

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VII.

THE PURPOSE OF THE BOOK OF RUTH.

BY PROFESSOR LOUIS B. WOLFENSON, MADISON, WISCONSIN.

THE purpose of the Book of Ruth depends largely on the time of composition. Many views of its purpose have been proposed. All of these, practically, are intrinsically impossible on other grounds besides that of date. It is the purpose of the present article to show this for a number of the most widely accepted views. Most of the recent views of the purpose have as a basis a late date of composition. In an article by the present author in the July, 1911, number of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, entitled "The Character, Contents, and Date of Ruth," it was shown that the assumption of a late date rests upon: (1) the opening words of the book, and the quiet and peace which pervade it, but which are supposedly incongruous with the age of the Judges and an early date of composition; (2) the genealogy in iv. 18-22, which is in the style of the Priestly Code, and hence late; (3) the passage iv. 7 relating what was customary "formerly" in Israel; (4) the place of Ruth among the Hagiographa, or last division of the Hebrew Bible, in the Jewish arrangement; and (5) the language of the book, which is supposed to be late and Aramaic. It was pointed out that the first four of these grounds can be most satisfactorily explained with an early date, and that the one word which has been considered irrefutably late, "therefore" (i. 13), must be Hebrew in this meaning. All five grounds for a late date are refuted.

On the other hand, it was shown: (1) that the language of the book is early; (2) that the graphic peculiarities are early; (3) that the internal evidence proves, conclusively, an early date, since (*a*) there is no mention of the Passover festival at the time of the barley harvest, (*b*) the manner of conducting the harvest is contrary to Deut. xxiv. 19, hence pre-Deuteronomistic and early, (*c*) the lack of mention of *Shebhu'oth*, or Pentecost, at the conclusion of the harvest, is likewise early, (*d*) the acquirement of Ruth as property in iv. 5 is again pre-Deuteronomistic, — is, indeed, confined to the most early times, — and (*e*) the absence of objection to intermarriage between a Hebrew and a Moabitess is conclusively early. All this, together with the vigor and consummate art of the book, compels us to adopt a pre-Deuteronomistic date.

Lastly, it was shown that Ruth was originally a part of the early Judaic popular David-Bethlehem stories, and stood in the JE-history before the account of Samuel. On account of its relation to King David, it was made an independent book, and then underwent a number of changes at the hands of the redactors of D and P (R^d and RP), there being added in iv. 5, "to keep alive the name of the dead on his estate," and in iv. 10, the foregoing plus "and that the name of the dead be not cut off from among his brethren and from the gate of his people." Finally, the genealogy iv. 18-22, which is exactly similar to those of the Priestly Code in the Pentateuch, is a later addition by P. At every point, therefore, the Book of Ruth is shown to be of early date.

With an early date for the book, the question of its purpose practically answers itself. Traces of Deuteronomistic editing practically prove that Ruth was once a part of the early Hebrew history J(E).¹ The story of Ruth must, thus,

have been one of a number of stories about Bethlehem and the family of David. The purpose of the book is, therefore, not at all different from that of any other history.

There has, however, been a considerable number of scholars who have considered our book to be a fiction founded perhaps on some old legend, but none the less a fiction. As evidence of this the names in the book are cited. Thus the Hebrew words for Naomi, Mahlon, Kilion, Orpah, and even Ruth and Boaz, are supposed to be fictitious names formed by the writer to illustrate the characters of his story. Very many have thought the names Mahlon and Kilion, which are supposed to mean "Sickness" (from the root *chalah*) and "Consumption" (from the root *kalah*), to allude to the early death of the sons thus named. Ruth has been variously explained as for *re'uth*,³ i.e. "female friend," from the Hebrew root *ra'ah*, or (since the foregoing assumes the loss of the consonant 'ayin, and this is not a usual phenomenon) as from the root *rawah*, "fill or sate," hence "she who satisfies." Boaz has been explained as equal to *bo'oz*, i.e. "in him is strength," in contrast to Mahlon and Kilion. But there is no proof or necessity that these were the meanings of the names.³ In the case of Boaz and Ruth, the etymologies and explanations given above are quite impossible. The real meaning and derivation of ancient names is very difficult to ascertain, and the idea that these names are fictitious is entirely unfounded. Oettli and Orelli, also, have considered the names authentic and the characters historic. Recently Stucken,⁴ followed by Cheyne⁵ and Winckler,⁶ has thought Ruth to be a mythological legend applied to the history of David's ancestors. Winckler⁷ especially has attempted to work out the theory that Ruth is a representation of Tamar (Gen. xxxviii.) = Ishtar, and that the other char-

acters are mythological impersonations. Even in Naomi under the name of *Mara'* (i. 20) = *Marah*, Winckler has managed to see a mythological personage, a representation of Tamar, by saying that *Marah* or *Marath* was not the original name, but *Tamar*, a similar form of the imperfect, which, according to him, is the usual Old Testament name of Ishtar. By means of various manipulations of letters and names, Winckler has read a complete system of mythology into the book. But that these manipulations and identifications are true requires as much imagination to believe as Winckler exercised in making them. Professor Haupt in his interpretation of Ruth⁸ rejected the attempt to see any mythology in the book.⁹

Indeed, if the book were at bottom nothing but a myth, none of the manifold purposes for which various scholars have believed the book to have been written would be possible, since a mere fiction would have had little or no weight or effect on the practical-minded Hebrews. An excellent summary of many of the views of the purpose of Ruth will be found in Reuss's "History of the Scriptures of the Old Testament."¹⁰ It is desired to take up here the most important and recent of the views advanced and point out the reasons for their untenability, and particularly so with regard to the view which sees in Ruth a protest against the rigor of Ezra and Nehemiah in the matter of marriage.

1. Bertholdt¹¹ and Benary¹² advanced the theory that Ruth was written to inculcate the duty of the levirate marriage by showing the happy results which followed Boaz' marriage with Ruth. Such a purpose is, however, quite impossible, since not only is this marriage not a levirate marriage, or brother-in-law marriage, but it is not even a Niyoga marriage, or one with the next-of-kin to raise up seed

to a dead relative.¹³ There is in Ruth no purpose of raising up seed to the dead husband of Ruth, nor yet of Elimelech.¹⁴ The only institutions to which reference is made in our book are the ancient customs of redemption of an estate by relatives, and the inheritance of women as property, which make it incumbent upon the heir or redeemer of the property to accept as wife, or otherwise provide for, the wife (or wives) of the dead relative. It is the right and obligation of the redeemer upon which the story of Ruth is based,¹⁵ not the levirate.

2. Reuss believed that the book was written after the fall of Samaria, and had for its purpose the furtherance of a reunion of the remnants of the Northern Kingdom left behind in Ephraim, with the Southern Kingdom, by showing that there could be no patriotic objections to a reunion on the part of the Ephraimites, as the Davidic dynasty in the South was really Ephraimitic. The connection with Ephraim came about, according to Reuss, through Elimelech and his sons Mahlon and Kilion, who were Ephrathites (i. 2) = Ephraimites. Now Ruth was Mahlon's wife, and when she became the wife of Boaz, the offspring of this marriage, Obed, was not alone heir, through Boaz, of Judah, but was also, legally, through Mahlon, the successor or heir (*Rechtsnachfolger*) of an Ephraimite; and thus the descendants of Obed, the sons of Jesse, i.e. the dynasty of David, are really Ephraimitic.

The first and chief reason why Reuss's theory is impossible is because *Ephrathites* (i. 2) does not mean Ephraimites: it is merely a coincidence that the Hebrew *Ephrathite* is the *nomen gentilicium* of the noun Ephrathah as well as of the noun Ephraim. In Ruth here, Ephrathite is intended (cf.

Ephrathah, iv. 11). With this, the basis of Reuss's view is withdrawn, as has been pointed out by a number of writers.¹⁶

Secondly, even if it were true that Ephrathite = Ephraimite, it would still be impossible that Ruth should have been written to pave the way for a reunion of the two kingdoms by showing that there could be no objection on the part of the Ephraimites. Such an objection would still exist. Reuss in his explanation represents the objection on the part of the Ephraimites as due to the fact that the Davidic house was a foreign one with no legal claim to, or connection with, Ephraim. Ruth shows, says Reuss, that this dynasty was, through its ancestor Obed, not alone the natural heir of Judah, but the legal successor of Mahlon, an Ephraimite. But this gives the Southern dynasty only a legal title; and a legal claim the house of David always had, since originally the Northern Kingdom was just as much a part of Israel as the Southern. The Northern state by revolting from the United Kingdom did not destroy the legal title of the Davidic house. Consequently, the Book of Ruth could not have removed the objections of the Ephraimites, granting they had any at that time, and even granting Ephrathite = Ephraimite.

Thirdly, still admitting the foregoing, nobody from reading the book would ever suspect what the object of the author was. Orelli has very justly said: "The political author would have concealed its purpose so effectually that scarcely anybody could have discovered it."¹⁷ Reuss's view has accordingly been rejected on all sides.

3. The view of Ludwig Köhler, that "the booklet of Ruth, for purposes of edification and apparently in a manner freely imaginative, depicts how Jahwe deprives a woman, Naomi, of all hope, how she bows herself to His will, and then how God answers all her prayers and repays her God-

fearing resignation even with happiness,"¹⁸ is rather a homiletical interpretation than the statement of a purpose of the book. In common with the old theologico-homiletical views that Ruth was written for moral purposes (to show the piety of Ruth and power of Yahweh, or to furnish an example of the proper behavior of mothers- and daughters-in-law toward each other¹⁹), Köhler's statement of what the book contains is rather a synopsis of a sermon on the lessons to be drawn from our book than a scientific statement as to the possible purpose of it.

4. Wellhausen²⁰ saw in Ruth a fiction tracing the descent of David to a heathen proselyte, in the manner in which in the Talmud there is a marked predilection for tracing the descent of the most notable Jewish families from heathen proselytes, manifesting itself in considering the most famous Scribes and Rabbis to be descendants of Sisera, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, and Haman.²¹ In this "*Tendenz*,"²² however, Wellhausen saw only a theoretic interest in history as opposed to the *Tendenz*-theory as enunciated by Geiger,²³ upon which the view to be discussed below (6.) is founded. Wellhausen's theory has failed to convince any one but himself, it seems. It cannot be shown that the tendency of the Talmud to trace the origin of Jewish families to heathen proselytes existed previous to the Talmudic age (at least the 3d century A.D.). The Talmudic tendency must have had its origin in the undoubted fact that the early Hebrews were a mixed race, and that many heathens became converted and entered "the congregation of the Lord." This the Rabbis knew, and such a book as Ruth kept the knowledge alive. Thus the tendency may have arisen; but the Book of Ruth is rather a foundation for it than an illustration of the practice.

5. A view of the purpose of Ruth that has frequently been propounded is that it was written to give some details of David's origin and family in addition to what is given in First Samuel. Such information the genealogy (iv. 18-22) is supposed to supply. But this passage may be shown to be a later addition, and must be so regarded. The Book of Ruth as originally written gave very little information as to David's origin and family, for it scarcely mentions David (iv. 17b). Even with the genealogy the amount of information given about David and his immediate family is very meager. We cannot, therefore, believe that the book was written as a separate composition for the purpose of shedding light on David's origin.²⁴

6. The theory that has of recent years found the widest acceptance is the one which makes the Book of Ruth a polemic or protest against the rigor of the reform of Ezra and Nehemiah in the matter of intermarriage of Jews with foreign women.²⁵ The view is found stated in Geiger's "Urschrift" (1857), pp. 49 ff.; it involves a date of composition as late as the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. The dating alone makes this theory quite impossible;²⁶ but for other reasons as well it may be shown to be untenable. In view of the wide prevalence of the theory at present, a statement of the most important objections to it, apart from the fundamental impossibility on the ground of its date, seems advisable.

If Ruth had been written by the opponents of Ezra and Nehemiah in favor of liberality in the matter of intermarriage, one would expect the purpose to appear from the book. But no one could tell from the story that its purpose is such as is claimed. Orelli's criticism of Reuss's view of the object of Ruth applies equally well, *mutatis mutandis*, to this theory: "*The . . . author would have concealed its*

purpose so effectually that scarcely anybody could discover it." Ludwig Köhler²⁷ has also pointed out that the view that the book is a polemical pamphlet is impossible because no trace of polemics appears in it. Professor Bewer,²⁸ likewise, saw the objection "that there is absolutely no indication of polemics in the book." To this Cornill²⁹ replies that a polemic or *Tendenz* should not be too coarse-fibered and obtrusive. Professor Bewer, also, replied to this very pertinent objection that the absence of polemics "might very well be an evidence of supreme art. The book would thus be all the more convincing." These answers, however, are not a refutation, nor even an answer to the objection. If a work is polemical, its object cannot be too obtrusive. Anything tending to make the position of the author more secure, and that of his opponent less forceful or impossible, is not only unobjectionable in a polemic, but a prime necessity. If one writes a pamphlet telling a most charming story, it may be "supreme art"; but if the story has absolutely no bearing on a certain vital issue, or a bearing so remote that even the sharpest intellects have difficulty in seeing any connection, of what use is such a story, be it ever so delightful, as a polemic? The same, too, is true of the *Tendenz*. If the *Tendenz* is not in the book, how can any one be expected to be influenced by it?

The advocates of this theory, however, point to certain features which are supposed to indicate the bearing of the Book of Ruth on the question of intermarriage. Bertholet³⁰ and Nowack³¹ draw attention to the repeated reference to Ruth as "the Moabitess," *hammo'abhiyah* (i. 22; ii. 2, 6, 21; iv. 5, 10), and that she herself speaks of herself as "a stranger" *nokhriyah* (ii. 10.), which is supposed to be unusual emphasis of the fact that Ruth was a Moabitess and stranger. Now this stranger, the Moabitess, attains an ex-

alted position in Israel by becoming the mother of Obed, the grandfather of King David. That a stranger should attain so high an honor in Israel is said to have been due to the blessing of Yahweh. From this, it is argued, the inference is to be drawn that Yahweh did not curse every marriage with a foreign woman, and hence such marriages are permissible. In this consists the *Tendenz* of the book, and because of this it is believed that Ruth was written at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the question of intermarriage was being adjusted.

The assumption of a *Tendenz* on the foregoing basis is, I believe, entirely unjustified. It will be observed that the assumption is based upon the occurrence of "the Moabitess" six times and "stranger" once, as applied to Ruth. This is by no means an undue emphasis of the fact of Ruth's foreign origin, and is not even a frequent reference to this circumstance — at least not frequent enough to justify the conclusion that the happy outcome of this one marriage is to be construed as an argument for other marriages of the same sort, and hence as a *Tendenz*. And, furthermore, when the text of the passages concerned is critically examined, it develops that of the six occurrences of *hammo'abhiyah*, "the Moabitess," the word is twice shown to be a gloss (ii. 2, 21) by the ancient versions — a fact that has thus far escaped notice or not been sufficiently considered.³² This leaves but four cases in which the word is genuinely used, so that there is no undue emphasis laid upon the fact that Ruth is a Moabitess, as in each of these instances the adjective is necessary to the thought. *Nokhriyah*, "stranger" (ii. 10), too, lays no undue stress on Ruth's being a foreigner, since, in the context in which the word is used, the sense is rather that of 'stranger, unknown person' (a sense which preserves the more original

meaning of the word³³), as the next verse, "It hath fully been showed me," etc., proves.

In state of affairs there seems to be no justification for the *Tendenz*-theory. Only those who are looking for some ground for an unlikely theory could elaborate an ulterior motive from the few and necessary descriptions of Ruth. Orelli is right in saying: "The naïve simplicity and grace of the narrative refute the hypothesis of a mere *Tendenz* and didactic composition."³⁴

However, even if we should grant that there may be some *Tendenz* in the Book of Ruth, as there is not, it would still be impossible to suppose the account to have been written as a protest against the rigor of Ezra and Nehemiah—a polemic advocating liberality in the matter of intermarriage. How could one reasonably argue that because a particular intermarriage resulted in a blessing to all concerned, such marriages were in general permissible? The exception only proves the rule; and nobody could thus legitimately argue from one case, and that, too, one that occurred under widely different conditions and circumstances. What was common practice and permissible at the time of the Judges was later forbidden; and to argue that because at that time Yahweh blessed one such marriage, even though it were the ancestors of King David, foreign marriages at any time, and particularly at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, were permissible, would have been most illogical and unconvincing. Moreover, the number of such marriages with non-Hebrew women was large³⁵ in the early time, and to cite the case of the happy marriage of Ruth and Boaz, who lived long before even David (through whom it was that Ruth and Boaz receive their importance), when David and Solomon and many others had foreign wives in still later times and were cen-

sured therefor,³⁶ would have had as much effect on the mind of the people of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah as it would have now, i.e. none at all. This theory of the purpose of the book is illogical and hence untenable.

The proof of the utter lack of cogency in the argument lies in the fact that the people themselves who, at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, had taken foreign women to wife, never denied that they had done wrong: they at once admitted this, and agreed to put away their foreign wives.³⁷ Those who clung to their wives did so in spite of their knowledge that their marriage with foreign women was not permissible or justifiable, and without, indeed, trying to justify their course of action. There was really no person who did not feel the logic of Ezra's argument.³⁸

The reasons for this will be clear from a consideration of the circumstances in Judea at that time. They were of a peculiar nature. The community at Jerusalem had just returned from the Captivity and become again established, and they were few in numbers.³⁹ If, now, many of the people intermarried with foreign women, it meant the extinction of the nation and race⁴⁰—the second and third generation would no longer be Hebrews (Jews), but Ashdodites, Ammonites, and Moabites.⁴¹ The feeling at this time was intense, and immediate action was imperative if the nation, race, and religion were to be preserved. Forceful measures were adopted to compel the priests and people to abandon their foreign consorts.⁴² This action had its effect. The loyal Hebrews (Jews) clung to their race and their God, and so the people survived to this day.

Are we now to suppose that the very few bolder and powerful men, who, at this juncture, were traitors to the cause of Yahweh and chose to cling to their wives of foreign race

rather than to their people and God, adopted the feeble method of writing or causing to be written a story of ancient days⁴⁸ — the Book of Ruth? Could any composition, no matter how forceful, have had any effect against the vigorous policy of Ezra and Nehemiah? And are we to suppose that the Book of Ruth, which at most contains seven references to the fact that Ruth was a foreign woman and says not a word in favor of such marriages — are we to suppose that this book was written as a protest against Ezra and Nehemiah?

The theory, therefore, that Ruth was written as a campaign pamphlet or "*Tendenzschrift*" seems to reduce itself to an absurdity (*reductio ad absurdum*), and would, thus, as in geometry, be shown to be impossible. As was pointed out, the theory involves a late date, which renders it *hors de combat*. Lastly, if written according to the theory, it seems most certain that the book would never have been included in the Hebrew scriptures. The memory of its purpose could not have died out, since the Scribes and Rabbis were the direct heirs of the traditions of Ezra and Nehemiah; and since they, later, determined which books should be considered sacred, they would surely have rejected Ruth.

There is, accordingly, no acceptable theory of the purpose of our book which has thus far been proposed. It has, in fact, no set purpose any more than any other historical narrative. Moreover, if Ruth was originally a part of the great history of J(E), as I have shown, I believe, to be likely,⁴⁴ we need look for no purpose in our book beyond that which any episode in a history has.

NOTES.

¹ Cf. author's article, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, July, 1911, pp. 298, 299.

² Cf. the Syriac form of the name, *r'uth*.

³ *Mahlon* may have meant "Sickness" or "Weakness"; but that it referred to the early death of the son so named is not a necessary conclusion. *Kilion*, on the other hand, probably never meant "Consumption." The root *kalah* means 'to end, be complete,' and hence "Completion" is as probable, at least, as "Consumption," for the meaning. It may have referred to the fulfillment of a vow or the like, and have been a usual Hebrew name. Professor Haupt has pointed out to the author that *Kilion* may mean "Perfection" (like *Mikhlol*), comparing *Tikhlah*, etc. With regard to *Mahlon*, "Sickness," Dr. Haupt questions whether a mother would be apt to name her child thus, as it would be a bad omen. He has also pointed out that *Mahlon* may be connected with *chaliy* and *chelyah*. Syriac *chly* means 'sweet,' Arabic *hhaliya*, *hhulu*, *mahli*, 'candy,' etc. This would make *Mahlon* mean "Sweet," "Sweetness," etc.; cf. the present "honey" applied to children as a term of endearment.

⁴ *Astralmythen*, p. 110.

⁵ Art. "Ruth," *Encycl. Bibl.*

⁶ *Altoriental. Forschungen*, vol. iii. part i., *Rut*, pp. 65 ff.; cf. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (3d ed. Berlin; 1903), p. 229, n. 2.

⁷ *Altoriental. Forsch.*, l. c.

⁸ In the Old Test. Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, 1904-05.

⁹ H. Zimmern (*Schrader, op. cit.*, p. 438) very moderately states that the figures of the biblical patriarchal history, etc., may be direct reflexes (*directe Nachwirkung*) of Babylonian gods, and that Ruth, among other personages, may go back to the Babylonian Ishtar in some features (*einzelne Züge*) with more or less probability (*mit mehr oder weniger Wahrscheinlichkeit*). In spite of Stucken and Winckler's far-reaching assumptions and assertions (*sehr weitgehende Aufstellungen*, n. 1), Zimmern does not seem to consider the whole subject as more than a possibility; his reserve in entering upon a presentation of the various features (*ohne in Einzelerörterungen desselben einzutreten*) may fairly be taken as an indication of his position on this subject, and that he saw "less probability" (*weniger Wahrscheinlichkeit*) in the case of Ruth.

¹⁰ Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments (2d ed.), sect. 243.

¹¹ Einleitung, pp. 2331 ff.

¹² De Hebræorum Leviratu (Berolini, 1835).

¹³ As believes Driver, Literature of the Old Testament (10th ed.), p. 455 and note 2. Reuss, Geschichte d. heil. Schrift. (2d ed.), p. 314, below, rightly saw that there is no levirate nor Niyoga in the book.

¹⁴ Ruth iv. 5, 10, and i. 13 are the passages upon which the view of a levirate marriage is founded. But in iv. 5, 10, the reference to raising up seed is a later addition, and in i. 13 there is no such idea.

¹⁵ Cf. chaps. iii. and iv. The acquirement of Ruth as property in chap. iv. represents an ancient custom essentially identical with the old Arabic custom, against which practice Qoran iv. 23. 26 is aimed.

¹⁶ Cf., e.g., Bertholet, Commentary on Ruth, Intro., p. 51, 1); Nowack, Commentary, p. 183, 2.

¹⁷ Art. "Ruth," Realencyclopädie (2d ed.), vol. xlii. p. 142; cf. 3d ed. (1906), p. 267: "Der politische Author hätte seine Absicht so gut versteckt, dass sie kaum jemand herausfinden mochte."

¹⁸ In Theol. Tijdschrift, 1904, p. 472. His words are: "Das Büchlein Ruth stellt in erbaulicher Absicht und in wahrscheinlich vielfach freierfundener Weise dar, wie Jahwe einer Frau Naemi alle Hoffnung nimmt, wie diese sich . . . unter seine Hand beugt, und wie dann Gott . . . alle ihre Wünsche erfüllt und sie für ihre gottesfürchtige Ergebung sogar mit Glücke belohnt."

¹⁹ The latter view is that of Noldenhawer, cited by Reuss, Geschichte d. heil. Schrift. (2d ed.), p. 313; cf. *idem* for other similar views.

²⁰ In Bleek-Wellhausen, Einleitung (4th ed.), p. 205.

²¹ For examples of this, see Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, *Pereq Cheleq*.

²² I.e. "hidden purpose, or tendency; ulterior motive, or tendency to a certain purpose."

²³ Urschrift, 1857, pp. 49 ff.

²⁴ P. de Lagarde, *Orientalia* (Göttingen, 1880), vol. ii. p. 41, says that the statement in iv. 18, viz. "Now these are the generations of Perez," shows that the author of Ruth intended to indicate that the house of David was equivalent to that of Aaron. This reveals a purpose to aggrandize the house of David. Cf. also the theory advanced by Lagarde in *Mittheilung* (Göttingen, 1891), vol. iv. p. 313, below.

²⁵ Cf. Ezra ix. ff.; Neh. xlii. 23 f.

* Cf. author's art., *l.c.*, pp. 291-300.

* In Teyler's Theol. Tijds., 1904, part II. pp. 458 ff.

* In Am. Jour. Sem. Languages, April, 1904, p. 205, below.

* Einleitung (5th ed.), p. 159, sect. 22, note.

* Com. on Ruth. p. 52.

* Com. on Ruth, p. 184.

* In these two cases the word *hammo'abhiyah*, "the Moabites," is quite out of place in the Hebrew, as it is not necessary to the thought; and, knowing the weakness of scribes for adding epithets and details on the basis of cases where there is a necessity for them, there can be no doubt that *hammo'abhiyah* is a gloss. A similar gloss, not noted recently, is *hashshabha*, "which returned" (i. 22); likewise *bisadheh mo'abh*, "in the country of Moab" (i. 6). Is such a gloss, I believe.

* Cf. Heb. *zar*. 'strange'; then 'foreign.'

* Art. "Ruth," *Realencyc.* (3d ed.), p. 267: "Gegen die Annahme einer blossen Tendenz- und Lehrdichtung sträubt sich die naive Einfachheit und Anmut der Erzählung."

* Cf. Judges III. 6, 14 ff. (Samson); 1 Sam. xxvii. 3; 2 Sam. v. 13 (David); 1 Kings xi. 1 ff. (Solomon), etc.

* *Ibid.*

* Ezra x. 5, 12.

* Neh. xiii. 28 is not at all against this, as the son of Joiada undoubtedly clung to his alliance for personal and political ambition.

* Ezra ix. 8.

* Ezra ix. 14 f.

* Neh. xiii. 23, 24.

* Ezra x. 9-44; Neh. xiii. 24 f., 28, 30.

* The theory of Winckler and Cheyne that Ruth is a mere myth, and yet was written as a protest against the rigorous policy of Ezra and Nehemiah, seems singularly impossible when viewed in the light of the real events of this period.

* Cf. author's art., *l.c.*, pp. 298 ff.