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεός*), very similar to the one in Peter and Paul, is based on an Old Testament formula, יהוה בָּרַךְ (Gen. ix, 26; xxiv, 27; Ezra vii, 27, etc.); so that Peter did not borrow this phrase from Eph i, 3. Even

¹If there had been passages in the Epistle based on Colossians and Philippians, the same difficulty would have presented itself, as these Epistles were written about the same time as Ephesians.

²The same word, *πρόγνωσις*, occurs both in this passage in the Acts and in 1 Pet i, 2, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

it he borrowed it from Paul, he could have taken it from 2 Cor. i, 3. In 1 Peter ii, 18 we have: "Servants, be in subjection to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." In Ephesians: "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ" (chap. vi, 5). In the first passage the Greek is, *οἱ οἰκέται, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις, κ. τ. λ.* In the second, *οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις μετὰ φόβου, κ. τ. λ.* It is thus seen that there is only *one* word in the Greek common to both passages. If the author of the Epistle under consideration had ever read this passage from Paul, is it likely that, in writing on the same subject, he would have hit upon a single word only of it, and that, too, in a different case? Besides, the ideas are only in part the same.

In chap. iii, 1, Peter says: "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that if any obey not the word, Other passages compared. they also may without the word be won by the conversation (deportment) of the wives." In Ephesians v, 22, 23 we find: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church," etc. Peter continues his remarks about wives in chap. iii, 2-6, in which there is nothing common to him with Ephesians. There is nothing common to the latter Epistle and that of Peter, except "Wives be in subjection to your own husbands." In the former the Greek is: *αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν (ὑποτασσόμεναι* to be supplied.) In the latter it is: *γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν.* Peter gives as the reason for the subjection of wives to husbands, and their correct deportment, that their husbands may be won over to the gospel by the godly example of the wives. Paul enjoins upon the wives subjection to their husbands, as to the Lord, even as Christ is the head of the Church; and as the Church is subject to Christ, so must wives be to their husbands. Now, in respect to the Greek common to both passages—on the supposition that Peter wished to enjoin subjection of wives to husbands—what other Greek could he have used? *Γυνή* is the only word in prose Greek for *wife*, and *ἀνὴρ*¹ is the only word in the New Testament used for *husband*. To express *subjection*, the word used in the New Testament is *ὑποτάσσω*, occurring thirty-eight times. But the general meaning of *γυνή*, rendered *wife*, is *woman*; and *ἀνὴρ*, rendered *husband*, strictly means *man*, so that another word was necessary to make the meaning definite, *ἴδιος, οὐν*. Let any one attempt to put into different English the phrase: "Wives, be subject to your

¹ *Γόσις* for *husband* rarely occurs in prose Greek, the common word being *ἀνὴρ*

husbands." We have no synonyme for wife, nor for husband, and the effort would be difficult. "Ye younger, submit yourselves to the elder, and all of you put on humility toward each other,¹ for God resisteth the proud," etc. (chap. v, 5). The nearest approximation to this in Ephesians is, "Being subject to each other in the fear of Christ" (chap. v, 2).¹ There is no probable reference in the former passage to the latter.

We have thus considered the passages adduced to show that the author of the Epistle was acquainted with the Epistle to the Ephesians, and have found no probable proof of such acquaintance; although, as we have already remarked, there is no improbability in the supposition that Peter may have seen some of the earlier Epistles of Paul, perhaps, also, that of James. But we must reject as destitute of proof, and, under the circumstances, as rather improbable, the claim that the author had ever seen the Epistle to the Ephesians, and thus the only ground at all plausible for the rejection of this Epistle of Peter is taken away.

The genuineness of this Epistle is vitally connected with the time of its composition. Schwegler, Baur, and Hilgenfeld refer its composition to the period of the persecution of the Christians under Trajan, about A. D. 113. Hilgenfeld contends that the references in the Epistle to the persecution of the Christians lead to that date. But the persecution of the Christians by Nero, about A. D. 64, to which Eichhorn, Hug, De Wette, Neander, and Ewald refer the allusions to sufferings, is to be accepted as the only one that fully accords with all the facts of the case.

In chap. i, 6 the persons addressed are represented as suffering various trials; and in chap. iv, 12 they are exhorted: "Beloved, be not surprised at the calamity (*πυρώσις*, *burning*) among you which is happening for your trial, as if a strange thing were befalling you." To which is added: "But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye. . . . But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters. Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be

¹The Greek of this clause is, Πάντες δε ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκυμβώσασθε, the reading adopted by both Tischendorf and Tregelles, and which is the reading of the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian Codices, and of the Peshito-Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian versions. De Wette has ὑποτασσόμενοι in his text. The omission of this takes away his chief ground of reference in this passage to Ephesians v, 21.

ashamed ; but let him glorify God on this behalf" (verses 13-16). In chap. ii, 12 the writer represents the Gentiles as speaking "against them as evil doers." Again he says, in respect to their former wicked lives: "They (the Gentiles) think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you" (chap. iv, 4).

From this it would appear that the cause of their sufferings was the false charges brought against them by their heathen neighbours—charges that originated in deep hatred of the Christians for their rejection of paganism, with all the splendid festivals connected with pagan worship. Under these circumstances the populace might rise up at almost any time against the Christians, and visit upon them terrible suffering, or bring them before the magistrates, and demand the infliction of punishment upon them as violators of the laws. All this could take place without the issuing of an edict by a Roman emperor, and without the prosecution of the Christians as such on the part of the Roman governors. And something similar occurred at Rome in the time of Nero. This wicked ruler, to destroy the rumour that he himself had set fire to Rome, attributed it, as Tacitus tells us, to a class of persons, "whom, hated for their crimes, the populace called Christians." Tacitus at the same time informs us that the punishment inflicted upon them was not so much on the charge of burning Rome as on *account of their hatred of the human race*,¹ that is, their contempt of paganism, which, as Christians, they felt and showed. It is clear, then, that they suffered as Christians; yet Hilgenfeld has the coolness to tell us that in this Epistle "the persecution under Nero cannot be intended, because in it the Roman Christians only were persecuted, and indeed as incendiaries; accordingly, on account of a definite crime of which they were accused. In our Epistle, on the contrary, the Christians as such (*ὡς Χριστιανοί*) are oppressed and ill-treated on account of their conduct in general, which was sought to be rendered suspicious as illegal and immoral" (*ὡς κακοποιοί*).²

But how does Hilgenfeld know that the persecution under Nero was limited to the Roman Christians? Is it not in itself very probable that the example set by Nero would be followed by the pagans in various parts of the empire? Suppose the Sultan of Turkey should institute a persecution of the Christians at Constantinople, how soon the example would be followed in the empire where the Mohammedans are in the ascendancy Suetonius, in describing the times of Nero, says: "The

The date given by Hilgenfeld improbable.

¹ Haud perinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis, convicti sunt.—*Anal.*, lib. xv, cap. xliv.

² Einleitung, p 638, 639.

Christians, a race of men of a new and wicked superstition, were punished." ¹ It is evident from his language that they were punished as Christians, nor does he limit this persecution to Rome.

It does not appear from the Epistle of Peter that legal investigations and persecutions were instituted against the Christians as such; and in this respect the state of things to which reference is made in the Epistle is more suitable to the latter times of Nero (about A. D. 64 and after) than to the latter times of Trajan (A. D. 112 and after), when Pliny, as governor of Pontus and Bithynia, punished them on account of their Christian profession, even when he had ascertained that they were guilty of no crimes. ² The Epistle of Peter is addressed to the Christians of five provinces, of which Pliny, about A. D. 111-113, governed but two, Bithynia and Pontus. The other three were then under governors respecting whose treatment of the Christians we know nothing. Yet this Epistle represents the Christians of the five provinces suffering the same afflictions with the rest of the world (chap. v, 9), and makes no discrimination respecting provinces. This does not suit well the time of Pliny's governorship. Merivale remarks, respecting the reply of Trajan to Pliny: "Trajan carefully limits his decision to the particular case and locality." ³

While we thus think it highly probable that the Epistle was written about A. D. 64 or 65, during the persecution under Nero, the references in it might suit some other persecution, not instituted by civil authority, but rather an outburst of pagan fanaticism against the Christians, such as is sometimes known in modern times in Mohammedan lands. The references to persecutions occupy but a small portion of the Epistle. Nor does it appear that there were many cases in which the Christians addressed were suffering the death penalty.

Hilgenfeld supposes the Epistle was written at Rome, ⁴ about A. D. 113, by a Christian of that city, during the persecution of the Christians of Bithynia and Pontus (described by Pliny the Younger, in his Epistle to Trajan ⁵), to strengthen them in their sufferings. That is, the Epistle was forged in the name of the Apostle Peter, about *forty-five years after his death*, and was everywhere received throughout the provinces of Asia Minor. Its universal reception in these provinces is certain. For we find

¹ Nero, cap. xvi.

² See Epistle xcvi of Pliny to Trajan.

³ History of the Romans under the Empire, vol. vii, p. 292.

⁴ In this case it would be astonishing that the forger did not represent it as written from Rome, where it was well-known that Peter spent the last days of his life, instead of from the obscure Babylon.

⁵ Epistola xcvi.

that it was used by Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, a disciple of the Apostle JOHN (in his Epistle, written about A. D. 115); by Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia; was attributed to Peter by Irenæus, bishop of Lyons (A. D. 177-202), who spent the earlier part of his life in Asia Minor; and it was admitted into the Peshito-Syriac version of the New Testament (made about A. D. 150), used in an adjacent region. The fact of its admission into this version is of great value, as the Second Epistle of Peter, that of Jude, the Second and Third of JOHN, and the Apocalypse, were never received into it. We also know that it was received without doubt all through the ancient Christian world.

Now, it is clear that the Christians of Asia Minor, as early at least as A. D. 115, accepted this Epistle as that of Peter, and if it was forged about that time and sent to them they must have believed that Peter was still living, though Clement of Rome had already stated in his Epistle to the Corinthians, written in the last part of the first century, that he had died as a martyr. This is, indeed, incredible. Or did the suffering Christians of the time of Pliny's governorship believe that Peter foresaw their sufferings, and to meet their case wrote the Epistle and delivered it to Silvanus to keep for *forty or fifty years*, until the emergency for which it was written should arise, when he was to deliver it to them? But this supposition is equally incredible with the former. It accordingly follows that it was written in the lifetime of Peter, and to this result internal evidence conducts us. In chap. iv, 7, it is said, "But the end of all things is at hand," which indicates that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. We find in various places indications that the persons addressed had been living at one time in paganism, and, consequently, that they belong to the apostolic age. "Not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance," is the language of chap. i, 14. Again: "Who in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God" (chap. ii, 10). "For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles," etc. (chap. iv, 3). Another indication of its belonging to the apostolic age is to be found in the way in which the writer speaks of Church officers. "The elders who are among you," says he, "I exhort, who am also an elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ. . . Feed the flock of God which is among you," etc. (chap. v, 1, 2) From this it is clear that the distinction between the bishop as presiding presbyter and the other presbyters was not yet made. This pertains to apostolic times.

The modest way in which Peter styles himself simply a "fellow-presbyter" and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, is a mark of

genuineness. Who in the second century would have put such language as this into the mouth of this great apostle? No reason can be assigned for the forgery of such a document, especially while Peter was still living. Nor is it easy to see how it could have been so skilfully executed as to deceive all antiquity, in which no vestige of suspicion appears. The Epistle was sent to the Churches through Silvanus, a former companion of Paul, as appears from its close Paul and Silas had preached the gospel in Galatia and the neighbouring regions about A. D. 52, before which time it is probable that few Christians were found there. The apostle himself states the design of his writing: "By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you as I suppose, I have written briefly, exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand." Neander well observes that the teachers of certain errors "accused Paul of falsifying the original Christian doctrine, and had appealed to the authority of the elder apostles in behalf of the continued obligation of the Mosaic law. Peter availed himself of the opportunity for addressing these Churches, in order to establish them in the conviction that the doctrine announced to them by Paul and his disciples and companions, of whom Silvanus was one, was genuine Christianity."¹

The genuineness of this Epistle has also been acknowledged by Hug, Schleiermacher, Bleek, and others. Ewald supposes that the Epistle was composed by Silvanus under the instructions of Peter. Renan thinks it was written a short time before Nero's persecution, and that Peter in its composition availed himself of the assistance of Silvanus; and De Wette remarks: "The hypothesis of its composition by an assistant in the name and with the knowledge of Peter, we leave undecided."²

Nothing has been adduced by the sceptical school to cast suspicion upon this noble document, and it has come down to us attested in the strongest manner as the product of the eminent apostle and eyewitness of the life of Christ.

PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

The place of its composition is determined from the salutations near the end: "The Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you (*ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή*), saluteth you; and so doth Marcus my son." The word *ἐκκλησία*, *Church*, is wanting in the Greek MSS. It is found, however, in the Codex Sinaiticus; the Peshito-Syriac, the Vulgate, and the Armenian versions also contain the word for Church. Neander thinks that instead of "Church" we are to understand Peter's wife, but it seems

The Epistle
written from
Babylon.

¹ Planting and Training, p. 374.

² Einleitung, p. 386.

improbable that he should speak of her as a fellow-elect in Babylon, and it seems best to supply *ἐκκλησία* (Church).

It is clear from this salutation that the Epistle was written in Babylon, or, at least, in its vicinity. But the question as to what Babylon is intended has been much disputed. Yet we can hardly suppose that a native of Palestine, or one living in Western Asia, could mean by this name any other place than the well-known city of Babylon on the Euphrates.¹ In the apostolic age a considerable number of Jews were found at this ancient site.² Some of the ancients, as well as of the moderns, regard Babylon as a symbolical name for Rome. It is true that Rome in the Apocalypse is called Babylon, but that is a book of symbols; and in an Epistle of a plain practical nature, written before the Apocalypse, such a name for Rome is extremely improbable. The symbolical exposition was quite natural for those fathers who held that Peter was for many years bishop of the Roman metropolis, from which it was to be expected that the Epistle would be written.

The Epistle was sent, as already stated, to the Christians of Asia Minor by Silvanus (Silas). There is nothing improbable in the supposition that he was with Peter at Babylon Sent by Silvanus. A. D. 64 or 65, as he no longer appears as the companion of Paul after A. D. 57. From the salutation, it seems that the Evangelist Mark was also with Peter. In this there is nothing strange, as Mark was an acquaintance of his, and Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians (about A. D. 63 or 64), speaks of the possibility of Mark's coming to them, and gives directions respecting him (chap. iv, 10). In Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy (about A. D. 68) Mark is spoken of as being in the East (chap. iv, 11). It is, therefore, very probable that, about A. D. 63 or 64, Mark visited Colossæ and the adjacent regions, then went to Babylon to see Peter, and made known to him the affairs of the Churches in Asia Minor, upon the receipt of which information the apostle addressed his Epistle to these Churches.

CONTENTS.

Peter reminds his readers of their election to the privileges of the gospel, of the glorious inheritance awaiting them through the resurrection of Christ, speaks of their trials and consolation, refers to the fact that the redemption through Christ was predicted by the prophets, exhorts them to holiness of life, and affirms the permanency of the divine word (chap. i). He counsels them to lay aside malevolent

¹ Babylon, now old Cairo, on the Nile, a little south of the modern Cairo, is not to be thought of.

² As we have before seen.

feelings, deceit, and evil-speaking, and to grow up a spiritual people. He also reminds them of their high privileges, enjoins upon them obedience to rulers, to honour all men, to love the brotherhood, to fear God, and to honour the king. He gives directions to servants, and encourages his readers by the example of Christ to be patient under bad treatment (chap. ii). He describes the duties of wives and husbands, exhorts his readers to unanimity, to affection for each other, to pity and courtesy, to avoid returning evil for evil, to do good, and to follow peace. He encourages them in their suffering for righteousness' sake, exhorting them to have a good conscience, and to be able to give a reason for their hope, and refers to the suffering of Christ for our sins, his preaching to the spirits in prison, who were disobedient in the time of Noah, and alludes to the symbol of baptism (chap. iii). He urges them to purity of life, sobriety, watchfulness, and prayer, to cultivate love, hospitality, and to be faithful ministers of the divine gift, and stewards of the grace of God. He encourages them to endure their trials, but warns them not to suffer as evil-doers, and counsels them to have confidence in God (chapter iv). He gives directions to the presbyters respecting the feeding of the flock of God, encouraging them by the reward they shall receive; inculcates the obedience of the younger to the elder, humility, trust in God, sobriety, vigilance, resistance to the devil, reminding them that God will perfect, establish, strengthen, and settle them; and assures them that it is the true grace of God in which they stand. He concludes by sending salutations, and telling the brethren to greet each other with a kiss of charity (chap. v).

CHAPTER XXXIX.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.

THE Epistle is addressed "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ," which shows that it is an encyclical Epistle; yet in chap. iii, 1 the writer states, "This second Epistle, beloved, I now write unto you, in which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance."

CONTENTS.

The writer reminds his readers of the high privileges which they enjoy in the gospel, and enumerates the virtues which they are to

cultivate, and which will insure them admission into the everlasting kingdom of Christ. He states that he is soon to put off his earthly tabernacle, assures them of the truth of the gospel, affirms that he was a witness of the transfiguration of Christ, and directs them to give heed to the inspired prophecies of the Old Testament (chap. i). He describes a class of arrogant, covetous, licentious heretics, who are to appear in the Church, and sets forth the certainty of their fate from God's punishment of sin in the past history of the world. He points out the dreadful state of those who, once being saved from sin through Christ, have again turned to their iniquities (chap. ii). He describes a class of scoffers who will appear in the last days, and ask, Where is the promise of Christ's coming? He attributes the conduct of such scoffers to their voluntary ignorance. He declares that God is long-suffering toward men, but that Christ will certainly come to judgment. He affirms that all things shall be dissolved, but that new heavens and a new earth are expected, wherein dwelleth righteousness. In view of these things he exhorts his readers to diligence and steadfastness, and refers to the difficulties in Paul's Epistles touching these matters (chap. iii).

THE GENUINENESS OF THIS EPISTLE.

The writer of the First Epistle styles himself simply "Peter an Apostle of Jesus Christ;" in this he styles himself "Simon Peter," and refers to his being with Christ, and hearing the voice, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," when he was with him in the Mount of Transfiguration, which he calls "the holy mount." In chap. i, 14 he refers to Christ's foretelling his death, which he says is near. In this there seems to be a reference to John xxi, 18, 19. In chap. iii, 1 he states that this is his *Second* Epistle to his readers. We have already seen that this Epistle, from the first verse, seems to be a general one, while the first is directed to the Churches in certain provinces of Asia Minor.

Between chapters ii, iii, 1-3, of this Epistle and that of Jude there is a very striking resemblance. The most of the distinguished modern critics regard Jude as the original. The allusions in Jude to the Old Testament and to angels seem more natural than they do in Second Peter.

And if we look at the matter in the light of probabilities, it is far more probable that Jude should be the original than Second Peter, for if the latter had been already written, there would have been no need of Jude's single chapter, for it was substantially found in Second Peter. But in the latter the similar passages are simply

Similarity between passages of Second Peter and the Epistle of Jude.

indirect paraphrased quotations. The false teachers who have already appeared in Jude are predicted in Second Peter, and afterward described in such a way as to make it appear that they had already come upon the stage (chap. ii). It is not probable that Peter would have followed Jude in this way. If we look at the style of the two Epistles attributed to Peter, we find that the Greek of the Second is more elegant than that of the First.

Cureton has translated from the Syriac, and published in English, an oration of Melito the philosopher, addressed to Antoninus Cæsar. This Melito was bishop of Sardis about A. D. 160-170. In this work occur the following passages, in which the Second Epistle of Peter seems to have been in the mind of the writer. "At another time there was a flood of waters, and all men and living creatures were destroyed by the multitude of waters, and the just were preserved in an ark of wood by the ordinance of God. So also it will be at the last time; there shall be a flood of fire, and the earth shall be burnt up together with its mountains, and men shall be burnt up together with the idols which they have made, and with the graven images which they have worshipped; and the sea, together with its isles, shall be burnt,"¹ etc.

If this is a genuine oration of Melito—and the probabilities seem in its favour—the passage is the first probable reference to Second Peter, in which alone of the New Testament writings the doctrine of the destruction of the earth by fire is found. Yet it must be remembered that the Stoics taught that the world was destined to be destroyed by a vast conflagration. And it is possible that the idea in the oration of Melito may have come from that source, though it is more probable that it came from Second Peter.

Origen, in commenting on the book of Joshua, says, "Peter sounds the two trumpets of his Epistles."² But in Eusebius he says: "Peter left one acknowledged Epistle; let it be granted (that he left) a Second, for it is a matter of doubt"³ (*ἀμφιβάλλεται*). The Epistle is placed by Eusebius among the disputed books.⁴

It was received as Peter's by the following writers of the fourth century: by Athanasius,⁵ archbishop of Alexandria; Epiphanius,⁶ metropolitan bishop of Cyprus; Ambrose,⁷ bishop of Milan; Hilary,⁸ bishop of Poitiers in Gaul; Cyril⁹

Recognized generally in the fourth century.

A reference to Second Peter in Melito.

¹ Spicileg. Syriacum, p. 51. ² Hom. vii, in the translation of Rufinus into Latin.

³ In his Commentary on Psalm i, preserved by Eusebius, vi, cap. 25. ⁴ iii, 25

⁵ Oratio i, Contra Arianos, sec. 16.

⁶ Hæresis, lxvi, 64.

⁷ Comment. in Epist. ad Philip., cap. i.

⁸ Lib. i, 18, De Trinitate.

⁹ Catechesis iv, De Decem Dogmatibus, xxxvi.

bishop of Jerusalem; Gregory Nazianzen,¹ who, however, remarks that some thought but one Epistle of Peter should be received; Macarius,² the Egyptian; and by Didymus of Alexandria, who quotes, "Until the day dawn and the day star arise in your hearts" (chapter i, 19), as from the *Second Epistle of Peter*.

It was received by Augustine⁴ (about A. D. 400); and Jerome, of the same age, remarks that "Peter wrote two Epistles which are called Catholic; of which the second is denied by most persons to be his, on account of its style differing from that of the First Epistle."⁵ It was not received as canonical by Chrysostom,⁶ bishop of Constantinople (about A. D. 400). And Cosmas Indicopleustes (about A. D. 535) states that only three Catholic Epistles, that of James, one of Peter, and one of John, were found among the Syrians.⁷

This Epistle obtained a very general recognition among the writers of the fourth century, although they made little use of it. Though not found in the early Peshito-Syriac version, nor in the old Latin version, it was incorporated into the versions of the third and fourth centuries, namely: the Memphitic, Thebaic, Æthiopic, and Armenian.⁸ At the time of the Reformation its genuineness was denied by Calvin and Erasmus, at a later period by Grotius; and in recent times it has been rejected by Semler, Credner, De Wette, Huther, Neander, Bleek, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, and others. On the other hand, the genuineness of the Epistle has been defended by Michaelis, Hug, Pott, Heydenreich, and others. It is written with a great deal of vigor, and its moral and religious doctrines harmonize with those of the apostles, as set forth in their undoubted writings. This is especially true of the first chapter, which contains a list of the virtues to be added to faith in order to secure admission into heaven. There is one subject—the consummation of all things—respecting which it sets forth doctrines peculiar to itself. It represents the heavens and the earth as reserved unto the day of judgment, in which "the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat" (chap. iii, 12). Bertholdt regarded the Epistle as genuine with the exception of chapter ii,

The opinions of the reformers and of modern critics as to the genuineness of Second Peter.

¹ Carminum, lib. i, ii.

² Homily xxxix.

³ Lib. i, xxviii, De Trinitate. At the end of the short exposition of Second Peter by him found in a Latin translation, it is stated, "We must not be ignorant of the fact that this Epistle has been falsified (falsatam esse), which, although in public use (publicetur), is nevertheless not in the Canon." These words appear to have been added by the translator.

⁴ De Doctr. Christ., lib. ii, cap. viii.

⁵ De Vir. Illus. Petrus.

⁶ Synop. Scrip. Sacr.

⁷ Topog. Christ., lib. vii.

⁸ It was, no doubt, the Gothic version, but it is not found in the fragments of that version that have reached us.

while Ullmann held to the Petrine origin of chapter i only. But no good ground exists for making any such distinction; the whole must be ascribed to one author.

CHAPTER XL.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

THE PERSON OF JUDE.

THE writer of the Epistle styles himself "Jude the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James." But the question is, whether he is the apostle of that name, the brother of James (Luke vi, 16; Acts i, 13), or a uterine brother of Christ (Matt. xiii, 55)? By the writer calling himself the brother of James, we naturally infer that he means the well-known James, bishop of Jerusalem in the apostolic age, in which case his apostleship would depend on that of James, and stand or fall with it. Yet this inference is not certain.

Respecting the field of labour of the Apostle Jude nothing is known; and but little is known respecting Jude the brother of Christ (Matt. xiii, 55). It would seem that the latter remained in Judea, as the Emperor Domitian summoned his grandchildren, and made inquiry of them respecting their descent from David.¹

CONTENTS.

The Epistle is addressed to the saints in general, and consists of but a single chapter, of twenty-five verses, and is directed against a certain class of ungodly men who are turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and "denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." He refers to God's retributive justice in the punishment of disobedient Israel, of rebellious angels, and of the wicked men of Sodom and Gomorrah. He gives a vivid figurative description of these corrupt men who have crept into the Church, and represents them as speaking evil of dignities, while Michael the archangel did not use reproachful language toward the devil. He says that Enoch prophesied of these men, and of the Lord's coming to judgment. He affirms that the apostles of Christ foretold these lascivious mockers. He exhorts his readers to build themselves upon their most holy faith and keep themselves in the love of God, gives

¹ According to Hegesippus, in Eusebius' Hist. Eccles., iii, cap. xx.

them directions respecting the saving of sinners, and closes with an ascription of praise "to the only wise God our Saviour."

THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle is not found in the Peshito-Syriac version of the second century, but it is included in the Canon of Mu- Opinions of the fathers. ratori. We find no use of it made by Irenæus, but it is quoted by Clement¹ of Alexandria, and by Tertullian² of Carthage, as the Apostle Jude's. Origen says: "Jude wrote an Epistle of a few lines, but filled with words powerful in heavenly grace."³ He supposes its author was a brother of Christ. He also says: "If any one would also admit the Epistle of Jude, let him see,"⁴ etc. It appears that Origen had no doubt that the Epistle was written by Jude the brother of Christ, but the question was, its canonical authority. In the Latin translation of Origen on the Romans, Jude is quoted as an *apostle*. It is very improbable that Origen thus distinguished him; it is rather the designation of Rufinus, the translator, who took liberties with the text.

Eusebius places the Epistle among the disputed books.⁵ He remarks that it is one of the seven Epistles called Catholic, and that not many of the ancients have mentioned it. "We nevertheless know," says he, "that also these (the Epistles of James and Jude), along with the rest, have been publicly read in most Churches."⁶ It is contained in the Canon of Cyril⁷ of Jerusalem (about A.D. 350); a passage from it is given substantially by Athanasius.⁸ It is in the Canon⁹ of Gregory Nazianzen (about A. D. 375), who, however, remarks that some do not receive it.¹⁰ It was received by Didymus¹¹ of Alexandria and Rufinus¹² of Aquileia in the last half of the fourth century.

Jerome remarks¹³ on Jude: "He left a short Epistle, which is one of the seven Catholic Epistles. And because testimony from the

¹ "For I wish you to know," says Jude, "that God once having saved the people out of Egypt," etc. (ver. 5). *Pædagogi*, iii, cap. viii. Also, in reference to certain heresies he says: "I think Jude spoke prophetically concerning these and similar heresies, 'Likewise also these filthy dreamers,'" etc. (ver. 8). *Stromata*, iii, cap. ii.

² *De Cultu Foem.*, lib. i, cap. iii.

³ *Comment. in Matthæum*, tomus x.

⁴ *Ibid.*, tomus xvii, 30. Both of these passages we have taken from the Greek text of Origen.

⁵ *Hist. Eccles.*, iii, cap. 25.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ii, cap. 23.

⁷ *Catechesis iv, De Decem Dogmatibus*, xxxvi.

⁸ *Comment. in Psalmum*, 149

⁹ *Carminum*, lib. i.

¹⁰ *Idem.*, lib. ii.

¹¹ He wrote an exposition of it.

¹² *Commentarium in Symb. Apostol.*, 37.

¹³ *Lib. de Viris Illus. Judas.*

apocryphal Book of Enoch is used in it, it is rejected by very many persons; nevertheless, it has acquired authority by antiquity and use, and is reckoned among the sacred Scriptures." It was not, however, received by Chrysostom.¹

The Epistle, though not found in the ancient Syriac version, was contained in the Memphitic, Thebaic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions, and in all probability in the old Latin version, as the Epistle is attributed by Tertullian to Jude the apostle.

The Christian writers of the early centuries made little use of this Epistle, a fact readily explained by its brevity. Modern opinion. Luther judged it to be of little value, and this was also the opinion of Grotius, Michaelis, and Schleiermacher. De Wette² attributes it to Jude the brother of the Lord, not to the apostle of that name. Neander³ is also inclined to attribute the Epistle to the same Jude, and to him it is confidently ascribed by Bleek. Hilgenfeld denies that it was written either by Jude the apostle, or by the brother of the Lord of that name, and refers its composition to a period not earlier than A. D. 140.⁵ De Wette⁶ observes that most critics recognize the Epistle as genuine.

The author does not profess to be an apostle, styling himself simply a *servant* of Jesus Christ, and brother of James; and his language seems to exclude him from the number of the apostles: "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were before spoken by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how they told you there should be mockers in the last time." This language also indicates that the Epistle was written after the death of at least most of the apostles.

Now, the very fact that the author does not wish to pass for an apostle, and intimates that the apostolic age was quite past, takes away from the Epistle all suspicion of forgery. Nor is there any thing in it that might not have been written by Jude the brother of the Lord, who was no apostle.

But there is a grave objection to its being regarded as the writing of the *Apostle* Jude. In verses 14, 15 he quotes the apocryphal Book of Enoch,⁷ written about the time of Christ, as a genuine production: "And Enoch also, the

¹ Synopsis Scrip. Sac.

² Einleitung, pp. 407-409.

³ Planting and Training, etc., p. 392.

⁴ Einleitung, pp. 642-648.

⁵ Einleitung, pp. 739-744.

⁶ Einleitung, p. 410

⁷ This book of Enoch has in modern times been found in the Ethiopic language, and was translated into English and published by Dr. Laurence in 1821. In 1853 the celebrated Ethiopic scholar, Dillmann, published a German translation of the book, with explanations.

seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of the saints, to execute judgment upon all," etc. Tertullian uses the fact that Jude has quoted this book as a proof of its prophetic character.¹

In verse 9 the Epistle says: "Yet Michael the archangel, when, contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Here the writer quotes an apocryphal book called *Ἀνάληψις Μωϋσέως* (The Ascension of Moses), as is evident from the following passage of Origen, in which, speaking concerning the seduction of Eve by the serpent, he remarks: "Concerning which, in the *Ascension of Moses*—which little book the Apostle² Jude mentions in his Epistle—Michael the archangel, disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, says, That the serpent inspired by the devil was the cause of the sin of Adam and Eve."³

THE TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

It is probable that the book was written a few years after the destruction of Jerusalem, as the Epistle itself indicates that the apostolic age was past. But there is nothing in it to indicate that it was written in the second century, as the men against whom the Epistle is directed are found in the Church itself, not, as the heretics of the second century, outside of the Church. Heretical teachers are referred to, both in the Apocalypse and in some of the later Epistles of Paul.

Credner and Ewald place its composition about A. D. 80; Bleek a short time before the destruction of Jerusalem.



CHAPTER XLI.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF JOHN.

THIS is one of the seven Catholic Epistles, and is addressed to no particular Church, but is rather of an encyclical character. The writer clearly sets forth the design of his writing: "These things

¹ De Cultu Foem., i, cap. iii.

² This is the Latin translation of Rufinus, and the title Apostle was doubtless given by the translator, as Origen, in his Greek Commentary on Matthew, says that this Jude was one of the brothers of Christ mentioned in Matt. xiii, 55.

³ Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, lib. iii, cap. ii, sec. i.

have I written unto you that ye may know that ye have eterna life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God" (chap. v, 13). It is possible that the writer may have had in his mind some of the corrupters of the true doctrine concerning Christ, especially Cerinthus, when he wrote: "This is he who came by water and by blood, Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and by blood" (chap. v. 6).

Cerinthus appeared in Asia Minor in the last part of the first century, and taught "that Jesus was not born of a virgin, but was the son of Joseph and Mary, born like all the rest of men, and became more just and wise (than they). And after his baptism the Christ came down into him from the power above the universe, in the form of a dove. And then he proclaimed the unknown Father, and performed miracles; and at last the Christ flew away from Jesus, and Jesus suffered and rose again, but the Christ remained impassible, a spiritual being."¹ In opposition to this John declares that Christ passed through baptism and through death. But in the passage: "Every spirit that acknowledgeth that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus² is not of God" (chap. iv, 2, 3), there seems to be a simple reference to the reception or rejection of Christ.

The main purpose of the Epistle is to enforce practical piety; the The purpose of this Epistle. censure of heretical doctrines occupies a subordinate position. The attempt of Hilgenfeld to find in it traces of the gnosticism of the second century is an entire failure. He says that the writer (chap. iii, 9) uses the gnostic expression *σπέρμα* (seed). Now, it is true that the Valentinians, who derived their tenets from Valentinus (after A. D. 140), and were refuted by Iræneus (about A. D. 180), did use the word in about the same sense as John, but it is ridiculous to suppose that the author of the Epistle derived the word from them, especially as they made great use of John's Gospel, and doubtless used the Epistle also.

ITS GENUINENESS.

We have already seen, in discussing the genuineness of John's Fully accepted by the Church. Gospel, that this Epistle was everywhere used by the early Church from the first part of the second century and was found in all the ancient versions of the New Testament. Nowhere does there appear a doubt of its having been written by

¹ Hippolytus, *Hæres. Omnium Confutatio*, lib. vii, 33.

² We follow the critical text of Tischendorf and Tregelles, and omit *Χριστόν ἐσ σαρκί ἐληλυθότα*, "Christ having come in the flesh."

the Apostle John. It bears the clearest internal evidence of having proceeded from an eyewitness of the life of Christ, and from the author of the fourth Gospel.

THE TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

As the Apostle John spent the latter part of his life at Ephesus, where he died in the beginning of Trajan's reign (about A. D. 98), the Epistle must have been written before that time, though it is impossible to say how long. It was probably written between A. D. 80 and 90; but we cannot determine whether before or after the author wrote his Gospel.

CONTENTS.

The author begins by declaring that the manifestations of Christ, which have been the objects of his senses, he proclaims to his readers, that they may share with him a divine fellowship, and that their joy may be full. He affirms that God is light, and that our profession of communion with him while we walk in darkness is false; but that by walking in the light we have communion with him, and are cleansed from sin through Christ. We deceive ourselves by denying that we are sinners, and make God a liar; but by confessing our sins we shall find forgiveness and deliverance (chap. i).

He states that Christ is our advocate with God, and the propitiation for the sins of all men, and that our knowledge of Christ is shown by our obedience to him. He lays great stress upon love, without which we cannot enjoy the light. He describes the different classes of the saints to whom he writes, warns them against the love of the world, refers to antichrists, and presupposes on the part of his readers a divine guidance, and exhorts them to continue in the truth that they may have confidence at Christ's coming (chap. ii).

He reminds them of their high privileges and glorious hopes, and urges them to holy living. He gives the characteristics of the sinner and the saint, makes love a prominent trait of the latter, and affirms that he who hates his brother is a murderer. He insists upon practical benevolence as a test of our love to God, and religious acts, not mere words. He shows that a good conscience is the ground of confidence toward God. The keeping of his commandment, to believe in Christ and love each other, gives us confidence in prayer. God's spirit in us is the proof of his presence (chap. iii).

He exhorts them to try the spirits, affirming that their acceptance or rejection of Christ is the test of their truth, or falsehood. He reminds them that their victory over the unbelieving men of the world is of God; and affirms that those who are of God hear him (the writer); but those who are not, hearken not. He exhorts them to

love each other, as love is the test of their knowing God, and declares that perfect love casts out all fear (chap. iv).

Those who have faith in Christ are born of God, and love him and Christ. To love God is to keep his commandments, which are not oppressive. He affirms that our faith in Christ is the victory over the world; that Christ came by water and by blood, and that there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the water and the blood; that we ought to receive God's testimony concerning his Son, in whom we have eternal life. He says that his design in writing is that they may believe in Christ and have eternal life. He expresses confidence in the efficacy of prayer, speaks of a sin unto death, and affirms that while the whole world lies in wickedness, they who are born of God are kept from sin and from Satan, and that the Son of God has given them understanding to know Christ, who is the true God and eternal life (chap. v).

THE GENUINENESS OF CHAP. V, 7.

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, The Father, the Chapter v, 7. Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." spurious.

The above is the reading of the English version, based on the received text, but the verse is certainly spurious, as it is wanting in the three most ancient MSS. of the New Testament, the Codices Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus of the middle of the fourth century, and the Alexandrinus of the latter part of the fifth century, and in the Peshito-Syriac of about the middle of the second century. If we begin with chapter v, 6, we read as follows in the Codex Vaticanus, and in this very ancient version: "This is he who came by water and by blood, Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and by blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, for the Spirit is truth; because there are three that bear witness, the Spirit and the water and the blood, and the three are for (agree in) one. If we receive the testimony of men,"¹ etc. The verse under consideration is wanting, also, as Tischendorf informs us, in all the Greek MSS. except two, one of the *sixteenth* century, the other, a Greek-Latin, of about the *fifteenth* century. It is wanting in the Peshito-Syriac, as we have already seen, and in the Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions; and in the Codex

¹ The text of Tischendorf and Tregelles, which gives substantially the reading of the three most ancient MSS., is: "Οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια. ὅτι τρεῖς εἶσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἶμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν. Cod. Sinait. adds πνεύματος after αἵματος; the Cod. Alex. does the same, and has πνεύματι instead of ὕδατι in verse 6

Amiatino of Florence, of the sixth century, containing Jerome's Latin version.

Not only is the authority of MSS. and versions opposed to the genuineness of the verse, but Tischendorf remarks: "It is likewise condemned by all the Greek Fathers, who cultivated letters in the first ten centuries after Christ and later. But the interpolation is a Latin one, although it remained unknown to the most ancient and the most celebrated Latin Codices and Fathers themselves, nor was it published by Jerome. It seems first to have made its appearance, according to the testimony of the *Speculum*, rather in the fourth than in the fifth century, although in these centuries, and also afterward, there were many, as Augustine and Jerome, as Leo the Great († 461; he copied the whole context of John, in his celebrated Epistle to Flavian, read in the Council of Chalcedon) and Facundus († about 570), who condemned the text by their silence. It is an error of an exceedingly grave character, if any persons, because the Church of Christ teaches the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, have thought that they should especially depend upon these words foisted upon John."¹ Tregelles remarks: "The more ancient Latin Codices do not contain these words. They were first inserted on the margin of Latin Codices, and afterward in the text."

In the first printed text of the Greek New Testament, published in 1514 as a part of the Complutensian Polyglot, 1 John v, 7 was inserted. The famous Erasmus then inquired of Stunica by what authority the editors had inserted that verse, "and whether they really had MSS. so different from any that Erasmus himself had seen: to this the answer was given by Stunica, 'You must know that the copies of the Greeks are corrupted; that *ours*, however, contain the very truth.'"² Erasmus omitted the verse in the first two editions of his Greek Testament; but in his third edition, published in 1522, he inserted the verse, since, he said, it was contained in a Greek MS. found among the English, that by so doing he might avoid calumny.³ After this it made its appearance in "the editions of Robert Stephens, 1546-1569; in the editions of Beza, 1565-1576. From them it passed over into the editions of the Elzevirs" (Tischendorf).

First appearance of this verse in the printed text of the Greek Testament.

¹ From the Latin of his Eighth Critical Edition of the Greek Testament.

² Tregelles, *Account of the Printed Text of the New Testament*, pp. 9, 10.

³ He states that he suspects that this verse in the Greek Codex has been inserted to conform it to the Latin Codices, and yet, to avoid calumny, he inserts it. No wonder he had not courage enough to embrace the Reformation.

CHAPTER XLII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN.

THIS Epistle contains but thirteen verses, and, according to the English version, it is addressed to "the elect lady." Neander and Bleek take the Greek word, *κυρία*, rendered *lady*, for the proper name of the woman, *Kuria*, in English *Cyria*, which De Wette favours. Robinson observes that the name was not "unusual among the Greeks" (Greek Lexicon). This view seems quite probable, as it is likely the woman's name would be given, as the man's name (Gaius) is given in the Third Epistle. The writer expresses his love for her and her children as possessors of the truth, and his joy in finding them walking in the truth, and urges upon them the duty of loving each other, and walking after the commandments of God. He warns them against deceivers, who do not acknowledge that Christ has come in the flesh, and affirms that the only way to possess the Father is to abide in the doctrine of the Son. He warns them against receiving into their house or imploring God's favour upon those who teach a different doctrine. He has much to write, but prefers to speak face to face, as he expects to come shortly to her.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE.

This Epistle was, doubtless, written by the Apostle John, as it bears the genuine impress of his writing; nor does the fact that the writer calls himself simply "The elder" militate against the apostolic authorship.

Irenæus¹ quotes verse 11, with the prefix: "For John, the disciple of the Lord, says." Clement of Alexandria quotes 1 John v, 16, 17 with the remark: "And John is seen to show in *the larger* Epistle that there are different kinds of sins."² This shows that he recognized at least two Epistles of John. Tertullian, discussing long quotations which he had taken from the First Epistle of John, speaks of them as what John asserts in his "First Epistle" (*in prima quidem Epistola*³), which shows his knowledge of one other at least. Cyprian quotes numerous passages from the First Epistle of John; he *never* quotes it, however, as the *First* Epistle, but speaks of it as *his* Epistle

¹ *Contra Hæreses*, lib. i, cap. xvi, 3.

² *Stromata*, ii, cap. xv.

³ *Liber de Pudicitia*, cap. xix.

nor does he give any hint of another. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria about the middle of the third century, speaks of a Second and a Third Epistle ascribed to the Apostle John.¹ Origen, after remarking that the Apostle John left one Epistle of a very few lines, adds: "Let it be granted (that he left) a Second and a Third; for all do not affirm that these are genuine, but both of them are not of a hundred lines."² Eusebius, after stating that the First Epistle of John was acknowledged without dispute, both by the Christians of his time and by the ancients, says: "But the remaining two are disputed."³

In the Canon of Muratori two Epistles of John are recognized, of which one is our First Epistle, from which a part of the first verse is given. It is very probable that the other is our present Second Epistle. This Epistle, and also the Third of John, are wanting in the ancient Syriac version; nor were they received by the Syrian Church in the first half of the sixth century, according to the testimony of Cosmas Indicopleustes who flourished at that time. It is, however, found in the Memphitic, Thebaic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions. Jerome remarks that the Second and Third Epistles of John "are asserted to be those of the presbyter John, of whom another tomb is shown, even to-day, at Ephesus, although some suppose that both monuments belong to the same John the evangelist."⁴

The Epistle was not in the canon of Chrysostom, but it formed a part of that of Cyril of Jerusalem, of Rufinus, of Epiphanius, and of Augustine. Its genuineness is acknowledged by Bleek and Neander, and favoured by De Wette.

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN.

THE address of this Epistle is: "The elder to the beloved Gaius." Several persons of this name are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (xix, 29; xx, 4), and in the Epistle to the Romans (xvi, 23), and in the First to the Corinthians (chap. i, 14). The same person is referred to in the two passages of Paul's Epistles; and it appears that he lived at Corinth. Another Gaius was of Derbe, and a third is called a Macedonian. But it is not probable that any of these is the Gaius here addressed, who probably lived in Asia Minor not very far from Ephesus.

¹ In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vii, cap. xxv.

² Ibid., vi, cap. xxv.

³ Ibid., iii, cap. xxiv.

⁴ De Viris Illustribus. Joannes

The apostle having learned of the piety of Gaius, and the hospitality he had shown to Christian missionaries, who were of the Jewish nation it would seem, writes the Epistle to him to express his hearty approval of his conduct. He prays that the prosperity and health of Gaius may be equal to his piety. He states that, notwithstanding the fact that he had written to the Church to aid the Christian missionaries, Diotrophes not only does not receive them, but also speaks evil of him, and prevents those willing to do this service and casts them out of the Church.

He exhorts Gaius not to imitate the evil but the good, affirming that he who does good is of God, but that the evil doer has not seen God. He observes that all men and the truth itself bear witness to Demetrius, to which testimony he adds his own. He adds that he has many things to write, but is not willing to put them upon paper, as he expects to see Gaius shortly, and closes with salutations.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle bears the impress of John's style, and, doubtless, was written by him. Though not found in the Peshito-Syriac version, it was nevertheless incorporated into the Memphitic, Thebaic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions. It is also found in the canon of Cyril, Rufinus, and Augustine, though it had been placed among the disputed writings by Origen and Eusebius. Gregory Nazianzen reckoned it among the canonical books, though he says that some acknowledge but one Epistle of John.

Its genuineness is acknowledged by Bleek,¹ and favoured by Neander² and De Wette.³ We have not been able to find extracts from it in the Fathers of the first three centuries after Christ; but this is not at all surprising when we remember its brevity, and the fact that it was addressed to a private individual.

The principal source of doubt respecting the Second and Third of John's Epistles arose from his styling himself "The elder," and from the fact that they were excluded from the Syriac version, and because they had been doubtless but little read in the earliest Church, as being private letters, and had been seldom or never quoted by the earliest ecclesiastical writers.

¹ Einleitung, pp. 596, 697.

² Planting and Training, etc., pp. 409, 410

³ Einleitung, pp. 403, 404.

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE APOCALYPSE.

THIS book, which closes the canon of Holy Scripture, is almost wholly unlike any other of the New Testament. No part of the Bible is so highly symbolical; it abounds in the most striking and awful imagery. Nothing can be more sublime than the description of our Saviour in the opening chapter; and the mighty events in the history of the Church are set forth in symbols and language of almost equal sublimity. Even the addresses to the seven Churches, which, of course, are didactic, assume an earnest and lofty tone. John reaches the loftiest heights without effort. He borrows, it is true, a part of his imagery from the Hebrew prophets, but he by no means slavishly copies them; in some respects he surpasses them. His descriptions are more lifelike and more terrible. He carries us to the throne of God, shows us the eternal, the magnificent court of heaven, the glorified saints, and the forces and weapons which the Almighty employs in the destruction of his foes. But amid all the storms of divine wrath, amid thunderings and earthquakes, he never loses sight of God's people; he represents them as secure.

This divine panorama, beginning with the appearance of Christ in a glorified state, unfolds the mighty conflict waged for centuries between Christianity and paganism, resulting in the complete overthrow of the latter, and closes with the resurrection of the dead, eternal judgment, and the creation of a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

ITS LINGUISTIC CHARACTER.

The linguistic character of the book is remarkable. It has more Hebraisms and irregular constructions than any other in the New Testament. The following are examples of Hebraisms: *Οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν*, κ. τ. λ. (chap. vii, 2), literally, *to whom it was given to them* to hurt the earth, the relative and the personal pronoun, both used for the relative simply; "*Ὁν ἀριθμῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο*, *which* no one was able to number *it* (chap. vii, 9); *ἣν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι αὐτήν*, *which* no one is able to shut *it* (chap. iii, 8); *ὧν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν*, of *which* the number of *them* (chap. xx, 8). That these construc-

Numerous Hebraisms of the Apocalypse.

English. 'Απὸ ὃ ὦν καὶ ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἐρχόμενος, *From him who is, and who was, and who is to come* (chap. i, 4). Here we would expect the genitive after ἀπὸ; it is probable, however, that the phrase ὃ ὦν was regarded as indeclinable. 'Ο νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ, κ. τ. λ., *The one who conquers, to him will I give to sit down with me*, etc. (chap. iii, 21), is obviously an *anacoluthon*. Anomalous is the connecting of the present and the future tense by καί: "Ἐρχομαί σοί καὶ κινήσω τῆν λυχνίαν σου, κ. τ. λ., *I am coming to thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick* (chap. ii, 5).

There are some other irregularities, but not of so striking a character. But, after all, the most of the language is as regular in its construction as it is in the other books of the New Testament, and scarcely less so than in some parts of Thucydides.

THE TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons (A. D. 177-202), is the first writer who bears testimony to the time of the composition of the Apocalypse: "For had it been necessary," says he, "that his name (the name of the Apocalyptic beast) should be clearly announced at this present time, it certainly would have been proclaimed by him who saw the Apocalypse. For it was seen not a long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the end of the reign of Domitian."¹ According to this statement, the book was written about A. D. 95, as Domitian's reign extended from A. D. 81 to 96. This testimony is valuable from the fact that Irenæus spent the early part of his life in Asia Minor, and was acquainted with Polycarp, a disciple of John. Yet Irenæus may have obtained no traditional knowledge upon the subject, and may have determined the time by critical conjecture.

Most probably written in the time of Nero.

Clement of Alexandria, president of its catechetical school (A. D. 191-200), states that John "returned to Ephesus from the island Patmos, when the tyrant was dead."² He does not state what tyrant, and yet it is probable that by this term he designates the emperor who was pre-eminently *the tyrant, Nero*. But if Domitian is the tyrant to whom Clement refers, then the return of John from Patmos could not have been earlier than the close of the year 96, as Domitian was assassinated in September of that year. John probably did not live more than two or three years after his return, as Irenæus states that he lived until the times of Trajan, whose reign began A. D. 98. Nor is it probable that he survived long after the beginning of this monarch's reign, as at this time he must have been between ninety and one hundred years of age.

¹ Lib v, cap. xxx, sec. 3.

² Lib. Quis Dives Salvetur, cap. xlii.

Now, the incidents that Clement relates of John, after the return from Patmos to Ephesus, cannot well be crowded into two or three years, and some of them do not suit a man of his age at that time. Clement states that after John returned to Ephesus from Patmos he went by invitation to the neighbouring nations, where he appointed bishops and organized Churches, and while engaged in this work he saw a young man of fine form and mien, whom he intrusted to the bishop of the place, to be trained in Christianity, after which the apostle departed to Ephesus. "The presbyter, having taken home the young man intrusted to him, nourished, kept, cherished, and finally instructed him." But after he had baptized the young man, he somewhat relaxed his diligent care of him. In the course of time the young man is corrupted by some of his own age, whom he forms into a band of robbers, and becomes their leader. John visited the bishop, and demanded of him the ward he had committed to him. The apostle was informed that the young man was dead to God and had become a robber, upon which, exhibiting strong marks of grief, John borrowed a horse and went in pursuit of him, and was conducted by a guide to his abode. The young man is brought to a knowledge of his guilt, weeps bitterly, and is restored to the Church.¹

It seems utterly impossible, at least very improbable, that all this could have occurred after the year 96, and that John at his great age should have travelled on foot through the regions adjacent to Ephesus. Hence we are led to infer that his return from Patmos must have been years earlier, and that the tyrant to whom Clement refers was Nero.

Origen, in commenting on Matt. xx, 23, remarks: "The king of the Romans, as tradition teaches, condemned John, who bore testimony on account of the word of truth, to the island of Patmos. John shows the following things concerning his own testimony, not stating who condemned him, affirming in the Apocalypse: 'I John, who am your brother,' etc., . . . and it appears that he saw the Apocalypse in the island."² From this it seems that Origen was not certain what emperor had banished John to Patmos.

Tertullian of Carthage, speaking of the sufferings of Peter and Paul at Rome, says: "Where the Apostle John, after he had been thrown into boiling oil and received no injury, is banished to an

¹We have abridged Clement's account, which he calls "no fable, but a real narrative respecting John the Apostle." *Quis Dives Salvetur?* cap. xlii. Clement as early as A. D. 170 or 175 travelled extensively in western Asia and in southern Europe, and in various places he had Christian teachers. The narrative bears the stamp of truth.

²Tomus xvi, 6.

island.”¹ It would seem from the context that Tertullian referred the banishment to the time of Nero. No reliance is to be placed upon the statement that John was thrown into boiling oil. Had it been true, we doubtless would have heard of it from some other writers.

Eusebius, speaking of the persecution of the Christians by Domitian, remarks: “At this time it is reported (*κατέχει λόγος*, the story goes) that the Apostle, and at the same time evangelist, John, being still alive, was condemned to dwell in the island Patmos on account of his testimony to the divine word.”²

Mention of the time of banishment by Eusebius and Jerome.

Epiphanius in the last half of the fourth century states that John returned from Patmos in the time of Claudius Cæsar³ (A. D. 41-54) Jerome says that “John wrote the Apocalypse when banished to the island Patmos by Domitian, who, after Nero, stirred up a second persecution in the fourteenth year of his reign.”⁴

The titlepage of the Apocalypse in the Syriac version states that the book was written in Nero’s time.⁵ The value of this testimony, however, is diminished by the fact that the present version of the Apocalypse in Syriac does not belong to the Peshito, but to the Philoxenian version, made about A. D. 500.

There is nothing satisfactory in the foregoing statements of the early fathers respecting John’s banishment, yet the most of the testimony points to the reign of Domitian as the period during which John’s abode in Patmos occurred, and consequently when the book was written. But internal evidence points rather to the latter part of Nero’s reign as the time of its composition (about A. D. 68). The author himself states that he was in the island called Patmos for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus (*διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ*) (chap. i, 9). The inference to be drawn from this is, that he either took refuge there to escape his persecutors, or was banished there. It is true that if Patmos had been a populous island at the time we might suppose that he went there to preach the gospel. But it is incredible that John would leave the populous cities to preach the gospel in an island that must have been but sparsely populated. From this passage we infer that the book was written during a persecution of the Christians, and there are other passages that indicate the same thing.

¹ Ubi Apostolus Joannes, posteaquam, in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. Præscrip., cap. xxxvi. ² Hist. Eccles., iii, cap. xviii.

³ Hæresis li, cap. 12.

⁴ De Viris Illus. Joannes.

⁵ “The revelation that was made to the Evangelist John from God in the isle of Patmos, to which he was banished by Nero Cæsar.” Bagster’s Edition.

During the first century there were but two persecutions of any note, those of Nero and Domitian. Under the reign of one of these Cæsars, our book, in all probability, had its origin. Respecting the persecution of Nero, Neander remarks: "This persecution was not, indeed, in its immediate effects, a general one; but fell exclusively on the Christians in Rome, accused as the incendiaries of the city, yet what had occurred in the capital could not fail of being attended with serious consequences, affecting the situation of the Christians, whose religion, moreover, was an unlawful one, throughout all the provinces."¹ In reference to Domitian's reign, he remarks: "The charge of embracing Christianity would, in this reign, be the most common one after that of high treason (*crimen majestatis*). In consequence of such accusations many were condemned to death, or to the confiscation of their property and banishment to an island."² The declaration made to John, "Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings" (chap. x, 11), is more suitable to John in the time of Nero than at the close of the reign of Domitian, when John was very old, and had but two or three years to live.

"Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple, leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months" (chap. xi, 1, 2). It seems clear from this passage that the Jewish Temple was still standing when the book was written; but the Temple perished when Jerusalem was taken by Titus, A. D. 70. With this passage compare Luke xxi, 24: "And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled."

In the description of the great whore who had corrupted the earth, sitting upon a beast with seven heads, the angel declares: "The seven heads are seven mountains [the seven hills on which Rome stood], on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition" (chap. xvii, 9-11). With the data here furnished, we are able to determine approximately the time of the composition of the book. Five kings of Rome are fallen; these would be Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caius Caligula, and Claudius. "One is," that is Nero; "the other has not yet come; and when he cometh,

¹ Church History, vol. i, 95.

² Ibid., p. 96.

he must continue a short space;" that is Galba, who reigned but seven months. "And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." This seems to refer to Nero, who was expected to reappear upon the stage of the Roman world. Tacitus remarks: "About the same time (A. D. 70) Achaia and Asia were troubled by a false alarm, as if Nero [who had been dead about two years] was about to make his appearance. Various were the reports concerning his death, and for this reason many pretended that he was alive, and not a few really believed it."¹ "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred and threescore and six" (chap. xiii, 18). Irenæus² suggests names, the letters of which will make 666, among which he gives ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ (LATINOS), which is favoured by Bleek.³ But it is stated that the number of the Apocalyptic beast is the number of a man, and therefore it is better to suppose, with Fritzsche, Benary, Hitzig, Reuss, Stuart, and Mangold, that Nero is intended, whose name in Hebrew, קֶסַר נְרוֹן, KESAR NERON, makes 666; thus: ק=100; ס=60; ר=200; נ=50; ר=200; ו=6; נ=50. This would add something to the proof that the book was written in Nero's reign.

Here the question arises, What light does the linguistic character of the work throw upon the time of its composition? The Greek of John's Gospel is more regular and freer from Hebraisms than is that of the Apocalypse. To the hypothesis, which we hold, that both books proceeded from the same author, this difference of style offers no objection, but is easily explained, if we suppose the Apocalypse to have been composed in Nero's reign. This being the earlier work, gives us a style and language in which the Hebrew idiom⁴ still cleaves to the author; while the Gospel, written probably fifteen or twenty years later, exhibits a higher degree of Grecian culture, the result of a long abode in Ephesus. But on the hypothesis that both books were written by the same author about the same time, the difference of language is not so easily explained. The composition of the book is placed in the time of Galba (A. D. 68-69) by Lücke,⁵ De Wette,⁶

¹ Sub idem tempus Achaia atque Asia falso exterritæ, velut Nero adventaret; vario super exitu ejus rumore, eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque. Hist. lib. ii, cap. 8.

² He gives ΕΥΑΝΘΑΣ, ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ, and ΤΕΙΤΑΝ. Lib. v, cap. xxx, sec. 3.

³ Einleitung, p. 715.

⁴ It is probable that John left Palestine some time before the Jewish war, perhaps about A. D. 65-67. ⁵ Die Offenbarung des Johannes, p. 840. ⁶ Einleitung, p. 416.

Neander,¹ Ewald, and Gieseler;² in the time of Nero by Professor Stuart;³ in A. D. 68-70 by Bleek;⁴ at the end of 68 or beginning of 69 by Hilgenfeld.⁵ Hengstenberg⁶ and Ebrard⁷ place it near the end of the reign of Domitian (95-96). But as the book was written in the midst of the persecution of the Church, it is best to place its composition not later than the first part of A. D. 63, as Nero died in the June of that year. Although I have been led to this conclusion, I am fully aware of the force of the arguments for the Domitian date, and confess that the evidence for either view is far from conclusive.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE APOCALYPSE.

"The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John: who bare record of the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ, whatever he saw" (chap. i, 1, 2). Such is the statement of the author respecting himself. He further states: "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience in Jesus, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus,"⁸ κ. τ. λ. (ch. i, 9). The last part of this verse refers to the testimony the author bore to the truth of Christianity as an eyewitness of the sufferings and glory of Christ. In the words, "his servant John: who bore testimony to the word of God," etc., we think there is a designation of the Apostle John. And who but an apostle would take it upon himself to address the Churches in Asia in such an authoritative tone, to chasten and to rebuke them? Could John the presbyter, to whom some have ascribed the book, be expected during the lifetime of the Apostle John to do this?⁹ But little, indeed, is known of this John, and nothing to indicate such a position as the author of this book held, to whom it is said, "Thou must prophesy again before many people, and nations, and tongues, and kings" (chap. x, 11).

It might be supposed that John would not have inserted his name in the book, as he has not done it in his Gospel, nor in his Epistles. Yet he clearly indicates that he is the author of the Gospel by stating, "And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true," etc.,

¹ Planting and Training, pp. 397, 398.

² Church History, vol. i, p. 97.

³ Commentary on Apocalypse, vol. i, p. 274.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 723.

⁵ Einleitung, p. 447.

⁶ Die Offenbarung Johannes, p. 30.

⁷ Wissenschaft. Kritik. der Evang. Geschichte, p. 1241.

⁸ We have followed the critical Texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles.

⁹ If the book had been written before the arrival of the Apostle John in Ephesus this objection to its having been composed by the presbyter would be invalid.

(chap. xix, 35). Prophets and the writers of Epistles insert their names in their works. In this statement, however, we must except the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistles of John, which are anonymous. On the other hand, the writers of sacred history omit their names in their works. We should, therefore, look for the name of the author in the Apocalypse, because it is both epistolary and prophetic.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH RESPECTING ITS AUTHOR.

Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, written about A. D. 150, supports his millenarian views by quoting the Apocalypse: "Since also among us a certain man by the name of John, one of the apostles of Christ, in the revelation made to him, prophesied that those who believe in our Christ will spend a thousand years in Jerusalem."¹ Irenæus, bishop of Lyons (A. D. 177-202), referring to the kings of the Roman empire, says: "John the disciple of the Lord in the Apocalypse showed," etc.² Clement of Alexandria quotes the Apocalypse with the remark, "As John says in the Apocalypse."³ Tertullian of Carthage, of nearly the same age (about A. D. 200), remarks: "The Apostle John in the Apocalypse describes a sword proceeding from the mouth of God."⁴

Eusebius states that Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (A. D. 169-180), wrote a work "with the title Concerning the Heresy of Herogenes, in which he made use of testimonies from the Apocalypse of John."⁵ He also says that Melito, bishop of Sardis (about A. D. 169), wrote a work On the Devil and the Apocalypse of John.⁶

Apollonius (about A. D. 190), in a work against the Montanists, "makes use of testimonies from the Apocalypse of John, and relates that a dead man in Ephesus had been raised to life through the divine power by this same John."⁷ He must have ascribed the book to the Apostle John, as we can hardly suppose he would have attributed to any other the power to raise the dead.

In the account of the sufferings of the Christian martyrs of Lyons and Vienna, written by Christians of those cities to the Christians of Asia and Phrygia (about A. D. 177), we have the following references to the Apocalypse: "That the Scripture may be fulfilled,

¹ Καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀνὴρ τις ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσει ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ Χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσεν.—Sec. 81.

² Lib. v, cap. xxvi, 1.

³ Adversus Marc., iii, cap. xiv.

⁴ Ibid., iv, cap. xxvi.

⁵ Strom., vi, cap. xiii.

⁶ Hist. Eccles., iv, cap. xxiv.

⁷ In Eusebius, v, cap. xviii.

He that is unjust, let him be unjust still' (Apoc. xxii, 11); "following the Lamb wherever he goes" (chap. xiv, 4).

Cyprian of Carthage (about A. D. 250) in various places quotes the Apocalypse.² Origen (about A. D. 230) exclaims: "What shall I say concerning John, who leaned upon the breast of Jesus, and who left one Gospel, acknowledging that he was able to write so many that not even the world could contain them? *He also wrote the Apocalypse,*" etc.³

Hippolytus (about A. D. 240), according to Jerome, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, and in his Refutation of all Heresies attributes the Apocalypse to John.⁴ On his Cathedra, discovered in 1551 (belonging probably to the sixth century), is inscribed as one of his works: *Απολογία ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, A Defence of the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse.*⁵ In the Canon of Muratori (about A. D. 160) it is stated: "We receive the Apocalypse of John."

The Apocalypse, however, was not received into the Peshito-Syriac version of the second century, though Hug has attempted to show⁶ that this version originally contained the Apocalypse, and that in the fourth century it was gradually left out of the books composing it. He refers to the fact that the Syrian writer, Ephraem (about A. D. 350), quotes the Apocalypse, which he contends Ephraem could not have done unless the book had been translated into Syriac, as he did not understand Greek.⁷ But inasmuch as Ephraem took with him in his travels a Greek interpreter, it by no means follows that he could not translate a few passages in the Apocalypse, or in any other book of the New Testament. How many men there are who can read foreign languages, but can not speak them with any degree of fluency! But it is not easy to believe that if the Apocalypse had originally formed

Not in the Peshito-Syriac version.

¹ In Eusebius, v, cap. i.

² Lib. de Opere et Eleemos., xiv; Lib. de Bono Patientiæ, xxi.

³ Τί δεῖ περὶ τοῦ ἀναπεσόντος λέγειν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Ἰωάννου. . . Ἐγραψε δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν. . . —In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi, 25.

⁴ Page 392.

⁵ See Gicseler, Church History, vol. i, pp. 225, 226.

⁶ Einleitung, Vierte Auf. Erst. Theil., pp. 306-308.

⁷ Theodoret states that Ephraem had not enjoyed a Greek education (Hist. Eccl., lib. iv, cap. xxvi), and similar is the statement of Sozomen (Hist. Eccles., lib. iii, cap. xvi). On the other hand, Photius asserts that Ephraem was not meanly educated in the Greek language (*παιδευθεὶς δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἑλληνα γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἀγεννῶς*). Codex ccxxviii. Assemani affirms that Gregory of Nyssa, Amphilocheus in his life of Basil, Metaphrastes in his life of Ephraem, and all the Syrians, show that Ephraem was acquainted with Greek, and that his knowledge of this tongue is evident from his writings. Bibliotheca Orientalis, tom. i, p. 55; from the Peabody Library, Balt.

a part of the Peshito version, it would have been left out at a subsequent time. It, indeed, seems strange that the Apocalypse, which we have seen was so well attested in the second century, formed no part of this version which belongs to the century. Nor is it easy to explain the omission. It is, however, possible, that the authors of the version were strong opponents of the Millenarians, who derived their chief support from the Apocalypse, and that they feared the translation of that book would disseminate the Millenarian doctrine among the Syrian Churches.¹ It would appear from Eusebius that Caius, presbyter of Rome (about A. D. 200), attributed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus: "But Cerinthus," says Caius, "who by means of Revelations, as having been written by a great Apostle [John?], by feigning wonderful things as having been shown him by angels, introduces them to us, affirming that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ will be upon the earth," etc.²

The Alogians (about A. D. 180) attributed both the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse to Cerinthus, who flourished in the last part of the first century.³ From the foregoing testimonies it is seen, that until the middle of the third century the testimony to the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John is almost unanimous. This is of the highest importance; and the testimony of Justin and Irenæus is especially valuable, as the Dialogue of the former, in which the Apocalypse is ascribed to the Apostle John, was held in Ephesus about fifty years after the death of John; and Irenæus was born in Asia Minor, and lived there about A. D. 150,⁴ and was acquainted with Polycarp. According to the testimony of Andreas in the last part of the fifth century, Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, also received the Apocalypse.

The first important opponent of the apostolic origin of the book was Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (A. D. 248-265). In his work on the Promises he gives the unfavourable views of some of his predecessors concerning the Apocalypse, and then states his own opinions. He affirms that the book is covered with such a thick veil that he cannot penetrate its meaning, yet confesses that it may have a sense too deep for

Dionysius first doubter of its genuineness.

¹ In illustration of this, we may cite what Philostorgius (about A. D. 425) says of Ulfilas, bishop of the Goths: "He translated into their language all the Scriptures, except, indeed, the Kings [two Books of Samuel and two of Kings], since they contain a history of wars, and the (Gothic) nation is fond of war, and needs rather a bridle upon their propensity to war than a spur to it."—Eccles. Hist., lib. ii, 5.

² Hist. Eccles., iii, 28.

³ Epiphanius, after speaking both of the Gospel and the Apocalypse, says: "They (the Alogians) affirm that these do not belong to John, but to Cerinthus."—Hær., li, 3

⁴ At a later period he was bishop of Lyons.

him. He grants that the book was written by a John, but not the apostle of that name, since the style of the Apocalypse differs from that of the Gospel and the Epistles of that apostle. He thinks the book was written by the presbyter John of Ephesus. The acute objections of this bishop have furnished the staple for the subsequent attacks on the Apocalypse.

The opposition of Dionysius to the Apocalypse evidently, in part at least, grew out of his relations to the Chiliasts. A Causes of the opposition of Dionysius. sensual Chiliasm was prevailing in the province of Arsenoe, the bishop of which was Nepos. So far did the Chiliasts carry their fanatical views, that whole Churches separated themselves from communion with the mother Church at Alexandria. Dionysius refuted them. It would be very natural for him to degrade, as much as possible, the book which was the chief support of the sect that had given him so much trouble.

Eusebius, of Cæsarea Palestinæ, the Church historian, who flourished in the first part of the fourth century, doubts the The opinions of others of the Fathers. apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. "After these (canonical Scriptures)," says he, "is to be placed, if thought fit, the Apocalypse of John, concerning which, at the proper time, we will explain the (various) opinions." Again, "besides these, as I said, if it is thought fit, (let) the Apocalypse of John (be added), which some, as I said, reject, but others place among the acknowledged Scriptures."¹ It appears from the foregoing quotations that the criticism of Dionysius perplexed him.

About the middle of the fourth century the Apocalypse is quoted as an authority by Athanasius;² it is ascribed to John the evangelist by Gregory³ of Nyssa, by Ambrose⁴ of Milan, by Didymus⁵ of Alexandria, by Epiphanius⁶ of Cyprus, and by Basil the Great⁷ of Cappadocia, and was contained in the canon of Rufinus⁸ of Aquileia.

¹ Hist. Eccles., iii, cap. xxv.

² Oratio i, Contra Arianos, II.

³ In quoting Apoc. iii, 15, he says, "I heard the Evangelist John in hidden things, saying," etc., in Suam Ordinationem. Also in Com. in Psalm, he quotes the Apocalypse as John's, cap. x.

⁴ He observes, "John the evangelist says there was a red horse upon which the Lord was sitting."—De Trinitate, cap. xxvii.

⁵ He remarks, "John the theologian said in the Gospel, . . . but in the Apoc'ypse, 'He who is, and who was,'" etc.—De Trinitate, lib. i, cap. xv.

⁶ Hærcsis li, cap. xxxiv. It is omitted in the Canon of Scripture of the Council of Laodicea (about A. D. 363).

⁷ He quotes, as belonging to the Evangelist, passages from John's Gospel, and adds, "And in the Apocalypse, 'He who was, and who is,'" etc., after which he gives passages as Paul's, from which it is clear that he ascribes it to the Evangelist. Adversus Eunomium, lib. iv, sec. I.

⁸ Comment. in Symb. Apostolic., 37.

These six writers flourished in the last half of the fourth century. About the same time it is quoted as an authority by Macarius.¹ The distinguished biblical scholar, Jerome, who flourished in the last part of the fourth century and in the beginning of the fifth, ascribes the Apocalypse to the Apostle John.² About the same time it was received as canonical by Augustine.³ It is attributed to the Apostle John by Cyril⁴ of Alexandria (A. D. 412-444). It was contained in the Memphitic, Thebaic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions, and in all probability in the Gothic.⁵ Although not found in the Peshito-Syriac version, it is quoted as canonical Scripture by Ephraem⁶ the Syrian († 378). On the other hand, it is omitted in the catalogue of Cyril⁷ of Jerusalem (about A. D. 350). Gregory Nazianzen (in the last half of the fourth century) omits the Apocalypse in his canon of Scripture, and remarks after naming the seven Catholic Epistles: "You have them all. If there is any (book) besides these, it is not genuine."⁸ In another place, however, he says: "Some receive the Apocalypse of John as genuine, but the most affirm it to be spurious."⁹

Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople (about A. D. 400), omits the Apocalypse in his canon of Scripture.¹⁰ He had previously been presbyter at Antioch, and his canon of Scripture is accordingly that of the Syrian Church, which received only three *Catholic Epistles*, and rejected the Apocalypse.

The Apocalypse, it appears, was rejected by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, in Syria (about A. D. 420-457), as we have found no reference to the book in his voluminous writings.¹¹ In his canon he

¹ Homil. xxx.

² De Viris Illus. Joannes.

³ De Doctrina Christ., lib. ii, cap. viii.

⁴ "The wise John testifies to the Son that he was without beginning in time: 'In the beginning was the Word;' saying, after these things, 'He who was, and who is,' etc. (Apoc. i, 8). *Περὶ Ἀγίας καὶ Ὁμοῦν σίον Τριῖδος*. Dialog. ii.

⁵ Of this version no part of the Apocalypse is preserved.

⁶ On Ephraem, Assemani remarks: "In this language (the Syriac) the holy doctor quotes the Apocalypse of John as a part of canonical Scripture" (In hoc sermone citat s. doctor Apocalypsim Joannis tanquam canonicam Scripturæ partem). — *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tom. i, p. 141, from the Peabody Library, Baltimore.

⁷ Catechesis, iv, De Decem Dogmat., xxxvi.

⁸ Carminum, lib. i, 261, 262.

⁹ *Ibid.*, lib. ii, 1104, 1105.

¹⁰ *Synopsis Scrip. Sac.* In the *Lexicon of Suidas* (in its present form not earlier than about A. D. 1100) it is stated at the end of a short article on the Apostle John: "Chrysostom receives his three Epistles and the Apocalypse." But this statement, contradicting Chrysostom himself, is of no value, and is out of place. It appears to have been inserted to claim his testimony to the Second and Third John, and the Apocalypse rejected by him.

¹¹ In the index to his works at the end of the fifth volume (Migne's edition) it is stated, "Nowhere does Theodoret make use of the Apocalypse on the Song of Sol

seems to have followed the Syrian Church. Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople (A. D. 806-815), places the Apocalypse among the disputed writings.¹

In concluding the ancient testimonies concerning the book, we must lay stress upon the fact that the great mass of them is decidedly favourable to the apostolic origin, and that the chief opposition to it sprang from dogmatic grounds.

“At the period of the Reformation,” says De Wette, “doubts respecting the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse generally again awoke with criticism, and Erasmus, Carlstadt, Luther, and Zwingli expressed themselves either by hints or decidedly against it.”² De Wette denies that the Apocalypse is the work of the Apostle John, on the ground that in its style and contents it differs greatly from the Gospel and Epistles of that apostle. He affirms that nothing need prevent our acceding to the ancient³ opinion that another John, the so-called presbyter, is the author, provided we place the composition of the writing and his authority in the Churches of Asia Minor, presupposed according to chapters ii, iii, before the abode of the Apostle John in that country.⁴

Quite similar are the objections of Lücke to the apostolical origin of the book: “The difference of language in the Apocalypse and in the remaining writings of John in the New Testament is so great, of such an individual and mental character—in short, a difference of individual genius in the similar original use of the New Testament Greek—that even if we should grant that John’s circle of words is not foreign to the author of the Apocalypse, nevertheless, the identity of its author with that of the Gospel and Epistles, especially of the First Epistle, can in no way be maintained, but the contrary is in the highest degree probable.”⁵ Again, “If all critical experience and rules in such literary questions do not deceive us, then it is as firmly established that the evangelist and the author of the Apocalypse are two different Johns, as it is in the very similar problem of the Epistle of the Hebrews, that the Apostle Paul did not write it.”

Bleek remarks: “The Apocalypse, indeed, exhibits many resemblances to the other writings of John, as well in the manner of presonon, where, in accordance with his hypothesis, he could have done so to a very great extent, as in Psalm xlv; nor where the place seemed to require it, as i, 1217, *Concerning Heaven and the Church.*”

¹ Quæ Scrip. Canon.

² Einleit., p. 430.

³ Dionysius of Alexandria and Eusebius alone favoured this view, as it appears

⁴ Einleitung, pp. 420-423.

⁵ Die Offenbarung des Johannes, p. 680.

entation as in style and use of language ; yet this is shown more or less in single points only, while on the other hand, in its entire character there is manifested a great difference, and such as can scarcely be explained on the supposition of identity of authorship."¹ He regards John the presbyter as most probably its author.²

Neander expresses himself as follows : " We cannot acknowledge the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle " (John), and after discussing the question, whether it was not written by John the presbyter, of Ephesus, he says : " It is, then, more probable that the author, a disciple of John, by some circumstance unknown to us, having devoted himself to write on a subject, which he had received mediately or immediately from the Apostle, thought himself justified [!] in introducing John as the speaker."³ Ewald also favours the view that John the presbyter wrote the book.

On the other hand, Gieseler, who is inferior to none of these men in learning and critical ability, and who is also a man of great candour, remarks : " I cannot, however, bring myself to refuse to the Apostle John the authorship of this book. The author designates himself as the Apostle ; the oldest witnesses declare him to be so. Had the book been forged in his name thirty years before his death, he would certainly have contradicted it, and this contradiction would have reached us through Irenæus from the school of John's disciples. On the contrary, the later contradictions of the apostolic origin proceed from doctrinal prepossessions alone. The internal difference in language and mode of thought between the Apocalypse which John (whose education was essentially Hebrew, and his Christianity Jewish-Christian of the Palestinian character) wrote, and the Gospel and Epistles which he had composed after an abode of from twenty to thirty years among the Greeks, is a necessary consequence of the different relations in which the writer was placed, so that the opposite would excite suspicion. There is much at the same time that is cognate, proving continuousness of culture in the same author."⁴

That the apostolic John is the author of the Apocalypse has been held by Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, Guericke, Stuart, Hengstenberg, Auberlen, Ebrard, Böhmer, Lange, Hase, Luthardt, and others, and we confess that we see no good reason for rejecting this view. We lay no stress upon the fact that the Tübingen ⁵ school acknowledges the

¹ Einleitung, p. 724.

² Ibid., p. 727.

³ History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church, vol. i, 396, 397.

⁴ Church History, American Edition, p. 97.

⁵ Baur, Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, pp. 146-148, Dritte Ausgabe. Hügenfeld, Einleitung, pp 407-452.

apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, since they do this that they may the more readily attack the genuineness of John's Gospel from its difference of style.

The only plausible ground on which the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse can be denied is its difference in style and language from the Gospel and Epistle of John. But this is very unsafe ground, especially as the Apocalypse was written probably fifteen or twenty years earlier than these other works, and the subject is entirely different. Who would expect to find the poems of a distinguished author similar to his prose writings? The Apocalypse is a prophetic book. Its visions are of the grandest, and often of the most terrible, character. It is impossible for a writer, in such an ecstatic state, not to speak and write in a lofty and symbolic style. The human spirit labours to give utterance to its magnificent conceptions; language is taxed to its utmost, and the mind, excited to the highest degree of tension, lays hold upon whatever will express its deep emotions. And it must be borne in mind that John wrote in the very midst of his awful visions. Had years elapsed before he wrote them down, the style and language would probably have been different. How unlike, too, is the language of Christ when predicting the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv; Mark xiii; Luke xxi) and that which he generally employs!

Nor can it be urged with any force against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, that its tone is not that which we should expect from the loving John, who dwells in the Gospel so much upon the love of Christ, and so rarely upon Christ's sterner attributes. The occasion of his writing was different. In the Gospel he discusses the profound internal relations existing between Christ and his Father, and between Christ and his followers. The discourses of our Lord that bear upon the subject he gives in their fulness. These are the rays of divine truth which he perfectly reflected, while the other evangelists reflected other rays.

When John wrote the Apocalypse, it was a time of bitter persecution. The power of the Roman empire was arrayed against Christianity; the sword was drawn against the Church. To meet this terrible enemy, Christ is represented as a mighty conqueror, before whom every foe is prostrated, and the power of the world brought to naught. Nor let it be said that this last representation of Christ is inconsistent with his character as drawn in the Gospels, nor that John in his different writings is inconsistent with himself; for souls the most amiable are frequently the most severe when once aroused. The divine goodness itself, when it has been repeatedly spurned,

becomes implacable and our Saviour, in the very midst of discourses full of benevolence and goodness, declares: "Upon whomsoever this stone [himself] shall fall, it will grind him to powder" (Matt. xxi, 44; Luke xx, 18). Is there any thing in the description which John gives in the Apocalypse at variance with what he gives in his Gospel? In the latter it is said: "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (chap. v, 28, 29).

But if the addresses to the seven Churches are the real words of Christ, if the visions are not the offspring of John's imagination, then we should expect in the Apocalypse a different presentation of divine truth from what John himself might have given. Very different was the case when he wrote the Gospel; from the multitude of Christ's discourses and acts he could select those that best suited his taste or purpose, and fill up what had been left incomplete in Christ's history by the other Evangelists. In the Apocalypse he delivers *all* the messages to the Churches; he is ordered to write what he sees. Little room is left for the display of his subjectivity.

But notwithstanding the difference of style between the Apocalypse and the Gospel and Epistles of John, we shall find, upon a close scrutiny of the former, a great deal that is decidedly Johannean, and which may, after all, render the apostolic origin of the book highly probable from internal evidence. The verb *νικᾶν*, to conquer, to overcome, occurs in the Apocalypse sixteen times; in the first Epistle of John six times; in the Gospel of John once; in all the rest of the New Testament but four times. *Ἄρνιον*, lamb, occurs twenty-eight times in the Apocalypse; it is found once in John's Gospel and nowhere else; but *ἀρνός*, lamb, occurs twice in John's Gospel, and twice in all the rest of the New Testament, and one of these is a quotation from the Old Testament, which the Ethiopian eunuch was reading. *Μαρτυρία*, testimony, occurs nine times in the Apocalypse, fourteen times in the Gospel of John, and seven times in his Epistles; in all the rest of the New Testament, seven times. *Διψᾶν*, to thirst, is used in a spiritual sense at least twice in the Apocalypse, three times in John's Gospel, and once in Matthew's Gospel. In a physical sense, nine or ten times in all the New Testament. In Apocalypse xxii, 17 it is said: "And let him that is athirst come, and take the water of life freely." With this compare John vii, 37: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." There is no other passage in the New Testament like these two. "Behold, I stand at the door, and

Points of similarity between the language of John's Gospel and that of the Apocalypse.

knock : If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me " (Apoc. iii, 20). With this compare John xiv, 23 : " If a man love me, he will keep my words : and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." " Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood " (Apoc. i, 5). There is no passage in the New Testament which so strikingly resembles this as First John i, 7 : " The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." " And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called The Word (Logos) of God " (Apoc. The verbal peculiarities. xix, 13). Christ is nowhere else in the New Testament called " The Word " (Logos), except in John's Gospel. In Hebrews iv, 12, " For the word of God is quick and powerful," etc., the reference is not to the personal Word, Christ, but to divine truth in its all-searching power. " Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him " (Apoc. i, 7). In this passage there is a reference both to Zechariah xii, 10, and to John xix, 34, 37, where it is stated that one of the soldiers pierced the side of Christ, and that the Scripture saith : " They shall look on him whom they pierced." Both in Apocalypse i, 7 and in John xix, 37, ἐξεκέντησαν, *they pierced*, is used, which is a correct translation of the Hebrew קָרַע, in Zechariah xii, 10, but is the translation of neither the LXX nor the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel. Now the use of this same word for pierced, both in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse, is no slight proof of identity of authorship. " Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ," etc. (Apoc. i, 2); with this compare John xix, 35, where, speaking of himself, the author says : " And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true." Ἀληθινός, *true*, occurs *ten* times in the Apocalypse, *eight* times in John's Gospel, *four* times in his First Epistle; elsewhere in the New Testament, *five* times only.

It is a peculiarity of John to state his propositions affirmatively, and at the same time to deny their contraries. Thus respecting the Baptist : " And he confessed, and denied not " (John i, 20). " God is light, and in him is no darkness at all " (1 John i, 5). " We lie, and do not the truth " (verse 6). This method of statement especially abounds in his First Epistle.¹ Nor is this peculiarity of John wanting in the Apocalypse : " For my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted;" " Thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith " (chap. ii, 3, 13). " I will blot out his name out of

¹ For this peculiarity, common to the Gospel and Epistle, see the proofs of the identity of authorship of both in *The Genuineness of John's Gospel*.

the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father," etc (chap. iii, 5). "And hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name" (verse 8). "Which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie" (verse 9). "That thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear" (verse 18).

There is nothing in the doctrines of the Apocalypse at variance with the other writings of John, or with the rest of the New Testament. Although the writer is manifestly of the Jewish race, and seems warmly attached to his people, there is nothing of an exclusive nature in the book, and he represents, in addition to those saved from the tribes of Israel, a "great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues" (chap. vii, 9).

Nothing in the doctrine of the Apocalypse at variance with the rest of New Testament.

In the description of the New Jerusalem he states that in the foundations of its walls are "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb" (chap. xxi, 14). That Paul is not included in this list shows no hostility toward him on the part of the writer, as the original apostles were twelve in number. Besides this, in a book, the numbers of which in most cases are artificial, no stress is to be laid upon the number twelve.

In the description of the hundred and forty-four thousand saints in heaven, it is said: "These are they which were not defiled with women, for they are virgins (*οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμόλυνθησαν· παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν*) (chap. xiv, 4). We are not to understand by this that the writer attached great importance to celibacy, or that he made it necessary to salvation, for the meaning is as well expressed by Robinson: "*For they are virgins, that is, chaste, pure, free from all whoredom and uncleanness as the symbols of idolatry.*" (Greek Lexicon). It is, indeed, clear that the author of the book held the marriage relation as holy, otherwise he would not have represented the union of Christ and his Church under the figure of a marriage (chap. xix, 7-9).

In concluding this part of our subject we may ask, Who but the Apostle John could have written the sublime book? We have no reason to suppose that the *presbyter* John was capable of it. John the Apostle, if we are to judge from the Gospel which he wrote, was competent for the task. His appreciation and appropriation of the profound discourses of Christ shows his mental power. Minds that make great use of symbols and imagery are often incapable of deep and philosophical reflection; but profound intellects can, if they wish, employ bold imagery and striking symbols.

CONTENTS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The book opens with the statement that it is a revelation from God, made by his angel to John while in Patmos. After greeting the seven Churches of Asia, John gives a sublime description of Christ, who appears to him and directs him to write to seven Churches in Asia, namely, unto Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea (chap. i). The two following chapters contain the messages to these Churches, in which they are praised or censured according as they have fulfilled or neglected the requirements of the Gospel.

John describes the throne of God, its occupant, the twenty-four elders, the four cherubim, and the worship rendered to the Almighty in heaven, which he beholds in the Spirit (chap. iv). He describes the book with seven seals in the right hand of Him who sits upon the throne, which no one could open and read, or look upon. Weeping on this account, he is checked by one of the elders, and assured that the Lion of the tribe of Judah is able to open the book. He thereupon describes the Lamb, who takes the book, and is worshipped by the host of heaven (chap. v). The opening of six seals of the book by the Lamb, and the events that followed, are portrayed (chap. vi). Four angels hold the four winds of heaven, to prevent their hurting the earth before seals are set upon the servants of God. He gives the number one hundred and forty-four thousand as redeemed from among the tribes of Israel, after which he describes an innumerable host of the redeemed of all nations standing before the throne and worshipping God. Their happy condition is described (chap. vii). An angel offers incense with the prayers of the saints. Seven angels with seven trumpets are prepared to sound. Great disasters follow the successive soundings of six of these trumpets (chaps. viii, ix). An angel with a little book in his hand comes down from heaven, and swears that time shall be no longer. John, as commanded, takes the little book out of the angel's hand, and devours it (chap. x).

The prophesying of the two witnesses, and the events connected with their ministry, follow. The seventh angel sounds, and the kingdoms of the world are converted to Christ; God is praised in heaven (chap. xi). An account is given of the birth of the man-child who is to rule the nations. A description follows of the war in heaven and the defeat of Satan, who, being cast out upon the earth, persecutes the pious children of the mother of the man-child (chap. xii). A description is given of the beast with seven heads and ten horns—to whom the dragon gives his seat and power—and also of a second beast

that slays all who refuse to worship him (chap. xiii). A hundred and forty-four thousand saints stand with the Lamb on Mount Zion. An angel proclaims the everlasting gospel; a second angel announces the fall of Babylon, and a third the punishment of those who in any way acknowledge the beast. Those who die in the Lord are pronounced happy. The reaping of the harvest of the earth is described (chap. xiv). Seven angels have the seven last plagues. A description is given of those who have gained the victory over the beast. One of the four cherubim gives seven vials full of divine wrath to seven angels (chap. xv). John describes the pouring out of the vials of wrath by the seven angels, and the disasters that follow (chap. xvi). He describes the great whore, her crimes, and the kings who shall destroy her. He states that she represents the city (Rome) that rules over the earth (chap. xvii). The fall of Babylon is announced. What she now is and what she shall be are described. The marriage of the Lamb is announced. The angel refuses to be worshipped. Christ is described as a warrior engaged in battle with the kings of the earth and their armies. The beast and the false prophet are captured and punished, and the remnant of Christ's foes are slain by the sword (chaps. xviii, xix). Satan is bound for a thousand years, and cast into the bottomless pit, during which time the martyrs reign with Christ. Satan is let loose, deceives the nations, and gathers them to battle. They are consumed, and the devil is cast into the lake of fire. The dead are raised, stand before God, and are judged (chap. xx). A description is given of the New Jerusalem that descends from heaven, and also of the happy condition of God's people, and the misery of the wicked and unbelieving (chaps. xxi, xxii, 1-5). The things in this book are affirmed to be true, and the man is pronounced blessed who keeps them. John is commanded not to seal up the prophecy of the book, as the time is at hand. Those who keep the commandments of God are pronounced happy. Jesus affirms that he is the author of these messages to the Churches. He gives a general invitation to partake of the waters of life freely, and utters a warning against adding to or taking away from this book of prophecy. He affirms he will come quickly (chaps. xxii, 6-21).

THE DESIGN OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The design of the revelation contained in the book is stated to be: "To show unto his servants things (*α, what things*) The general design. which must shortly come to pass" (chap. i, 1). It appears from various parts of the book (chaps. i, 9; ii, 10; iii, 10; vi, 9, 10, 11) that it was written in a time of a general persecution of

the Church, which must have come from Rome, and to this source it is manifestly attributed in chap. xviii, 24.

As the persecution of the Christians before Nero had been chiefly instigated by the Jews, and was generally of a local character, this one, proceeding from the head of the empire in Rome, would be naturally followed in the provinces, and must have excited strong fears in the minds of many believers that their religion would be crushed by the enormous power of the Roman Government. To console them, and to assure them of the utter overthrow of paganism, the defeat of Satan and his allies, the complete triumph of Christianity, the reward of the faithful followers of Christ and the punishment of the wicked, was the object of the writing. In regard to these points no difference of opinion need exist.

In other respects, however, great diversity of views prevails in the Three views of its meaning. interpretation of the book, which have been reduced to *three* leading classes. The *first* view regards the Apocalypse as containing a compend of the history of the Church and of the world, even to isolated events, until the coming of Christ.

The *second* does not acknowledge the divine origin of the vision of the author of the Apocalypse, but supposes that he describes in the form of a vision only the fears and the hopes of his time respecting Rome, Jerusalem, and the immediate completion of the kingdom of God. This view is held by Bleek, Ewald, De Wette, and Lücke, who deny the apostolic origin of the book.

The *third* view acknowledges that the prophecies in the Apocalypse were given of God, and that they refer to the future development and completion of God's kingdom, but do not give a detailed history of the future, but only the great epochs and moving forces of the development of that kingdom in its relation to the kingdom of the world. This view is held by Hofmann, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Auberlen, and Luthardt.¹ With these should be classed Moses Stuart.

The view of the *second* class we instantly reject in acknowledging the apostolic origin of the book; and that of the *first* has no solid basis, and admits of no probable defence, and has given rise to the wildest speculations. The view of the third class of expositors is the only tenable one. Of this class, Professor Stuart and Auberlen are among the very best.

¹Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis*, pp 369-434. Dritte Auflage. Bleek's *Einleitung* by Mangold, p. 702.

INDEX OF TOPICS.

- Acts of Solomon,**
Book of, 286.
- Acts of the Apostles,**
accuracy of historical allusions in, 637.
apparent error in, regarding Theudas, 642.
author of, 631.
Baur's theory of the purpose of, 633.
Chrysostom's opinion concerning, 644.
contents of, 631.
credibility of history in, 632.
geographical accuracy of, 643.
Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* upon, 632.
Paul's character the same as exhibited in Acts and in Epistles, 635.
reproof of Peter by Paul explained, 634.
sources of the history in, 632.
theological difference between Peter and Paul, none recorded in, 636.
- Æthiopic version,** 64, 478.
- Agag,**
a generic title for Amalekite kings, 167.
- Ahasuerus,**
probably identical with Xerxes, 318.
- Alexander the Great,**
hellenized the nations he conquered, 457.
- Alogians,**
reject John's Gospel, 585, 630.
- Alphabetical writing.**
Israelites possessed it when they went down into Egypt, 99.
originated among Palestinians, 99.
proofs of the early existence of, among the Hebrews, 101.
- Amos,**
date of his prophecy, 423.
literary style of, 428.
personality of, 428.
- Antediluvians,**
their longevity not mythical, 223.
- Apocalypse,**
authorship of, 738.
Church fathers, quotations from, relative to authorship of, 759.
contents of, 770.
doubts, early, as to its genuineness, 761.
general design of, 763.
harmony of its doctrines with rest of New Testament, 765.
imagery of, borrowed from Daniel, 423.
John the Presbyter not its author, 763.
linguistic character of, 749, 755.
linguistic similarity of John's Gospel and the Apocalypse, 765.
meaning, three views of its, 770.
modern scholars, opinions of, as to its authorship, 762.
omitted from various canons and versions, 753, 761.
peculiarities of, in use of participle, 750.
peculiarity of contents, 749.
sublimity of, 749.
time of composition, 751.
written before downfall of Jerusalem, 754.
written in times of persecution, 754.
- Apocrypha,**
absurdities of, 420.
additions to Daniel in, 423.
bound up with Septuagint, 53.
- Apocryphal Gospels,**
absurdity of, 621.
Gospel according to the Egyptians, 629.
Gospel according to the Hebrews, 627.
Gospel of Peter, 627.
not received in early Church, 503.
Protevangel of James, 628.
various other, 629.
- Apologists of Christianity,**
early, literary competency of, 454.
- Apostles,**
inspiration of, 30.
selected and trained by Jesus, 449.
- Apostolic Epistles,**
established fundamental doctrines of Christianity, 500.
- Aquila's version,**
of Old Testament, 54.
- Arabic language,**
helps to its study, 43, 47.
spread by the Koran, 43.
unchanged since composition of Koran, 140.
- Arabic versions,** 65.
- Aramæan languages,** 42.
- Archaisms,**
in Deuteronomy, 124.
in the Pentateuch, 110, 112.
prove the unity of the Pentateuch, 113.
rationalistic treatment of, 113.
- Ark,**
directions for its construction, 133.
- Armenian version,** 64, 480.
- Arts and sciences,**
in ancient Egypt, 101.
- Assyrian monuments,**
confirmed Bible account of conquests of Tiglath-Pileser, 292.
confirm record of greatness of Omri, 291.
mention Ahaz, Jehu, Hazael, Rezin, Menahem, and other kings, 292, 295.
record capture of Samaria, 293.
record dealings of Sennacherib with Hezekiah, 293.
- Authors of Gospels,**
men of repute, 531.
- Balam's prophecy,**
evident antiquity of, 167.
- Babel,**
confusion of tongues at, 227.
- Babylonian dress,** 419.
- Babylonian monuments,**
confirm the Bible history of "cities of the plain," 230.
- Babylonian tradition**
of creation, 221.
- Paruch,**
copies Jeremiah's prophecies, 391.
- Bashmuric version,** 478.
- Bethany,** 603.
- Bethany beyond Jordan,** 577.
- Bethel,** 157.

- "Beyond Jordan," 167.
 Biblical criticism,
 progressive, 24.
 Bishop and presbyter,
 identity of, in apostolic Church, 685.
 Book of Acts of Solomon, 286.
 Book of Chronicles,
 of Kings of Israel, 286.
 of Kings of Judah, 286.
 Book of the Upright, 265.
 Book of the Wars of Jehovah, 166.
 Books of Moses,
 contents of, 95.
 Brahma,
 Indian account of his creation of the world,
 218.
 Bricks,
 early made in Egypt, 235.
 Cæsar, Julius,
 his versatility, 122.
 Cæsarea,
 inhabited by Greeks, 458.
 Cana of Galilee, 604.
 Canaanites,
 God commands their extermination, 255.
 Canon,
 of Ambrose, 495.
 of Athanasius, 494.
 of Augustine, 497.
 of Chrysostom, 495.
 of Cyril, 494.
 of Eusebius, 493.
 of Irenæus, 493.
 of Jerome, 497.
 of Muratori, 490.
 of Origen, 493.
 of Titus Flavius Clemens, 492.
 origin of term, 33.
 Canon of the New Testament, 488.
 according to the Itala version, 492.
 not all universally received in first three
 centuries, 488.
 testimony of early Church respecting, 490.
 testimony of Tertullian concerning, 492.
 Canon of the Old Testament, 23-41.
 according to Josephus, 33.
 according to Philo, 39.
 according to the Talmud, 40.
 according to various fathers of the Church,
 33-39.
 alluded to by Jesus, son of Sirach, 39.
 Hebrew, its arrangement by the rabbis of
 Tiberias, 401.
 Canonical books,
 requirements of, 28.
 Catalogue,
 of Athanasius, 35.
 of Cyril, 35.
 of Epiphanius, 35.
 of Gregory Nazianzen, 35.
 of Hilary, 35.
 of Jerome, 36.
 of Josephus, 37.
 of Melito, 33.
 of Origen, 34.
 Catholic Epistles, 701.
 Cedron,
 brook, 603.
 Celsus,
 acknowledges apostolic origin of the Gos-
 pels, 520.
 unintentionally supports the genuineness
 of the Gospels, 518.
 Cerinthus,
 his heresy, 742.
 Chaldaisms,
 of the later Hebrew prophets, 415.
 Chaldee language, 43.
 best helps in its study, 46.
 spoken by the Jews in time of Christ, 43.
 that of Daniel and Ezra differs from that of
 the Targums, 415.
 Chedor-laomer,
 origin or type of his name, 231.
 Christ,
 advent of such a character would naturally
 call forth historians, 449.
 reason for his not writing his own religion,
 448.
 Christianity,
 became the State religion under Constan-
 tine, 453.
 its rapid diffusion testified to,
 in the Acts of the Apostles, 451.
 by Bardesanes, 452.
 by Cornelius, 453.
 by Justin Martyr, 451.
 by Origen, 453.
 by Pliny, 451.
 by Tacitus, 450.
 by Tertullian, 452.
 written records necessary for its perpetua-
 tion, 449.
 Christians,
 early literary proficiency of, 454.
 portraits of, by Tacitus and Pliny, 450.
 Christian writers,
 of first four centuries, 455.
 Chronicles, Books of the,
 author of, not a partisan, 305.
 contents of, 297.
 credibility of, 302.
 depreciation of, by sceptics, 302.
 Ezra probably their author, 298.
 genealogies in, 297.
 historical character of, 303.
 numbers exaggerated in, 305.
 originally one book, 297.
 purpose of, 300.
 sources of, 300.
 written in same style as Book of Ezra, 299.
 written in time of Ezra, 297.
 Chronological table,
 of Hebrew prophets, 364.
 Chronology,
 differences of, between Hebrew, Samaritan,
 and Septuagint Pentateuchs, 179.
 early, untrustworthy, 230.
 Church, primitive,
 able to transmit to posterity genuine writ-
 ings of the apostles, 457.
 believed in inspiration of the Scriptures, 25.
 Cities of the plain,
 their location, 231.
 Clementine Homilies, 521.
 history of, 523.
 Codices,
 Codex Alexandrinus, 464.
 Codex Angelicus, 474.
 Codex Basilienis, 467.
 Codex Bezae Graeco-Latinus, 466.
 Codex Bobbiensis, now Taurinensis, 475.
 Codex Brixianus, 474.
 Codex Cantabrigiensis, 474.
 Codex Claromontanus, now Vaticanus, 466,
 475.
 Codex Colbertinus, 467, 474.
 Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, 465.
 Codex Laudianus, 466.
 Codex Leicestrensis, 467.

- Codices, (continued.)**
 Codex Palatinus, 474.
 Codex Sinaiticus, 463.
 Codex Tischendorfii Actorum, 467.
 Codex Vaticanus, 465.
 Codex Verceilensis, 474.
 Codex Verouensis, 474.
 Codex Vindobonensis, 475.
 Codices Petropolitani, formerly Corbeien-
 ses, 475.
- Colossæ,**
 city of, 674.
- Colossian Church,**
 composed largely of Gentiles, 674.
 founded by Epaphras, 674.
- Colossians, Epistle to the,**
 attacks upon its genuineness, 676.
 Hilgenfeld's objections to, 677.
 modern criticism upon, unreasonable, 677.
 no traces of Gnosticism in, 677.
 Pauline origin of, 678.
 personal allusions in, by Paul, 678.
 received by the ancient Church, 676.
 synopsis of contents of, 675.
 to be read to the Laodiceans, 676.
 written during Paul's first imprisonment
 in Rome, 675.
- Confusion of tongues, 227.**
- Constantine,**
 orders fifty copies of Scriptures to be made
 on parchment, 462.
- Coptic language,**
 in three dialects, 475.
- Coptic versions of the New Testa-
 ment, 475.**
- Corinth,**
 Church founded in, 653.
 city of, 653.
- Corinthians, First Epistle to the,**
 author of, 656.
 contents of, 655.
 genuineness of, 656.
 persons addressed in, 653.
 time of composition of, 654.
 written at Ephesus, 654.
- Corinthians, Second Epistle to the,**
 addressed to all Achaia, 657.
 author of, 657.
 contents of, 657.
 genuineness of, 659.
 place and time of composition, 657.
- Cosmogony of India,**
 compared with that of Moses, 218.
- Creation,**
 Babylonian account of, 221.
 Etruscan traditions concerning, 221.
 Hindoo theory of, 218.
 hypotheses of, in modern science, 220.
 Mosaic account reconcilable with modern
 science, yet adapted to Jewish pre-con-
 ceptions, 222.
 Persian traditions concerning, 221.
 Plato's theory of, 219.
- Criminals, Jewish,**
 sometimes put to death on feast-days, 618.
- Critical School, The New,**
 views of, 66, 148.
 on the Pentateuch, 73.
- Criticism,**
 biblical, progressive, 24.
 minor interpolations do not weaken au-
 thority, 157.
 necessity of proper pre-conceptions on the
 part of critics, 158.
- Crucifixion of Christ,**
 date of, 616.
- Cursive letters, 463.**
- Cursive manuscripts,**
 the most important, 466.
- Cyrus,**
 mentioned prophetically in Isaiah, 382.
- Dan,**
 city so named, 159.
- Daniel,**
 acquainted with religion of Zoroaster, 413.
 carried into captivity, 396.
 Christ and his apostles refer to him as a
 prophet, 422.
 esteemed a prophet by the Jews of the time
 of Christ, 401.
 exact historical knowledge of, 417.
 Ezekiel's references to, 398.
 no other eminent man of the same name,
 400.
 no reason for supposing him to be a myth-
 ical character, 398.
 personal history of, credible and probable,
 398.
 personality of, 396.
 silence of Jesus Sirach concerning, 405.
 testimony of Josephus concerning, 413.
- Daniel, Book of,**
 admission of, into the canon, 411.
 agreement between Daniel's circumstances
 and his book, 421.
 alleged Greek words in, 402.
 alleged historical errors of, 406.
 alleged obscurity of later prophecies in, 410.
 ancient behalf in its genuineness, 397.
 apocryphal additions to original text, 423.
 Darius's decree ordering the worship of
 himself, 410.
 Darius the Mede no fiction, 408.
 descriptions of dress in, agree with the
 monuments, 419.
 disparaged by Jewish rabbis because of
 the fulfillment of its prophecy in Christ's
 coming, 401.
 divided into historical and prophetic sec-
 tions, 396.
 genuineness of, assailed by critics in an-
 cient and modern times, 397, 400.
 imagery of, borrowed by St. John, 422.
 imagery of, similar to that found on Nine-
 vite monuments, 420.
 impossibility of forgery of, 412.
 language of, 414.
 minute historical statements of, confirmed
 by independent authorities, 418.
 Nebuchadnezzar's history, as regarded in,
 supported by Babylonian legends and
 monuments, 409, 419.
 Nebuchadnezzar's image as described in,
 409.
 no prayers in, 422.
 partly written in Hebrew and partly in
 Chaldee, 397.
 phrase "son of man" adopted by Christ,
 422.
 proofs of its genuineness, 411.
 purity of its Hebrew and Chaldee, 414.
 resemblances of, to Book of Ezekiel, 417.
 shown to Alexander the Great, 413.
 similarity of its Chaldee to that of Ezra,
 415.
 singular position of, in the canon, 400.
 social customs described in, verified by in-
 dependent testimony, 419.
 unity of authorship of, 396.
- Darius, the Mede,**
 his existence proved, 408.
- David,**
 appointed singers, 341.
 high poetic character of, 338.

- David, (*continued.*)
 instituted singing of psalms as a part of divine worship, 301.
 not the author of all the first seventy-two psalms, 342.
- Deluge,
 indications of two accounts of, 82.
 period between it and the building of the great pyramid, 229.
 remarkable account of, found on tablets in ruins of Nineveh, 225.
 traditions of, universal, 224.
- Dens of lions, 419.
- Deuteronomy, the Book of, 122.
 archaisms of, 124.
 contains additions to other Mosaic history, 127.
 differences in its style to be expected, 124.
 directions in, concerning future king of Israel, 170.
 exact time of incidents related not to be expected in, 128.
 genuineness of, its undigested form an evidence of, 132.
 impossibility of its forgery, 123.
 internal evidence of Mosaic authorship of, 123.
 its entire spirit Mosaic, 96.
 legislation in, 129.
 Mosaic origin, its language not inconsistent with, 131.
 presupposes previous legislation, 131.
 prohibition in, of the removal of landmarks, 172.
 proofs that it was written by Moses, 126.
 similar in ethics to rest of Pentateuch, 130.
 supposed argument against, 122.
 synopsis of its contents, 95.
 the Pentateuch incomplete without, 96.
 traditions, none floating, out of which it could have been compiled, 127.
 "unto this day," objection to the term, 169.
 written from Moses's geographical standpoint, 125.
 written in Mosaic age, 125.
- Devil and Satan,
 in Paul's writings, 670.
- Difficulties,
 in Bible study, 24.
- Document hypothesis, 70.
 examination of the, 78.
 if proved, does not disprove Mosaic authorship of Pentateuch, 79, 85.
 indications of two accounts of the deluge, 82.
 origin of, 78.
- Ebal, Mount,
 law written on, 209.
- Ebionites,
 mutilate Matthew's Gospel, 512, 538.
- Ecclesiastes; or, The Preacher,
 authorship of, 351.
 Chaldaisms in, 352.
 contents of, 353.
 date of the composition of, 351.
 design of, 350.
 Elohistic, 352.
 purports to be written by a son of David, 349.
 religious teaching in, 349.
 written in an age of despondency, 352.
- Edessa,
 Syriac literature flourishes there in second century, 468.
- Editions of Greek New Testament, 481.
- Edom,
 an elective and hereditary monarchy, 162.
 enumeration of its kings a proof of genuineness of Pentateuch, 161.
 extreme fertility of, 231.
- Egypt,
 art of writing in during the Mosaic age, 101.
 bricks early made in, 235.
 hieroglyphics, 102.
 Israelites, remarkable increase of, in, 236.
 monuments of, attest biblical accuracy, 235.
 sciences and arts in ancient Egypt, 101.
- Egyptian customs,
 accurately described in story of Joseph, 232.
- Egyptian idolatry,
 imitated by Jeroboam, 199.
- Egyptian priests,
 privileges of, 234.
- Egyptians,
 bestow gifts on departing Israelites, 242.
- Egyptian translations, 63.
- Elohim,
 Joseph's use of, 79.
 places where used, 79-81.
 used exclusively in first two chapters of Exodus, 79.
- Elohim and Jehovah, 79.
 propriety observed in alternating these terms in Genesis, 80.
- Enon, 576.
- Enumeration,
 of Israelites, 91, 92, 134.
 of Levites, 93.
- Epaphras,
 founder of the Colossian Church, 646.
- Ephesians, Epistle to the,
 an encyclical letter, probably, 662-666.
 certainly written by Paul, 668.
 charged with being a mere copy of Colossians, 668.
 contents of, 666.
 difficulties in supposing it written by Paul to the Church in Ephesus, 664.
 genuineness of, acknowledged by ancient Church, 667.
 Hebraisms in, 670.
 Marcion's copies of, addressed "to the Laodiceans," 664.
 modern doubts of its genuineness, 667.
 not simply an elaboration of Colossians, 670.
 Pauline digressions in, 671.
 Pauline words and phrases in, 669.
 persons addressed in, 662.
 written shortly after Colossians, 666.
 written while Paul was a prisoner, 666.
- Ephraim,
 city of, 605.
- Epistles,
 catholic, 701.
 pastoral, 682-706.
 Pauline, 644.
- Esther, Book of,
 contents of, 317.
 historical character of, attested by the observance of the festival of Purim, 321.
 improbable, but not incredible, 317, 319.
 Mordecai the probable author of, 322.
 name of God nowhere mentioned in, 318.
 not found in all catalogues of Old Testament, 317.
- Ethiopic language, 43.
 helps for its study, 47.
 its literature, 43.

- Ethnology**,
accordant with the genealogy of Noah's sons, 226.
- Etruscan legends**,
of creation, 221.
- Evangelists**,
their disagreement a proof of general truthfulness, 26.
- Evidences**,
of biblical inspiration, 31.
- Exode**,
independent accounts of, 114.
route of, clearly identified by modern travellers, 244.
traces of, at Kibroth-hattaavah, 246.
- Exodus, Book of**,
account of the building of the tabernacle given in, 92.
connects closely with Genesis, 97.
contents of, 95.
genealogy of Moses and Aaron peculiarly given in, 87.
genuineness of chapters iii-v, 87.
internal evidences of the genuineness of, 133.
numbering of the children of Israel in, 91.
repetitions in, for emphasis, 88.
- Ezekiel**,
his symbolical actions really performed, 395.
individuality of, stamped upon all his writings, 394.
personal history of, 393.
wonderful gifts of, 395.
- Ezekiel, Book of the Prophet**,
arranged chronologically, 395.
contents of, 394.
genuineness of, beyond dispute, 394.
Jewish traditions of its revision, 395.
language of, abounds in Chaldaisms, 395.
- Ezra**,
probable author of Chronicles, 298.
- Ezra, Book of**,
affinity of its language to that of Chronicles, 299.
historical character of, 316.
its unity, 307.
once united with Nehemiah, 306.
probably written by Ezra, 308.
- Fathers, Christian**,
value of their testimony, 490, 509.
- Feasts and sacrifices**,
in tabernacle and temple similar, 197.
- Forgeries**,
unknown to the early Church, 532.
- Furnace**,
fiery, a frequent mode of punishing in Babylon, 419.
- Fire worshippers**, 419.
- Galatia**,
character of its inhabitants, 659.
origin of the Church there, 660.
- Galatians, Epistle to the**,
contents of, 661.
genuineness of, 662.
occasion of writing of, 661.
persons addressed in, 661.
time and place of composition of, 660.
- Genealogy**,
in Chronicles, 297.
of Christ, as given by Luke, 570.
of Christ, as given by Matthew, 536, 543.
- Genealogy, (continued.)**
of Mordecai, 319.
of Moses and Aaron, 87.
of Noah's sons, accordant with modern ethnology, 2-6.
omissions of, for generations, usual, 240.
- Genesis**,
an introduction to the Mosaic covenant, 96.
antiquity of, incidentally proved, 159.
Colenso's objections to, 249.
connects with Exodus, 97.
document hypothesis of the origin of, 78, 79.
enumeration of Edomite kings a proof of its genuineness, 161.
indications in, of two accounts of deluge, 82.
its history of creation differs from all other accounts, 218.
rationalistic treatment of archaisms of, 113.
sacred character of history in, 96.
synopsis of contents of, 95.
the terms Elohim and Jehovah in, 79.
- Georgian version**, 64.
- Gethsemane**, 604.
- Gnosis**,
Paul's use of the term, 684.
- Gnosticism**,
no traces of, in Colossians, 677.
- Gnostics**,
accepted our Gospels as a sacred authority, 529.
sought admission into the Christian community, 530.
- Gospels, Apocryphal**, 627.
- Gospels, The Four**,
external evidence of their genuineness, 500, 501.
if genuine, establish Jesus' title as Messiah, 500.
only Gospels universally received in early Church, 503.
quoted by Basilides, 526.
quoted by Gnostics, 527.
quoted by Marcion, 524.
quoted by Serpent Brethren, 529.
quoted by Valentinus, 522.
read on Sundays in Christian assemblies, 508.
reasons for writing each of the, 502.
truth of Christianity does not depend on the, 500.
universal reception of the, 500.
- Gothic version**, 64, 479.
- Grammars**,
the best Hebrew, 46.
- Greek influence**,
on Babylon culture, 403.
- Greek language**,
Æolic dialect, 459.
Attic dialect, 460.
diffusion of, in Roman Empire, 457.
Doric dialect, 459.
Hellenistic dialect, 460.
Ionic dialect, 459.
means by which it spread, 457.
partly prevalent in Palestine in Christ's day, 458.
used in Jerusalem synagogues, 458.
why New Testament was written in, 459.
- Greek literature**,
read in nearly all nations in the apostolic age, 457.
- Greek words**,
in Daniel, 403.
in Genesis, 404.

- Habakkuk, Book of the Prophet,**
 contents of, 437.
 date of delivery of prophecies of, 438.
- Hadar,**
 not to be confounded with Hadad, 163.
- Haggai, Book of the Prophet,**
 contents of, 440.
- Hagiography,** 36, 40.
- Hebraisms,**
 in Matthew, 547.
 in New Testament Greek, 461.
 in the Pauline Epistles, 670.
- Hebraists,**
 German, English, and American, 45.
- Hebrew language,**
 ancient characters of the, 45.
 cultivated almost exclusively by Jews in
 the Middle Ages, 45.
 dead in time of Christ, 458.
 destruction of early MSS. in, 48.
 imperative mood often used for a simple
 future in, 344.
 list of most valuable MSS. in, 48, 49.
 MSS., none very ancient extant in, 48.
 not liable to change, 44.
 periods of the, 44.
 probability of change in the, 103.
 simpler in its construction than Greek, 461.
 sources of acquaintance with, 45.
 square characters of the, 44.
 the language of the Canaanites, 41.
 the language of the Old Testament, 41.
 varieties of, 42.
- Hebrew philologists,** 45, 46.
- Hebrew poetry,**
 characteristics of, 323.
- Hebrew prophets,**
 chronological table of, 364.
- Hebrew Scriptures,**
 lack of modern critical labors upon, 50.
- Hebrews, Epistle to the,**
 anonymous in the most ancient Greek
 MSS., 532.
 apostolic doctrines in, 706.
 conjectures as to date of its composition,
 705.
 contents of, 706.
 impossibility of fixing on author of, 704.
 local—not general, 698.
 no mention of the author in the, 700.
 not addressed to Palestinian or Alexan-
 drian Christians, 698, 699.
 objections to Pauline origin of, 703.
 opinions of the Fathers on its authorship,
 700.
 probably addressed to Jewish Christians in
 Asia Minor, 699.
 reasons for believing it to have originated
 at least indirectly from Paul, 702, 705.
 reasons for crediting it to Apollos, 704.
 reasons for crediting it to Barnabas, 704.
 style, peculiarity of its, 703.
 style, purity of its, 700.
 value of, 706.
 written before the destruction of Jerusa-
 lem, 705.
- Hebron, city of,** 165.
- Heliopolis,**
 a depository of ancient learning, 115.
- Hellenistic Greek,**
 characteristics of, 460.
- Heresies,** 521-530, 585, 586, 742.
- Heretics,**
 testimony of, to the four Gospels 521.
- Hexapla,** 54.
- Hieroglyphic writing,**
 in Egypt, 102.
- Hobab,**
 his relationship to Moses, 90.
- Horeb, Mount,** 90, 124.
- Hosea,**
 personality of, 424.
- Hosea, Book of the Prophet,**
 contents of, 424.
 date of composition of, 424.
 poetical style of, 425.
- Human race,**
 unity of, 222.
- Hyperbaton,**
 Paul's frequent use of, 25.
- Indo-Germanic languages,**
 originated in Western Asia, 222.
- Inspiration,**
 degrees of, 27-30.
 evidences of, 31.
 human element in, 27.
 verbal, held by Jews, and some of the early
 Fathers, 28.
- Interpolations,**
 minor, do not weaken authority, 157.
- Isaiah,**
 personal history of, 365.
- Isaiah, Book of the Prophet,**
 analysis of its chapters, 370.
 analysis of third section of, 376.
 ancient testimony to its genuineness, 367.
 Chaldaisms not found in latter part of, 379.
 contents of, 364.
 explanation of difficulties in, 381.
 genuineness of chapters xi to lxvi, 378.
 historical portion of, 366.
 internal evidence against authorship of,
 during the captivity, 380.
 last division, genuineness of, denied by
 rationalistic school, 367.
 last division, largely Messianic, 382.
 last division, not written during the Baby-
 lonian captivity, 381.
 most wonderful book of ancient world, 364.
 predictions of restoration of Judah, 377.
 predictions of the rebuilding of the temple,
 377.
 prophecies of, concerning Cyrus, 382.
 prophecies concerning foreign nations, 371.
 prophecies concerning the Messiah, 371.
 prophecies relating to King Josiah, a hun-
 dred and fifty years before his reign, 382.
 purity of its style, 368.
 quoted by Jeremiah and Zephaniah, 383.
 quoted in New Testament, 368.
 rationalistic criticism unable to do it jus-
 tice, 369.
 second division of, historical, 375.
 when written, 365.
- Israel,**
 to be governed by kings, 160.
 warned against false prophets, 360.
- Israelites,**
 enumeration of, 91, 92, 134.
 increase of, reasons for, 241.
 in Egypt, 237-241.
 in Egypt, length of stay, 238.
- Itala version,** 62, 472, 492.
 proof of its African origin, 474.
- Jacob,**
 explanation of discrepancies, 238.
 his family—discrepancies in list of, 237.
- Jairs,**
 in Judges and Joshua, 169.

- James, General Epistle of**,
addressed to Jewish believers, 713.
agreement of, with the writings of Paul, 713.
early doubts of authenticity of, 711.
genuineness of, 714.
its author, James, son of Alphaeus, 707.
not circulated among Gentile Christians of the early Church, 713.
not received by Erasmus or Luther, 712.
peculiarities of style of, 714.
quoted by early fathers, 711.
written before destruction of Jerusalem, 716.
- James, son of Alphaeus**,
author of Epistle of James, 707.
bishop of Jerusalem, 709.
cousin of Jesus, an actual, 709.
identical with "the Lord's brother," 709.
surnamed "the Just," and "the Less," 707, 709.
was he an apostle? 709.
- James, son of Zebedee**,
his early death, 707, 708.
- Jashur**, (see Book of the Upright.)
- Jehoiada**,
carried out musical arrangements of David, 341.
- Jehoshaphat**,
appointed singers unto the Lord, 341.
- Jehovah**,
especially the God of the Hebrews, 80.
God reveals himself to Moses as, 86.
no fixed place to worship in the time of David, 215.
probability of Moses using the term, 81.
the term, used alternately with Elohim, 65, 83.
use of both terms—Jehovah and Elohim—no proof of the document theory, 82-84.
- Jeremiah**,
character of, 384.
commanded by God to write his prophecies, 391.
credited with the composition of the Books of Kings, 389.
death of, not recorded, 384.
personal history of, 383.
propheied in a period of great corruption and idolatry, 384.
- Jeremiah, Book of the Prophet**,
collection and arrangement of prophecies in, 391.
contents of, 384.
dates of the deliverance of prophecies in, 385.
few Messianic prophecies in, 384.
four divisions of, 384.
genuineness of, 385.
Hebrew text of, and Septuagint, differ, 392.
its imitation of Isaiah, 386-388.
last chapter of, appended by a later hand, 391.
passages in, doubted by modern critics, 386-390.
prophecies of, not in chronological order, 392.
shortening of proper names, 388.
- Jericho**,
falling of its walls, 268.
- Jeroboam's idolatry**,
proves that the Mosaic law was held sacred in his day, 198.
- Jerome**,
erudition of, 62.
gradual corruption of his version, 62.
his revision of Old and New Testament, 62.
Jerome's revision, 475.
- Jerusalem**,
destruction of, by the Romans, a punishment for its sins, 257.
the council at, to guard sacred books, 40.
- Jerusalem Syriac version**, 472.
- Jethro**,
relationship of, to Moses, 90.
- Jews**,
modern, violate Mosaic law, 216.
- Job**,
his existence verified by the mention of his name in Ezekiel, 329.
traditionally one of the seven heathen prophets of primitive times, 329.
- Job, Book of**,
a sacred drama, 326.
author of, probably an inhabitant of southern Judea, 322.
contents of, 326.
date of composition of, 330, 332.
design of, 329.
divides into prologue, dialogue, and epilogue, 326.
Elihu's discourses in, rejected by some critics, 327.
genuineness of prologue and epilogue conceded by critics, 327.
no reason assigned in, for Job's great sufferings, 329.
not history, 328.
probably written in the time of Solomon, 332.
sublimity of, 333.
supposed by some to have been written by Moses, 330.
value of teachings of, 334.
written in a post-Mosaic age, 331.
- Joel, Book of**,
character of prophecy in, 426.
date of prophecy, 426.
personal history of the prophet unknown, 425.
plague of locusts in, to be literally understood, 425.
resemblance to Amos, 426.
- John, First Epistle General of**,
chapter v, 7, spurious, 744.
contents of, 743.
design of, 706.
genuineness of, 598, 742.
time of composition of, 743.
- John, Gospel according to**,
alleged discrepancy between John and other evangelists respecting date of Christ's crucifixion, 616.
ancient testimony in its favor, 586.
authenticity of chapter v, 3, 4, 627.
authenticity of chapters vii, 53-viii, 11, 626.
authenticity of chapter xxi, 626.
author of, acquainted with Hebrew language, 600.
author of, acquainted with Samaritans, 601.
author of, familiar with Jewish customs, 602.
authorship of, indicated throughout the book, 607.
Canon of Polycrates, which must have been that of Ephesian Church, included it, 588.
correctness of the reports of Christ's discourses in, 611-613.
delineation of Christ in, apparently different from that of other Gospels, 609.
estimates of, by modern critics of various schools, 621.
genuineness of, received by early Church, 583.

- John, Gospel according to, (continued.)**
 integrity of, 625.
 internal evidence that it proceeded from John, 600.
 modern attacks on its genuineness, 583.
 passages in, suggesting an eye-witness, 606.
 quoted by the Fathers, 5. 1
 rejected by Alogians, 585, 620.
 relation of, to Passover controversy, 619.
 sceptical theory concerning, untenable, 585.
 similarity of John and the other evangelists, 611.
 synopsis of contents of, 624.
 term Logos in John's Gospel and Philo, 615.
 testimony of Canon of Muratori concerning, 539.
 time and place of its composition, 623.
 topographical accuracy of, 603.
 written by the author of the First Epistle of John, 595.
- John, Saint,**
 account of, by Polyerates, 581.
 anecdotes of, related by Clement, 752.
 author of the Apocalypse, 756.
 banishment of, to Patmos, 752.
 Irenæus's account of, 580.
 peculiarities of literary style of, 765, 766.
 personal history of, 579.
 return of, from Patmos after Nero's death, 751.
 was the beloved disciple, 607.
- John, Second Epistle of,**
 authorship of, 746.
 opinions of Church Fathers concerning, 747.
 to whom addressed, 746.
- John, the Presbyter, 762, 763.**
- John, Third Epistle of,**
 contents of, 748.
 genuineness of, 748.
 personality of Gaius, 747.
- Jonah, Book of,**
 character and design of, 431, 433.
 conjecture of critics concerning, 431.
 contents of, 430.
 mission of Jonah to Nineveh real, 434.
 peculiarities of language of, 433.
 regarded by Jews and early Christians as real history, 432.
- Jonathan ben Uzziel**
 personality of, 58.
- Jordan,**
 crossing of the, by Israelites, 268.
 use of the phrase, "beyond Jordan," 164.
- Joseph,**
 his story an exact picture of Egyptian customs, 232.
- Joshua, Book of,**
 account in, of the falling of the walls of Jericho, 268.
 authorship of, 267.
 contents of, 259.
 credibility of, 267.
 crossing of the Jordan, as related in, 268.
 date and authorship of, 261.
 difference in literary style of the two divisions of, 261.
 evidently written before Judges, 266.
 no contradiction between its two divisions, 296.
 not a collection of fragments, 264.
 not written by the same author as the Pentateuch, 266.
 Pentateuch, the existence and authority of, confirmed in, 208.
 proof of antiquity of, 210.
- Joshua, Book of, (continued.)**
 references to, in Deuteronomy, 208.
 standing still of sun and moon, as related in, 268.
 unity of, 260.
- Judaism,**
 necessarily local, 448.
- Jude,**
 personal career of, 738.
- Jude, Book of,**
 author of, does not claim to be an apostle, 740.
 contents of, 738.
 date of composition of, 741.
 modern criticism upon, 740.
 quotations in, from apocryphal writings, 740.
 various opinions of Christian fathers concerning the genuineness of, 739.
- Judges, Book of,**
 apparent contradictions in, harmonized, 275.
 authorship of, 374.
 begins where Joshua leaves off, 266.
 contents of, 270.
 corroborates Pentateuch, 210.
 credibility of its history, 274.
 date of, 274.
 mainly written by one author, 271.
 not written before the time of Saul, 273.
 unity of, 270.
 written before the middle of David's reign, 272.
- Kings, Books of,**
 annals of the respective kings, 288.
 author of, unknown, 289.
 credibility of, 290.
 documents referred to throughout, 286.
 history in, confirmed by ancient monuments, 290.
 history in, confirmed by Phœnician records, 286.
 history in, confirmed by that of Berosus, 296.
 history in, distinguished by fidelity and impartiality, 290.
 history in, may be divided into three periods, 286.
 originally one book, 286.
 source of, 286.
 when written, 287, 289.
- Lamentations, Book of,**
 contents of, 358.
 Jeremiah, author of, 359.
 versification of, artificial, 358.
- Landmarks,**
 removal of, 172.
- Language of Deuteronomy,**
 proves a Mosaic origin, 131.
- Languages,**
 Arabic, 43.
 Aramaean, 42.
 Chaldaic, 43, 415.
 Ethiopic, 43.
 Greek, 457.
 Hebrew, 42.
 Indo-Germanic, 222.
 Oriental, stability of, 140.
 Punic, 42.
 Syriac, 47.
- Latin versions,**
 numerous and conflicting, 62.
 the Itala has preference over the other, 62.
 the origin of Vulgate, 62.

- Latin versions of the New Testament,** 472.
- Law of Moses,**
 adapted to Israelites, 257.
 concerning lepers, 133.
 divine authority of, 28.
 non-observance of, no proof of its non-existence, 213.
 observed in time of Jeroboam, 198.
 observed in time of Judges, 210.
 severity of, 28, 257.
 violated by modern Jews, 216.
 written on Mount Ebal, 209.
- Legislation,**
 in Deuteronomy, 139.
- Leprosy,**
 laws respecting, written in desert, 133.
- Levitical precepts,**
 in force in time of Judges, 210.
- Leviticus,**
 contents of, 95.
 records made at time of occurrence of the events, 133.
- Lexicons,**
 best Hebrew, 46.
- Literary proficiency,**
 of the early Christians, 454.
- "Logos,"**
 used by Philo, 587.
- Longevity,**
 of the antediluvians not mythical, 223.
- Luke, Gospel according to,**
 contents of, 573.
 date of composition of, 570.
 depreciates none of the apostles, 576.
 design of, 575.
 language of, similar to that of the Acts, 569.
 matter in Luke not in Matthew, 573.
 matter in Matthew not in Luke, 574.
 no doubt in ancient Church as to its author, 570.
 statement of, respecting Lysanius, 578.
 statement of, respecting taxing under Cyrenius, 577.
 written before the fall of Jerusalem, 572.
- Luke, Saint,**
 author of third Gospel and of Acts of the Apostles, 564.
 his accurate knowledge of Greek and Roman history and geography, 578.
 his personal history, 563.
 qualifications as a writer, 564.
 unquestionably Paul's travelling companion, 565.
- Maccabees,**
 Scripture learning flourished under the, 412.
- Maccabees, Books of,**
 contain absurdities, 420.
 in favour with some early Fathers, 35.
- Mai,**
 publishes Codex Vaticanus, 465.
- Malachi, Book of,**
 character of prophecy, 447.
 contents of, 446.
 date of, 446.
 questions as to the identity of its author, 446.
- Manna,**
 cessation of the, 163.
- Manuscripts,**
 easily destroyed, 462.
 uncial, 463.
 ancient, many still existing, 462.
 cursive, 466.
- Mark, Gospel according to,**
 brevity of, 554.
 character of, 554.
 date of composition of, 557.
 derived from independent sources, 555.
 Ewald's complex theory of, 556.
 genuineness of, 556.
 integrity of, 559.
 last twelve verses of, not genuine, 559.
 omissions of, 554.
 place of composition of, 559.
 use of "Lord," "Christ," and other phrases in, 562.
 written after the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, 557.
 written for Gentile Christians, 556.
 written originally in Greek, 559.
- Mark, Saint,**
 personal history of, 553.
 wrote at Peter's dictation, 502.
- Masorites,**
 their labours, 49.
- Matthew, Gospel according to,**
 chronological order more clearly observed in, than in Luke or Mark, 549.
 Church Fathers agree that Matthew was author of, 534.
 contents of, 551.
 date of composition of, 544.
 designed especially for Jewish Christians, 544.
 doubts of late critics respecting, considered, 548.
 early reception of, by Jewish Christian sects, 541.
 genuineness of, 547.
 Greek original of, some modern critics favour a, 542.
 Greek version of, everywhere received in the early Christian Church, 542.
 Hebraisms of, show that its author's vernacular was Hebrew or Syro-Chaldee, 547.
 internal evidence that it was designed for Jewish Christians, 542.
 interpolations in, alleged, 546.
 matter in Luke not in Matthew, 573.
 matter in Matthew not in Luke, 574.
 mutilated by the Ebionites, 534.
 oldest of the four Gospels, 545.
 written originally in Hebrew, 534-537.
- Matthew, Saint,**
 his personal history, 533.
- Medes and Persians,**
 fire-worshippers, 419.
 laws of, 418.
- Memphitic version,** 476.
- Meribah and Massah,** 89.
- Messianic prophecies,**
 fulfilment of, 32.
- Micah, Book of,**
 character of its style, 435.
 date of prophecy, 435.
- Midianites,**
 slaughter of, 248.
- Minor prophets,** 423.
- Miracles,**
 conceivable as the foundation of a religion, 253.
 general objections to, 252.
- Mishna, its date,** 132.
- Moab,**
 topography of, correctly given in story of Balaam, 247.
- Moabite stone,** 290.

- Monuments,**
 Assyrian, corroborate Kings and Chronicles, 292.
 Babylonian, confirm Bible narrative, 230.
 Egyptian, explain customs mentioned in Genesis, 235.
- Mordecai,**
 genealogy of, 319.
 probable author of Esther, 322.
- Mosaic account of creation,**
 compared with that of Plato, 219.
 compared with that of the Hindoos, 218.
 in harmony with modern science, 230.
- Mosaic history,**
 sacred character of, 96.
- Mosaic law,**
 adapted to the Israelites, 257.
 equally severe to idolaters and disobedient Hebrews, 257.
 its non-observance no proof of its non-existence, 213.
 severity of, 28, 257.
 written on Mount Ebal, 209.
- Moses,**
 author of Pentateuch, 114.
 author of Psalm xc, 339.
 genealogy of, 87.
 had ample time to write laws and annals, 116.
 his father-in-law known by various names, 90.
 independent testimony concerning, 114.
 meekness, reports his own, 120.
 probability of his having written history and laws, 114, 116.
 record of his law kept by himself, 117.
 versatility of, 122.
- Mount Ebal,**
 the Law of Moses written upon, 209.
- Music,**
 in temple worship, 341.
- Mythology, Greek and Roman,**
 traces of Mosaic history in, 238.
- Nahum, Book of,**
 date of its composition, 436.
 prophecies concerning Nineveh, 436.
 prophetic style of, 437.
- Nathan,**
 probable author of Books of Samuel, 280.
- Nebuchadnezzar,**
 early history of, 406, 407.
 golden image of, 409.
 insanity of, 409.
 palace of, 419.
- Nehemiah, Book of,**
 author of. obtains permission to visit and rebuild Jerusalem, 312.
 contents of, 312.
 doubts concerning authorship of chapters viii ix, x, 312.
 historical character of, 316.
 unity of, 312.
 written by Nehemiah, 313.
 written wholly in Hebrew, 312.
- Nero,**
 blames Christians for firing Rome, 450.
 expected to reappear, 755.
 his name answers to the number six hundred and sixty-six, 755.
 persecution of Christians during his reign, 754.
- Nimrod,**
 story of, illustrated on ancient monuments, 226.
- Nineveh,**
 really visited by Jonah, 434.
- Noah's sons,**
 their genealogy, 226.
- Numbers,**
 contents of, 98.
 enumeration of the Israelites in, 134.
 Meribah and Massah, 89.
 miraculous supply of quails mentioned in, 89.
- Obadiah, Book of,**
 date of, 429.
 personal history of its author unknown, 429.
 resemblance of, to Jeremiah, xlix, 17-22, 429.
- Omer, size of, 164.**
- Omri,**
 mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions, and on the Moabite stone, 292.
- Onkelos, 58.**
- Oriental languages,**
 stability of, 140.
- Origin of man,**
 recent, 222.
- Papyrus,**
 the most common writing material in the apostolic age, 462.
- Parchment,**
 used in the apostolic age, 462.
 after fourth century, commonly used in copying Scriptures, 462.
- Passover controversy, 619.**
- Passover, Feast of,**
 credibility of history of, 243.
- Pastoral Epistles,**
 absurdity of theory of forgery of, 690.
 apostolic origin, proofs of, 684.
 doubts of genuineness of, 684.
 genuineness, inherent proof of, 690.
 historical incidents referred to in, 688.
 likelihood of Paul writing such epistles, 685.
 objections drawn from style of, 685.
 Pauline origin, proofs of, 688.
 special objections to First Timothy, 686.
 unity of authorship, proofs of, in, 687.
 universally received in early Church, 687.
- Patmos,**
 Saint John banished to, 753, 754.
- Patristic views of inspiration, 24-27.**
- Paul, Saint,**
 apparent inconsistencies in his statements, 120.
 attainments of, in knowledge, 645.
 characteristics of, 649.
 conversion of, 646.
 his traveling companion, 565.
 his use of terms "devil" and "Satan," 670.
 his use of the term "gnosis," 684.
 imprisonments of, 672.
 later history of, 647.
 missionary journeys of, 646.
 personal history of, as given in Acts and epistles, 635, 644.
 reproof of Peter by, explained, 634.
 travels of, after his first imprisonment in Rome, 688.
 use of hyperbaton by, 25.
 visit of, to Philippi, 672.
- Pauline digressions, 671.**
- Pauline epistles, 644, 672, 683.**
- Pauline phraseology, 669, 670.**

- Pentateuch,**
 accuracy of, proved by Egyptian monuments, 234.
 allusions to, in the Books of Proverbs and Psalms, 191.
 antiquity of, proved by account of Edomites, 162.
 apparent contradictions in, 93.
 arrangement of laws in, unmethodical, 85.
 attacked by Colenso, 249.
 attacked in the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, 69.
 author of, had an intimate knowledge of events narrated, 264.
 authority of, indicated in Books of Samuel and Kings, 196.
 authorship of, its own statements concerning, worthy of credit, 118.
 authorship of modern skepticism regarding, 67.
 authorship of, Mosaic, 66, 85, 258.
 chronological difficulties of, 93.
 contents of, 95.
 credibility of the history in the, 218.
 defended by certain rationalists, 68.
 divine authority of, assumed, 258.
 document hypothesis of, its origin, 78.
 enumeration of Edomite kings, a proof of genuineness of, 161.
 external evidence of the antiquity, authority, and integrity of, 180.
 falsity of the theory that the early legislation of the Pentateuch consisted only of Exodus xxi-xxii, 142.
 Genesis and Exodus closely connected, 97.
 genuineness of, evidenced by genealogies and lists of kings, 158, 159.
 genuineness of, evidenced by slight treatment of unimportant years, 141.
 genuineness of, internal evidences of, 133.
 Hebrew, advantage of, over Samaritan Pentateuch, 178.
 historical facts in, correspond with those in Joshua, 209.
 history in, closely interwoven with its legislation, 139.
 history in, credible, 218.
 history in, natural order of, 97.
 history of creation in, differs from all other accounts, 218.
 history of views respecting it, 66.
 interpolations in, conceded to be few and slight, 142.
 king of Israel, directions in, concerning, 168.
 laws of, improbability of their modification, 132.
 laws of, interwoven with history in, 139.
 laws of, recognized by Jezebel, 200.
 Mosaic authorship of, acknowledged by Peter and Paul, 259.
 Mosaic authorship of, assumed, 258.
 Mosaic authorship of, want of candour in its opponents, 155.
 Moses's meekness, as recorded in, reported by himself, 130.
 Moses undoubtedly the author of, 66, 85, 258.
 no contradiction between Deuteronomy and other books, 129.
 no portion of it of post-Mosaic origin, 170.
 not written by the author of the Book of Joshua, 316.
 objections to, based on its explanation of the size of an omer, 164.
 objections to, based on the time of the cessation of manna, 160.
 older than any other part of the Old Testament, 110.
 origin of the word Pentateuch, 66.
 parallels between history in, and the history in the Books of the Kings, 200.
- Pentateuch, (continued.)**
 passages in, supposed to indicate a post-Mosaic age, 165.
 phrase, "unto this day," as used in, 169.
 probably revised by Moses shortly before his death, 153.
 post-Mosaic age in the, alleged traces of, 157.
 proof of the great antiquity of, 103.
 proof of the existence and authority of, in the Book of Joshua, 208.
 quoted by David, 202.
 quoted by Solomon, 198.
 rationalistic critics, concessions of, concerning, 137.
 rationalistic treatment of archaisms in, 60.
 references in, to Moses in third person, 120.
 references in, to the Book of the Law, 119.
 reference to, in Joshua's acts, 203.
 referred to by the "Greater" and the "Lesser" Prophets, 180-190.
 repetition in, for emphasis, 88.
 repetitions, frequent, in, 83.
 Samaritan, scant agreement between, and that of the Septuagint, 178.
 Samaritan versions of, 65, 174.
 statement of the Pentateuch concerning its author, 117.
 tabernacle, account of, as given in Mosaic age, 133.
 terms Elohim and Jehovab, as used in, 65.
 testimony by the history of the Books of Samuel and Kings to the existence and authority of the Pentateuch, 194.
 topography of, accurate, 248.
 traces of, in Book of Ruth, 205.
 unity of its plan, 95, 138.
 use and authority of, throughout post-Mosaic age, 180.
 various difficulties in, answered, 90.
 various styles of, 94.
 wonderful elevation of its theology, 258.
- Persecution of Christians,**
 by Nero, 450, 754.
 under Domitian, 754.
 under Trajan, 451.
- Persians,**
 regarded their kings as the incarnation of Ormuzd, 418.
 their relations with the Medes, 418.
 their traditions of creation, 221.
 the sexes mingled at their feasts, 417.
- Peshito version,**
 contains possibly to a great extent the original Syro-Chaldee text of Matthew's Gospel, 471.
 first known to Europeans in sixteenth century, 469.
 its antiquity and value, 469.
 late valuable printed editions, 470.
 most ancient manuscripts of, 470.
 of Old and New Testaments, 61.
- Peter, First Epistle General of,**
 addressed to Gentiles chiefly, 732.
 contents of, 732.
 doubtless written by Peter, 732.
 Hilgenfeld's theory of, absurd, 739.
 improbability of its rejection by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 723.
 objections to, of modern critics considered, 724.
 passages in, said to be borrowed from Paul and James, 725, 728.
 sent by Silvanus, 733.
 written from Babylon, 732.
 written, probably, during persecutions under Nero, 729.

- Peter, Saint,**
 characteristics of, 719.
 his crucifixion in Rome, A.D. 67 or 68, 721.
 notices of, in the writings of the Fathers, 720, 721.
 personal history of, 718.
 probably four years in Rome, 721.
 tomb pointed out in A.D. 200, 721.
- Peter, Second Epistle General of,**
 contents of, 734.
 doubts of reformers and modern critics as to its genuineness, 737.
 hardly noticed by the Fathers, 736.
 persons addressed in, 734.
 recognized in the fourth century, 736.
 resemblance of, to Jude, 735.
 written in more elegant Greek than the First Epistle, 736.
- Plagues,**
 narrative in Genesis correspondent with Egyptian customs, 235.
 of locusts, 425.
- Plato's cosmogony,**
 compared with that of Moses, 219.
- Philemon, Epistle to,**
 cause of writing of, 696.
 date of, 697.
 genuineness of, 697.
 opinions of the Fathers concerning, 697.
- Philippi, city of,** 671.
 Paul's visit to, 672.
 its Church composed of Gentiles, 672.
- Philippians, Epistle to the,**
 assailed by modern sceptics, 674.
 genuineness of, 673.
 synopsis of contents of, 673.
 written during Paul's first imprisonment in Rome, 672.
- Philistines,**
 familiar with history of Israel as recorded in the Pentateuch, 204.
- Philoxenian translation,** 471.
- Phœnicians,**
 Books of Kings confirmed by their records, 286.
 mention of Solomon's temple by their historians, 296.
- Poetry of the Hebrews,**
 parallelisms in, 323.
 poetical books, in the Old Testament, 322.
 poetry quoted in the Pentateuch, 166.
 rhythm of, 323.
 stanzas in, of same number of words, 324.
- Population of Roman Empire,**
 in age of Claudius Cæsar, 454.
 in time of Augustus, 454.
- Predictions,**
 by specific names, 332.
- Presbyter and bishop,**
 identity of, in apostolic Church, 685.
- Priests,**
 among the Israelites previous to time of Moses and Aaron, 88.
- Primeval condition of man,**
 according to the
 ancient Persian books, 223.
 Chinese classics, 223.
 classical poets, 222.
 Hindoo literature, 223.
 Zendavesta, 223.
- Prophets, Heathen,**
 the seven, of primitive times, 329.
- Prophets, Hebrew,**
 characteristics of, 361.
 chronological table of, 364.
- Prophets, Hebrew, (continued.)**
 earlier, 259.
 false, 360.
 impossibility of blending writings of, 368.
 language of, sublime, 363.
 manner of inspiration of, 29.
 predictions without a parallel, 32.
 schools of, 360.
 symbolic actions of, 362.
- Prophecies, Biblical,**
 communicated in visions in which future events passed before the eyes of prophets as present realities, 381.
 exactly fulfilled, 32.
 many preserved, respecting the genuineness of which there can be no doubt, 362.
 respecting the universality of Christ's kingdom and the conversion of the Jews not yet fulfilled, 363.
 some dependent upon circumstances, others unconditional and limitless, 363.
 spoken of as being fulfilled, yet in the future, 381.
- Prophecy,**
 furnishes an argument for the existence of God, 382.
 Hebrew, characteristics of, 360.
 most brilliant period of, 361.
 various views of its character, 362.
- Proverbs, Book of,**
 Agur and Lemuel, mentioned in, unknown, 345.
 consists of four sections, 345.
 copied out by the men of Hezekiah, not collected, 347.
 genuineness of, 345.
 Jehovistic, 345.
 one third of Solomon's proverbs not in our collection, 345.
 peculiarities of language of Solomon's proverbs, 345.
 scepticism as to its authorship, 345.
 written by Solomon, 345.
- Psalms,**
 authority of their superscriptions, 334.
 Book of, divided into five parts, 334.
 Book of, its arrangement, 340.
 classes, various, of the, 343.
 collection in existence in time of Hezekiah, 341.
 divided by some critics into Jehovistic and Elohist sections, 340, 342.
 doxology at end of each division, 334.
 exhibit Israelitish history and customs, 191.
 fifty anonymous, 335.
 how many were written by David, 336, 337, 338.
 imprecations in the, 338, 343.
 integrity of the, 343.
 none written later than Nehemiah, 340.
 origin of the collection of the Book of, 340.
 Psalm II, not necessarily written as late as Babylonian captivity, 337.
 some passages in, not models for the imitation of Christians, 355.
 some superscriptions obscure, 335.
 sung in Hebrew worship, 341.
 superscription "to the chief musician," not found in Psalms composed after Babylonian captivity, 335.
 ten attributed to the sons of Korah, 339.
 twelve attributed to Asaph, 338.
- Pul, King,**
 mentioned by Berosus, 292.
- Punic language,** 42.
- Punishment,**
 methods of, in Babylon, 418.

- Purim, Feast of,**
attests historical character of the Book of Esther, 321.
- Raguel,**
his relationship to Moses, 90.
- Recorder,**
first mentioned in David's time, 288.
- Resurrection of Jesus Christ,**
established independently of testimony of the evangelists, 500.
- Revelation,**
not an impossibility, 23.
- Romans, Epistle to the,**
contents of, 651.
genuineness of, 650.
integrity of, 652.
persons addressed in, 649.
time of its composition, 650.
written at Corinth, 650.
- Rome,**
probable origin of the Church there, 650.
subdued by the arts of Greece, 438.
- Ruth, Book of,**
contents of, 275.
date and author of, 276.
events of, occurred in time of Judges, 275.
its beauty, 277.
its design, 276.
rabbinical estimate of, 277.
- Sabbath,**
Christians accustomed to meet on "the day of the sun," 490.
- Samaria,**
capture of, recorded in Assyrian inscriptions, 293.
- Samaritan Pentateuch, the,** 174.
disagreement between, and the Pentateuch, 178.
- Samaritans,**
animosity of Jews to, 175, 176.
antiquity of the characters in the Samaritan Pentateuch, 177.
author's interview with the highpriest of the modern sect, 176.
dispute of, with Jews concerning the temple, 175.
origin of, 174.
Pentateuch used by, 65, 174.
temple built by, under Sanballat, 175.
their worship of Jehovah based on the Mosaic law, 177.
- Samuel, Books of,**
alleged contradictions in, examined, 281.
character of the history of, 280.
date and authorship of, 278.
have genuine historical stamp, 281.
originality of, 278.
used in the compilation of the Chronicles, 301.
were originally but one book, 277.
- Saul quotes the Pentateuch,** 171.
- Sciences and arts,**
in ancient Egypt, 101.
- Scriptures,**
atheists unfit to deal fairly with, 23.
human and divine factors in, 24.
read in the services of the primitive Church, 490.
studied carefully under the Maccabees, 412.
- Semitic languages,**
are simple in structure, 44.
five branches of, 42.
peculiar features of, 43.
- Sennacherib,**
the miraculous destruction of his army referred to in Herodotus, 295.
- Septuagint,**
authoritative at time of Christ, 53.
character of, 52.
criticism of, a difficult task, 55.
editions of Holmes and Parsons, 57.
most important editions of, 56.
origin of, 50.
recensions of, in third century, 55.
text of, in an unsettled state, 53-55.
two remarkable interpolations in the Book of Joshua, 157.
version in the early Church, 53.
- Shiloh,**
a sacred place, 215.
- Siloam,**
pool of, 575.
- Sinai, Mount,**
a single summit of the mountainous group called Horeb, 124.
identification of Jebel Músa with, 246.
identification of Rás Susáfeh with "the Mount of the Law," 246.
- Sinaitic peninsula,**
thoroughly explored by Professor Palmer, 245.
topography of, correctly given in Exodus, 245.
- Slavonian version,** 65.
- Solomon,**
his dedicatory prayer given in his exact words, 213.
his departure from Mosaic regulations, 169.
no reason to doubt his authorship of the Song of Solomon, 357.
not the author of Ecclesiastes, 351.
quotes the Pentateuch, 198.
undoubtedly the author of the Proverbs attributed to him, 346.
- "Solomon, Book of Acts of," 286.
- Solomon, Song of,**
a dialogue, 353.
an allegorical poem, 354.
analysis of, 354.
attributed to Solomon by ancient tradition, 357.
contents of, 353.
design of, 354.
oriental usages present reasons for an allegorical interpretation of, 325.
questions concerning the canonicity of, 357.
similar sacred songs sung by the dervishes of Egypt, 325.
written in Solomon's age, 357.
- "Son of Man,"
praise taken from Daniel, 422.
- Sun,**
standing still of, recorded in Joshua, 268.
standing still of, referred to in Habakkuk, 269.
- Superscriptions,**
of the Gospels, an evidence of their genuineness, 530.
of the Psalms, modern criticisms on their accuracy, 356.
- Symbolic actions of the prophets,** 395.
- Symmachus,**
his version of the Old Testament, 54.
- Syriac language,**
extent of, 42, 467.
helps for its study, 47.
literature, richness of, 42.

- Syriac language, (*continued.*)
 little changed for centuries, 140.
 translation of Old and New Testaments into, 61.
- Syriac literature,
 flourished in second century, 468.
- Syriac version,
 probable antiquity of, 468.
- Syro-Chaldee language, 458.
- Tabernacle,
 difficulty concerning its building, 93.
 directions for its building, 133.
 located in Shiloh, 130.
 services in, similar to those of Solomon's temple, 193.
- Talmudic canon, 40.
- Targums,
 of Jerusalem, 60.
 of Jonathan, characteristics and value of, 59.
 of Onkelos, its intelligibility, 59.
 later editions of, 61.
 of Pseudo-Jonathan on Pentateuch, 59.
 on the Hagiographa—their various styles, 60.
- Temple, Second,
 construction of, 308.
- Temple, Solomon's,
 its arrangement a proof of the existence of Moses's law, 197.
 its building mentioned in Phœnician records, 296.
 parallel between it and the sanctuary in Exodus, 197.
 services similar to those of tabernacle, 108.
 singing at, 341.
- Testament, New,
 introduction to, 448.
 origin of the term, 33.
 references to, in early writers, 489.
 times and occasions of composition, 488.
 why written in Greek, 459.
- Testament, Old,
 Concordances of, 57.
 Greek translations of, 57.
 impartiality of its history, 211.
 its purpose, 448.
 origin of the term, 33.
 versions, list of, 50-65.
 Syriac translation of, 458.
- Tetrapla, 55.
- Thebaic (or Sahadic) version, 477.
- Theists,
 cannot deny possibility of written revelation, 23.
- Theodotion's version,
 of Old Testament, 54.
- Thessalonians, First Epistle to,
 contents of, 679.
 genuineness of, 680.
 misconception of Paul's meaning in, 680.
 quoted by Fathers, 680.
 written from Corinth, 679.
- Thessalonians, Second Epistle to,
 contents of, 681.
 Hebraisms in, 683.
 Hilgenfeld's doubts concerning, stated and considered, 681.
 probably written from Corinth, 680.
 received by ancient Church, 681.
- Thessalonica,
 city of, 678.
 date of Paul's visit to, 679.
- Thomas of Charkel,
 his diligence in improving the Syriac Philoxenian translation of the New Testament, 472.
- Tiberias,
 John's neglect to notice it, an evidence of the antiquity of his Gospel, 604.
- Timothy,
 bishop of Ephesus, 692.
 his personal history, 691.
- Timothy, First Epistle to,
 allusions in, to Timothy's youth, 686.
 contents of, 692.
 date of writing of, 686, note.
 doubts of genuineness of, 686.
 rejected by Marcion, 653.
 testimony of early Fathers to its genuineness, 692.
- Timothy, Second Epistle to,
 contents of, 693.
 found in all ancient versions, 694.
- Tischendorf,
 publishes *fac-simile* edition of Codex Sinaiticus, 463.
 publishes corrected edition of Codex Vaticanus, 465.
 publishes Monumenta Sacra Inedita, 467.
- Titus, Epistle to,
 contents of, 695.
 universally received, 696.
- Tobit, Book of,
 absurdities of, 420.
- Traditions,
 of the confusion of tongues at Babel, 227.
 of the creation, Babylonian, 221.
 of the creation, Etruscan, 221.
 of the creation, Hindoo, 218.
 of the creation, Persian, 221.
 of the deluge, found on tablets in the ruins of Nineveh, 225.
 of the deluge, universal, 224.
 of the fall, 223.
 of the golden age, Chinese, 223.
 of the golden age, Greek and Latin, 222.
 of the golden age, Hindoo, 223.
 of the longevity of the ancients, 223, 224.
- Tregelles,
 his rank as a critical editor, 487.
- Trent, Council of,
 order the revision of the Vulgate, 63.
- Tyre,
 its relation to Zidon, 266.
 prophecies of its overthrow, 373.
- Uncial letters, 463.
- Uncial manuscripts,
 description of the most important, 463.
 number of, 463.
- Unity of God,
 revealed by inspiration, 31.
- Unity of the Pentateuch, 95.
- Upright, Book of the, 265.
- Vatican Manuscript,
 order of books in, 488.
- Versions of New Testament,
 Æthiopic, 759.
 Armenian, 761.
 Bashmuric, 759.
 Coptic, 756.
 Gothic, 760.
 Itala, 472.
 Jerome's revision, 475.
 Jerusalem Syriac, 472.
 Memphitic, 757.

- Versions of New Testament, (cont'd.)**
 Peshito Syriac, 467.
 Philoxenian translation, 471.
 Thebaic or Sahidic, 758.
- Versions of Old Testament,**
 Æthiopic, 64.
 Arabic, 65.
 Armenian, 64.
 Egyptian, 63.
 Georgian, 64.
 Gothic, 64.
 Greek, 54.
 Itala, 62.
 Samaritan Pentateuch, 65.
 Septuagint, 50.
 Slavonian, 65.
 Syriac, 61.
 Targums, 58.
 Vulgate, 62.
- Visions of Prophets, 30.**
- Vowel points,**
 not originally used in Semitic languages,
 44.
 their introduction into Hebrew, 140.
- Vulgate,**
 gradually corrupted, 62.
 made the standard by the Council of Trent,
 63.
 origin of, 62.
 various revisions of, 63.
- Wars of Jehovah, Book of, 166.**
- Wisdom of Jesus Sirach,**
 its date, 39.
 omission of Daniel from the list of distinguished men in, 405.
- Wolfenbütel Fragments, 69.**
- Writing,**
 alphabetic, 99, 101.
 antiquity of the art of alphabetical, 100.
 in Egypt in the Mosaic age, 101.
 on papyri, 462.
 on parchment, 462.
- Xerxes,**
 probably identical with Ahasuerus, 313.
- Zechariah,**
 his personal history, 440.
- Zechariah, Book of,**
 contents of, 441.
 genuineness of chapters ix to xiv, 441.
 strong external evidence of genuineness
 of, 444.
 style of language, 445.
 style of thought, 445.
 variation in style of, accounted for, 444.
- Zephaniah,**
 his personality, 438.
- Zephaniah, Book of,**
 character of prophecy, 439.
 date of, 439.
- Zidon,**
 its relations to Tyre, 266.
- Zoar, ancient,**
 its site, 231.
- Zoroaster,**
 religion of, 419.

INDEX OF AUTHORS QUOTED.

- Abarbanel**,
on the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Aben Ezra**,
his doubts concerning the Mosaic author-
ship of portions of the Pentateuch, 67.
on the authorship of the last part of the
Book of Isaiah, 366.
- Abydenus**,
his reference to the Tower of Babel, 227.
- Agrippa Castor**,
refutes Basilides, 454.
- Alexander**, (of Princeton),
his criticisms on Isaiah xl to lxvi, 378.
- Ambrose**,
canon according to, 495.
receives the First and Second Epistles of
Peter, 723, 736.
quotes the Apocalypse, 760.
- Andreas**,
on the reception of the Apocalypse in the
fifth century, 759.
- Apelles**,
quotes John's Gospel as an authority, 95.
- Apollonius**,
quotes the Apocalypse of John, 757.
- Aristides**,
writes in defence of Christianity to the
Emperor Hadrian, 454.
- Aristobulus**, (in Eusebius),
his account of the Alexandrian version, 51.
- Arnobius**,
on the early increase of the Christians, 453.
- Arrian**,
says Cyrus was the first king honoured by
prostration, 418.
- Assemani**,
on Ephraem's knowledge of Greek, 758,
note.
on the views of Ephraem the Syrian as to
the authorship of the Apocalypse, 761,
note.
- Astruc**,
on the "document hypothesis," 70.
- Athanasius**,
his catalogue of the books of the Old Testa-
ment, 35.
canon according to, 494.
receives both Epistles of Peter, 723, 736.
quotes the Apocalypse as an authority, 760.
quotes John's Gospel in proof of the divini-
ty of Christ, 600.
- Aubleren**,
defends the authenticity of the Book of
Daniel, 398.
acknowledges St. John as the author of the
Apocalypse, 763.
his theory of the prophecies of the Apoc-
alypse, 770.
an authority on the Apocalypse, 770.
- Augustine**,
on literal inspiration, 26.
on the perspicuity of the Itala version, 62.
on the canonical books of the New Testa-
ment, 497.
- Augustine**, (*continued*)
acknowledges the genuineness of both the
Epistles of Peter, 723, 737.
makes no mention of 1 John v, 7—745.
receives the Second and Third Epistles of
John, 747, 748.
regards the Apocalypse as canonical, 761.
- Bardesanes**,
his testimony to the spread of Christianity,
453.
- Barnabas**, (Epistle of),
quotes from our Gospels, 515.
- Basilides**,
his exposition of the New Testament, 526.
valuable testimony to the authenticity of
the Gospels, 529.
quotes the Epistle to the Romans, 651.
- Basil of Ancyra**,
uses John's Gospel as an authority, 601.
- Basil**, (the Great),
Epistle to the Ephesians, 653.
quotes the Apocalypse, 762.
- Baumgarten**,
defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Baur**,
on the date of the composition of Luke's
Gospel, 571.
thinks Luke's Gospel Pauline in character,
575.
his attack on John's Gospel, 584.
his estimate of the Acts of the Apostles,
663.
on the purport and bearing of the Pastoral
Epistles, 683, 684.
on the martyrdom of Peter at Rome, 722.
denies the genuineness of the First Epistle
of Peter, 724.
on the date of the First Epistle of Peter,
728.
acknowledges the Apostle John as the au-
thor of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Benary**,
on the meaning of the number Six hundred
and sixty-six, 755.
- Berosus**,
mentions Pul, 292.
his account of Nebuchadnezzar, 406.
records Babylonian conquest of Syria, 407.
- Bertholdt**,
on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 70.
on the authorship of the Book of Daniel,
396, 398.
his objections to part of the prophecy of
Zechariah, 441.
on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 447.
his defence of John's Gospel, 584.
acknowledges the Apostle John as the au-
thor of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Beza**,
his Greek Testament contains 1 John v, 7—
745.
- Bleek**,
on the use of the Septuagint version by
Hellenistic Jews, 53.

Bleek, (continued.)

- on the antiquity of the Vatican and Alexandrian Codices, 55.
 on the compilation of the Pentateuch, 72.
 on supposed inconsistencies in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, 86-92.
 on the directions to the Israelites concerning their future king, 168.
 on the Samaritan religion, 177.
 on the early existence of the Pentateuch, 211, 212.
 on the erection of twelve stones in the Jordan, 263.
 on supposed interpolations in Joshua, 268.
 admits that the last chapters of Judges were composed at an early date, 271.
 refers Book of Judges to the time of the earlier kings, 274.
 on the forms of language in the Book of Ruth, 276.
 on the value of the Books of Kings, 288.
 on the materials of the Books of Chronicles, 301.
 on the relation of the Books of Chronicles to the other books of the Old Testament, 302.
 thinks the statements of Chronicles sometimes inexact, 304.
 his remarks on the composition of the Book of Ezra, 307.
 on supposed historical blunders in Ezra, 309.
 on the alleged incredibility of Esther's history, 319.
 on the misrepresentations regarding Esther, 320.
 on the historical character of the Book of Esther, 320.
 on the historical basis of fact in the Book of Esther, 321.
 on Job's prologue and epilogue, 327.
 on the habit of Hebrew poets to give names to their songs, 336.
 Psalms rejected by, as not belonging to David, 336.
 thinks certain Psalms attributed to David probably not written by him, 337.
 on Psalm ii, 338.
 holds Asaph not to be the author of any Psalms, 338.
 considers Moses the author of Psalm xc, 339.
 thinks no Psalm should be placed at a later date than the time of Nehemiah, 340.
 infers that the collection of Psalms was formed at different times, 341.
 thinks that some of the Psalms were revised by later poets, 343.
 admits that a large portion of the Proverbs are undoubtedly Solomon's, 346.
 refers Ecclesiastes to the Persian or Greek period, 352.
 disapproves of Delitzsch's divisions of the Song of Solomon, 354.
 denies an allegorical meaning in the Song of Solomon, 355.
 does not believe Solomon to be the author of the Song of Solomon, 356.
 on the authorship of Lamentations, 360.
 on the date of the composition of Lamentations, 360.
 on the genuineness of various disputed sections of Isaiah, 364-378.
 attacks the Book of Daniel, 398.
 on the inferences deducible from Ezekiel's mention of Daniel, 399.
 on the omission of Ezra by Jesus Sirach, 405.
 on the "plague of locusts," in the prophecy of Joel 425.
 on character of the prophecy of Joel, 427.

Bleek, (continued.)

- on the prophecy of Amos, 428.
 on the date of Obadiah's prophecy, 430.
 on the prophecy of Jonah, 431.
 on the date of Habakkuk's prophecy, 438.
 on the date of Zephaniah's prophecy, 429.
 his objections to part of prophecy of Zechariah, 441, 442.
 on the date of Zechariah's prophecy, 443.
 on allusions in Zech. xi, 8-444.
 on Zech. xii-xiv, 444.
 thinks Malachi the real name of the prophet so-called, 446.
 on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 447.
 holds the Gospel of Matthew to have been originally written in Greek, 542.
 on the date of the Gospel of Matthew, 545.
 thinks Mark unquestionably the author of the Gospel of Mark, 557.
 on the date of the Gospel of Mark, 558.
 holds that the Gospel of Mark originally appeared in Rome, 559.
 on the question, Was Timothy Paul's companion in travel? 566.
 on the date of the Gospel of Luke, 571.
 on the genuineness of John's Gospel, 584.
 believes John xxi to be a late addition, 625.
 on the value of the apocryphal Gospels, 630.
 on the persons addressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 698.
 his objections to the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 703.
 on date of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 705.
 thinks James, the brother of the Lord, was not an apostle, 709.
 defends the Epistle of James, 714.
 refers the composition of James' Epistle to A. D. 63, 64-716.
 on the crucifixion of Peter at Rome, 722.
 acknowledges the genuineness of the First Epistle of Peter, 732.
 rejects the Second Epistle of Peter, 739.
 acknowledges the genuineness of the Second and Third Epistles of John, 747, 748.
 on the meaning of the mystical number Six hundred and sixty-six, 755.
 on the date of the Apocalypse, 756.
 does not regard John as the author of the Apocalypse, 762.
 his theory of the meaning of the Apocalypse, 770.
- Böhmer,**
 accepts the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Bolingbroke,**
 attacks the Mosaic writings, 68.
 of the great length of human life in the early ages, 224.
- Bonomi,**
 reproduces a Ninevite picture of Nimrod, 227.
 on the musical instruments of the Ninevites, 404.
- Brandis,**
 on the contact of the Greeks with the Assyrians, 403.
- Bredenkamp,**
 opposes the new theory of Graf, 77.
- Bretschneider,**
 makes a systematic attack on the Gospel of John, 583.
- Buffon,**
 on the prolonged life of the patriarchs, 224.
- Bunsen,**
 attacks the Book of Daniel, 398.
 on Ezekiel's mention of Daniel, 399.
 on Jonah's thanksgiving hymn, 431.

- Bunsen, (continued.)**
 on the date of the prophecy of Joel, 426.
 objects to part of the prophecy of Zechariah, 411.
- Caius,**
 on the graves of Peter and Paul, 648, 722.
 attributes the Apocalypse to Cerinthus, 759.
- Callistus of Rome,**
 quotes John's Gospel as an authority, 595.
- Calmborg,**
 defends John's Gospel, 584.
- Calvin,**
 on the divine authority of the Scripture, 27.
- Carlstadt,**
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 67.
- Carpzov,**
 defends the genuineness of the Pentateuch, 68.
 on the composition of the Book of Job, 326.
- Caspari,**
 his criticism on Isaiah xxxiv, xxxv, 375.
 on the originality of Obadiah, 429.
- Cassiodorus,**
 on the taxing under Cyrenius mentioned in Luke's Gospel, 576.
- Cerinthus,**
 his heretical doctrines, 742.
- Chrysostom,**
 on disagreements of the evangelists, 26.
 on the inspiration of St. John, 26.
 canon according to, 497, 723.
 his strange remark concerning the Book of Acts, 644.
 rejects Second Peter, 737.
 omits the Apocalypse from his canon, 761.
- Cicero,**
 on the diffusion of the Greek language, 457.
- Clement of Alexandria,**
 on the equal inspiration of both Testaments, 25.
 his statement regarding the Gospels, 502, 503.
 his notice of the Apostle John, 583.
 his testimony to John's Gospel, 590.
 quotes the Epistle to the Romans, 651.
 quotes the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, 656.
 quotes the First Epistle of Peter as his only Epistle, 733, 737.
 quotes Jude's Epistle, 739.
 alludes to the Second Epistle of John, 746.
 on John's return from Patmos, 751.
 relates anecdotes concerning Saint John, 752.
 regards the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse, 757.
- Clement of Rome,**
 his quotations from the Gospels, 512.
 his reference to the martyrdom of St. Paul, 649.
 refers to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 656.
 his notice of Peter, 720, 731.
- Colenso,**
 his estimate of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, 71.
 on the Pentateuch and the Moabite Stone, 71.
 his objections to the accounts of the tent-life of the Israelites, 249.
 on the size of the Israelitish camp, 251.
 his objections to miracles, 252.
- Collins, Anthony,**
 attacks the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, 397.
- Corrodi,**
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 63.
 his attack on the Book of Daniel, 398.
- Cosmas Indicopleustes,**
 on the canonicity of the three Catholic Epistles, 737, 738.
- Council of Ancyra,**
 quotes John's Gospel, 596.
- Council of Seleucia,**
 quotes John xiv, 26—596.
- Council of Trent,**
 makes the Vulgate the standard version of the Bible, 63.
- Cowper,**
 on Codex Alexandrinus, 464.
- Credner,**
 his testimony to John's Gospel, 584.
 on the date of Jude's Epistle, 741.
- Crome,**
 defends John's Gospel, 584.
- Cureton,**
 discovers ancient recension of Gospels in Syriac, 471.
 on Peshito version of the New Testament, 471.
 his translation of Melito's oration, quoted, 734.
- Curtius,**
 on the respect of the Persians for their kings, 410.
- Cyprian of Carthage,**
 regards the First Epistle of Peter as authentic, 723.
 his views of Second Peter, 737.
 quoted the Apocalypse, 758.
- Cyril of Alexandria,**
 attributes the Apocalypse to John, 761.
- Cyril of Jerusalem,**
 on the number of the canonical books, 35.
 the canon according to, 494.
 his views of the Epistles of Peter and Jude, 700, 739.
 on John's Epistles, 748.
- Dana,**
 on the order of the creation, 220.
- David Kimchi,**
 on the Book of Isaiah, 369.
- Davidson,**
 on the Elohist and Jehovistic originals of the Pentateuch, 72.
 admits that there are no positive contradictions in the Pentateuch, 129.
 on the phrase, "Moses, the servant of Jehovah," 262.
 alleges difference in style between the first and second parts of the Book of Joshua, 263.
 rejects the account of the falling of the walls of Jericho, 268.
 regards part of Joshua as mythical, 263.
 on the date of composition of the Book of Judges, 274.
 concedes that the Book of Judges bears the impress of historical truth, 275.
 on the historical accuracy of the Books of Samuel, 280.
 on the contradictions in First Samuel, 285.
 on contradictions in list of Saul's sons, 285.
 on the historical accuracy of the Books of Kings, 289.
 on the date of composition of the Books of Samuel, 299.
 admits the general credibility of Chronicles, 304.

Davidson, (continued.)

his suspicion of inaccuracy in parts of Chronicles, 304.
 on the prologue and epilogue in the Book of Job, 327.
 thinks that the Davidic authority of most of the Psalms should be assumed, 337.
 thinks Asaph probably the author of Psalms I and lxxiii, 338.
 on the authorship of Solomon's Song, 356.
 his criticism on Jer. xxvii, xxviii, xxix, I, and li, 387, 388, 390.
 his attack on the Book of Daniel, 393.
 on the prophecy of Jonah, 432.
 on the date of the prophecy of Malachi, 447.

De Groot,

on the Logos in John's Gospel, 616.

Delitzsch,

his view of Song of Solomon, 354.
 rejects the allegorical meaning of Solomon's Song, 355.
 his criticisms on Isa. xxxiv, xxxv, xxxviii, and xl-lxvi, 375-378.
 defends the Book of Daniel, 398.
 on the date of the prophecy of Obadiah, 430.
 considers Jonah a type of Christ, 432.
 his defence of the Book of Jonah, 432.

Demosthenes,

uses expressions similar to those in the Gospels, 250.

De Wette,

rejects the accepted account of the origin of the Septuagint, 52.
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 70, 121.
 on the Samaritan Pentateuch, 177.
 on miracles, 251.
 on the contradictions in the Books of Joshua and Judges, 260.
 on the date of the Book of Joshua, 265.
 admits the genuineness of the Book of Judges, 274.
 on alleged inconsistencies in the Books of Samuel, 281.
 maintains that the writer of the Books of Chronicles must have been familiar with earlier writings, 302.
 his attack on the Books of Chronicles, 303.
 modified his earlier views concerning Chronicles, 303.
 on the discourses of Elijahu in the Book of Job, 327.
 thinks many anonymous Psalms may have been written by David, 338.
 rejects the period of the Maccabees as being the date of any Psalms, 340.
 thinks the first collection of Proverbs not made by Solomon, 346.
 refers Ecclesiastes to the Persian or Greek period, 352.
 on the authorship of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, 359.
 on the genuineness of the first twelve chapters of Isaiah, 370.
 acknowledges the genuineness of Isa. xiv, 28-32, xvii, 1-11, xviii, xxiv, xxvii, 372, 373.
 his criticisms on Isa. xiv-xxvii, xxxiv, xxxv, and xl-lxvi, 374-378.
 his criticisms on Jer. x, 1-16, xxvii-xxix, xvii, 386-389.
 on Ezekiel's chief peculiarity, 394.
 his attack on the Book of Daniel, 398.
 admits that Greek musical instruments could be known to the Babylonians, 401.
 on the Book of Jonah, 431.
 on the date of the prophecy of Habakkuk, 438.
 on the date of the prophecy of Zephaniah, 439.

De Wette, (continued.)

defends Zechariah ix-xiv, 441.
 on the character of the prophecy of Malachi, 447.
 thinks Matthew's Gospel had a Greek original, 542.
 on the date of Matthew's Gospel, 545.
 says that Matthew disregards the order of time in his narrative, 549.
 considers Mark to be the author of the Gospel bearing his name, 557.
 thinks Mark's Gospel originally appeared in Rome, 559.
 on the date of Luke's Gospel, 571.
 his defence of John's Gospel, 584.
 doubts the genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 668.
 considers the genuineness of the Epistle to the Philippians to be beyond doubt, 674.
 admits the genuineness of the Epistle to the Colossians, 676.
 his difficulties in regard to the Pastoral Epistles, 687.
 considers the genuineness of the Epistle to Philemon not to be doubted, 697.
 on the reasons for the rejection of James' Epistle by the Reformers, 714.
 doubts the tradition of Peter's martyrdom in Rome, 722.
 his doubts concerning the First Epistle of Peter, 725.
 on the date and composition of First Peter, 728, 732.
 attributes Jude's Epistle to Jude the brother of the Lord, 740.
 on the "eleet day," 710.
 on the genuineness of Third John, 748.
 on the position of the Reformers as to the authorship of the Apocalypse, 762.

Didymus,

canon according to, 495.
 regards the First Epistle of Peter as authentic, 723.
 quotes the Second Epistle of Peter and Jude, 737, 739.
 quotes the Apocalypse as an authority, 760.

Diodorus Siculus,

on the worship of Apis, 199.

Dion Cassius,

on the taxing under Cyrenius mentioned in Luke's Gospel, 576.

Dionysius,

on the life and death of Peter and Paul, 720.
 on the Second and Third Epistles of John, 747.
 opposes the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 759.

Döderlein,

on the prophecy of Zechariah, 441.

Douglass, (Professor,)

tries to prove that Ecclesiastes were written by Solomon, 353.

Ebrard,

on the date of Luke's Gospel, 571.
 declares John to be the author of the Apocalypse, 584.
 on the prophecies of the Apocalypse, 770.

Eckermann,

on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 70.

Eichhorn,

defends the genuineness of the Pentateuch, 68.
 on Elohist and Jehovistic documents, 71.
 on the division of the Book of Isaiah into fragments, 367.
 on the authenticity of Jer. I, li, 390.

- Eichhorn, (continued.)**
 his theory regarding the Book of Daniel, 396, 398.
 on the originality of Obadiah, 429.
 objects to part of the prophecy of Zechariah, 441.
 on the date of the prophecy of Malachi, 447.
 defends the Gospel of John, 584.
 on the time of the composition of First Peter, 728.
 declares John to be the author of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Ephraem the Syrian,**
 quotes the Apocalypse, 758.
- Epiphanius,**
 his catalogue of the canonical books, 35.
 New Testament canon according to, 497.
 his remarks on the Ebionite Gospel of Matthew, 535.
 his views on Peter's Epistles, 736.
 receives the Second Epistle of John, 747.
 on the date of John's return from Patmos, 753.
 ascribes the Apocalypse to John the Evangelist, 760.
- Erasmus,**
 denies the genuineness of Second Peter, 737.
 his reasons for inserting in his Greek Testament First John v, 7—745.
 doubts the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 762.
- Eusebius,**
 records Melito's catalogues of the canonical books, 33.
 on Hegesippus's acquaintance with a Syriac version of Matthew, 468.
 New Testament canon according to, 493.
 makes mention of a copy of Matthew's Gospel written in Hebrew, 534.
 on the date of Matthew's Gospel, 545.
 on the composition of the Gospel of Mark, 555.
 his statements regarding Luke, 563.
 says Paul was beheaded by Nero, 648.
 regards the First Epistle of Peter as authentic, 723.
 on Clement's views of the Catholic Epistles, 736.
 on Second Peter, 736.
 places Jude among the disputed books, 739.
 on the standing of John's Epistles, 747.
 on John's banishment to Patmos, 743.
 quotes Theophilus, Melito, and other early Christian writers, on the Apocalypse of John, 757.
 doubts the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 760.
- Evanson,**
 his attack on John's Gospel, 583.
- Ewald,**
 traces three periods of biblical Hebrew, 44.
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 71.
 on the remarkable increase of the Israelites in Egypt, 242.
 on the date of the composition of the Books of Samuel, 299.
 attributes eleven Psalms to David, 337.
 refers Ecclesiastes to the period of Persian rule, 352.
 his criticisms on Isaiah xxxiv, xxxv, 341.
 on the style of Isaiah, 379.
 his criticism on Isaiah lvi, 9—lvii, 11—479.
 his criticism on Jeremiah l, li, 390.
 his attack on the Book of Daniel, 398.
 on Ezekiel's mention of Daniel, 399.
 on the character of the prophecy of Amos, 429.
- Ewald, (continued.)**
 his objections to part of the prophecy of Zechariah, 441.
 on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 447.
 on the date of Matthew's Gospel, 545.
 his theory concerning Mark's Gospel, 557.
 on the similarity of language in Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, 570.
 on the date of Luke's Gospel, 571.
 his defence of John's Gospel, 584.
 on the date of First Peter, 728.
 credits Silvanus with the composition of First Peter, 732.
 rejects Second Peter, 736.
 on the date of Jude's Epistle, 741.
 on the date of the composition of the Apocalypse, 756.
 believes that John the presbyter wrote the Apocalypse, 763.
 regards the Apocalypse as not inspired, 770.
- Facundus,**
 condemns First John v, 7—745.
- Firmilian,**
 quotes the Gospel of John, 595.
- Fisher,**
 defence of John's Gospel, 584.
- Fritzsche,**
 on the number of the Apocalyptic beast, 755.
- Fulda,**
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 69.
- Fürst,**
 on the authorship and revision of the Pentateuch, 72.
 renders the "Book of Jashur" the "Book of the Israelites," 265.
 his remarks on Ezra, 298.
 considers the Purim festival a Persian feast, 321.
 thinks the Song of Solomon symbolical or allegorical, 354.
 on the traditional history of Ezekiel, 395.
 on Greek words in the Book of Daniel, 402.
 on the time of the closing of the Hebrew canon, 412.
 on the Book of Jonah, 433.
 on the birthplace of the Prophet Nahum, 436.
 on the disputed chapters of the prophecy of Zechariah, 445.
- Gelasius,**
 on the reception of John's Gospel by the Nicene Council, 595.
- George,**
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 70.
- Georgius of Laodicea,**
 quotes John's Gospel, 596.
- Gesenius,**
 his definition of נָבִיא, 29.
 on the golden and silver ages in biblical Hebrew, 44.
 on the origin of the Pentateuch, 70.
 his remarks on the word "generation," 239.
 on the Book of Jashur, or, the Upright, 265.
 on Cambyses and Smerdis, 310.
 on the location of Uz, 333.
 on the phrase, "to the chief musician," 335.
 thinks that none of the Psalms were written in the Maccabean age, 340.
 on Koppe's criticism of Isaiah, 366.
 on the order of the prophets, 369.

- Gesenius, (continued.)**
 on the genuineness of the first twelve chapters of Isaiah, 370.
 refers Isaiah ii-iv to reign of Ahaz, 370.
 on the genuineness of Isaiah xiv, 24-32; xv, xvi, xvii, 1-11—372, 373.
 his criticisms on Isaiah xiv-xxvii, xxviii-xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxv, xxxviii, xl-lxvi, 372-380.
 on the unity of tone maintained by Ezekiel, 394.
 on Greek words in the Book of Daniel, 402.
 his remarks on Darius the Mede, 408.
 on the "plague of locusts" in the prophecy of Joel, 426.
 on Zechariah xi, 8—443.
 on the "eye," used as a symbol in Zechariah iv, 10, ix, 8—444.
 on the name "Malachi," 445.
- Gibbon,**
 on the sublimity of Job, 333.
 on the population of the Roman empire, 454.
 on the subjugation of Rome by the arts of Greece, 458.
- Gieseler,**
 on Origen's views of inspiration, 26.
 on the Serpent Brethren, 529.
 concedes the truth of the tradition of the martyrdom of Peter at Rome, 722.
 on the date of the composition of the Apocalypse, 756.
 favours the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Goethe,**
 on the Book of Ruth, 277.
- Graf,**
 opponents of the theory of, 77.
- Gramberg,**
 denies all credibility to the Books of Chronicles, 303.
 on Jeremiah I, li, 390.
 regards the Book of Jonah as a poetical myth, 432.
- Green, (Professor,)**
 replies to Colenso, 71.
 refutes Robertson Smith, 77.
- Gregory Nazianzen,**
 his catalogue of canonical books, 35.
 New Testament canon according to, 495.
 receives the First Epistle of Peter as genuine, 723.
 receives Peter's Second Epistle, but expresses doubts, 736.
 receives the Epistle of Jude, 739.
 places the Third Epistle of John among the canonical books, 748.
 omits the Apocalypse from his canon, 761.
- Gregory of Nyssa,**
 ascribes the Apocalypse to Saint John, 760.
- Grotius,**
 on the date of Ecclesiastes, 351.
 rejects Ecclesiastes as a writing of Solomon, 351.
 rejects Peter's Second Epistle, 737.
 rejects the Epistle of Jude, 740.
- Guericke,**
 attributes the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, 763.
- Hagenbach,**
 on the early Christian view of inspiration, 25.
 quotes Origen on inspiration, 26.
 quotes Theodore on inspiration, 27.
- Haller,**
 on the ages of the antediluvians, 223.
- Hartmann,**
 on the composition of the Pentateuch, 70.
- Hase,**
 defends the apostolic origin of John's Gospel and the Apocalypse, 584.
- Hasse, J. C.,**
 his contradictory views regarding the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, 63.
- Hasselquist,**
 on the serpent-charmers of Egypt, 236.
- Hauff,**
 his defence of John's Gospel, 584.
- Havernick,**
 on Eichhorn's criticisms, 68.
 attributes the authorship of the Books of Kings to Jeremiah, 289.
 vigorously defends the Books of Chronicles, 303.
 criticises Isaiah xl-lxvi, 378.
 defends the Book of Daniel, 398.
 on the originality of Obadiah, 429.
 on the date of Obadiah's prophecy, 430.
 defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
 defends Zechariah ix-xiv, 441.
 on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 447.
- Heeren,**
 on the reverence felt by the Asiatics for their kings, 410.
- Hegesippus,**
 refers to the reading of the Gospels in the service of the primitive Church, 509.
 on the examination of the grandchildren of Jude, the brother of Christ, by Domitian, 738.
- Hensen,**
 defends John Gospel, 584.
- Hengstenberg,**
 on the value of the Samaritan Pentateuch, 179.
 refers Ecclesiastes to the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, 351.
 his criticism on Isaiah xl-lxvi, 378.
 defends the Book of Daniel, 388.
 on alleged historical errors in the Book of Daniel, 406.
 on the "plague of locusts" mentioned in Joel's prophecy, 425.
 on the originality of Obadiah, 429.
 on the date of Obadiah's prophecy, 430.
 defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
 defends the authenticity of Zechariah ix-xiv, 441.
 on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 449.
 defends John's Gospel, 584.
 on the date of the composition of the Apocalypse, 756.
 on the authorship of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Heracleon,**
 his commentary on the Gospel of St. John, 523, 586.
- Herbst,**
 on the revision of the Pentateuch, 70.
 defends the Book of Daniel, 398.
- Herder,**
 regards the Book of Jonah as a fiction, 432.
- Hermas, the Pastor,**
 ignores Second Peter, 735.
- Herodotus,**
 on Cyrus the Great, 254.
 refers to the great defeat of Sennacherib, 295.
 mentions several Egyptian kings who were Ethiopians, 304.

- Herodotus, (continued.)**
 records the subjugation of Egypt by Xerxes, 319.
 on Babylonian dress, 419.
 on the capture of Nineveh, 434.
- Hesiod,**
 on the Golden Age, 223.
- Hess,**
 defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Heydenreich,**
 defends the genuineness of Second Peter, 737.
- Hilary,**
 his catalogue of sacred Scriptures, 35.
 receives both Epistles of Peter, 723, 736.
- Hilgenfeld,**
 on the date of Joel's prophecy, 426.
 his acknowledgment respecting Justin Martyr, 508.
 on the Clementine Homilies, 522.
 on the Greek original of Matthew's Gospel, 540.
 on alleged additions to Matthew's Gospel, 543.
 on the date of Mark's Gospel, 558.
 thinks Mark's Gospel originally appeared in Rome, 559.
 on the authorship of the Acts of the Apostles, 568.
 denies the genuineness of John's Gospel, 584.
 on the language of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 670.
 on the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, 680.
 on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, 682.
 on references in the Pastoral Epistles to existing heresies, 681.
 on the origin of James ii, 12—714.
 on the bearing of James ii, 6, 7; v. 6—714.
 on the judicial punishment of the early Christians, 715.
 accepts the tradition of Peter's martyrdom at Rome, 722.
 denies the genuineness of First Peter, 724.
 on the persecution of the early Christians, 729.
 on the date and authorship of First Peter, 730.
 rejects Second Peter, 737.
 thinks there are traces of Gnosticism in First John, 742.
 on the date of the Apocalypse, 756.
- Hippolytus,**
 on the Samaritan Scriptures, 175.
 receives John's Gospel, 595.
 on the doctrines of Cerinthus, 742.
 attributes the Apocalypse to John, 758.
- Hitzig,**
 attributes to David fourteen psalms, 337.
 refers some psalms to the period of the Maccabees, 340.
 his criticism on Isaiah xl—lxvi, 378.
 his criticism on Jeremiah xxvii, l, and li, 390.
 attacks the Book of Daniel, 398.
 objects to portions of Zechariah's prophecy, 441.
 on the number of the Apocalyptic beast, 755.
- Hobbes,**
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 67.
- Hoffman,**
 on the date of Obadiah's prophecy, 432.
- Holland,**
 his conjecture as to the mode of supplying the Israelites in the desert with water, 245.
- Holtzmann,**
 on the identity of authorship of Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, 570.
- Hug,**
 on date of Codex Vaticanus, 465.
 believes that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Greek, 542.
 on the date of Matthew's Gospel, 545.
 defends John's Gospel, 584.
 believes the allusions in First Peter to the sufferings of Christians to refer to their persecution under Nero, 728.
 acknowledges the genuineness of First Peter, 732.
 defends the genuineness of Second Peter, 737.
 attempts to show that the Syriac version originally contained the Apocalypse, 758.
 defends the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Humboldt,**
 on the Book of Ruth, 277.
- Huther,**
 rejects Second Peter, 737.
- Ignatius,**
 testimony of his Epistles to the Gospels, 516.
- Ilgen,**
 declares Genesis to be a compilation, 71.
- Irenæus,**
 on the divine origin of the Holy Scriptures, 25.
 on Paul's frequent use of hyperbaton, 25.
 on the early spread of the Gospel, 452.
 canon according to, 493.
 testifies in favour of the authenticity of the Gospels, 503.
 says that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Hebrew, 534.
 on the date of Matthew's Gospel, 544.
 on the date of Mark's Gospel, 557.
 on the personal history of Luke, 563.
 on the date of Luke's Gospel, 570.
 his testimony respecting the Apostle John, 580.
 his testimony respecting John's Gospel, 587.
 quotes the Epistle to the Romans, 651.
 acknowledges the authenticity of the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, 659.
 declares the Epistle to the Galatians to have been written by Paul, 662.
 on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 694.
 asserts that Peter and Paul preached the Gospel in Rome, 720.
 quotes the First Epistle to Peter, 723, 731.
 refutes the Valentinians, 742.
 quotes Second John ii as having been written by the Apostle John, 746.
 on the date of the Apocalypse, 751.
 suggests names, the letters of which will make the number Six hundred and sixty-six, 755.
 attributes the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, 757, 759.
- Isaac ben Salomo,**
 denies the antiquity of Gen. xxxvi, 31—66.
- Jahn,**
 on Isaiah xl—lxvi, 378.
 regards the Book of Jonah as a parable 432.
 defends the genuineness of Zech. ix—xiv, 441.

- Jerome,**
acknowledges the human element in inspiration, 27.
his catalogue of the canonical books, 36.
on the conflicting texts of the Septuagint, 55.
on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 66.
treats Ecclesiastes as the work of Solomon, 351.
in his canon makes of the twelve minor prophets one book, 423.
on the birthplace of the Prophet Nahum, 436.
on the Prophet Malachi, 446.
on the canonical books of the New Testament, 497, 498.
on the Hebrew origin of Matthew's Gospel, 534.
on the Ebionites, 537.
his testimony to John's Gospel, 590.
on the beheading of Paul at Rome, 648.
on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 702.
on the episcopacy and death of Peter at Rome, 721.
on Peter's Epistles, 723, 737.
receives Jude's Epistle, 739.
condemns First John v, 7, by silence, 745.
attributes Second and Third John to the Presbyter John, 746.
states that John was banished to Patmos by Domitian, 753.
attributes the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, 761.
- Jesus, Son of Sirach,**
his catalogue of the Hebrew canon, in the prologue of the Greek translation, 89.
omits Daniel from his list of great men, 405.
- Jonathan ben Uzziel,**
Messianic allusions in his Targum, 59.
- Josephus,**
his catalogue of the Old Testament Scriptures, 37.
his account of the Alexandrian version, 51.
on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, 66.
on the Samaritans, 175.
on the great age of the ancients, 224.
on the date of the building of Solomon's Temple, 296.
credits Esther's history, 318.
supposes Ahasuerus to be Artaxerxes, 318.
on the Book of Isaiah, 367.
on the Book of Daniel, 401.
counts the twelve minor prophets as one book, 423.
on the Book of Jonah, 432.
on Greek cities, 458.
his account of Herod's death, 638.
- Jovius Maximinus Augustus,**
his testimony to the number of Christians, 453.
- Justin Martyr,**
on the inspiration of the Old Testament, 25.
on the early increase of the Christians, 451.
his testimony for the four Gospels, 505.
quotes John's Gospel, 591.
attributes the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, 757, 759.
- Juvenal,**
asserts that the Greek was the prevailing language of his time, 457.
- Kamphausen,**
his theory of the origin of the Pentateuch, 72.
- Kamphausen, (continued.)**
considers the Book of Esther to be a skillful romance, 321.
believes Ecclesiastes to have been written in the third century B. C., 352.
- Keil,**
on the affinity of the language of Chronicles and that of Ezra, 299.
on the historical narratives in Chronicles and the Books of Samuel and Kings, 301.
on the hostility to the Jews in the time of Xerxes, 310.
attributes seven psalms to Asaph, 338.
believes the Psalms to have been collected together at one time by one man, 340.
on the arrangement of the Psalms, 342.
assigns to Solomon Proverbs i-xxix, 348.
refers Ecclesiastes to the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, 352.
on the Song of Solomon, 355.
refers Isaiah ii-iv to the reign of Jotham, 370.
his criticisms on Isaiah xxxiv, xxxv, and xxxviii, 375.
on the character of Ezekiel, 395.
in defence of the Book of Daniel, 398.
on the style of Hosea, 425.
on the originality of Obadiah, 429.
on the date of Obadiah's prophecy, 430.
defends the Book of Jonah as a true history, 432.
on the style of Micah, 435.
defends Zechariah ix-xiv, 441.
on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 447.
- Keim,**
on the date of Matthew's Gospel, 545.
- Kleinert,**
on Isaiah xl-lxvi, 344.
on the originality of Obadiah, 429.
- Klosterman,**
on the identity of authorship of Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, 570.
- Knobel,**
maintains the genuineness of the first twelve chapters of Isaiah, 370.
acknowledges the genuineness of Isaiah xiv, 24-32-372.
refers Isaiah xv, xvi, to an older prophet, 372.
his criticisms on Isaiah xiv-xxvii, xxxiv, xxxv, and xxxviii, 374, 375.
on Jeremiah l, li, 390.
disputes the genuineness of portions of Zechariah, 441.
- Koppe,**
attacks the genuineness of Isaiah's prophecy, 366.
- Koran, The,**
asserts its own verbal inspiration, 118.
- Koster,**
maintains the genuineness of Zechariah ix-xiv, 441.
- Kuener,**
on the ten commandments, 75.
divides priestly laws into three groups, 75.
refuted by Hosea, 147.
- Lactantius,**
quotes from the fourth Gospel, as the work of the Apostle John, 595.
- Lardner,**
believes that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Greek, 542.
- Lane,**
on the resemblance of certain Egyptian songs to the Song of Solomon, 355.


- Lange,
defends the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Layard,
on Assyrian music, 404.
- Le Clerc,
attributes the Pentateuch to a captive priest, 67.
on Job, 329.
- Lekebusch,
on the similarity of language of Luke's Gospel, and that of the Acts of the Apostles, 569.
on the date of Luke's Gospel, 571.
- Lengerke,
attacks the Book of Daniel, 398.
- Lenormant,
investigations on the deluge, 225.
- Leontius of Byzantium,
on the rejection by Theodore of Mopsuestia of the Catholic Epistles, 723.
- Leo the Great,
rejects First John v, 7—745.
- Less,
regards the Book of Job as an historical allegory, 432.
- Liddell,
on Greek words in the Book of Daniel, 402.
- Lilienthal,
defends the historical character of the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Livy,
on the fabulous character of the early history of Rome, 254.
- Lücke,
defends John's Gospel, 584.
on the date of the Apocalypse, 755.
denies the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Lüderwald,
defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Luthardt,
defends John Gospel, 584.
defends the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Luther,
concedes historical contradictions in the Bible, 27.
on the date of the prophecy of Obadiah, 430.
on the Epistle of James, 711.
declares the Epistle of Jude to be of little value, 740.
doubts the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 762.
- Lützelberger,
attacks John's Gospel, 582.
- Macarius,
receives Second Peter, 737.
quotes the Apocalypse as an authority, 761.
- M'Caull,
on the Etruscan views of creation, 221.
- M'Gill,
on Daniel's use of Chaldee, 415.
- Manetho,
his account of Moses, 114.
- Mangold,
on the identity of authorship of Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, 570.
on the number of the Apocalyptic beast, 735.
- Marcellus,
quotes the fourth Gospel as the work of John, 596.
- Marcion,
heretical views of, 524.
- Masius,
denies that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, 67.
- Mayer,
writes in defence of John's Gospel, 584.
- Melanchthon,
on inspiration, 27.
- Melito,
his catalogue of the Books of the Old Testament, 33.
on the position of the Book of Daniel, 401.
alludes to the twelve minor prophets as one book, 423.
alludes to Second Peter, 736.
wrote a book on the Apocalypse of John, 757.
- Merivale,
on morbid scepticism, 121.
on the population of the Roman Empire, 454.
on St. Paul's converts, 454.
on persecution of early Christians, 730.
- Methodius,
quotes John's Gospel, 595.
- Meyer,
on the identity of authorship of Luke's Gospel and the Acts, 570.
- Michaelis,
defends the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, 68.
on Num. i, 92.
on Chaldaisms found in the Book of Daniel, 416.
on the fictitious character of the Book of Jonah, 432.
defends Second Epistle of Peter, 737.
rejects the Epistle of Jude, 740.
- Mohammed,
prophecies concerning the Greeks, 32.
asserts the verbal inspiration of the Koran, 118.
- Müller, (Max.)
on the Persian origin of the Indo-Germanic languages, 222.
- Muratori, (Canon of.)
account of, 490.
receives the Gospels of Luke and John as the third and fourth, the two others being presupposed, 491.
receives the Acts of the Apostles, 491.
enumerates as canonical thirteen Pauline Epistles, a letter of Jude, and two Epistles and the Apocalypse of John, 491, 598, 659, 662, 667, 674, 676, 680, 681, 692, 694, 696, 697, 739, 747, 758, 761.
omits the Epistles of James and Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews, 491, 702, 710, 723, 735.
- Nachtigal,
on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 69.
- Neander,
on Irenæus's views of inspiration, 25.
states that the Syrian version was used in the Armenian Churches, 64.
on the value of the fourth Gospel, 584.
thinks that John xxi was probably received from John's own lips, 625.
on the date of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 666.

- Neander, (continued.)**
 on the similarity of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, 668.
 on the teachings of the Apostle James concerning faith and works, 704.
 defends the Epistle of James, 705.
 on the date of the Epistle of James, 707.
 considers the tradition of Peter's martyrdom at Rome probable, 713.
 on the time of the composition of First Peter, 723.
 on "the Church that is at Babylon," 732.
 rejects Second Peter, 737.
 attributes the Epistle of Jude to Jude, the brother of the Lord, 740.
 on the meaning of *κρῖνα*, as used in Second John 1—746.
 acknowledges the genuineness of the Second Epistle of John, 747.
 favours the genuineness of the Third Epistle of John, 748.
 on the persecution by Nero, 754.
 on the persecution under Domitian, 754.
 on the date of the Apocalypse, 756.
 denies the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Nicéphorus,**
 places the Apocalypse among the disputed writings, 763.
- Noetus,**
 receives John's Gospel as genuine, 595.
- Nöldeke,**
 on the origin of the Pentateuch, 71, 77.
 opposes the new theory, 77.
- Novatian,**
 quotes John's Gospel extensively, 595.
- Oosterzee,**
 on John's Gospel, 584.
- Origen,**
 declares the inspiration of both Testaments, 25.
 not an advocate of literal inspiration, 26.
 his catalogue of the canonical books, 34.
 acknowledges the canonicity of the Books of the Maccabees, 35.
 his Hexapla, 54.
 on the Samaritan Scriptures, 176.
 on the position of the Book of Daniel, 401.
 on the great number of the early Christians, 453.
 his commentary on Matthew, 501, 539.
 his reply to Celsus, 518.
 on the Hebrew origin of Matthew's Gospel, 534.
 on the Ebionites, 535.
 on the Apostle John, 582.
 on Marcion's rejection of the last two chapters of Romans, 652.
 on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 700.
 quotes from the Epistle of James, 709.
 records the martyrdom of St. Peter, 720.
 acknowledges the genuineness of the First Epistle of St. Peter, 723.
 refers to two Epistles of Peter, 736.
 refers to the Epistle of Jude, 740.
 on the genuineness of the Second and Third Epistles of John, 747, 748.
 on the banishment of the Apostle John to Patmos, 752.
 asserts that the Apostle John wrote the Apocalypse, 753.
- Osburn,**
 on the Egyptian "nou," 226.
- Ovid,**
 on the Golden Age, 222.
- Paley,**
 notices coincidences between the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's epistles, 633.
- Palmer, (E. H.,)**
 on the brackish water at Marah, 245.
 on the wilderness of Shur, 245.
 his experience in the Sinaitic desert accords with that of the Israelites, 245.
 follows the Israelitish route from the Red Sea to Mount Sinai, 245.
 identifies Mount Sinai, 246.
 discovers the remains of a large encampment at Erweis el Ebeirig, 246.
 quotes an Arab legend referring to the stay of the Israelites at Erweis el Ebeirig, 247.
- Papias,**
 his testimony as given in Eusebius, 510.
 on the authorship of Matthew's Gospel, 534.
 quotes from First Peter, 722, 731.
 receives the Apocalypse, 759.
- Pareau,**
 considers the Book of Jonah a parable, 432
- Pausanias,**
 on the gods of the Athenians, 639.
- Peyrere,**
 on the origin of the Pentateuch, 67.
- Philo,**
 his catalogue of the sacred books of the Hebrews, 38.
 his account of the Septuagint, 51.
 speaks of Moses as the writer of the sacred books, 66.
- Philostorgius,**
 on the suppression of portions of the Holy Scriptures, 759, note.
- Photius,**
 asserts that Ephraem was not meanly educated in the Greek language, 758, note.
- Piper,**
 defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Plato,**
 his theory of the development of animals, 219.
- Pliny,**
 on coriander seed, 161, note.
 on the great number of Christians, 451.
 on the persecution of Christians, 730.
- Plutarch,**
 on Persian customs, 410.
 on Alexander's conquests in Asia, 457.
- Polycarp,**
 quotes from some of the Gospels, 513.
 quotes from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 656.
 quotes from First Peter, 722, 723.
- Polycrates,**
 his account of the Apostle John, 581.
 his testimony to John's Gospel, 583.
- Porphyry,**
 declares the Book of Daniel to be spurious, 397.
- Pott,**
 defends the genuineness of the Second Epistle of Peter, 737.
- Praxeas,**
 receives John's Gospel as genuine, 595.
- Pseudo-Aristeas,**
 his history of the Septuagint, 51.
- Quadratus,**
 writes an "Apology" for the Christian religion, 454.


- Rawlinson, (George,)**
 on the traditions of a golden age, 223.
 on the universality of the traditions of a deluge, 225.
 on biblical and modern ethnology, 226.
 on the early Cushite kingdom, 227.
 on the migration of tribes, 242.
 on the great increase of the Israelites in Egypt, 242.
 on Pul, 292.
 on the Assyrian records, 292.
 on the annals of Sennacherib, 294.
- Renan,**
 thinks additions were made to Matthew's Gospel, 544.
 on the identity of authorship of Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, 570.
 on the date of Luke's Gospel, 571.
 on the date of John's Gospel, 586.
 his high estimate of John's Gospel, 621.
 on the date and authorship of First Peter, 732.
- Reuss,**
 on the number of the Apocalyptic beast, 755.
- Riggenbach,**
 on John's Gospel, 584.
- Robinson,**
 on the frequency of the proper name *Kuria* among the Greeks, 746.
- Rosenmüller,**
 his criticisms on Isaiah xxiii, 20-25, xxxiv, xxxv, xxxviii, 373-375.
 on Greek musical instruments used by Babylonians, 404.
 on the originality of Obadiah, 429.
 objects to part of the prophecy of Zechariah, 441.
 on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 447.
- Rufinus of Aquileia,**
 on the books of the New Testament, 495.
 designates Jude as an apostle, 739.
 receives the Second and Third Epistles of John, 747, 748.
 receives the Apocalypse as canonical, 760.
- Sack,**
 defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Schleiermacher,**
 defends John's Gospel, 584.
 doubts the genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 667.
 acknowledges the genuineness of First Peter, 732.
 rejects the Epistle of Jude, 740.
- Schneckenburger,**
 on the unity of authorship of Luke's Gospel and Acts, 570.
- Schott,**
 defends John's Gospel, 584.
- Schrader,**
 on the document hypothesis, 72.
 on the Book of Joshua, 264.
 refers the composition of the Book of Judges to the close of the Jewish kingdom, 274.
 on the authorship of the Books of Chronicles, 302.
 his remarks on the Books of Chronicles, 303.
 on the authorship of Nehemiah, 313.
 on the prologue and epilogue in Joh, 327.
 does not ascribe any psalm to Asaph, 338.
 concedes a large share of the Proverbs to Solomon, 346.
 on the religious doctrine of Ecclesiastes, 350.
 his divisions of the Song of Solomon, 354.
- Schrader, (continued.)**
 on the character of the Song of Solomon, 355.
 thinks Solomon was not the author of the Song, 356.
 on the authorship of Lamentations, 359.
 his criticism on Isaiah xxiii, 373.
 finds repetitions and contradictions in the Book of Judges, 375.
 on the date of Joel's prophecy, 426.
 his objections to Zechariah ix-xiv, 441.
 on Zechariah ix-xi, xii-xiv, 442.
 on the date of Zechariah's prophecy, 443.
 on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 446.
- Schwegler,**
 assails John's Gospel, 584.
 assails First Peter, 724.
 on the date of the composition of First Peter, 728.
- Scott,**
 on the Greek in the Book of Daniel, 402.
- Scrivener,**
 enumerates cursive and uncial manuscripts, 463.
 on Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, 465.
- Semler,**
 on the character of the Book of Jonah, 432.
 on the authorship of First Peter, 724.
 rejects Second Peter, 737.
- Simon, (Richard,)**
 on the origin of the Pentateuch, 67.
- Smend,**
 on the priestly laws of the Pentateuch, 76.
- Smith, (George,)**
 on the Chaldean account of Genesis, 221.
 on the Babylonian story of the creation, 221.
 on the Assyrian account of the deluge, 225.
 on the capture of Nineveh, 436, 437.
- Smith, (Robertson,)**
 incorrect translation of passage in Hosea, 145.
- Smith, (William,)**
 on the versatility of Julius Cæsar, 122.
- Solon,**
 his code of laws, 257.
- Sophocles,**
 his remarks on what Papias wrote, 512.
- Sozomen,**
 asserts that Ephraem the Syrian was ignorant of Greek, 758, note.
- Spinoza,**
 on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 67.
 objections to the Book of Daniel, 397.
- Stähelin, (J. J.,)**
 on the arrangement of the Pentateuch, 70.
 defends Zechariah ix-xiv, 441.
- Stäudlin,**
 on the fictitious character of the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Stein,**
 defends John's Gospel, 584.
- Stephens, (Robert,)**
 inserts First John v, 7, in his Greek Testament, 745.
- Steudel,**
 defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
- Strabo,**
 on Moses, 114.
 on the zeal for learning exhibited in Tar-sus, 640.

- Strauss**,
on the genuineness of the Gospels, 69.
his acknowledgment respecting Justin, 508.
on the language in which Matthew's Gospel was originally written, 540.
on alleged additions to Matthew's Gospel, 545.
his views of John's Gospel, 583.
- Stuart, (Moses,)**
on Ecclesiastes, 351.
defends the Book of Daniel, 398.
defends the Book of Jonah, 432.
on the number of the Apocalyptic beast, 755.
places the composition of the Apocalypse in the time of Nero, 756.
defends the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, 763.
- Suetonius**,
on persecution of early Christians, 729.
- Suidas**,
on the taxing under Cyrenius mentioned by Luke, 576.
- Swanbeck**,
refers the "we" sections of the Acts to Silas, 567.
- Tacitus**,
on the Mosaic law, 114.
witnesses to Christianity, 450.
on the taxing under Cyrenius mentioned by Luke, 576.
on the conviction of Christians as incendiaries, 716, 729.
on the popular expectation of the reappearance of Nero, 755.
- Talmuds**,
their catalogue of holy writings, 40.
account of Onkelos, 58.
account of Jonathan ben Uzziel, 59.
credit Moses with authorship of Pentateuch, 66.
- Tertullian**,
on the spread of Christianity, 452.
appeals against heretics to autographs of Paul's epistles, 462.
on the authenticity of Luke's Gospel, 502.
on Valentinus, 523.
on the authorship of the Epistle to the Galatians, 662.
on the title of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 663.
on the martyrdom of Peter and Paul at Rome, 721.
quotes from First Peter, 723.
ignores Second Peter, 734, 735.
quotes from Jude's Epistle, 739.
on Jude's quotation from Enoch, 740.
alludes to the First Epistle of John, 746.
on the persecutions of the Apostle John, 752.
attributes the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, 757.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia**,
on degrees of inspiration, 27.
on Job, 332.
his rejection of the Catholic Epistles, 723.
- Theodoret**,
on the Ebionites, 536.
on the First Epistle of Peter, 723, 724.
on the ignorance of Greek of Ephraem the Syrian, 758.
rejects the Apocalypse, 761.
- Theophilus**,
on the inspiration of the Prophets and the Gospels, 25.
on Gospel of John, 586.
- Theophilus, (continued.)**
quotes from Epistle to Romans, 651.
quotes from the Apocalypse of John, 757.
- Tholuck**,
on the date of Luke's Gospel, 571.
on the genuineness of John's Gospel, 584.
- Tischendorf**,
on the use of parchment and papyrus, 462.
on the large number of ancient sacred manuscripts existing, 463.
on date of Codex Sinaiticus, 464.
on date of Codex Alexandrinus, 465.
on date of Codex Vaticanus, 465.
on date of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, 465.
on date of Codex Bezae Graeco-Latinus, 466.
on date of Codex Laudianus, 466.
on date of Syriac version, 471.
his critical edition of the Greek Testament, 522.
on the Greek original of Matthew's Gospel, 542.
on Mark's Gospel, 560.
on John's Gospel, 584.
on First John iv, 2, 3—742.
on First John v, 7—744, 745.
on Apocalypse ii, 7—750.
on Apocalypse i, 9—756.
- Tregelles**,
on date of Codex Sinaiticus, 464.
on date of Codex Alexandrinus, 465.
on date of Codex Laudianus, 466.
on date of Codex Claromontanus, 466.
on date of Codex Bezae Graeco-Latinus, 466.
on date and importance of Codex Colbertinus, 437.
on date of Syriac version, 471.
his plan in editing the Greek Testament, 487.
his critical edition of the Greek Testament, 522.
on First John iv, 2, 3—742.
on First John v, 7—744, 745.
on Apocalypse xii, 7—750.
on Apocalypse i, 9—756.
- Tristram**,
on Balaam and Balak, 247.
- Ulphilas**,
his reasons for not translating the Books of Samuel and Kings into the Gothic language, 65.
- Urban**,
quotes John's Gospel, 595.
- Usher**,
holds the Epistle to the Ephesians to have been encyclical, 665.
- Valentinus**,
quotes Luke's Gospel, 522.
gives valuable testimony to the Gospels, 522.
- Van Dale**,
attributes the Pentateuch to Ezra, 68.
- Van der Hardt, (Hermann,)**
regards the Book of Jonah as an historical allegory, 432.
- Vater**,
on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 69.
- Vatke**,
on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 70.
- Victorinus**,
quotes the Fourth Gospel as John's, 595.
- Vitringa**,
on the arrangement of the canon, 369.
on the date of Malachi's prophecy, 447.

- Volkmar,
denies the genuineness of John's Gospel,
584.
- Volney,
on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 70.
- Von Bohlen,
on the authorship of the Pentateuch, 70.
- Von Lengerke,
on the sources of the Pentateuch, 71.
- Wellhausen,
on the Pentateuch, 74.
- Whiston,
doubts the genuineness of Zechariah's
prophecy, 441.
- Wilkinson,
on the Eight Books of Hermes, 115.
on the temple of Zoan, 162.
on the character of Egyptian worship, 199.
on the use of horses and camels in Egypt,
228.
- Wilkinson, (*continued*)
on the making of bricks by Egyptian cap-
tives, 225.
on habits of Egyptian gentlemen, 226.
- Wilson,
on Indian cosmogony, 218.
on Brahma, the creator, 218.
on the origin of castes, 219.
- Wolfenbüttel Fragments, 69.
- Wutke,
on repetition in Egyptian poetry, 83.
- Zeller,
on the identity of Kefr Kenna with Cana
of the Gospel, 605.
on the origin of James ii, 12—714.
- Zunz,
on the antiquity of the Targum of Pseudo-
Jonathan, 60.
- Zwingle,
expresses doubts of the apostolic origin of
the Apocalypse, 762.







21741

Bio. Lit

Author Harman, Henry M

H.

Title An introduction to the study of the Holy Scriptures.

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

