

several times in speaking of the pursuits of Socrates. In p. 486, C. he says: *ἄλλοις τὰ κομψὰ ταῦτ' ἀφείς, εἴτε ληρήματα χεῖρ φάναι εἶναι εἴτε φλυαρίας.* In 489, B. he says: *οὕτοσὶ ἀνήρ οὐ παύσεται φλυαρῶν.* And again in 490, E. occurs the passage which has already been cited: *ποῖα ὑποδήματα φλυαρεῖς ἔχων.* Now after three such passages and many others, filled with insults, it might be more in keeping than on any other occasion with the character of Socrates to retort the words in allusion to those of his adversary. And Plato might write thus with more than usual reason in the Gorgias, because this dialogue is marked by unusual earnestness and by an irony which sometimes runs into sarcasm and severity. If then the text is sound, which certainly for the reason given by Heindorf must be with reason questioned, we believe that the above is the only possible defence of these words. In conclusion we remark that σοφός ὢν playfully carries the mind back to σοφίζεσθαι occurring three lines before.

ARTICLE IV.

HÄVERNICK'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO HIS COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL.

Translated from the German by Edward Robie, Resident Licentiate, Theol. Seminary, Andover.

[H. A. Ch. Hävernicks, late ordinary professor of theology in the university at Königsberg, was born in 1799 at Cröpelin in Mecklenburg. He studied some time at Halle and became the pupil and intimate friend of Prof. Tholuck. He then went to Rostock as a *privat docent* and licentiate, and thence as Professor to the New Theological School at Geneva. Here, however, he remained but a short time. From Rostock, where he had returned as professor extraordinarius, he was called by the government of Prussia to the university of Königsberg. Here, it is well known, he encountered a violent opposition from the rationalist party long predominant there. His health sank under it, and, it is said, that he died of a broken heart. He was a man of indefatigable industry and of great learning, and all his works breathe the spirit of fervent love to the truth as it is in Jesus. Some of his earlier productions betrayed marks of haste and inaccuracy. This charge has not been laid, so far as we know, against his more

mature works. His Introduction to the Old Testament, published 1836—1844, in four volumes, is in many respects a very able and satisfactory performance, though the neological critics assail it of course. It fearlessly and with great learning vindicates the Divine Word against the assaults which have been made upon it. The Commentary on Ezekiel is the last work which appeared from his pen. Prof. Tholuck remarked to the writer of these lines, that, in his judgment it was the best Commentary on that prophet which has ever appeared. Hitzig's Commentary was published in 1847. See p. 391. The following translation includes the author's general preliminary observations.—E.]

§ 1. *Circumstances of the Life of Ezekiel.*

It is an opinion as unfounded as it is prevalent, that we have but scanty means of information respecting the lives of most of the prophets, and are thereby unable to form a well-defined picture of their prophetic activity. The error lies in the wrong point of view from which information of that kind has been sought for, which, if obtained, would be of little service towards enabling us to understand the peculiar work in which they were engaged as prophets. When their prophetic calling brought them into connection with the State, and thereby made their outward life subject to many changes, we are told of it, as in the case of the earlier prophets, especially in the kingdom of Israel, and also of the later prophets as Jeremiah. But when their labors were more properly spiritual, consisting chiefly in the preaching of the word, then the record of their words is in fact the description of their activity, and their prophetic biography. The latter is the case with Ezekiel. While we have but few data respecting his outward life, we have the more abundant information respecting his inner life, his divine commission as a prophet and the peculiarity of his activity in this relation.

In the year 599 B. C. Jehoiachin, king of Judah, after a reign of three months was obliged to submit to the king of the Chaldeans and was led into captivity together with the principal Jews. The same lot befell Ezekiel, the son of Buzi. He belonged to a distinguished sacerdotal family and was therefore particularly liable to the calamities of captivity, cf. 2 Kings 24: 14. It is evident also from chap. xi. that the prophet was intimately connected with the principal priesthood. It is often assumed that he left his native land while yet young, but this is not probable. The mature, comprehensive and sacerdotal spirit which prevails in his prophecies (connected with the fact that

the word of the Lord came to him in the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin) renders it probable that it was not at an early age that he left his home. Undoubtedly he had served as a priest in the temple, of the plundering of which by Nebuchadnezzar he was witness, 2 Kings 24, 13. He betrays a thorough knowledge of the ancient sanctuary in all its individual parts, which therefore had been deeply impressed upon his memory. What we have supposed of his age when led into captivity compares well with what is said of the time he spent in exile, which was twenty-seven years (cf. 1: 1 with 29: 17), and we have no account of his having survived this period.

Ezekiel was led into the northern part of Mesopotamia to Tel-abib on the banks of the river Chebar. His family also was with him, 3: 24. 8: 1. 24: 18. The place was remarkable by the meeting there of the earlier exiles from the kingdom of the ten tribes with the later exiles who were companions of Ezekiel. It was therefore peculiarly fitted to be the scene of the labors of the prophet. But not till the fifth year of his banishment was Ezekiel called by God to the prophetic office. The embassy that Zedekiah sent at this time to Babylon and the letter of Jeremiah carried by that embassy to the captives, Jer. 29: 1-3, may be regarded as connected with the divine call given to Ezekiel. In a wonderful vision he receives the commission to appear as a prophet to the children of Israel and is told what to say to them, that they may know that a prophet is in the midst of them, 2: 5.

The work of the prophet as represented in his book is a well-completed, harmonious whole. It is divided into two sections, the turning point of which is the destruction of Jerusalem, chap. i—xxxii. and xxxiii—xlviii. (The first section embraces a period of seven years, the second of sixteen years.) In the first, he speaks the language of rebuke and condemnation, in the second of consolation and promise.

The prophet as a true watchman of Israel, appointed by God, had in view not merely the small circle immediately surrounding him, but the entire Theocracy. His attention, therefore, is chiefly directed to Jerusalem which remained proud and secure in her sins, and hastening recklessly to destruction. In the first period of his labors, it is his leading purpose clearly to set forth the primitive judgments which were coming upon the devoted city, and to point out all the causes which were hastening their coming. God's decree is as unalterable as it is just. This thought pervades his discourse—a continual cry of wee—a word of energy and power, already sounding forth the thunders of the approaching judgment.

Such was the relation of the prophet to the Jewish people generally. He had also a more immediate relation to the exiles among whom he

lived. His announcement of the judgment which awaited the whole nation was to them a more powerful warning to repentance, inasmuch as the judgment had in part already fallen upon them. Even here it was necessary to cast down the foolish and carnal hopes of those, to whom it seemed impossible that Jerusalem should be destroyed, and the sanctuary become a ruin. But, in order to prevent the feeling of despair which might arise in the bosoms of some because of the misery around them and their distance from the land of their fathers, the prophet even in the midst of threatenings gives glimpses of the Divine mercy, 11: 16. Moreover, there were those in Babylon who loved their idolatrous pursuits, and had no sense for the ways and works of God, and scorned his justice; to them the word of the prophet came, earnestly rebuking them for their hardness of heart and warning them to turn unto God. The central point of his activity is the idea of *judgment*, and from this his anxious care goes out over all the people. But while embracing the entire nation in his view, he also has a tender regard for the circumstances and relations of the individuals who are with him, so that we have not anywhere a more graphic picture of the condition of the exiles than that given by Ezekiel.

But Ezekiel does not regard the condition of the Theocracy alone, he also takes into view their relation to the Gentile world. When, for a long time, he had preached repentance unto Israel, he directs his attention to the Gentiles, chap. xxv—xxxii. He will have it known by the proud and haughty nations who are now triumphing over his suffering country, that their power is certainly failing, and that the Theocracy is ripening for an eternal victory over the world.

The great catastrophe, the turning point of the prophecy, has taken place. Jerusalem has been destroyed, and the sanctuary lies in ashes. The word of the Lord has been fulfilled, and the people quake and tremble at the awfulness of the fulfilment. But a new spiritual period begins to dawn upon them, and the prophet now speaks to them in the language of encouragement and promise. He directs their view beyond the present with its oppressive sorrows to a future rich in its blessings. The eye of faith should be immovably fixed upon the inexhaustible fulness of Divine mercy. In this faith, Israel should be strong in their God, patient in tribulation and joyful in hope. And as before the prophet had uncovered and brought to light the mass of corruption in the people, and the merited punishments which were near at hand, so now he describes in rich and exalted imagery the development of the coming salvation.

The influence, which the prophet exerted upon his contemporaries, was uncommonly important. As in the days of Elijah and Elisha,

the prophets in the kingdom of Israel supplied the want of a sanctuary, and took the place of an anointed priesthood, so the priest Ezekiel, by his prophetic office, gave testimony to the deserted exiles that God was not departed from them, and that a sanctuary still remained for them, in which they might trace the gracious presence of God. His influence was the more powerful because of their sad condition. There is evidence of this in those accounts, according to which the people and their elders frequently assembled around the prophet and listened to his words, 8: 1. 11: 25. 14: 1. 20: 1. 33: 31, 32. In the words of God to the prophet, it is implied that the people were accustomed at appointed times to come to Ezekiel, to sit before him, and to receive his instructions with reverence. He was considered as a public teacher, who appointed meetings at his house as in a public school, and there before a crowded assembly interpreted the Divine will. Nor was this influence transitory or confined to his own generation, but is to be regarded as extending to the formation of the entire religious character of the later Judaism. In this respect the book of Ezekiel is analogous to that of Daniel. When we see evidences of a remarkable change among the exiles in their relation to the law, when we observe the colony which returned home conforming to the requirements of the law with a scrupulosity and constancy before unknown, an essential share in the production of this phenomenon is to be ascribed to the influential labors of such a man as Ezekiel. Without such an influence the unity of the people amid so many tendencies to dissolution, is with difficulty to be accounted for. It was undoubtedly permitted to Ezekiel, what was denied to Jeremiah, to witness the beginning of this renovation of his afflicted country.¹

§ 2. *Personal Character of Ezekiel.*

In the prophecies of Ezekiel we discover a character of marked peculiarity. The most prominent features of this character are the following.

First of all, the prophet is distinguished by uncommon strength and energy. We see in him an individuality naturally endowed with great intellectual strength, penetrated and sanctified by a higher power to which it is made subservient. The appearance of Ezekiel as an inspired messenger of God must have been among the most impres-

¹ Ezekiel was held in special veneration by later Jews and also by the Christian Fathers. Cf. Son of Sirach 49: 8. Gregory of Nazianzus calls him *ὁ τῶν προφητῶν θαυμασιώτατος καὶ ὑψηλότατος*; also, *ὁ τῶν μεγάλων ἐπόπτης καὶ ἐξηγῆτης μυστηρίων καὶ θεαμάτων*.

sive of any of those who under the Old Testament dispensation spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The glow of divine wrath, the holy majesty of Jehovah, the mighty rushing of the Spirit of the Lord, as the seer himself had seen and heard them, were reflected in his discourses. He opposed with abruptness and firmness the corrupt spirit of the age in which he lived. When he had to contend with a people of brazen brow and stiff neck, he also on his part is of unbending nature, opposing presumption with unwavering boldness, and denouncing abominable deeds with words of consuming fire. This glow of discourse is united with a clear and constant prudence. The prophet never passes hastily from one subject to another, he occupies himself entirely with the one before him, embraces it with all his power, views it in all its aspects, and does not rest till he has completely exhausted it. Hence, he often returns to the great leading thoughts that animate him. In these he lives and moves. Unceasingly he presents to the hardened ears and hearts of the people what the necessity of the case requires. And to this union of perseverance and strength the great efficacy of his eloquence is to be ascribed.

In the next place, Ezekiel is distinguished by his *sacerdotal* spirit. This is much stronger in him than in Jeremiah. Even as prophet he does not deny his levitical origin and disposition, for he has with all his soul served the Lord in the sanctuary. Moreover, the circumstances, in which he was placed, required him to maintain the character of a priest, not merely because a man of his family must of course enjoy a certain authority among the people, but because in him as priest a spiritual blessing was conferred upon them, a continual memento of the sanctuary of the Lord was given them, and his voice awakened their longings for those gracious manifestations of Jehovah which had been lost. Numerous evidences of this sacerdotal spirit are found in the book of Ezekiel. It appears in the manner of his calling (e. i. cf. c. x). Individual features of it are frequently seen in his attachment to the law given by Moses, 20: 12. 22: 8, 26. Some have wished to discover in this disposition of the prophet a narrowness of mind.¹ Even Ewald² says that "it was in consequence of a one-sided attachment to the ancient Judaism as described in books and made venerable by tradition, as well as a result of a despondency of spirit in view of the long banishment and present degradation of the people." But in opposition to this opinion we might say, that Ezekiel, from the commencement of his life as a prophet, was devotedly attached to the law, and that so far from manifesting any despondency of mind, he possessed

¹ Gesenius z. Jes. II. s. 205. De Wette Einl. 5te Aufl. s. 317.

² d. Proph. d. A. B. II. s. 209.

a noble courage, looking away from the sufferings of the present time, and living with constant enthusiasm in the hopes of a new formation of the kingdom of God in the future. The origin of this opinion is an unscriptural view of the law and of the relation of the prophets to the law. If one regards the ceremonial law as inculcating merely forms of worship and thereby impairing the freedom of mind, then such devotedness to the law as manifested by Ezekiel appears to be narrowness of mind. But the law in his view was not merely ceremonial. In all his fidelity and love to it, he sees spiritual ideas expressed in its ritual. The closing section beginning with c. xl, shows that his adherence to the law was not a servile dependence upon it, but that he knew its meaning both for the time of the Old Testament and that of the New, and in their agreement as well as in their difference.

This close adherence to the Pentateuch is specially interesting in a character of such marked originality as that of Ezekiel. He will stand on no other foundation than that which God has laid, and on this he will build. No self-will, no false effort to promote his own glory, are seen in him, but a true and faithful yielding up of himself to the Divine arrangement of things, an inner organic connection with the same. A like principle is manifest in the relation of Ezekiel to other prophets. In a time in which true prophecy was given but seldom (Lam. 2: 9. Ez. 12: 21 f.), and the disposition to appreciate it was visibly declining, Ezekiel appeals to the former prophets as the witnesses of the divine truth, 38: 17, and declares that his word is in unison with theirs. A proof, how qualified for his calling and how entirely consecrated to his office was that prophet, who was so completely penetrated by the organic power of the *διαδοχή τῶν προφητῶν*, ordained by God, the unity which embraces all possessed by the prophetic spirit! In this respect the relation of Ezekiel to Jeremiah, his elder contemporary, is specially important. As already remarked, his first appearance as a prophet was intimately connected with Jeremiah by the message which the latter sent from Jerusalem to the Jews in captivity, and many passages in his book refer to expressions of Jeremiah, 3: 14. 7: 14. c. 18. cf. Jer. 28: 9 f. Not merely in single passages, but in entire trains of thought and their application to the times, there is a remarkable similarity in the prophets, as has been frequently observed by the earlier theologians. E. g. Calvin says: *neque naturaliter contigit, ut unus Hierosolymæ, alter vero in Chaldea sic quasi ex uno ore proferrent sua vaticinia, ac si duo cantores alter ad alterius vocem sese componerent. Non potuit enim desiderari melior nec concinnior melodia, quam apparet in istis duobus servis Dei.* The old

tradition both among Jews and Christians¹ according to which Ezekiel was the son or servant of Jeremiah, may be well explained as arising from the perception of the harmony of the two prophets, without its being necessary to suppose that any relation of that kind existed, or even that ever there was any formal agreement between them.

In Ezekiel there is perceptible no small degree of intellectual cultivation, for which his distinguished birth and his sacerdotal rank would naturally give him many advantages. Traces of his learning are seen not only in his precise knowledge of the law, but also in his knowledge of the history both of his own people and of other nations, and in his views of architecture. This has been noticed by other theologians, e. g. *Witsius*²—*fuit sane hic magister vir eruditio et ingenio eximius, ita ut seposito etiam prophetiae dono, quod incomparabile est, cum aliis illustribus scriptoribus comparari mereatur, ob pulcherrimas involas, comparationes elegantes et magnam rerum multarum, praesertim architecturae, peritiam.* Ewald has presented this characteristic of Ezekiel in an extravagant manner, when he makes a distinction between "public life, an active participation in the experiences of the same, and the mere literary life of the scholar confined to the narrow limits of his home," and ascribes the latter to the prophet, but denies that the former belonged to him.

Ewald's view of Ezekiel would make him appear as a scholar who lives among his books alone. But no prophet ever lived in this way, and of Ezekiel the contrary is most certainly true. An active character like his could not possibly be confined to the limits of mere literary activity. His whole tendency is decidedly practical. How interested he was in the life and minutest relations of his contemporaries, is evident from his discourse to the exiles, c. xii. sq. His influence upon them appears from the fact that they rallied around him as their centre. It was he, who regulated their religious observances, and gave a new form to their whole life. Such results, however, would have been impossible, if the prophet had not had a most active share in public life, so far as we can speak of a public life as existing in that day, and been present among the people amid the desolations that prevailed, endeavoring to rescue what could be rescued, and, as an instrument of God, promote the design which was to be realized by the Divine punishments inflicted upon them in their captivity and exile.

With good reason, *Witsius* called the *donum prophetiae* in Ezekiel *incomparabile*. All his prophecies are pervaded with that certainty, which he knows to attend the Divine counsels. His views of the condition of the world as it then was show how clearly he had

¹ Carpzov. *Introd.* p. 194.

² *Miscell.* ss. I. p. 243.

apprehended it in its nature, how he had examined it in all its relations and was qualified to give judgment respecting it (c. xiv). No less wonderful are his glances into the future. It is true, that the prophet regards the future mostly in its general outlines, his view is directed chiefly to the kingdom of God in its widest extent. But, at the same time, there are not wanting remarkable glimpses of minute particulars in the unfolding of the future, special predictions, which, by their precise fulfillment, have received a seal of the truth and Divine illumination of the prophet. Among the prophecies directed against foreign nations, those directed against Tyre and Egypt (c. xxvi. f.) may be referred to in this connection. Among those directed to the Jews, the announcement of the fate of Zedekiah (c. 12: 12 f. and the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem (c. xxiv, cf. xxxiii.) are specially prominent. This particularity in the description of coming events has been noticed by several modern theologians.¹ Zunz² supposes that such special predictions are unknown in true prophecy, and finds in them a reason for assigning a later date to the composition of the book. No more striking confession can be desired than this, of the embarrassments into which scepticism must ever fall when brought in contact with the words of prophecy. An unbelieving spirit does not find itself at home, when it comes to the criticism of so wonderful, so exalted a work as that of Ezekiel. This very work it is, which serves as a clear testimony against the narrow view of those, who, in defiance of all history, would maintain that the time of the Babylonish captivity was not an age specially distinguished by the revelations of God unto his people.

§ 3. *Style and Method of Ezekiel.*

The style and method of Ezekiel is by no means the same throughout, but is exceedingly various and changing. There is in part a pure didactic manner with quiet progress of thought. This is found mostly in c. xii—xix, inclusive. In this section he frequently connects his instructions with well-known proverbs. He also explains the words of the law with a minuteness not found elsewhere, c. xviii. The prevailing style is that of prophetic oratory. The prophet seldom rises to poetic elevation; examples, however, of genuine poetry, expressive of deep emotion, will be found in c. xix, xxvii, xxxii.

A prominent characteristic of the style of Ezekiel is a frequent use

¹ Jahn, Einl. 2, s. 589. De Wette says that "in no one of the prophets do we find so particular prophecies as in Ezekiel." Einl. s. 318.

² Gottesdienstl. Vortr. d. Juden, 5. 158.

of allegory and of symbols. He opens to our view a peculiar kind of imagery. He describes visions which astound by their splendor and majesty. In their form and purport they may be compared with those seen by the prophet Daniel. In the composition of these images, sometimes reality is disregarded, and not seldom the literal and the figurative are mingled together (c. xvii, xxix). The symbols are of colossal character, corresponding to the great thoughts that fill the mind of the prophet. While unfolding his visions, the prophet himself appears completely wrapped up in them and deeply affected by them. In this way, his discourse has received a dramatic form, in which the prophet faithfully describes his own feelings and thoughts in his relation to Jehovah. Hence arises the numerous variety of symbolical actions, in which the prophet sets before us in an impressive manner his own participation in the objects of his vision, and which appear in him more clearly than in the other prophets as purely mental processes.

Some have regarded the symbolical style of Ezekiel as belonging to his literary art, and would give it no higher origin than this.¹ The *author*, it is said, has swallowed up the *prophet*. The productions are purely artistic. Now, it is true, that there is a certain art employed in this method of the prophet. But it is a misunderstanding of the nature of prophecy, if one supposes that an artistic impulse was the productive principle of these compositions. Prophecy has its root in another soil than that of art; otherwise, it would, at the best, be but an imitation. The art of the author is seen in the prophet by his graphic, complete and faithful reproduction of the visions as he originally saw them. It is the historic art of narrating what he had seen, which must be ascribed to the prophet, and in which he displays a masterly skill. Improper judgments on this point respecting Ezekiel will at once be removed, if it be remembered that the prophet is not to be judged merely as an artist or poet. On the other hand, it must be admitted that this symbolical method, while it immediately introduces us into the inner world of the prophetic spirit, is at the same time mysterious, often enigmatical and obscure. The prophet prefers it, because it awakens attention, incites to examination and strikes impressively upon the heart. Jerome calls the book of Ezekiel, *scripturarum oceanum et mysteriorum Dei labyrinthum*. Because of its difficulties, the Jews prescribed, that no one should read it until thirty years of age.²

The style of the prophet considered in its general features has often

¹ De Wette, Einl. s. 318. Ewald, s. 210. cf. Hitzig, z. Jes. Einl. s. XXVIII.

² Hieron. praef. ad Ezechiel. Zuns, gottesdienstl. Vortr. d. Juden, s. 163.

been unjustly censured. But as length Ewald¹ has well remarked: "This prophet, regarded merely as an author, has great excellences, especially for the unhappy time in which he lived. His style has, indeed, as is the case with most of the later Jewish writers, a certain prolixity and diffuseness, often very involved sentences, rhetorical intricateness and redundancy; but it never becomes so diffuse as that of Jeremiah, the prominent subject is easily resumed and usually well concluded. The discourse is rich in singular comparisons, often both pleasing and apposite, full of variations and yet well finished. When the discourse rises to a description of the prophet's exalted visions, a genuine dramatic life is seen. Moreover, there is a certain calmness and quietness, qualities which especially distinguish it from the manner of Jeremiah."

Ezekiel frequently repeats certain forms of expression which are characteristic both of himself and of his age. Among these are, e. g. the address to the prophet, "son of man," the designation of the people as *בְּנֵי מִצְרָיִם* "rebellious house," (2: 5. 8: 9. 12: 2), the declaration "they shall know that I am the Lord," or "they shall know that a prophet is in the midst of them," (12: 9. 33: 36. 2: 5), the announcement of a vision, "The hand of the Lord was upon me," "set thy face," etc., the frequent assurance, "the word of the Lord came unto me," the solemn introduction, "as I live, saith the Lord."

With regard to the language employed by Ezekiel, we may observe, on the one hand, a dependence upon the old models, such as prevailed throughout this period. The language is strongly colored by the influence of the Pentateuch. On the other hand, the originality of Ezekiel is seen in the great number of expressions not found elsewhere, and which perhaps were first formed by the prophet. Besides, the influence of the Aramaean element and of the popular dialect is very perceptible. In this respect, Ezekiel has much that is analogous to Jeremiah and Daniel, and presents more grammatical anomalies than are to be found among the other prophets.²

§ 4. *Composition of the Book.*

Although there is no doubt even among modern critics, but that Ezekiel was the author of the prophecies ascribed to him, yet there has not been a uniformity of opinion respecting their collection and arrangement in one book.

Jahn³ supposed he discovered a want of order in the arrangement

¹ Die Propheten des Alten Bundes, s. 212.

² Hävernick, Handbuch der Einleitung, I. 1. s. 234.

³ Einleitung, 2. s. 503.

of the predictions, as those against foreign nations are arranged together, and the chronological order is interrupted by 29: 17 and also by 26: 1, compared with 29: 1. Similar exceptions to the chronological order are found in chap. xxxv, xxxviii, xxxix. But to explain this arrangement, as Jahn does, by ascribing it to the mere "chance according to which the collector copied the several predictions in the order in which he found them in copies already existing," is altogether impossible. For in the first place, this explains nothing, since the question again arises, why in the original copy the passages referred to were in that precise order in which they were. In the next place, this assumed sway of "chance" in arranging together the parts which are similar in the nature of their subjects, is utterly fallacious. Why should the collector have adopted an arrangement regarded by Jahn as suitable, and not have followed another and more convenient plan? But Jahn has not troubled himself conscientiously to seek such a plan.

While Jahn thus with a certain coolness is satisfied with the general assumption of "chance," Eichhorn¹ endeavors to determine more definitely what this chance was. The arbitrary manner in which Eichhorn determined the time of individual predictions from their internal character is seen in his work on the Hebrew Prophets. To explain the confusion which he supposes to exist in the collocation of the prophecies, he takes refuge in the assumption that there were a number of small volumes or scrolls, from which the whole book was composed, and since the principle of economy was stronger than a regard to the proper connection of the several parts, in order to save time and parchment, two predictions belonging to very different periods were often written upon the same scroll. In the present state of criticism this once favorite mode of explanation can only be regarded as belonging to the department of curiosities. The evidence that the collector had really the purpose to put together what was of kindred nature, and regarded therefore the purport of the predictions and not such a crude and unessential circumstance, is too undeniable, and is not denied by Eichhorn, but is immediately supplanted by the new hypothesis that he united together the separate scrolls to save the trouble of transcribing!

According to Bertholdt,² the collector of the whole book found two old collections, chaps. xxv—xxxii. and 33: 21—xxxix.; the other predictions he found only separately, which he endeavored to arrange in chronological order. But this assumption is shown to be ground-

¹ Einleitung, IV. s. 237.

² Einleitung, IV. s. 1487.

less, as De Wette¹ has already remarked, by the fact that 33: 21 stands in necessary connection with 24: 27. Bertholdt says, "In this arrangement the collector naturally followed his own judgment unless at times he was directed by an old tradition where a prediction was to be placed." Had Bertholdt investigated more minutely the nature of the plan which the collector adopted, he might have discovered the reasons of that "judgment" and seen how old the "tradition" must have been. Several modern critics, as De Wette, Knobel² and Ewald, have very justly acknowledged that the manner in which the predictions are collected and arranged is such, that it may be regarded as coming from Ezekiel himself. For this view the following reasons are especially decisive. (a) This arrangement proceeds according to a plan corresponding to the purport of the predictions. A chronological order is united with the order of subjects in the predictions respecting foreign nations, and a strictly chronological order, denoted in the superscriptions, is seen in the prophecies respecting the people of Israel. Such a regular arrangement may be most properly traced to the author himself as employed in the publication of the whole book. (b) The predictions have an intimate relation to each other. This is true not only of those which were written in the same period, but of those which were written in different periods. Each successive section has frequent references to the preceding. If this organic connection had been observed, many hindrances to the right understanding of the book in former times would have been prevented. Ewald regards the passages, 46: 16—18 and 19—24, as "for an unknown reason out of their proper connection," but even if this opinion were better founded than it is, it forms too unimportant an exception to prove anything against the general plan of the book. (c) Finally, the manner in which Ezekiel sometimes at the close of a prediction adds a historical notice of himself (11: 24, 25), makes it probable that the prophet made such additions while collecting his predictions, since the committing to writing of the single predictions was undoubtedly previous to the publication of the whole, and no other man than the prophet could well have allowed himself to have made notices of that kind. Ewald indeed supposes that the predictions were not committed to writing till some considerable time after they were received by the prophet, and that the book was gradually formed out of several series. But for this assertion there is no sufficient proof. On the contrary, we have evidence that the prophets,³ especially of this period, were accustomed to write their predictions immediately on re-

¹ Einleitung, s. 319.

² Die Propheten der Hebräer, II. s. 315.

³ Commentar zu Daniel, s. XXVIII.

ceiving them, Dan. 7: 1. Jer. xxxvi. Moreover, it appears from the particularity of the dates with which each section is provided, that the prophet had been careful to denote the day on which he had received his revelations. Finally, the peculiarity of Ezekiel in describing his visions with a minuteness of detail, representing even the smallest features, shows that the impression of the revelation which he had received and of his consequent rapture, was too lively and powerful for any considerable period to have elapsed between the time of the vision and the writing of it. Otherwise, we must assume a later artificial decoration from the mere fancy of the prophet, against which we have already protested, § 8.

ARTICLE V.

TRAVELS IN NORTHERN SYRIA. DESCRIPTION OF SELEUCIA, ANTIOCH, ALEPPO, ETC.

By Rev. William M. Thomson, American Missionary in Syria.

[In the Numbers of this work for February and May last, we published Mr. Thomson's narrative of his Tour from Beirût to Bahluliah, where he was taken ill and obliged to abandon at that time the further prosecution of his object. Subsequently, he visited Aleppo and returned to his home on Mount Lebanon by a very interesting route, through Jebel el-Aala, Apamia, Ribla, etc. The narrative of this tour we shall insert hereafter. We now present to our readers Mr. Thomson's account of the continuation and completion of his journey to Aleppo. A few notices gathered from earlier tours are incorporated. Northern Syria is a most interesting region both to the biblical and classical scholar. Large portions of it remain unexplored, and valuable discoveries will doubtless be made as men of science shall be attracted thither. We are surprised that a field so tempting as Palestine and Syria must be to the geologist and to students in other branches of natural science, is permitted to lie so long fallow.—E.]

Aug. 6th, 1846. It was two by the clock, when, with a prayer, a blessing, and a silent adieu to loved ones asleep, I left Abeih, and by the soft, calm moonlight of a Syrian morning descended to Beirût. A boat, called the Express, I chartered forthwith, purchased