find that your teaching has not been in vain. For then, like your Master, you will teach with authority, and not as teach the Scribes.

Take the Book into your life. Try the precepts, test the promises; not in thought but in action; not in the study but in the school, the shop and the street. Prove them, not by the experience of others, but by your own. And then you will revere even more than you revere to-day the Book in which the Divine Law and the Divine Love are proclaimed and revealed; and with new loyalty and devotion you will adore, trust and obey the Person—the Living, the Eternal Saviour—from Whom the Book derives its power.

Alfred Dale.

THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

III. Deborah and Barak.

The Judges, as we have seen, were local leaders, who rose up to save and deliver particular districts of Israelite territory, when danger threatened. This time the area threatened was in the north. The "Great Plain," as Josephus calls it, the "Plain of Megiddo" (2 Chron. xxxv. 22; Zech. xii. 11), through which the Kishon flows, bounded on the N. by the Galilaean hills and Tabor, on the E. by "Little Hermon" (Jebel Dahî), Jezreel, and the back of the Gilboa range, and on the S.W. by the mountains stretching out to the N.W., and ending in Carmel, is held by the Canaanites: Sisera, their leader, has his residence at Harosheth, which is identified, if not certainly, yet very plausibly, with Tell el-Heraithiyeh, very near the right bank of the Kishon, on the slope of an outlying spur of the Galilaean hills, which projects into the plain opposite to Carmel, and thus, as sheet V. of the great P. E. F. Map at once shows us, forms a narrow pass, less than a mile across, through which, close
at the foot of the Carmel range, the Kishon flows to its mouth in the Bay of Acre. The hills above El-Harithiyeh are covered now with a fine oak forest. The Tell consists of a large double mound, with remains of walls and buildings; and a stronghold on it would effectually command the entrance to the Great Plain from Acre (the ancient Acheh), and the commercial highways which led through it.\(^1\) Megiddo, Taanach and Ibleam,\(^2\) on the slope of the hills on the S.W. and S. of the Great Plain are Canaanite fortresses (Jud. i. 27). As is now well known, Megiddo and Taanach have been recently excavated, and extensive remains of the ancient walls have been discovered.\(^3\) The Vale of Jezreel, leading down on the E. of Jezreel into the Jordan valley, with the fortress of Beth-shean, at the bottom, is also held by Canaanites (Josh. xvii. 16, cited on p. 397). The historical significance of all this is that the four northern tribes, Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali, are cut off from the tribes of Central Canaan: the national unity of Israel is imperilled by the aggressive movements now being made by the Canaanites; and the removal of the danger is a national concern.

Such, briefly, is the historical situation. Before proceeding further, however, we must consider our literary sources. We have two accounts of Deborah and Barak, a prose

---


\(^2\) Probably, where Bileam (a name found only in 1 Chron. vi. 70 [Heb. 55]), in *Wady Bel'ame*, is marked in G. A. Smith's Maps, 8 miles S. of Jezreel (Moore, pp. 44, 46). Conder's site, about half-way between Beth-shean and Endor, must have found its way into G. A. Smith's by an oversight: Smith himself (H. G. p. 387 n.) does not mention it. Besides, as can easily be shown, Bileam and Ibleam were really the same place: in Joshua xxii. 25 (the source of 1 Chron. vi. 70) *Gath-rimmon* (which corresponds to Bileam in 1 Chron. vi. 70) is manifestly repeated from verse 24 by a *laprus calami*; and LXX *Iefsaba* (cod. B) can be nothing but a corruption of *Iefsanaμ.*

\(^3\) See for particulars the writer's "Schweich Lectures" on *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible* (1909), p. 80 ff.
account in Judges iv., and a poetical account in Judges v. The two accounts should be carefully compared: in most particulars they agree; but there are also some divergences, which, as A. B. Davidson remarked long ago, "can be accounted for only on the supposition that ch. iv. is an independent tradition." The song is contemporary with the events: the prose narrative is based upon tradition, and is later; where, therefore, the two differ, the poem must be followed by preference.

The compiler tells us in iv. 1-3 how he viewed the situation. Jabin was "king of Canaan," and he reigned in Hazor. Hazor has not been certainly identified; but it can hardly have been far from Kedesh of Naphtali. Kedesh of Naphtali is the modern Kades, on the East slope of the mountains of Naphtali, 4 miles N.W. of Lake Huleh (doubtfully identified with the Waters of Merom), in a small green plain, encircled by wooded hills, and with various remains of ancient buildings. Jabin had 900 chariots of iron; and Sisera was the captain of his host, who lived at Harosheth. But there are difficulties in this view. Thus (1) though the compiler, both in verse 2 and in verses 23, 24,

1 Expositor, January, 1887, p. 50. (In my last article, p. 523 note for Theology of the Old Testament read Old Testament Prophecy.)
2 See Moore, pp. 111, 112.
3 Notice how Kedesh and Hazor are mentioned near one another (Josh. xix. 36, 37; 2 Kings xv. 29; 1 Macc. xi. 63 f., 67). Three miles S.S.W. of Kedesh there is a Jebel Hadireh, which recalls the name Hazor, though as "Hadireh" is a common Arabic word meaning sheepfold (Moore, p. 112), no great stress can be placed on the similarity. As on J. Hadireh there are moreover no ancient ruins, this itself can hardly be the site; so Buhl (Geogr. p. 236) regards either (Robinson) Hurēb, 2 miles to the E. of J. Hadireh, or (Dillm.) Harra, 2 miles still further to the E., as the real site of Hazor, supposing the name to have been transferred in the course of centuries, as has happened in other cases, to a neighbouring site. G. A. Smith marks Hazor at J. Hadireh itself: but it is unfortunately difficult to feel sure whether this expresses his own judgment on the question, or only his engraver's. Guthe, in his beautiful and very scholarly Bibelatlas in 20 Haupt- und 28 Nebenkarten (1911), Map 3, places Hazor at Hurēb.

4 See the art. Merom in the Encycl. Biblica.
calls Jabin king of Canaan, in the older narrative which he incorporates into his narrative he is only king of Hazor (ver. 17); (2) if Sisera is his general, it is a little strange that (supposing the site of Harosheth to be rightly identified) he lives so far from his master's capital, some 35 miles, as the crow flies, to the S.W., and with many difficult mountain ranges and wadys intervening; (3) the Song speaks (ver. 19), not of a "king" of Canaan, but of "kings" of Canaan, and Sisera's mother is attended, not by ladies, but by princesses (ver. 28): in other words, she is the queen-mother, and Sisera is a king! The representation of the poem is thus this: the foes of Israel are not a king of Canaan, with Sisera as his general, but the kings of Canaan—i.e., presumably, the kings of the Canaanite fortified towns, Taanach, Megiddo, etc., in the neighbourhood of the Great Plain—with Sisera as their leader. This is in accordance with the book of Joshua, which speaks throughout of the kings of Jericho (ii. 2), Ai (viii. 1), Jerusalem (x. 1), and other individual towns (x. 3, 28, 33; xii. 1, 9–24), but never of a "king of Canaan." If we look further, we find other indications in the prose narrative, which support this view. Not only, as I have pointed out, is Jabin called king of Hazor, not king of Canaan, but Jabin is moreover a mere name: he takes no part in the struggle. The real leader is Sisera: and the 900 chariots, which the compiler assigns to Jabin (ver. 2), are Sisera's (ver. 13) in the independent narrative. It is also remarkable that in Joshua xi. we read of a "Jabin, king of Hazor," who with his three allies,¹ the kings of Madon (probably not far from Hazor ²),

¹ Verses 2, 3 mention other allies; but these verses, like verse 8 (first and last clauses) and verses 10–23, are a Deuteronomic expansion (Expositor, November, 1911, p. 403 n.).
² The "king of Madon" (LXX Maron) is mentioned also in Joshua xii. 19, in the list of kings smitten by Joshua, next before the "king of Hazor"; but without any clue as to the actual site of the city.
Shim'on, in Zebulun (Josh. xix. 15),\textsuperscript{1} and Achshaph, in Asher (Josh. xix. 25), is defeated by Joshua.

The conclusion to which these facts point, and which is adopted by nearly all recent writers on the subject,\textsuperscript{2} is this, that the foes with whom Barak had to contend were the kings of Canaan, with Sisera, also a king, at their head; but that there has been a confusion: the oral tradition underlying ch. iv. has interwoven with the memory of this victory of Barak over Sisera reminiscences of the victory of Israel over Jabin, king of Hazor—some 30 miles N. of the scene of Barak’s victory—recorded in Joshua xi. (vers. 1, 4–7, 8\textit{middle}, 9)—the two traditions having been superficially harmonised by Sisera being made into Jabin’s general. The compiler afterwards further harmonised his view (that Jabin viz. was “king of Canaan”) with that of the older narrative (that Jabin viz. was “king of Hazor”), by describing him as “king of Canaan, who reigned in Hazor.” It is moreover noticeable that whereas in the Song nearly all the tribes N. and S. of the Great Plain take part in the rising, Issachar, Zebulun, and Naphtali on the north, and Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin on the south, in the prose narrative only the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali are mentioned. Whether, however, the mention of Zebulun and Naphtali alone in ch. iv. is to be attributed, as has been supposed, to the fact that the war with Jabin, king of Hazor, though represented in Joshua xi. as waged by Joshua and “all the people of war,” was in reality a struggle, undertaken by these two tribes for the purpose of gaining possession of their territory in the N., is less certain: it is possible that in the tradition on which Judges iv. is based, the names of Zebulun and Naphtali were alone preserved.

\textsuperscript{1} So read, probably, with LXX, both here and Joshua xix. 15, for Shimron. It may very well be Semâniyeh, five miles W. of Nazareth (see E. B. s.v.). Achshaph is not certainly identified; see E. B. s.v.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. the arts. JABIN and SISERA in D.B.
as those of the two tribes which were the most prominent, and most brightly distinguished themselves under Barak (ver. 18). This view of the relation of Judges iv. to Joshua xi. does not materially modify the picture which we form from Judges iv. and v. respecting Deborah and Barak, and their victory over Sisera: it leaves the general representation untouched, and merely bids us disregard a few elements in ch. iv., which have properly no connexion with Sisera.

Let us then, disregarding the notices of Jabin in ch. iv., endeavour to form a picture of the whole occurrence. I will try to work into it the particulars of both the poetical and the prose narrative. There are parts of the poem in which the text is corrupt, and the meaning consequently uncertain; but the general sense is sufficiently clear.

The state to which the Israelites had been reduced before the deliverance is vividly portrayed in the poem—

6 In the days of Shamgar, son of Anath,  
In the days of Jael, caravans ceased,  
And travellers walked through devious paths;

7 Villages ceased in Israel, they ceased,  
Until thou, Deborah, didst arise,  
Till thou didst arise, a mother in Israel.  
Was there a shield to be seen, or a spear,  
Among forty thousand in Israel?

The Canaanites apparently took the aggressive. The country was harried by armed bands of Canaanites: travel on highways was consequently stopped: men travelled by circuitous or unfrequented by-paths; villages were deserted by their inhabitants: as compared with the well-

1 So nearly all recent scholars. As Lagrange remarks, in verse 12 the poet addresses Deborah: she can consequently hardly be the author of the poem herself. Ehrlich (Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel, ii., 1911, p. 82) points out in addition that, if Deborah were speaking herself, Heb. idiom would have required the separate personal pronoun to be added (as Dan. ix. 2, x. 2, 7, xii. 5, Eccles. i. 12), which is not here the case. The rendering involves no change in the Heb. text: יְתֹלֶפֶּה has the old ending of the 2nd fem. sing.; see G.-K. § 44 h.
equipped Canaanites, the Israelites could be described—naturally with some hyperbole—as unarmed. Even now, we are told, when the government is weak, highways at once become unsafe: wandering bands of Arabs cross the Jordan for plunder: villagers leave their homes and enter the towns for protection; and travellers are obliged to confine themselves to by-ways.¹ The number of warriors, 40,000, contrasts favourably with the immense figures by which later writers often estimate the former military resources of their country.

As, so often in the history, it is a prophet who discerns the needs of the times, and counsels what is to be done to relieve them, so now Deborah, a prophetess, takes the initiative. Her home, we are told (iv. 5), was between Ramah 5 miles N. of Jerusalem, and Bethel 10 miles N. of it, in the territory of Benjamin; and there, under a sacred palm-tree—like Saul under the pomegranate-tree at Migron, or the tamarisk tree at Ramah (1 Sam. xiv. 2; xxii. 6)—she sat as arbitress, to adjudicate differences which the Israelites brought to her for decision.² Deborah was the moving spirit in the rising against the Canaanites. She calls upon Barak, of Kedesh in Naphtali, to take the field; and bids him march 10,000 men of Naphtali and Zebulun to Tabor. Let us look again for a few moments either at the P. E. F. Map, or at G. A. Smith’s Map, which distinguishes so clearly the elevations. Here is the Great Plain; and here in the N.E. angle of it is Tabor, 30 miles S. of Kedesh. Here, on its E. edge, is Jezreel, the later residence

¹ Land and Book, ibid. p. 223.
² It is remarkable, however, that Deborah’s home should be so far from that of Barak; and Judges v. 15 at least suggests that she belonged to the tribe of Issachar. It is not impossible therefore that Deborah’s connexion with Bethel and Ramah may be due to a confusion with Gen. xxxv. 8 (where another “Deborah,” Rebekah’s nurse, is buried under an oak tree “below Bethel”), and that her home was really in the North, in the tribe of Issachar.
of the house of Ahab, whence the Plain stretches out, as far as the eye can reach, an almost unbroken level, well fitted for the evolutions of chariots and cavalry, to Carmel, 20 miles to the N.W. Jezreel stands on a slight elevation; and if we remember its relation to the country around, we can picture the scene in 2 Kings ix. 17–20, where the watchman on the tower in Jezreel describes in the distance Jehu and his horsemen drawing nearer and nearer. Here is the Kishon, running down from very near Ibleam, with numerous tributaries flowing into it; and here are the three Canaanite fortresses, Taanach, Megiddo, and Ibleam, on the slope of the hills, on its S.W. edge. Here is Nazareth, on the edge of the hills on the N., 5 miles across the valley to the W. of Tabor. And here are Nain and En-dor, on the hills across the valley on the S. of Tabor. Tabor is a land-mark conspicuous far and near. It is a symmetrical, rounded mountain, 1,843 ft. in height above the sea, with a large oval platform, some 3,000 ft. by 1,300 ft., at the top, rising nearly 1,600 ft. above the Great Plain, and commanding a view over nearly its entire extent. "Its situation and natural strength made it a most advantageous position in a struggle with the Canaanites of the Plain."

Deborah adds, to encourage Barak, that, when he has massed his men on Tabor, Yahweh will lead the enemy on to his ruin (iv. 7): Sisera will be tempted to advance against him, and will be brought thereby into the valley of the treacherous Kishon, and "delivered into his hand."

The words in this verse, "the captain of Jabin’s army," referring to Sisera, if the view taken above be correct, will not belong to the original story of Sisera. Deborah and Barak go together to Kedesh: there Barak summons Zebulun and Naphtali to join him; and the two together, with their 20,000 men, proceed to the trysting-place on Mount Tabor.
But if we look at the Map, a difficulty appears here. Kedesh of Naphtali is in the mountainous country, 30 miles N. of Tabor; and Hazor, Jabin’s capital, presumably not far off (see p. 26). Is it not remarkable that Barak should go to Kedesh, in the very heart of the enemy’s country, summon his troops to meet him there, and even, if Hazor is rightly located (p. 26), march then un molested almost past its very gates, to Tabor? If “Jabin, king of Hazor,” has no real place in the narrative of Barak, the difficulty would disappear. Or is the “Kedesh” of Judges iv. 9, 10, 11, distinct from the “Kedesh of Naphtali” of ver. 6, and to be placed with Conder (T. W. 69), and G. A. Smith (H. G. 396 n.), at Kadis, a mile S.W. of the Sea of Galilee, and 10 miles E.N.E. of Tabor? Then Barak would not have approached Hazor within 23 miles. Happily, this uncertainty does not affect our general idea of the means by which Barak achieved his victory.

A parenthetic note explains here in advance what the reader needs to know about the scene and the perpetrator of Sisera’s tragic death. “Now Heber the Kenite had severed himself from Kain, even from the children of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses, and had pitched his tent as far as the terebinth of Ba’annim (cf. Josh. xix. 33), 1 which is

---

1 Where R.V. marg. has Bezaanannim.

2 Identified by Conder (T. W. 69; Memoirs of P. E. F. i. 365 f.; cf. Name-lists, p. 121) with Besgüm, a ruined site 4 miles W. of the Kadis, S.W. of the Sea of Galilee, mentioned in the text above. The names, however, do not agree phonetically. As the reader will now understand, the site depends wholly upon the assumption that the Kedesh of Judges iv. 11 is this Kadis.

The treatment of the name in English Maps, professing to mark ancient sites, is remarkable, but characteristic. In the 3 inch to the mile Map of the P. E. F., sheet 6, just N.E. of Besgüm there is marked a plain called Sahel (= “plain”) el-Ahmá, and immediately below it, in the large red letters indicating that it is a Biblical site, The Plain of Zaanaim. (It should be explained that Zaanaim and Ba’annim [or Betsaannim] denote the same place, according as the be at the beginning is regarded as the preposition, or as part of the word: the latter view is much preferable.)
by Kedesh.” The Kenites were a people who, tradition told, had been friendly with Israel at the time of the Exodus. Hobab had been pressed by Moses to become “eyes” to Israel, when they left Kadesh-barnea, to show them the best camping-places in the wilderness (Num. x. 31), and, it may be inferred from Judges i. 16, had in the end acceded to the request. Jethro, the name which he bears in another tradition, in an interesting and important chapter, which sets before us Moses legislating (Exod. xviii.), advises Moses what to do when the burden of judging the whole people was too much for him; and it has been conjectured that the Hebrews even derived some elements of their religion from their association with the Kenites. However this

The Map of Palestine at the beginning of Hastings’ D. B. “according to the P. E. Survey” [see, on this misnomer, Expositor, Nov., 1911, p. 389] obediently follows, marking Plain of Zaanaim in the same place. Dr. Grundy, in Murray’s shilling Map, does the same. Even G. A. Smith (not noting Bese‘ēm at all) marks Betsa‘anim—in the Map in H. G. without a query, in the large wall-map with a query—above Sahel el-Aḥmā, as the name of the plain. But the remarkable thing is that a “plain,” whether of Zaanaim, or Ba‘’annim, is a non-existent locality,—as non-existent as the “Plain of Mamre,” which—mirabilissimum et mirabundissimum dictu—figures even in G. A. Smith’s maps: for, as a student reading his Hebrew Genesis for the first time, as soon as he reaches xii. 6, discovers, “plain” is simply a mistranslation of פָּרָה, and the word beyond all question denotes a tree! probably a terebinth (so, naturally, G. A. Smith himself, H. G., p. 318, and, of Betsa‘anim, p. 396). Yet the authorities responsible for all these maps, in defiance of philology, continue to mislead English students by inserting in them these non-existent “plains.” Naturally, the Map of Galilee in the Enc. B., and the Map in Guthe’s Bibelatlas, are both in this respect immaculate.

1 In Exodus ii. 18 he bears a third name Reuel (perhaps inferred incorrectly from Numbers x. 29, as though the words “Moses’ father-in-law” referred there to Reuel and not to his son Hobab). Prof. Sayce, however, writes, with regard to Reuel and Jethro (Early Hist. of the Hebrews, p. 163): “Tradition has handed down more than one name for the high priest of Midian”; so clearly none of the passages which mention either Jethro or Reuel can be regarded by him as written by Moses. See further, on the confusion between these three names, Chapman, Introd. to the Pent. (1911), pp. 104–7. There seem also to have been different traditions about the nationality of Moses’ father-in-law: for Hobab is a Kenite here (cf. i. 16), but a Midianite in Numbers x. 29, as Jethro also is in Exodus iii. and xviii.
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may be, Judges i. 16 describes them as accompanying Judah, when the tribe "went up" from Jericho to gain possession of its territory, as far as Arad (16 miles S. of Hebron). Afterwards, however, true to their Bedawi instincts, they settled, not in Judah, but further to the south, among the Amalekites, as must certainly be read for the vague "with the people," with MSS. of the LXX, in Judges i. 16.1 The argument in favour of this reading is clinched when we find that Saul, about to start on his expedition against the Amalekites, sends a friendly message (1 Sam. xv. 6) to the Kenites, resident among them, biding them leave the Amalekites, and so escape his sword, "for thou shewedst kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt." In 1 Sam. xxvii. 10 they are found settled in a district called the "Negeb of the Kenites." 2 These friendly relations with the Kenites continued in David's time; for in 1 Sam. xxx. 29 David sends presents of his spoil to them. The main body of the Kenites was thus settled in the far south of Canaan; and the present note explains how Heber belonged to a family which had separated from the main body, and migrated to the North.

The prose narrative mentions Zebulun and Naphtali, but says nothing about the other tribes who took part in the rising; let us hear now what the poem says about these. The poet enumerates them with evident pride—

13 Then came down [viz. from Tabor into the Plain] survivors of nobles,3
   The people of Yahweh came down for me4 as warriors.
14 Out of Ephraim [came they] whose root is in Amalek,
   After thee, O Benjamin, with thy clansmen;
Out of Machir came down truncheon-bearers,¹
And out of Zebulun they that hold ² the marshal's staff.³

A district in Ephraim is called the "mountain of the Amalekites" (xii. 15), presumably from having been once a settlement of Amalekites; and "those whose root is in Amalek" is accordingly commonly supposed to mean the inhabitants of this region. But the text cannot here be correct: the expression is a strange one, and a verb is also strongly desiderated. The line cannot, however, be restored with any confidence, though Out of Ephraim they took their way into the Vale (cf. ver. 15) has been suggested.⁴ The second line is understood to mean that the Ephraimitic contingent followed Benjamin, Benjamin led the attack: but again the text is suspicious. Machir was the principal clan of Manasseh: in the Hexateuchal source J he is his "firstborn" (Josh. xvii. 1b, 2), i.e. not, of course, as an individual, but as the most important clan, the clan most early developed, and the successful conqueror of Gilead; in P he is Manasseh's only son, the "father" of Gilead, the country⁵ (Num. xxvi. 29-32)—the clans, Abiezer, Helek, Abiezer, Helek.

1 So Moore: men bearing truncheons (Numb. xxi. 18: EVV. "sceptre") as emblems of rank and authority.
2 Or perhaps march with. The exact meaning is uncertain. See Moore, p. 153.
3 See the note below. Prof. Sayce's imputation (Monuments, p. 56) that critics have invented this rendering in place of the familiar "pen of the writer" for the purpose of getting rid of the early reference to the use of writing, rests upon an extraordinary misconception: for the rendering 'marshal' (see note ² p. 36) itself presupposes the use of writing! So Bertheau in his Commentary (1883) gives "Schreiber" as the primary sense of the word.
4 נֶגֶר, from נָגָר to journey (once in Hebrew, Is. lvii. 9 [Ez. xxvii. 25 is very doubtful]: also in Ass. and Arab.), for מַעֲשֵׂי, with MSS. of LXX, for מַעֲשֵׂי. But it is difficult to feel sure that מַעֲשֵׂי would have been the word used in the present connexion. If it was used, דַּעְי for דַּעְי would give it the somewhat needed explicit subject: "The children of Ephraim (Ps. lxxviii. 9) took their way into the vale."
5 The name has the article, shewing that it denotes not a person, but a country.
etc., who in J are his brethren, being in P his grandsons: the clans, it is evident, were by different genealogists brought differently into relation to one another. Machir is elsewhere a clan, with considerable possessions, on the E. of Jordan (cf. Num. xxxii. 39 "And the children of Machir went to Gilead and took it"); here they are still pretty clearly on the West of Jordan. The passage supports the view referred to above (Expositor, November 1911, pp. 398, 400) that Machir acquired its settlements in the N. half of Gilead (Josh. xiii. 31), by a raid not from the East of Jordan (Num. xxxii. 39-42), but from the West. The truncheons and staffs are ensigns of authority: the "marshal" (R.V.) or (Moore) "muster-master," is the officer who enrols the troops—here probably the chieftains themselves.

And the princes of Issachar were with Deborah,
And Issachar, so Barak:
Into the Vale were they let loose at his feet—
i.e., they sped forth, following him from Tabor down into the Great Plain. The second line reads in the Hebrew as here translated: but the text cannot be right. Perhaps "Issachar" is a lapsus calami for "Naphtali": Naphtali also (N) was with Barak is the kind of idea which we should expect.

But some of the tribes are reproached for not coming forward to assist in repelling the national danger—

Why satest thou among the sheepfolds, to hear the pipings for the flocks?
Among the septs of Reuben were great soundings of heart.

Contrast Joshua xvii. 2 (J) with Numbers xxvi. 29-32 (P).
See more fully Hastings' D.B. ii. 231 f., where the different genealogies of the tribe of Manasseh are drawn out in tabular form.

Lit. the scribe—the scribe (in connexion with the army) being an officer who in later times seems to have had charge of the enumeration and enrolment of the troops (cf. Jer. lii. 25 "the scribe of the captain of the host, who mustered [lit. made to war or serve in the host] the people of the land"): here, probably, the "chieftains themselves, who muster the quotas of their own clans" (Moore).

Lit. hissings—the pastoria sibila of Ov. Met. xiii. 785 (Moore).
To crouch down "between the sheepfolds" is attributed to Issachar in Genesis xlix. 14, as a mark of indifference and indolence. To "search" a man in Hebrew means to sound him, to discover what is in his mind (see 1 Sam. xx. 12): so the "searchings of heart" of A.V., R.V. does not mean anxious self-questionings, as the expression is often understood to mean, but mutual inquiries to ascertain each other's feelings and purpose. There were great inquiries, great discussions among the different septs of Reuben; but they resulted in nothing: "the fractions of the tribe were divided in counsel, and squandered in dissensions the time for deeds." The tribe was inactive: another poet once declared that it should not "excel" (Gen. xlix. 4); and it verified its character on the present occasion.

"Gilead abode beyond Jordan;
And Dan, why doth he sojourn among ships?
Asher sat still by the shore of the sea,
And abode by his creeks."

Gilead was the rugged, yet picturesque, mountainous and wooded region E. of Jordan, partly N., partly S., of the Jabbok (the modern Nahr ez-Zerkā). The name stands here for its inhabitants, i.e. the Gadites, who occupied its southern half (Josh. xiii. 25). Gad was a tribe celebrated elsewhere for its martial prowess (Gen. xlix. 19 "Gad, a troop may troop upon him, But he will troop upon their heel"); see also the glowing description of the Gadite warriors in 1 Chron. xii. 8, with "faces like the faces of lions, and as swift as the roes upon the mountains"); but now it was satisfied to remain quiet in its own home. The second line seems to mean, Why is Dan—i.e. the Northern Dan (above, p. 525)—content to serve as a foreign mercenary on Phoenician ships? Asher held most of the seaboard between Carmel and Tyre (Josh. xix. 24-31); and there it now remained, devoted to its own occupations, perhaps
TWO AMERICAN BIOGRAPHIES OF LUTHER

The year 1911 will be memorable in the annals of the Luther literature. At the moment when German experts are discussing the volumes of the Jesuit Professor Hartmann Grisar of Innsbrück, two American scholars have written on Luther from the Protestant point of view. Professor McGiffert's book, reprinted from articles in the Century Magazine, is an unambitious effort to introduce the personality of the Reformer to the general public. Students who know the thoroughness and competence of Dr. McGiffert's work in other fields will learn with disappointment that he ignores their needs entirely. What are we to think of a Life of Luther, published in 1911, which is without

1 Martin Luther: The Man and his Work, by Arthur Cushman McGiffert (T. Fisher Unwin); The Life and Letters of Martin Luther, by Preserved Smith, Ph.D. (John Murray).