

than as the promise of a miracle. No miracle in His withdrawal from the mob at Nazareth (Luke iv. 30) should be assumed, only the controlling influence of a strong and calm personality over the fickle fury of a crowd. The calming of the storm, and the walking on the sea were not deliverances of Himself from danger; they taught lessons of trust to His disciples. The withering of the fig-tree (Matt. xxi. 18-22, Mark xi. 12-14, 20-24) is the most difficult of all the miracles to explain. Without taking refuge in the assumption that we have here a misunderstood parable (compare Luke xiii. 6-9), we must deny that the act showed impatience or indignation unworthy of His grace, but may suppose that, to impress His disciples, Jesus acted instead of speaking a parable, in symbol executed God's judgment on His unfruitful people. There was not only the severity of disregarded righteousness, but also the pathos of unrequited love and rejected grace in the deed. That miracle, rightly understood, also reveals the heart of Jesus, in which ever dwelt the love of the Eternal Father.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

ON THE MEANING AND SCOPE OF
JEREMIAH VII. 22, 23.

(CONCLUSION.)

LIKE Hosea vi. 6a so Jeremiah vii. 22 has often been included in the list of passages in which לֹא־יִשְׁׁ is said to express only a *relative negation*. Passing over the earlier representatives of this opinion I may mention only the latest. Giesebrecht, in the *Handcommentar*, on Jeremiah (1894), speaks of the "rhetorical character" of the passage vii. 22, and compares 1 Corinthians i. 17. Hommel¹ also would find in the same passage the clue to the correct in-

¹ *Die altisraelitische Ueberlieferung, etc.*, 1897, p. 16.

terpretation of Jeremiah vii. 22. But the Apostle actually denies that he had received the commission to baptize. Finally, Von Orelli, in the *Kurzgefasster Commentar* on Jeremiah vii. 22, refers to chapter ii. 2. There we find, as a proclamation of Jehovah, the following: "I remember for thee the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals," etc. Thus the fact is overlooked that the idolatrous people had hewn for themselves a graven image (Exodus xxxii. 1 ff.). But this "people" was not the whole People, and the dark features which characterized the historical picture of Israel's exodus are not expressly eliminated in Jeremiah ii. 2. On the contrary, the passage vii. 22 f. adds, as a positive assertion, the very opposite of the position that God had required sacrifices.

What then is the meaning of Jeremiah vii. 22?

All the factors in the text of this passage will receive due consideration if we find in it this meaning, that the *fundamental* legislation (*Grundgesetzgebung*) which was promulgated at the period of the Exodus did not contain instructions as to sacrifice. This sense of Jeremiah vii. 22 I have been the first to establish, inasmuch as I have shown the relation between the expression "with your fathers" and the historical circumstances which are narrated in Exodus xx. 19-21 and in Deuteronomy v. 1 ff. Of course the same interpretation has already and for long been aimed at. David Kimchi, for example, says on the passage: "It is possible to interpret it so that the root (=the main element) of the legislation did not concern burnt offering and slaughter offering, but that this root lay in the words 'Give ear unto My voice, then shall ye be My people,' and that under this condition He gave them the Law; and, in fact, there is not among all the Ten Commandments which form the sum of the whole Torah a single mention of either burnt or slaughter offering." But up till the present time it has not been possible

to derive this interpretation from the text. This interpretation, however, finds still further support in the Old Testament.

The emphasis upon the Ten Commandments (Exod. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13, x. 4) as the fundamental law is found even in Deuteronomy. For chapters vi.-xi. form an interpretative paraphrase of these basal principles. It was absolutely right and proper that those divine requirements should be emphasized which had been promulgated before the *whole* community. For it would have been incomprehensible why the Deity should have proclaimed a compendium of His requirements to the whole people and to them in the first place, unless these requirements had been intended to contain what we may call the Magna Carta of the constitution of the theocratic kingdom. But that did not involve the denial that other Divine commands existed.

The position is the same in regard to Jeremiah vii. 22. Beyond doubt the primary rank of those Divine ordinances which had been proclaimed before the representatives of the whole people is expressed in this passage. But that does not mean that these ordinances alone derive from the period of Israel's deliverance. For, *imprimis*, that is not stated in the passage itself, but the possibility is there left open that apart from the ordinances which were published before the whole people and therefore have a fundamental significance, yet other Divine commandments exist which were revealed in the first place to Moses. Nay, this passage itself actually suggests the possibility. For the words, "walk ye in all the way that I command you that it may be well with you" (23b) may just as well refer to Divine instructions which were mediated through Moses as to Divine teaching made known by his successors (Deut. xviii. 15-18, etc. Jer. vii. 25). Exactly the same distinction between two classes of Divine commandments

is met with outside this passage in Jeremiah. For in Exodus xx. 21 ff., and still more plainly in Deuteronomy v. 28 ff., reference is made to such instructions from God which were no longer proclaimed direct to the whole community, and which comprise the "whole way" by the keeping of which Israel can secure its well-being. How closely do Deuteronomy v. 30 and Jeremiah vii. 23^b agree with one another in this point!

In any case, however, the words of Jeremiah vii. 22 f., as well as of the other passages to the same effect (Exod. xx. 19 ff.; Deut. v. 21 ff.), declare plainly that the Divine instructions which were not proclaimed directly in the presence of the representatives of the whole community have not the same fundamental authority as the Decalogue. And what content could those Divine instructions have had for the consciousness of Jeremiah, which had been only indirectly communicated to the people? Is it possible that in his judgment they referred to sacrificial worship? Even this reference may be contained in Jeremiah vii. 22 f., and is not positively excluded by the passage. But whether, according to Jeremiah, it was actually the case and what parts of the sacrificial directions of the Pentateuch were known to this prophet must be ascertained from his language elsewhere. This examination of the context of Jeremiah vii. 22 f. opens with very satisfactory success. For does not the interpretation of this passage which I have suggested at once find support in what immediately follows? Undoubtedly. That Divine requirement which Jeremiah vii. 23 sets forth as the sole standard certainly finds its continuation in the address of the prophet which is attached to it. In this, however, it is *morality* that is required. The inference is thereby established that Jeremiah regarded the religious moral principles as the basis and main content of the Divine legislation.

This interpretation of Jeremiah vii. 22 f. is further

supported by the wider context of the passage. For in vi. 20a we read: "To what purpose cometh there to me frankincense from Sheba?" etc. Now frankincense is mentioned as an ingredient in the "perfume" of Exodus xxx. 34 ff., etc., and also as an addition to the meal-offering in Leviticus ii. 1 ff., etc. It follows that the negative attitude of Jehovah towards incense could not have been expressed so absolutely in Jeremiah vi. 20a, if only those offerings were to be dispensed with which were presented by certain people. Thus in the words which follow, "your burnt offerings are not acceptable," etc., it is not possible to lay the emphasis upon the possessive pronoun "your." And this is further precluded by the sentence in ix. 24: "Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgement, and righteousness in the earth: for in these I delight." Thus no mention is made of any other object of the Divine satisfaction. Moreover, we read in xiv. 12, "Although they shall bring burnt offering and oblation yet have I no pleasure therein": so that here also no regard is had to the circumstance that God has ordained sacrifices by the offering of which sin may be covered and the favour of the Deity secured. And, further, in the fundamental passage on the "new covenant" no mention is made of sacrifices (xxx. 31-34).

Neither does the interpretation of Jeremiah vii. 22 f. which I have set forth above conflict with those passages in Jeremiah which have frequently been adduced to show that *'al dibré* means "in reference to," and that *lô*, in vii. 22, involves an absolute negation. The series of such passages in Jeremiah begins with the sentence (xvii. 26), "and they shall come from the cities of Judah . . . bringing burnt offerings and sacrifices and oblations and frankincense, and bringing sacrifices of thanksgiving unto the house of the Lord." The offering of sacrifices is here

mentioned as an element in the worship which is to be practised under the future conditions of the Divine kingdom. But Jeremiah does not, as Rupprecht has recently asserted, "enjoin"¹ the offering of sacrifices as though these were commanded by God. Again, xxxi. 14a runs: "and I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness," but neither does this contradict the interpretation of vii. 22 suggested above. For prophecy may also approve such elements in the constitution of the theocratic kingdom as are not fundamental to its constitution. And, again, Bredenkamp has remarked:² "Why does Jeremiah complain so bitterly" (xxxii. 34) that the Temple has become a den of thieves, and has been polluted by Israel with the abomination of idolatry? But the condemnatory remark which we read in this passage might have been made by Jeremiah even if he had not regarded the sacrifices as a direct and fundamental ordinance of God. Finally, in xxxiii. 11, there is mention made of those persons who say: "Give thanks to the Lord of Hosts, for the Lord is good," etc.; and there is similar language in verses 17 ff., 22. But still it remains one thing for any one to deny that the sacrificial laws belong to the fundamental legislation of God, and quite another thing for him to mention the sacrifices and the other acts of worship as a natural expression of piety.

In any case the following consideration must not be lost sight of. In the history of Israel prayers and sacrifices are recorded to have been offered by pious persons of the pre-Mosaic period without any mention of a direct Divine institution of either prayer or sacrifice. It certainly follows that it is at least possible that prayers and sacrifices were for the pious in Israel an expression of the piety aroused by some higher impulse of the human heart as a work

¹ E. Rupprecht, *Des (Pentateuch) Räthsels Lösung*, ii. 1 (1896), p. 229.

² Bredenkamp, *Gesetz und Propheten*, p. 106.

of God. Böhmer, therefore, is mistaken when he says: "If it follows from passages like Jeremiah vii. 22 that the prophets have no knowledge of any sacrificial legislation, then it is clear also from the same passages that they reject all sacrifices."¹ He has not borne in mind the sacrifices of the pre-Mosaic period. Much less do these four passages of the Book of Jeremiah stand in contradiction with that interpretation of Jeremiah vii. 22 which I have shown above to be the probable one.

It has been thought, however, that the possibility of this interpretation must be challenged on the ground that Jeremiah was acquainted with the Jehovistic and Deuteronomic part of the Pentateuch. For example, the view that *'al dibrê* has the sense of the objective "in regard to," and that the *lô* of vii. 22 involves an absolute negation, was objected to by Von Orelli in the following words: "In that case, Jeremiah could not have known the so-called book of the Covenant with its sacrificial ordinances (Exod. xx. 24, xxiii. 18; cf. xxxiv. 25). Just as little could the Jehovistic narrative have been known to him, according to which Jehovah summoned His people to a sacrificial feast in the wilderness (Exod. v. 1, iii. 8). And Deuteronomy also, the Mosaic rank of which Jeremiah evidently champions, contains ordinances in reference to the sacrifices (Deut. xii. 6, xi. 13 f., 27)."² Some light is thrown upon these words of Orelli by the following considerations. The passage in Exodus xx. 24 speaks in a positive way only of the character of the altars which may be built for Jehovah. Further, the narrator, in Exodus v. 1 ff., mentions expressly as a word of Jehovah (verse 1) only the summons: "Let My people go that they may hold a feast unto Me in the wilderness." In like manner, in Deuteronomy xi. 6, xi. 13, the expressions "your burnt

¹ J. Böhmer, *Brennende Zeit- und Streitfragen der Kirche* (1897), p. 43.

² V. Orelli, *Kurzgefasster Commentar zu Jes. und Jer.*, p. 254.

offerings" and "thy burnt offerings" are selected. But at the same time God is actually mentioned as the Person who has ordained at least the subsidiary conditions of the presentation of offerings (Exod. xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25; Deut. xii. 14b, 27). From these facts many have drawn the conclusion that the *lô* in Jeremiah vii. 22 cannot have its absolute sense.¹ This inference is groundless, however, if the interpretation of Jeremiah vii. 22 ff. which has been set forth above be accepted as the most probable. For, according to this interpretation, Jeremiah may have been acquainted with ancient regulations concerning the sacrifices, but he did not reckon them among the fundamental principles of the legitimate religion of Israel.

Once more, Giesebrecht, commenting on the passage, is of this opinion: "legislative codes such as the Jehovistic and the Deuteronomic are quite compatible with the declaration of Jeremiah, but not a legislation such as is contained in the 'Priestly Codex.'"² Even this assertion cannot be completely established by the assumption of "a rhetorical character in this prophetic passage." But the contradiction between Jeremiah vii. 22 ff. and Jeremiah's knowledge of the sacrificial regulations vanishes as soon as that construction of Jeremiah vii. 22 f., for which I have given reasons above, is accepted as correct. According to my interpretation, this sets aside only the primary rank, but not the existence, of the laws concerning sacrifice.

The exact measure of Jeremiah's knowledge of sacrificial regulations which had been handed down as divine and Mosaic, is another question. A sufficiently secure basis for the answering of it ought to be found in vi. 20a. For the question: "To what purpose cometh there to me frankincense from Sheba?" stands in contradiction to Exodus xxx.

¹ Marti, *ut supra*, p. 221; Köhler, *Lehrbuch der Biblischen Geschichte*, ii. 2, p. 27, and others.

² Giesebrecht, *Handcommentar zu Jer.* (1894) p. 49.

23b, 34 and Leviticus ii. 1 ff. ; and it is indeed in the following passages alone that incense is mentioned at all: Exod. xxx. 34; Lev. ii. 1 f., 15 f., v. 11, vi. 8, xxiv. 7; Num. v. 15; Isa. xliii. 23, lx. 6, lxvi. 3; Jer. vi. 20, xvii. 26, xli. 5; Cant. iii. 6, iv. 6, 14; Neh. xiii. 5-9; and 1 Chron. ix. 29 (without any parallel in the earlier historical books!). In this we cannot but find an unmistakable trace of the fact that such sacrificial ordinances as are formulated in harmony of form and content with the Pentateuchal sections just referred to (Exod. xxx. 34; Lev. ii. 1, etc.), were not (as vi. 20a shows) recognized by Jeremiah as divinely sanctioned or as Mosaic.

At this point of our investigation Jeremiah viii. 8 must also be taken into account. Verse 8a runs: "How do ye say, we are wise and the law of the Lord is with us?" These words offer no difficulty. Then verse 8b begins with "But, behold." The expression which immediately follows, "*lashsheker*," occurs ten times: Lev. v. 24, xix. 12; 1 Sam. xxv. 21; Jer. iii. 23a, v. 2b, vii. 9, viii. 8, xxvii. 15; Zech. v. 4; Mal. iii. 5. In six of these passages it is combined with the word "swear" (Lev. v. 24, xix. 24; 1 Sam. iii. 23a, v. 2b, vii. 9; Zech. v. 4; Mal. iii. 5), and signifies "in accordance with deceit," or "for deceit," that is, "deceitful." Further, in 1 Samuel xxv. 21 we read: "Surely for deceit, that is, unsuccessfully, have I kept." Then in Jeremiah iii. 23a "*lashsheker*" signifies "in accordance with, and for, deceit." Moreover, xxvii. 15 runs thus: "they prophesy in My Name in accordance with, and for, deceit" = in a lying manner and for the purpose of deception. What then does *lashsheker* mean in the tenth passage (viii. 8b)? This depends on the sense of the עֲשֵׂה which follows it.

Ought this עֲשֵׂה to have an object or not? There are many analogies to support the suggestion that either עֲשֵׂהָ or עֲשֵׂהָ was meant. For the pronoun which represents something already mentioned is often regarded in Hebrew

as understood (Gen. ii. 19*a*, etc.).¹ The interpretation of the text in Jeremiah viii. 8*b* which first suggests itself is that after $\eta\psi\epsilon$ a pronoun is involuntarily supplied which refers to the Torah of Jehovah mentioned before. Nevertheless, the verb $\eta\psi\epsilon$ might also be used in this place without an object. For it stands without an object in Genesis xxx. 30, etc. (Syntax, § 209). But this fact that $\eta\psi\epsilon$ occurs also without an object does not make it certain or even entirely probable that the \aleph in Jeremiah viii. 8*b* was intended to be taken in this absolute sense. For the passages Gen. xxx. 30, etc., do not refer to anything which could form the natural object to $\eta\psi\epsilon$. On the other hand, Jeremiah viii. 8*b* actually names before $\eta\psi\epsilon$ something which is the natural object of a pen's activity, namely, the Torah of Jehovah. It is therefore an incontrovertible fact that the "law of Jehovah" is involuntarily supplied as the object to this verb of making.

Nevertheless, there are still two other translations which are possible: (a) Surely, behold, in a deceitful manner, or, for deceit has the pen of scribes established it (*eam* = the Torah of Jehovah). In this case what would be expressed would be this, that the lying pen had introduced the Torah of Jehovah in its entire contents. This declaration is not probable. (b) The other interpretation which is still possible is the following: "For deceit has many (see my Syntax § 256) a false pen of scribes made it (*eam*)." Then the sense of Jeremiah viii. 8*b* would be this: the basis of the Torah of Jehovah, which was made authoritative by the classes having the control at the time, was actually a Divine Torah, but this basis had received false additions through the lying pen of scribes.

In what did these additions consist? It cannot be regarded as impossible that verse 8*a* signifies that the then dominating party was appealing to the Torah of Jehovah for the authorization of their Tophet cultus (cf. vii. 31 ff.). We

¹ Compare my *Historisch-comparative Syntax des Hebräischen*, p. 342, Note 1.

may recall the fact that in vii. 31*b* and in xix. 5 Jehovah protests against the idea that He had commanded the sacrifice of children. But the definite article, "the Torah of Jehovah" is a difficulty in this interpretation. It suggests that this explanation should at least be extended. It must also be remembered that verse 8*a* refers back in the first instance to the words: "My people know not the ordinance of the Lord" (7*b*), that is to say, Israel does not know the fundamental Divine requirement of loyalty, of inward dependence upon God, which is referred to in vii. 21-23, etc. This pretermission of loyalty towards God was the source of all kinds of immorality. And so it provides a ground of complaint quite sufficiently serious for viii. 8 to refer to it. And who, finally, are the scribes on whose pen reproach is cast in verse 8*b*? In verse 10 the prophets and priests are accused of "bringing deceit (*sheker*) to pass." Here, therefore, exactly the same conduct is ascribed to them as is complained of in verse 8*b*. It follows that the lying pen of scribes is to be sought for in the circle of the false prophets and the priests.

The attitude of Jeremiah to the Pentateuchal ordinances touching sacrifice was, according to the passages we have discussed, this: the commandments regarding sacrifice formed no part of the principles of the Law which, on a certain occasion, were promulgated immediately before the entire community, and were therefore invested with fundamental significance (Jer. vii. 22*a*; Exod. xx. 19*b*; Deut. v. 22*f*). These principles could not possibly be superseded by sacrificial regulations, in view of their importance as evidence of Israel's covenant loyalty (Jer. vii. 23). Moreover, in the formulating of the laws of sacrifice, there operated, no doubt, the natural inclination to purchase the Divine favour by the costliness of the sacrificial materials (vi. 20*a*; cf. viii. 8).

This exposition of Jeremiah vii. 22 *f*., while it offers the

right means for grasping as a homogeneous whole all the passages in Jeremiah which contain references to sacrifice, throws at the same time a welcome light upon other utterances in the Old Testament which concern the rank assigned to the sacrificial regulations. But these must be discussed on another occasion.

ED. KÖNIG.

*DID OUR LORD, OR ENOCH, "PREACH TO
THE SPIRITS IN PRISON"?*

DR. RENDEL HARRIS has recently contributed to this magazine some very interesting notes on the connexion of 1 Peter with the Book of Enoch. (6th Series iv. 194-346, v. 317.) He suggests that the name *Ἐνώχ* in 1 Peter iii. 19 has dropped out of the text, by similarity (of sound) or the *ἐν ᾧ καὶ* with which that verse commences.

In his last paper, he states that the proposed emendation had occurred to Dr. M. R. James recently, and to the Dutch theologian Cramer in 1891. They, however, seem to consider the *ἐν ᾧ καὶ* as a substitute for *Ἐνώχ*. His view is certainly the preferable one (if one of the two emendations must be adopted) for reasons which he gives.

But I venture to call his attention and that of your readers to the note in Stier and Thiele's Polyglot New Testament of A.D. 1855. It is

19. Ap. *Bow.* (pro *ἐν ᾧ*): *Ἐνώχ* s. *Νῶε* (Al.: *ἐν ᾧ κ.* *Ἐνώχ*) cll. Ind. 14s. 2 Pt. 2. 5.

Bowyer published in 1763 in London a Greek New Testament in two volumes, with Wetstein's approved readings, and a collection of critical conjectures, which were not necessarily his own. These conjectures were afterwards published separately. They also are contained in Knapp's