

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

by Koreæ upon Bethel, and thence unopposed to the very walls of Zion. In 37 B.C. Herod marched from the north and took Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> In 68 A.D. Cestius Gallus came up by Beth-horon and Gibeon to invest Jerusalem, but speedily retreated by the same way. In 70 Titus marched his legions to the great siege past Gophna and Bethel. It seems to have been by Pompey's route that the forces of Islam came upon Jerusalem; they met with no resistance either in Ephraim or Judah, and the city was delivered into their hands by agreement, 637 A.D.

In 1099 the first Crusaders advanced to their successful siege by Ajalon; in 1187 Saladin, having conquered the rest of the land, drew into his power Hebron, Ascalon and the north.

This paper has been occupied with the borders of Judæa. I must leave to the opening of the next the general conclusions to be drawn from them with regard to the isolation and security of the province; and then, after describing the rocky plateau itself, I shall state the three features of its geography that are most evident in its famous history, viz., its pastoral character; its unsuitableness for the growth of a great city; and its neighbourhood to the desert.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

### THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.<sup>2</sup>

STUDENTS will find this an extremely useful book. There is not a subject connected with the text of the Old Testament, its history and condition, on which it does not afford all needful information. It is written with great clearness and commendable brevity, and is by far the best manual that exists on the subjects of which it treats.

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *I. Wars*, xvii.

<sup>2</sup> *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, by Dr. Frantz Buhl, translated by Rev. John Macpherson. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1892.

The work consists of two parts, devoted to the Canon and the Text respectively. The second part, on the Text, is naturally much the longer, treating of the printed editions and MSS., the Massorah, the translations, the various kinds of script employed at different times, the vocalization, and other things. Hitherto the student's best guide on such questions was Wellhausen's edition of Bleek's Introduction, and various articles in Herzog; but the present work gathers all the best in these scattered essays together, and supports the conclusions drawn with a wealth of references to literature which leaves nothing more to be desired.

The first division on the Canon is perhaps of greatest interest, partly owing to the obscurity which hangs over the question of the Canon, and partly because of the greater importance of that question in reference to more general interests. The subject is treated in three sections: the Canon of the Palestinian Jews, that of the Alexandrian Jews, and the Canon in the Christian Church. The first question is the most important; the other two, owing to the great influence of the Septuagint in the early Church, are closely connected together, for, though Jerome was inclined to adopt the Palestinian Canon and recommend it to the Church, prevailing custom was too powerful to be overcome, and teachers of great influence differed from him. It has only been in some churches of the Reformation that his view has come to prevail.

Buhl considers the reading of the Law book by Ezra and the acceptance of it by the people to have been the first step in canonizing the Old Testament (B.C. 444). Without any reference to the somewhat similar procedure in the case of Deuteronomy in the time of Josiah, he calls this the canonization of the Law. It is, of course, doubtful how much of the present Pentateuch Ezra read, and there may be elements in it later than his time; but the author speaks generally, leaving these special questions to be settled by Introduction.

He is inclined to allow some value to the tradition (2 Macc. ii. 13) that Nehemiah "founded a library," and thinks that this may have been a preliminary step to the canonizing of the other two divisions, the Prophets and Writings. On the evidence of Ecclus. ch. xlix., he regards the canonizing of the prophets to have been not later than B.C. 200; he would put it considerably earlier, though the way in which the Chronicler refers to uncanonical books makes him hesitate to place it so early as this writer

(c. 300). It is not quite certain what precise idea was attached to canonicity among the Palestinians. Practically it differed little from suitability to be read in the synagogue, though the two things were not always the same, as certain minor reasons might weigh against public reading of books, or parts of books, though these might still be retained in the sacred collection. It is not difficult to conjecture the reasons which led to the reading of the Prophets. Apart from the feeling that prophecy had ceased, the prophetic books had been greatly read even when the Prophets still existed, for Ezekiel and Zechariah both refer formally to their predecessors, and the religious instincts of the pious in the congregation would turn to them in preference to the Law; and possibly the official doctors only set their seal to the practice that had gradually been adopted. It is certain that the doctors raised questions about the books which did not trouble the minds of the congregation, and had only theoretical interest. The book of Ezekiel, for example, created difficulties to the learned, because the prophet's ritual was not in harmony with the Law. The anxiety shown to reconcile the differences is proof of the firmness of the position of Ezekiel in the sacred collection; a certain Hananiah, a contemporary of Hillel and the elder Gamaliel, the master of St. Paul, had 300 measures of oil brought him, and he sat in his upper room and reconciled the differences. It is not said that Hillel himself took any part in the operation, or thought it of much consequence (p. 24, l. 10 of the transl. should read: However, Hananiah, a contemporary of Hillel and of the elder Gamaliel, succeeded, etc.)

Information in regard to the canonization of the third division, the Writings, is much less precise. "David" is already mentioned in connection with the "library" of Nehemiah. Sirach (c. 190) refers to Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Psalms, and his translator (c. 130) speaks of the Law, Prophets, and other Writings. In 1 Macc. (c. 100) Psalm lxxix., and in a writer somewhat later, Ecclesiastes are quoted as "scripture." In the New Testament most of the books are quoted also as "scripture"; and before 100 A.D. two Jewish writers testify to the completed Canon, the Apocalypse of Ezra and Josephus against Apion. The view of both these writers is peculiar, but the point in regard to both is that they regard the limits of the sacred collection as having been fixed centuries before their time. The conclusion to which

Buhl comes is "that the third part of the Old Testament writings . . . had its Canon finally closed before the time of Christ . . . that the Canon and the clear idea of the Canon was there, and formed the basis of a definite theory of the sacred writings." The author speaks cautiously; but so advanced a scholar as Cornill does not hesitate to fix 100 B.C. as the time by which the Canon must have been closed (*Introd.*, p. 280). Objections continued to be urged in some quarters against certain books, but such objections are no evidence that the books objected to had not yet found a place in the collection, any more than objections existing still among ourselves prove such a thing; at the most they raised the question whether the books had been rightly included in the Canon. In point of fact, objections continued to be urged against some books long after the Synod of Jamnia (90 A.D.) had authoritatively declared them canonical. These final discussions at Jamnia were not an isolated thing; they were part of the general effort of the Jewish mind after the fall of Jerusalem to clearly define its position, both in regard to its own internal life and in opposition to Christian thought without; and the fixing of the text, belonging to the same period, was part of the same effort.

There is one thing in which every one will agree with Buhl, viz., the regret he expresses that our Bibles have not followed the Jewish Canon in the arrangement of the different books. Such an arrangement would have shown the reader that the Canon was not completed at once, but arose by a historical process, and would have suggested that such a book as Daniel, which is not placed among the prophets, belongs, at least in its present form, to a time posterior to the closing of the prophetic Canon.

The translation is bright and readable, though occasionally a little wanting in precision; p. 30, l. 33, "inconsistency . . . other passages," would better be: "difference in kind . . . the other," etc. A disturbing press error occurs p. 36, l. 23, where for "there are teachers," read, *than our* teachers. P. 80, l. 24 is hardly intelligible; read, "that no real variation, though corrected away at a later time according to the original text, may be lost," etc. On p. 91, l. 27, read, "this list must be corrected."

A. B. DAVIDSON.