Meanwhile we have learnt that some whom St. Paul recognises as possessing the real spiritual life of children of God were yet immature and unstable as children, that before even the most mature he sets a still higher maturity as a definite goal for spiritual effort, that he taught that all spiritual maturity is a relative fitness for the service of Christ, and taught that the surest mark of spiritual maturity is consciousness of the need of, and eagerness for, still further growth.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

NOTES ON OBSCURE PASSAGES OF THE PROPHETS.

THE distinction maintained in one of the XXXIX. Articles between the "four prophets the greater" and the "twelve prophets the less" is, we may hope, on its way to the land of oblivion. Expositors at any rate have found out its unreality, and study the "four" (or rather "three") and the "twelve" with equal humility and respect; or, if a difference is ever made, it is probably in favour of those who used to be called the "minor prophets." Hitzig wrote, in 1838, respecting the earlier commentators on the Dodecapropheton: "Too often the flesh of the expositors was willing, but the spirit was weak; and the least in the kingdom of knowledge found in his insignificance a call to take up the explanation of a small prophet."[1] This cannot any longer be said. A prophet is no longer reckoned as a minor one because his record is scanty. Nor are there many specimens left of what Hitzig calls the *Universalkritiker*, the critic who soars above details and gives clever, generalizing views of men and periods; almost everywhere the necessity of the division of labour is heartily recognised.

[1] *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, erklärt von F. Hitzig. Leipzig, 1838. "Vorwort," p. vi.

This is of course not intended to discourage those students who aspire to master the entire field of Old Testament study; the achievement of their aim must, however, plainly come as the reward of many years of work, and no sooner does it seem to have been achieved than the reality of their success will appear to the workers themselves to be problematical. Never mind; let us aim at the stars, and not at the garden palings. But let us always remember that though some workers are more versatile than others, no well-trained and industrious student can be dispensed with.

One of the many signs which Prof. G. A. Smith, like other deservedly esteemed scholars, has lately given of willingness to learn from critics who are popularly regarded as rash and arbitrary is to be found on pages 171 and 172 of his attractive work on the *Twelve Prophets* (vol. i., 1896), where he discusses that difficult verse of Amos (v. 26), rendered in the Revised Version,—

Yea, ye have borne Siccuth your king and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves.

He points out the serious syntactical and exegetical difficulties of the passage, and refers briefly to the opinions of the most recent critics on the words סכות and כיון, which the Revised Version understands to be names of non-Israelitish deities. For his own part he holds his judgment in suspense, and (as the best critics do under such circumstances) leaves the words untranslated. This critical caution is certainly preferable to the rashness of older commentators — of Adam Clarke, for instance, who blindly accepts Chiun, and refers to a Peruvian idol, named (as Picart informs him) Choun. And it is true that the Assyriological explanation of Siccuth and Chiun fails to satisfy such an acute and learned critic as Prof Tiele,[1] who gives

[1] *Geschiedniss van het godsdienst*, p. 315. That Koun and Keiwân are purely

"the tent" (the sacred *parakku* of the Babylonians) as the equivalent of סכות, and with some hesitation thinks "the pillar of the star of your god" perhaps the best rendering of כיון כוכב אלהיכם (he omits צלמיכם). Still I am surprised at Prof. Smith's suspense of judgment. Had he gone further into the Assyriological evidence, I think he would have been convinced that the proof of the Assyriological explanation is so nearly complete that we ought not to hesitate to adopt it. Of course Siccuth and Chiun are monstrous forms, suggested by *shiḳḳuṣ* ("an abomination" = "an idol"); Saccut and Kewan or Kaiawan should be substituted.

With regard to the versions, I doubt if it is correct to say, with Prof. G. A. Smith, that the LXX. translator gives *τὴν σκηνήν* for סכות. If he read סכות, why did he not render *τὰς σκηνάς*? Aquila gives *τοὺς συσκιασμούς*. Surely his reading was סֻכַּת. But this, easy as it may seem, is as arbitrary and mistaken a conjecture as the vocalization given to סכות בנות in 2 Kings xvii. 30 (A.V. and R.V. Succoth-benoth). Probably Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch is right in regarding Succoth-benoth as the misprinted name of a god, the first part of which is Saccut.[1] From 2 Kings xviii. 30 we learn that the cultus of סכות בנות was introduced into the "cities of Samaria" by the Babylonian colonists after the fall of Samaria. Considering this fact (which we have no reason to doubt), and also the circumstance that Amos nowhere else accuses the Israelites of worshipping foreign gods, and that the supposed antithesis between "Did ye offer *unto me*" in *v.* 25, and "Nay rather, ye love your imported deities—your own fabrications," is really inconsistent with the train of thought in the context,

Phœnician deities, as Tiele, according to Prof. G. A. Smith, once held, seems to me an arbitrary conjecture. To Robertson Smith's valuable note in his *Prophets of Israel* I have ventured to add a few qualifying remarks in the recent new edition.

[1] *Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 215 f.

it appears certain that, at the very least, Saccut and Kaiwan, or Kaiawan (for so the divine names should, on the Assyriological theory, be read) should be omitted as interpolations, and with them, כוכב, "the star," and either צלמיכם, "your images," or (better) אלהיכם, "your god." Prof. G. A. Smith is half inclined to make this omission, rendering the clause which is thus produced: "And ye shall lift up your king and your images which you have made for yourselves." But the syntactical and exegetical difficulties of ונשאתם remains. Prof. Driver (who does not propose the excision of סכות and כיון) inclines to think that the easiest rendering is "And ye shall take up." But it seems to me that in order to justify such a rendering we must (1) supply a lost passage between *v.* 25 and *v.* 26 relative to the objects of Israelitish worship mentioned so enigmatically in *v.* 26, and (2) produce a parallel for the carrying away of their idols by the Israelitish exiles into their land of banishment. The sense required is, "Nay rather, ye have carried idol-gods in procession." This, however, compels us to omit the whole verse as a late insertion. The editor probably found the original words of Amos illegible, and filled up the lacuna to the best of his ability. In the substituted passage (from which we need only, with Wellhausen, omit כוכב as a gloss to כיון and צלמיכם as a gloss to אלהיכם) he antedates a cultus which was really not known in the land of Israel before B.C. 722. There is not improbably an exact parallel for this supposed insertion in Isaiah x. 4 (see below).

Passing over not a few difficult but attractive problems, I now turn to the close of the Book of Amos (ix. 7–15). Our most recent commentator denies the authorship of Amos, so far as *vv.* 8*b*–15 are concerned. It is a serious step to take, and some readers of Prof. G. A. Smith's *Isaiah* and *Historical Geography* were hardly prepared to see it taken. But it is entirely in harmony with the

author's free but (in the best sense) reverent attitude towards the Scriptures to which I have in this magazine given unstinted appreciation that this important and far-reaching critical decision should be ventured. Those who most differ from and regret some of Prof. Smith's incidental utterances will feel bound in fairness to be the most forward to recognise his merits. It is indeed a point which needs to be argued, because of its (to most readers) startling novelty,[1] "that the prophetic books contain numerous signs that later generations wove their own brighter hopes into the abrupt and hopeless conclusions of prophecies of judgment" (p. 197), and that writers "for whom the day-star was beginning to rise [were wont] to add their own inspired hopes to the unrelieved threats of their predecessors of the midnight" (p. 192). I think, however, that we can hardly say, consistently with the evidence as to the character and teaching of Amos, that it was [psychologically] possible for Amos, after threatening the most complete ruin, "to see the sunshine flooding the ruins and to prophesy a restoration." I have no doubt indeed that Amos continued to hope in God even after he became certain that his people was undone. But injustice is done to the austere sublimity of this prophet if we suppose him capable of imaginative speculation on the future. He left the future entirely in the hands of God, who was able "out of these stones to raise up children" unto Israel. And I believe that, out of his extreme desire to be fair to traditionalists, the author has been unfair to the critics. It is too much to say (pp. 191, 196) that nothing in the language used by the writer of ix. 8*b*–15 precludes us from assigning this passage to Amos. The affinities of language and ideas (for language and ideas

[1] It is perhaps a sense of this "startling novelty" which has helped to blunt the edge of Prof. G. A. Smith's criticism in dealing with Hosea xiv. At any rate, he is, I am compelled to think, far too confident in the soundness of his position.

cannot be treated apart) between the close of Amos and productions of the later periods are singularly numerous and striking. I venture to give a summary of them, premising however (1) that I see no reason for dividing *v.* 8 between Amos and a later writer; (2) that not all of these affinities will be acceptable to students who belong to what I may without offence call the "mediation" school of criticism; and (3) that though the late origin of Hosea xiv. is somewhat less easy to show than that of Amos ix. 8–15, it is, perhaps, considerably more certain than Prof. G. A. Smith as yet feels able to recognise.

V. 8, "sinful kingdom"; cf. Ecclus. xlvii. 21, *βασιλείαν ἀπειθῆ*. *V.* 9, "house of Jacob" and "house of Israel," used of Judah, or of the restored exiles of Judah, as Isa. xiv. 1; Jer. v. 20; Obad. xvii. 18; but in Am. iii. 1, v. 1, 4 (cf. 6) primarily of N. Israel. *V.* 9, the wide dispersion of Israel (*i.e.* Judah), as Isa. xi. 11, 12, etc. Figure of grain, as Zech. x. 9, Isa. xxvii. 12 ("one by one"). Contrast ix. 1–4, for the distinction between the fates of Israel and Judah is unknown to Amos (iii. 1*b*, vi. 11). *V.* 10, "the sinners of my people"; cf. Isa. i. 28, xxxiii. 14 (late). *V.* 11, גָּדֵר פֶּרֶץ, as Isa. lviii. 12. הֲרִסֹת, cf. הֲרֶסֶת, Isa. xlix. 19, כִּימֵי עוֹלָם, as Mic. vii. 14, Mal. iii. 4, cf. כְּ קֶדֶם, Isa. li. 9, Jer. xlvi. 26 (all late passages). Note that there is no express prediction of the fall of "David's booth"; could a pre-Exilic prophet have omitted this? *V.* 12, the phrase "the remnant of Edom" implies a time when the vengeance upon Edom was a prominent feature in pictures of future glory (cf. Isa. xxxiv., xxxv.). *V.* 13, see above. עָסִיס occurs again only in Joel i. 5, iv. 18, Isa. xlix. 26, Song viii. 2, *i.e.* only in late writers (cf. *New Heb. Lex.*). נוּג in Hithp., as Nah. i. 5, Ps. cvii. 26 (late in use). *V.* 14, שְׁבוּת שׁוּב is seldom, if ever, used except of the restoration from the Exile (see Giesebrecht on Jer. xxx. 18). For the details, cf. Deut. xxviii. 30, 39; Isa. lxv.

21, 22; also Isa. liv. 3 ("waste cities"). *V.* 15, cf. Jer. xxiv. 6, etc., "Saith thy God," in the comforting manner of II. Isaiah; cf. Isa. xli. 10, Ps. cxlvii. 12; also Joel iii. 17, "so shall ye know that I am Jehovah your God." (Lev. xviii. 2, 4, etc., is in a different tone.)

Next, let us turn to one of the many fragments connected together in the present Book of Hosea (Hos. vi. 7–11). Like all the prophets, Hosea is a close observer, and finds a sad satisfaction in graphic pen-pictures of contemporary manners. The passage before us, however, is so dark that Wellhausen can hardly translate it, and divines rather than makes out the meaning. This is his rendering:

[7]*They have in . . . broken the covenant; there have they fallen away from Me.* [8]*Gilead is a city of evil-doers, full of bloody footprints.* [9]*And as bandits . . . the gang of priests . . . in Shechem; yea, crimes have they committed.* [10]*In Bethel I have seen horrible things; there thou playest the harlot, O Ephraim; there Israel is departed; Judah also . . .*

In *v.* 7 Wellhausen rejects the usual rendering "like (other) men" (cf. Jer. xxxii. 20), and insists that אדם must be some noted holy place, because of שָׁם, "there," which follows, and the localizing of crime in the next verse. In *v.* 10, besides one minor correction, he reads "in Bethel" for "in the house of Israel." In *v.* 9, he doubts וכחכי and איש; and "murder in the way to Shechem" is, he thinks, certainly incorrect. He cannot heal the corruption of the text, but the sense seems to him clear; the holy place Shechem is a den of robbers, the priests themselves are the robbers, their victims are those who come to sacrifice. More recently some bold but by no means contemptible suggestions have been made by Mr. Paul Ruben (*Critical Remarks upon Some Passages of the Old Testament*, 1896). Of these, one, as it appears to me, *se non è vero, è ben trovato.* With great feeling for rhythm, Mr. Ruben transfers some

words to the preceding and some to the following distich, so that the translation of *v.* 6 will read thus:

> "Robber bands are hidden in its (*i.e.* Gilead's) mountains;
> Him who goes down to Jericho they murder."[1]

"Gilead's mountains"; cf. "the mountains of Samaria" (Jer. xxxi. 5). "Are hidden" (חֻבְּאוּ) is suggested by the ἔκρυψαν of LXX., to which Bachmann had already pointed as nearer to the true text than the חֻבַּר of the Massoretic text. "Him who goes down to Jericho" (יֹרֵד יְרֵחוֹ) is a correction of a LXX. reading (codd. Alex. et Marchal.), דרך יהוה (ὁδὸν Κυρίου)[2]. That the route from *es-Salṭ* to Jericho (see Baedeker, *Palestine*,[2] pp. 176 f.) was a dangerous one, can easily be believed. Accepting this view, it would be natural to identify the city of Gilead in Hosea vi. 9 with *Jebel Osha'* (=Hosea's mountain), which is less than an hour's distance from *es-Salṭ*, and belongs to the mountain ranges south of the lower Zerḳa, called Jebel Jil'âd. On the name of the sanctuary in *v.* 7 no one has been able to throw any light; either Adam or Adamah is a possible name, but we expect some more celebrated name. In the great uncertainty of things we may at least affirm that the present text of this difficult fragment is partly based upon the conjectures of an ancient editor. The result in *v.* 9 produces a picture of priestly brigandage and assassination which can hardly be called probable.

Nahum ii. 7 runs in the Revised Version thus:

And Huzzab is uncovered, she is carried away, and her handmaids mourn as with the voice of doves, tabering upon their breasts.

Prof. Davidson, in his recent excellent contribution to

[1] גְּדוּדִים חֻבְּאוּ בְּהָרֶיהָ יֹרֵד יְרֵחוֹ יְרֻצָּחוּ.

[2] שכמה כי (the words which follow in the Mas. text) Mr. Ruben corrects into השכימו, producing for the next distich:

> "They rise up early, they commit crimes;
> In Bethel I have seen horrible things."

the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, finds himself unable to throw any fresh light on this passage. His concluding suggestion that for *Huzzab* we might point *hazzab*, (1) "the litter" (Isa. lxvi. 20), (2) possibly, on an Arabic analogy, "the lady" (carried in the litter), reminds one of Gesenius, whose friend Rödiger, I find, actually makes the same suggestion (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s. v. צָב). The Targum had preceded both.[1] But while Prof. Davidson's book was passing through the press, Mr. Paul Ruben mentioned in a corner of the *Academy* (March 7, 1896) that for הועלתה we should do well to read הועתלה, referring to Delitzsch's statement in his small Assyrian dictionary, "*etellu*, fem. *etellitu*, great, high, exalted; as a subst., lord, or, if necessary, lady, used of gods and kings." It now becomes plain that והוצב is the corrupt fragment of a hemistich corresponding to גְּלֻתָה הָעָתְלָה. "Huzzab" is evidently corrupted from some verb in a passive conjugation, perhaps from חֻשְׁפָּה, and some word, meaning "the queen," perhaps מֻלְכָּה, has dropped out.[2] The Assyrian root detected by Mr. Ruben in Nahum also, as it appears to me, accounts for the name Athaliah (עתליה), also for the name Athlai (Ezra x. 28), precariously explained by Gesenius as meaning "whom Jehovah afflicted."

Isaiah ix. 19 [*Heb.* 18] is given by our Revisers thus:

Through the wrath of the Lord of Hosts is the land burnt up: the people also are as the fuel of fire; no man spareth his brother.

The rendering "burnt up" shows how necessary it is for translators to leave untranslatable words unrepresented. "Burnt up" is no rendering of נֶעְתָּם; Robertson Smith long ago proved that the supposed Arabic connection of עתם given by Gesenius was imaginary. R.V. follows the LXX., which has *συγκέκαυται* or *συγκαυθήσεται*; but

[1] Targ., ומלכתא יתבת ציבא, "and the queen sitting in the 'litter.'"

[2] Kimchi's נצבה שגל (cf. Psa. xlv. 10) was therefore not so far wrong.

it omits to state this. The reading of the Targum varies between חרוכת and חרובת (Lagarde's text). Both confirm the supposition that the Hebrew text originally had נִצְתָּה, which may be interpreted differently as meaning "was burnt up" and "was desolate." Just afterwards R.V. naturally enough translates the received reading כְּמַאֲכֶלֶת אֵשׁ "as food for the fire," which seems indeed to be secured by the parallel phrase "is burnt up." Duhm, however, who has induced Hackmann to follow him, proposes כְּמוֹ אֹכְלֵי אִישׁ, "like cannibals." This, he remarks, leads on to the description which follows, in which the people is described rather as "eating" than as "eaten up" (cf. Hos. vii. 7). But the transition involved in the usual text is not too abrupt for Isaiah. For literary readers it may be added that there is a striking parallel passage in Dante. The poet is speaking of Italy:

> "While now thy living ones are constant foes,
> And each one gnaws the other—even they
> Whom the same moat, the selfsame walls enclose."
> (*Purgatory*, vi. 82-84; Wright's translation.)

Isaiah x. 4 (first part) runs in the Revised Version:

They shall only bow down under the prisoners, and shall fall under the slain.

This is not a smooth form of expression, but the general sense is not inappropriate to the context. We seem to expect a threat of punishment for the grandees analogous to Isaiah's threat to Shebna. If, however, we look at the Hebrew apart from the context, and apart from the historical circumstances of Isaiah, Lagarde's proposal, made originally in the *Academy* for December 15, 1870, to read בֵּלְתִי כֹּרַעַת חַת אֹסִיר (cf. xlvi. 1, Jer. l. 2, and also Jer. xlvi. 15 LXX.), *i.e.*, "Beltis boweth down, Osiris is broken down," is highly plausible.[1] I have therefore been

[1] See *Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 144 f., and cf. Wiedemann, *Sammlung altägypt. Wörter*, p. 33; W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 100, n. 1.

led to suggest in Haupt's edition of the Hebrew Old Testament (London: David Nutt) that a late editor inserted the words proposed by Lagarde in lieu of a group of words which had become illegible, just as (according to the view adopted above) an editor inserted the reference to Sakkut and Kaiwân in Amos v. 26. In both cases the editor fell into an anachronism. It is worthy of notice that Isa. xlvi. 1, Jer. xlvi. 15 and l. 2, all belong to late compositions; also that the text of Isa. x. 4 seems to have been imperfect in the time of the LXX. translator, who gives simply τοῦ μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς ἀπαγωγήν. It may perhaps turn out that sobriety of judgment is not necessarily identical with critical hesitancy, as has too generally been supposed. Hesitancy is natural and justifiable for a time, but further study may lead even a lover of sobriety to unexpected conclusions.

T. K. CHEYNE.

ST. JOHN'S VIEW OF THE SABBATH REST.

REVELATION I. 10.

I.

"I WAS in the spirit on the Lord's day." Such is the initial note of the greatest allegorical poem that ever was written. It is hardly the note we should have expected. We should have expected the day itself rather than its spirit to have been the subject of the opening chord. A man about to receive a revelation from heaven might be supposed to be looking first of all upon the curtain, to have his eye riveted originally upon the lifting of that veil which was interposed between him and the mystery. We should imagine that his earliest thought would be, What was the nature of that mystery which should be rent into sunbeams when the curtain fell? what should he see when the veil was with-