marks the resting-place of the faithful wife who had been for more than thirty years 'a crown' to her husband in his 'public station and appearances.'

Nearly 170 years have passed since the vanishing of the hand that penned the *Fourfold State*, and the stilling of the voice that preached it to trembling multitudes. Yet how the interval is bridged, when we remember that Hogg's mother was a child of two when Boston died, and Hogg's daughter is still alive! There may never come a time when the Shepherd's songs will lose their sweetness, or his *Bonnie Kilmeny* cease to charm, as there may never come a time when the tremendous sermons to which his grandfather listened in Ettrick Kirk—if he did listen—will touch human hearts again. But who that has ever inhaled one deep breath from the first question in the Shorter Catechism will doubt that what, more than aught else, gives Ettrick a glory as everlasting as its own green hills, is the saintly life and apostolic ministry of Thomas Boston?

Israel's Restoration in the Persian Period.[1]

By the Rev. J. Dick Fleming, M.A., B.D., Tranent.

Of recent years a new theory of Israel's Restoration and Return from Captivity has made its way to the front, and promises to be no unimportant supplement to the earlier pentateuchal criticism. It has encountered considerable opposition not only from those who regard all critical theories with repugnance, but also from advanced critics like Wellhausen. Though accepted in the main by such men as Oort of Leyden, Wildeboer, Matthes, and Cheyne, and incorporated in the 'American Series of Historical Text-Books for Bible Students,' by Professor Kent of Brown University, in a volume conspicuous for its compactness and thoroughness, it must be confessed that the newer criticism would have stood its ground better, and been more readily received in our country, if it had not taken us so much by surprise. Dr. Cheyne's recent book was a bolt shot from the blue: it presented the theory summed up dogmatically, the conclusions without the proofs and premises. For those who were not previously initiated in the studies that formed the critical basis, it was inevitable that this new reconstruction of Jewish history should be judged arbitrary and fantastic. The ordinary student is already aware that Ezra-Nehemiah (originally one book) is a compilation containing memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, which have been supplemented and edited in the same spirit, and probably by the same hand, as the Books of Chronicles; that there is room for criticism in details, and that some chronological rearrangement is inevitable. But when he hears it stated without proof that there was *no Return from the Captivity till the time of Ezra*, that the temple was rebuilt by the people of Judah, and that the walls and gates of Jerusalem were already completed before Ezra and the returning exiles set foot in the Holy City, what can he conclude but that the critics are more imaginative than the Chronicler himself, and playing pranks with history for their mere amusement? It is all the more necessary to inquire into the foundation of the structure, and the quarry from which the stones were drawn.

The honour of the new construction of Jewish history rests with Dr. W. H. Kosters, the successor of Kuenen at Leyden. While pastor at Deventer, Dr. Kosters was invited by Kuenen to take a part in the new Dutch translation of the Old Testament. On Kuenen's death in 1891, Kosters was elected to the vacant chair, which he filled till his early and sudden death in 1897. As professor he followed in the steps of Kuenen, that acknowledged master of Old Testament literature, and devoted himself specially to the study of the Exilic and post-Exilic period. He published the result of his investigations in a small work, *The Restoration of Israel in the Persian Period* (*Het Herstel van Israel in het Perzische Tijdvak*, 1894), and defended his main positions later in several articles of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, of which he was

[1] W. H. Kosters, *Het Herstel van Israel*, 1894; T. K. Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, 1898; C. F. Kent, *History of the Jewish People*, Part First, 1899.

joint-editor. This book is the source from which later writers have drawn their inspiration; and it deserves accordingly more than a passing notice. We shall be satisfied if we can show here that the results obtained are not due to the working of a too lively imagination, but to a most painstaking scrutiny of the Old Testament documents themselves.

Kosters starts from an analysis of the sources in Ezra-Nehemiah, which is, in the main, that generally accepted by critical students. (Compare Professor Ryle's Introduction to *Ezra and Nehemiah* in the Cambridge Bible.) The fragments are arranged as follows:—

(*a*) Memoirs of Ezra (Ezr 7^{27}–9, except $8^{35.\ 36}$, Ezr 10 (adapted from Ezra's memoirs); Neh 7^{6}–10, and 13^{1-3}, on the basis of Ezra's memoirs). Memoirs of Nehemiah (Neh 1–7^{5}, 11, 12^{27-43}, and 13^{4-31}).

(*b*) Other documents:—A doublet in Ezr 5–6^{18}; a list used in Neh 12^{1-26}.

(*c*) Chronicler of the Greek period:—(Ezr 1, 3, 4, 7^{1-26}; Ezr 5, 6, piecing two documents; Neh 12^{1-26} (using an old list), 12^{44-47}).

Taking now these three sources, the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, the other documents incorporated in the text, and the work of the compiler himself, we are prepared to hear that the critic does not give them an equal historical value. The memoirs are most worthy of credit; they tell of events in which the writers themselves were the chief actors, and Kosters accepts them as undoubtedly historical. On this point he is much more conservative than those who have followed him; for Cheyne finds even in Ezra's memoirs many historical improbabilities, and Dr. Kent holds that the compiler has only given us 'free citations.' The second sources are records more or less contemporaneous; and Kosters assumes that they are trustworthy in the main. There are, lastly, the additions of the Chronicler, which were written a century and more after the time of Nehemiah, and can therefore lay least claim to historical exactness. The same caution has to be observed here as in the additions of 1 and 2 Chronicles. The 'Persian edicts' reveal the mind of the Chronicler rather than that of the kings of Persia; and the strange chronological arrangement in Ezr 4 has been the despair of critics. The Chronicler may have been misled by quite unhistorical presuppositions: he may have arranged his documents in the wrong order; his judgments are evidently open to question, and may be capable of revision.

The revision of history proposed by Kosters, after examination and rearrangement of the sources, may be briefly summarized as follows:—

(*a*) The temple founded and built under Darius I. by the people remaining in Judah. The Chronicler's account to be revised in the light of Haggai and Zechariah. There was no return under Cyrus.

(*b*) The walls rebuilt under Artaxerxes I. by the people of Judah under the leadership of Nehemiah. The passages from Nehemiah's memoirs to be reunited thus:—

Neh 1–7^{5}.—Nehemiah's building of walls.

Neh 11^{3-36}.—List of population found by Nehemiah.

Neh $11^{1.\ 2}$.—Lots cast to populate Jerusalem.

Neh 12^{27-43}.—Dedication of the walls.

Neh 13^{4-31}.—His second visit to Jerusalem.

(*c*) Later still, the Return under Ezra, and the formation of the Holy Community. The passages from Ezra's memoirs to be reunited and rearranged thus:—

Ezr 7^{27}–10.—The Return under Ezra.

Neh 9, 10, 13^{1-3}.—The forming of the Community.

Neh 7^{6-73}.—A list of the Community.

Neh 8.—Introduction of the Priestly Law.

The reasons which Kosters has given in detail for this alteration and rearrangement of the history are shortly as follows:—*First*, in regard to the Return from the Exile and the rebuilding of the temple, as narrated by the Chronicler, Kosters dwells on the inherent improbabilities of the Chronicler's narrative, as well as its inconsistency with the testimony of Haggai and Zechariah. The supposed decree of Cyrus is so Jewish in its standpoint that it may well be considered as the free product of the Chronicler's fancy, working under the influence of the early prophecy regarding Cyrus. The list in Ezr 2 is a roll of the whole Community of Jerusalem, and is probably transplanted from the time of Ezra, in which connection it again occurs. Ezr 4 is irrelevant, and sins plainly against the well-established chronology of the Persian reigns. Ezr 5, 6 contains two fragments that have been pieced together; one of which declares, in contradiction to the general narrative, that the Jews in Judah and Jerusalem

(which can scarcely mean returned exiles) *began to build* the temple under the leadership of Zerubbabel and Joshua in the time of Darius. But further, this narrative of the early chapters of Ezra is quite inconsistent with the testimony of Haggai and Zechariah, the prophets of the Restoration. It has already been proved by Schrader, Kuenen, and Stade that both these prophets assume that the foundations of the temple were laid in the time of Darius, and that Haggai expressly mentions the very day of the foundation as being the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month of Darius's second year (Hag 2^{18}, Zec 8^{9}). And not only do the prophets remain silent as to any return from exile fifteen years previously; not only do they address the builders of the temple as 'this people,' 'the remnant of this people,' 'House of Judah,' 'the people of the land'; but Zechariah expressly prophesies the cessation of the divine chastisement and the return from captivity as a consummation to be still expected. 'O Lord of hosts, how long wilt Thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which Thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? . . . Ho, ho, flee from the land of the north, saith the Lord: for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of heaven, saith the Lord. . . . They that are afar off shall come and build in the temple of the Lord. . . . Behold, I will save My people from the east country, and from the west country; and I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and they shall be My people, and I will be their God, in truth and righteousness' (Zec 1^{12}, $2^{6.\ 7}$, 6^{15}, $8^{7.\ 8}$). All such passages plead eloquently for the position of Kosters that Israel was still in captivity, and that those actually engaged in the temple-building were no returned exiles, but the remnant of the people that remained in Judah. This last argument is so convincing that Professor G. A. Smith, in order to weaken its force, declares one of these passages (Zec $2^{6\text{-}13}$) to be an intrusion among the visions of Zechariah, a citation from a prophet who lived before the Return from Captivity. But one excision is not enough; many more such operations will be needed in order to harmonize the prophecies with the traditional story of the Return. Surely we are on a false track when we shut our eyes to the plainest indications of contemporaneous prophecy?

But it has been urged that we have a distinct reference to the Return from Exile in Hag 1^{9}, 'Ye looked for much, and, lo, it came to little. . . . Why? . . . Because of Mine house that lieth waste, while ye run every man to his own house'; that is, interprets Wellhausen, 'while ye hasten to build houses for yourselves, ye have no thought of God's house.' It is asked, How shall we explain the disappointment and want of enthusiasm of the Jews, with which the prophet had to contend, unless we suppose that their hopes had been raised to a high pitch by the return of a large number of exiles, and been dashed again by the continuance of poverty and adversity? And does not the prophet plainly imply the recent return from captivity when he speaks of the people busied with the building of their own houses, and neglecting the building of the temple? We may answer, was ever a verse of the Bible so run to death? There is no mention here of the building of private houses; but only of men running to and fro on their own private affairs, and forgetting their wider duties. Nor does the prophet speak of high hopes disappointed, but only of poor harvests, which, the prophet says, are a judgment upon religious indifference. The only disappointment indicated is that which every farmer experiences when he has but a small and light crop to reward him for all his labour!

One general objection may be noticed. Is it possible to conceive the poor remnant of Judah, consisting of the dregs of the people, few in number and doubtless given over to half-heathen superstition, rebuilding the temple on their own initiative? Professor Smith asks: 'Whether was it more probable for the poverty-stricken people of the land, the dregs which Nebuchadnezzar had left behind, or for the body and flower of Israel in Babylon, to rebuild the temple? Surely for the latter?' We might reply by another question, equally relevant. Whether was it more probable that the body and flower of Israel should return *en masse* to a wasted and wall-less city, where they would associate with the dregs of their nation, or that they should wait in Babylon till the men of Jerusalem had rebuilt the temple and the walls of the city, and so prepared the way for a safe and prosperous return? As a matter of fact, the builders of the temple *were* poverty-stricken (Hag 1^{6}, Zec 1^{12}), and are expressly named 'the people of the land' (Hag 2^{4}, Zec 7^{5}). If it is reasonable to argue that the remnant of the

people were poor and oppressed, and semi-heathen in their worship, and therefore could not have built the temple, it is equally legitimate to argue that, as they actually did build the temple, they were not such a 'poor lot' after all, and possibly not quite so heathenish as was supposed. We know far too little about the social conditions of Palestine in the time of the Exile to dogmatize either on the numbers or on the religious character of 'the people of the land.' Estimate the numbers deported by Nebuchadnezzar at as high a figure as you please, it must be allowed that a nation may rise from the very ashes of degradation and weakness in the space of seventy years. New leaders would soon stand forth; and some of the old leaders, who had fled to escape the Babylonian invasions, would return. Judah was never wholly deprived of its priests and prophets and elders (Lam 1^4 2^{10}). The spiritual lessons of that dark period were not learned exclusively in Babylon. In short, if we place ourselves fairly at the new point of view, and free ourselves of the presuppositions of the Chronicler, we shall find that the new conclusions of Kosters harmonize perfectly with the general circumstances of the case.

Secondly, in regard to the later period, that of Nehemiah and Ezra, Kosters' rearrangement of the documents is admirably simple, and fortified at every point with close and careful reasoning. He finds that if we take the fragments of Nehemiah's memoirs, and reunite them, they form a plain and continuous narrative; and if we take the memoirs of Ezra along with those portions of Nehemiah which have been previously regarded as based on these same memoirs (Neh 8–10), we again bring order out of the chaos. We shall limit our attention here to the main thesis, which substitutes for traditional order, Ezra-Nehemiah, the new order, Nehemiah - Ezra. The strange 'eclipse of Ezra' in the Nehemiah memoirs has been often noticed, but never satisfactorily explained. In the narrative of his visit to Jerusalem, and the building of the walls, Nehemiah makes no mention of Ezra, or of any return of exiles thirteen years before his arrival. Rather, in his prayer to Jehovah (chap. 1), he presupposes that Israel is yet in captivity. 'Remember the word to Thy servant Moses, If ye trespass, I will scatter you abroad among the peoples: but if ye return unto Me, though your outcasts were in the uttermost part of heaven, I will gather them from thence, and bring them to the place that I have chosen to cause My name to dwell there.' If this was a thing of the past, fulfilled in the return under Cyrus, fulfilled again in the recent return of Ezra with his following, what meaning is attachable to such a prayer? Again, in Ezra's memoirs the name 'Israel' is given to the restored community in Palestine; whereas Nehemiah never applies to the people this more venerable name, but refers to them as the Jews, or Judah. Further, when we compare the list of builders at the walls with the list of Ezra's company, and observe that scarcely a name is the same in the two lists, the conclusion seems reasonable that Ezra's company had not yet arrived. Kosters shows, further, that the last portion of Nehemiah's memoirs, narrating his second visit to Jerusalem (chap. 13), points to events that occurred before Ezra's arrival. The high priest at this time is Eliashib; whereas in Ezra's time the high priest was apparently the 'son of Eliashib' (Ezra 10^6). The measures taken by Nehemiah are only preliminary steps to the more decisive measures of Ezra. He does not require, as Ezra did, that the Jews shall absolutely and immediately separate themselves from their heathen wives; but only that they shall no longer allow their sons and daughters to intermarry with the heathen. And Nehemiah expresses satisfaction at having driven from Jerusalem the son-in-law of Sanballat the Horonite; a very insignificant victory, surely, if the people had already solemnly engaged to put away their foreign wives! In short, what we find in Neh 13 is but the beginning of the movement that was carried later by Ezra to its consummation. We can scarcely doubt, in view of such arguments, that Kosters has good ground for his rearrangement of the order of history, and that the period covered by Nehemiah's memoirs precedes the entire period of Ezra's activity.

When the sources of the history have been in this way passed through the fire of Dutch criticism, the order of events is seen to be as follows. In the twentieth year of Artaxerxes 1. came Nehemiah as governor of Judah from Babylon He roused the people, and inspired them to rebuild the walls, which had lain in ruins since the days of Nebuchadnezzar. Jerusalem had now its temple and its walls complete; but still Israel was in the Dispersion. In order to increase the city's population, Nehemiah took measures to bring a portion of the

country people into the town (Neh 11[1. 2]). He also made provision for the temple service; he brought the Levites of the country to Jerusalem, and made arrangements as to the offerings and temple-dues. But Nehemiah was not yet satisfied. Artaxerxes was still his patron: might he not be persuaded to give the Jews liberty to return? Nehemiah may have gone back to Babylon with this hope in his mind; he may have met Ezra there, and devised with him the steps to be taken. At all events, when he returned to Jerusalem on a second visit, he came more decidedly as religious reformer. He not only maintained the rights of the Levites, but appeared as the defender of the sanctity of the Sabbath, and zealous against the mixed marriages. It would seem as if he were already inspired by Ezra, and preparing for the return of the exiles. His earnest endeavours, however, met with no great success; and when Ezra arrived with his company from Babylon, he found that the people of Judah had not separated themselves from the heathen. A heroic attempt of Ezra to do away with the evil at one stroke failed. Many of the nobles agreed to Ezra's proposal, but some refused; the Jews were knit by so many ties to the heathen around them that the endeavour was hopeless (Ezr 9–10). Yet Ezra did not altogether despair. If the people as a whole were not to be weaned from heathenism, he could still draw together the purer elements of Jewish society, and make them a crystallizing point round which the true Israel might be formed. In a solemn gathering (Neh 9–10) the people of the Captivity and those who had separated themselves from their foreign alliances bound themselves by a solemn oath to live in accordance with the law of Moses (the Deuteronomic law), and to be a separate and holy congregation. Thus was the church-community formed. Somewhat later a new law-book was introduced by Ezra (the Priestly Law, P^1 and P^2, Neh 8); and thus the work of the Restoration was finally consummated.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Jülicher on the Parables.[1]

JÜLICHER'S exposition of our Lord's parables, which we noticed some time ago, was speedily followed by the second edition of his introductory work on the subject, which was first published in 1886, and which the author has now brought up to date. This general introduction is the outcome of such painstaking study, and is written so methodically and clearly, that no one can read it without much pleasure and great profit. It sets forth and defends the general principles upon which the detailed exposition in part ii. is based. Those who have read the latter work will find here a good deal with which they are familiar; but they will also find much that throws fresh light not only on the parables, but on many other matters of profound interest to all students of the New Testament.

In six chapters Jülicher discusses the genuineness of the parables, their nature, their aim, their value, their committal to writing, and the history of their interpretation. His conclusions on most of these points are already well known; we need only say that he works them out here with great wealth of illustration, and on the whole in a most convincing manner. No one who wishes to understand our Lord's parables and parabolic sayings can afford to overlook this great work. The more we study it, we are the more convinced of its great value to the practical expositor of Scripture.

D. EATON.

Glasgow.

[1] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu.* Von D. Adolf Jülicher, Professor d. Th. in Marburg. Erster Theil. Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im Allgemeinen. Zweite, neu bearbeitete Auflage. Freiburg i. B., Leipzig, und Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1899. Cr. 8vo, pp. x, 328. Price M.7.20.

'Jesus and the Church of the First-Days.'[2]

PROFESSOR BOVON'S work is all of the finest quality. He is a theologian accomplished enough, and tried enough now, to stand among

[2] *Jésus et l'Eglise des premiers jours.* Esquisses Historiques par Jules Bovon, Professeur de théologie a Lausanne. Lausanne: Georges Bridel et Cie.