to banish the second from the text. From this point of view, even 1 St. John v. 7 is not indefensible. St. John did not write it, but the Western Church for twelve centuries, and practically the whole Church for three, has accepted it as harmonizing well with what he did write; and in view of the Church's acceptance it is rash to deny that it is a relevant as well as an orthodox gloss, rightly appended for popular use to the text.

W. H. SIMCOX.

THE PROPHETESS DEBORAH.

THE history of Israel is a history of prophecy, a history in which men of prophetic rank and name stand at the great turning points of the people's life and direct the movements. And the inner progress of the people was throughout guided by prophets, who fertilized the religious life of the nation with new thoughts, or nourished the seeds of truth and the higher aspirations already planted in the heart of the people, into fuller growth and fruitfulness; and who, especially in the many crises of the nation's history, prepared for the crisis by revealing truths regarding God which enabled the people to encounter the storm without sinking beneath it, as, for example, at the time of the destruction of the State.

It is the conviction of the prophets and writers of Israel that the line of prophetic teachers has been unbroken since the days of Moses. Jeremiah brings Moses and Samuel together: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before Me, yet My mind could not be toward this people; cast them out of My sight, and let them go forth" (xv. 1). And elsewhere he speaks in the name of the Lord: "Since the day

that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day, I have sent unto you all My servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them" (vii. 25). And the representation of Amos is similar: "I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and led you forty years through the wilderness; . . . and I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazirites" (ii. 10, 11). The Nazirites were a class dating very far back; we find illustrious examples of them in Samson and Samuel in the time of the Judges, and no doubt there were prophets contemporary with them, though, with the exception of the prophetess Deborah, they are only incidentally mentioned (Jud. vi. 8) till the time of Samuel.[1]

To say that the history of Israel is a history of her prophets is to say that it is a history in which the moving and significant agent is Jehovah, whose mouthpiece and representative the prophets were: "For the Lord God doeth nothing without revealing His counsel to His servants the prophets; the Lord God speaketh, who can but prophesy?" (Amos iii. 7 *seq.*); in other words, it is a history of revelation, for revelation implies that to certain individuals, and not immediately to the people at large, God makes Himself and His will known. According to this conception of prophecy, Moses was the first of that goodly fellowship; for though we think of him particularly as a lawgiver, and supposing he were what we call so, as he spake from God to men he belongs, whether he spake laws or great truths of the kingdom of God, or gave these truths expression and embodiment in institutions, to the class of prophets. And this is the conception which the O. T. writers entertain of him, and which he is represented as entertaining of himself: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy

[1] The question whether the *name* prophet (nabî') be early or later (1 Sam. ix. 9), is a different question.

brethren, like unto me" (Deut. xviii. 15); and it said in Hosea: "By a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt, and by prophets was he preserved" (xii. 13; Mic. vi. 4). The history and development of Israel was started by a prophet, and prophets conducted it along its whole course, and led it to its issue. The literary or canonical prophets whose writings are preserved to us are fully conscious of this. They are, as they think, but links in a chain. They did not create that ideal of Israel which they seek to see realized; they received it from the past. It is, no doubt, the opinion of some modern scholars that the great prophets of the eighth century, such as Amos aud Hosea, are to a greater extent creative minds, and more distinctly the authors of the pure religious truths which they enunciate, than they give themselves credit for being. It is thought they were not able to distinguish between the sentiments which they saw to be necessary and true and the sentiments which satisfied a less advanced age and went for truth then. They imagined that the present must have been the *semper* and the *ubique;* and the condemnation passed by them upon their contemporaries who did not share their high conceptions of God and morals, though no doubt a just condemnation from the point of view of conceptions of religion and ethics true abstractly, was still a condemnation somewhat unjust in reference to their contemporaries, for these really held by the old opinions, and the chasm between them and the canonical prophets was not occasioned by their having retrograded, but by the canonical prophets having advanced. To us nowadays such a question has only secondary interest. The settlement of it requires a review and an estimate of the history of Israel from the beginning down to the eighth century; and, owing to the fact that the history as we possess it is mainly external, and to the other fact that it is not contemporary, but written somewhat later than the periods which

it covers, and may therefore be coloured with sentiments of a more advanced age, such an estimate is not easy to make in a way altogether satisfactory. The modern writers just referred to, however, appear to allow less weight to the historical sense of the prophets and their judgment regarding the past history of their nation than it is justly entitled to, and to push historical scepticism further than common sense will warrant.

We have some details of the external history of Moses, but little is told us of the history of his mind. It is the manner of the Old Testament to ascribe all that men do immediately to God, He being the real source of all true thoughts and great deeds; and those mental movements which we know to be always present when God enters into fellowship with men, it passes over. To detect them we have to read between the lines, to carry back something of our knowledge of how minds operate now when God is moving them, into the times of early history. God's revelation of Himself to Moses, and of His purpose of redeeming His people, was not made to a mind unprepared or out of sympathy. We are informed of the earlier efforts of Moses in the direction of delivering his people, and from the few facts mentioned we can imagine what aspirations filled his heart. Neither can we suppose that he was a mere mechanical instrument in conveying laws from Jehovah to Israel, or in embodying great principles of religion and civil order in practical institutions. The instruments employed by God are usually fit. The concurrence of the human mind with Him in all that He does by its means, is a thing which He requires, and which may in every case be assumed by us. It is this concurrence, or that mental range and elevation which enables a man to concur and co-operate with Jehovah, which is the secret of such a man's power over men, and fits him to be the servant of God in leading them. Moses was the servant of the Lord in the same sense in which Amos

and Hosea and Isaiah were His servants, and from reading their writings we know the mental tension, the high-strung feeling, the play of thought and emotion,—in a word, the devotion of heart and mind, with which they served Him. These were all great minds, but their place in history made their influence but secondary; at best, they could but give a happier direction or cut a deeper channel to the current already running. But Moses stood higher up; he had to unseal the fountain, to create the consciousness and life which those who came after him but deepened. And it is with this creative genius that we must credit him. He stamped an impress upon the people of Israel which was never effaced, and planted seeds in the mind of the nation which the crop of thorns that sprang up after his death could not altogether choke. Of course, even he did not create a nation or a religious consciousness in the sense of making it out of nothing. When he appealed to the people in Egypt in the name of Jehovah their God, he did not conjure with an abstraction or a novelty. The people had some knowledge of Jehovah, some faith in Him, or His name would not have awakened them to religious or national life. In matters like this we never can get at the beginning. The patriarchal age, with its knowledge of God, is not altogether a shadow, otherwise the history of the Exodus would be a riddle. Moses found materials, but he passed a new fire through them, and welded them into a unity; he breathed a spirit into the people, which animated it for all time to come; and this spirit can have been no other than the spirit that animated himself.

The controversies that rage around the name of Moses have little relevancy for the reader of prophecy. The prophets were religious and moral teachers; they directed their attention almost exclusively to the thoughts of God which men should cherish and to the conduct which they should practise, and to the influence which the first should

exert upon the other. The ritual was of interest to them only in so far as it might inspire right thoughts of Jehovah, or perhaps in so far as it might express these. In point of fact, in the days of the canonical prophets the ritual was associated with conceptions of Jehovah decidedly false, and the attitude of the prophets to it was less than friendly.

The term Theocracy was used by Josephus to express his idea of the government in Israel with which he was familiar, namely, the rule of God through a priestly hierarchy. If the theocracy in this sense was set before the people at the Exodus, it was only very slowly that it made any impression upon them, and it brought their life under the influence of its conception only at the return from exile. But in another sense the constitution of Israel was always a theocracy: Jehovah was their king and ruler because he was their God. The theocracy in this ideal sense, however, the kingdom of God of the prophets, did not require any particular external form, and did not cramp the life of the people into any particular mould. It was compatible with all forms: with the confederation of tribes under the Judges, with the monarchy whether independent or tributary, and with the condition of a mere community under the Persians. And the higher principles of the religion of Jehovah appear to have set to work just upon the conditions which they found, the forms of life existing; these, like leaven, they seized and sought to bring under their subjection. The principles which we see operating from the earliest times are the principles wielded by the prophets. They are few but comprehensive. They form the essence of the moral law—consisting of two principles and a fact, namely, that Jehovah was Israel's God alone; and that his Being was ethical, demanding a moral life among those who served Him as His people; and these two principles elevated into a high emotional unity in the consciousness of redemption just experienced.

The primary element of the nation's consciousness was this sense of having been redeemed and delivered at the Exodus. This was the operation of Jehovah that "created" the people. If He who calls Himself "Jehovah" declares His identity with the God of Abraham and Isaac, it was under the name Jehovah that He performed His great act of salvation, and this act both gave the people existence and stamped indelibly on their consciousness that Jehovah was their God, and made them in thankfulness avow themselves His people. The conceptions "God" and "people" are correlative—Jehovah is Israel's God from the land of Egypt (Hos. xii. 9, xiii. 4). The two principles just referred to and the fact are entirely practical. To our minds such a statement as this, that Israel shall have no god but Jehovah, immediately suggests the inquiry, whether there be any other god but Him. But such questions might not present themselves to minds of a different cast from ours and in early times, for our minds are quickened by all the speculations about God which have filled the centuries from the days of Moses to our own. We may not have evidence that the mind of Israel in the earliest times put these general and abstract questions to itself. But we are certainly entirely precluded from inferring from the form of the first commandment that the existence of other gods was admitted, only that Israel should have none of them. For if we consider the moral element of the code, we find the commandments all taking the same negative form; but who will argue that when Moses said to Israel, Thou shalt not kill, he made murder unlawful merely in Israel, without feeling that it was unlawful wherever men existed?

The teaching of the prophets consists very much in ethicising the conception of Jehovah; the question which modern scholars discuss is, whether they may be observed themselves learning, or whether they are merely expanding into details and expressing, as history and events furnished

them with occasions, what was already known.[1] The answer we give to this question may modify our view of the history of revelation in Israel, but it can have no effect whatever on our own practical use of Scripture. The efforts of the prophets to reduce or to expand the conception of Jehovah into ethical forms, moved on two lines; the nature of Jehovah and His operations. Each of the great prophets has a particular conception of Jehovah, which he impresses on men. It is not improbable that this conception of each prophet may correspond to his own peculiar cast of mind, or reflect it. If this be so, it only means that God, in order to reveal the full round of His Being, chose for the purpose, one after another, a succession of men, in the mind of each of whom some one of His attributes was more clearly and strongly reflected than it was in the minds of ordinary men. In the mind of Amos it was His righteousness, in that of Hosea His love and mercy, in that of Isaiah His majesty and sovereignty. And thus, when step after step the full round of His being is presented, He appears as a transcendent moral Person. Love and mercy are included in the moral conception as much as justice, although the hope of redemption is always supported by remembrance of the salvation wrought at the beginning of the nation's history, from which new conclusions are drawn. But not only the nature of Jehovah, His operations also are gradually translated into moral forms. That which without irreverence may be called the theurgical, is resolved into moral processes, both on the side of God and on that of man. In the earlier prophets God forgives the nation's sin as a mere act of mercy, no doubt not without repentance on the people's part, produced by His judgments. But in a later prophet the Divine act is mediated—the Servant of

[1] A very good statement of the questions in dispute is furnished in König's *Hauptprobleme der altisrael. Religionsgeschichte.* Some of the arguments used are inconclusive, but the questions are clearly presented.

the Lord has borne the iniquity of them all. Similarly, in earlier writings He restores the people from their dispersion, and they are all righteous, though by what processes in their own minds they become so is not revealed. But later, the idea of a remnant appears, who have not fallen away, a holy seed, which becomes the root of a new community, widening out till a nation arise. At first the perfect kingdom of God is introduced by a single act of God, a great interposition and operation, men being spectators rather than agents. At a later period the kingdom is formed by God pouring out His Spirit on the people, on the king (Isa. xi.), and on all flesh (Joel ii.), and by writing His law on men's hearts (Jer. xxxi. 33). Possibly the O. T. does not go further. But even this operation of the Spirit needs resolution into moral forms on both sides, and this it receives in the N. T.: He receives of that which is Christ's and shows it; and, the love of Christ constraineth us.

The two principles, that Jehovah alone is God of Israel, and that His nature is moral, along with the memory of the redemption from Egypt, may be said to express the higher consciousness of the people—a consciousness that never died out. The two oldest written documents which Hebrew writers refer to, express this consciousness in their names. One of them is the Book of the Wars of Jehovah. It was the thought of Jehovah their God that made Israel strong in battle; He taught their hands to war; it was His battles which they fought, and the victories which they won were the righteous acts of Jehovah, the righteous acts of His rule in Israel (Jud. v. 11). The other was the Book of Jashar, the Upright. That which made Israel's heroes worthy of being commemorated was their righteousness. And the same two principles appear in all the utterances and acts of the Prophets. In the written prophecies this is evident in every page, but the scattered traditions of an earlier time reveal the same. The remonstrance of Nathan

with David in the matter of Uriah (2 Sam. xii.) does not need to be recalled, nor Gad's rebuke of his pride in numbering the people. It is evident that the policy of Solomon was disapproved by the prophets, for one of them, Ahijah of Shilo, foretold to Jeroboam his elevation to the sovereignty of the ten tribes, even when Solomon was alive (1 Kings xi. 29); and the same Ahijah denounced the wickedness of Jeroboam afterwards, and predicted the downfall of his dynasty (1 Kings xiv.). Similarly, Jehu the son of Hanani rebuked the wicked acts of Baasha (1 Kings xvi.) And it is difficult to know whether the indignation of Elijah was kindled most by the Baal worship of Ahab or by his nefarious murder of Naboth the Jezreelite. For it is not easy to say which of the two principles seemed the more important to the prophets. It is probable that they reacted on one another, and that each contributed to clarify and elevate the other. Modern writers endeavour to show that the theoretical or formal doctrine of the unity of God, expressed in later prophets, was reached through the conception of His ethical perfection; but it is doubtful if any priority on the side of either principle can be made out.

At any rate the history of Israel, as we read it in the pages of the prophets and in the O. T. in general, is the history of a conflict in which these two great principles, forming the higher consciousness of the people, are seen making strenuous efforts to gain possession of the whole life of the nation and to rule it, efforts which the lower tendencies of the people's minds, their sensuousness both in life and thinking, ministered to by the seductions of nature and the baser religious rites of their neighbours around them, seemed continually to resist. Practically the victory may appear to have been won by the lower, for the people as a whole would not convert and be healed, and they had to be cast out; but in truth the victory remained with the higher,

for the teaching of the prophets was accepted by the people when they saw it verified in their disastrous history, and from them it passed to mankind, and is our inheritance to-day.

The first period of the nation's history is the period of the Judges. Unfortunately our information regarding this period is scanty, the only testimony from the higher spirit, as we may call it, being the Song of Deborah. But the scattered notices which we can glean give us a glimpse into processes going on during this time which greatly help to explain the conflict which the prophets had to wage in after ages. The Book of Judges which covers this period is composed of two elements easily separable. The main substance of the Book consists of brief histories of six persons called Judges, with references to six others of whom few historical reminiscences are preserved. There is no reason to suppose that the number twelve is artificial, corresponding to the number of tribes, for there are several tribes from which no judges arose. Besides this main substance of the Book, there is a frame in which the histories are set, appearing most obviously in ch. ii. 6–iii. 6, but also in the introductions to most of the individual histories. This frame is probably younger than the histories, and its point of view may be that of a later time. It connects the histories together by giving a summary of them under the form of an ideal *schema* in which the same steps are regularly repeated: "The children of Israel did that which was evil and served the Baalim. And they provoked the Lord to anger, and He sold them into the hand of their enemies. And when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, He raised up a saviour who saved them; and the land had rest so many years." This regular movement of apostasy, subjugation, penitence, and deliverance is hardly strict history. It is rather the religious philosophy of the history. It is a summary of the historical move-

ments written under the idea that Jehovah presided in the history of Israel, and to bring it down to our level we must read second causes into the movements and the operations of the people's mind. We shall not misunderstand it if we put ourselves into the author's point of view, and remember that he speaks of Israel as an ideal unity, and attributes to this unity defections which no doubt characterized only fragments of the whole; and finally that he uses the nomenclature of his day, calling by the name of Baalim and the like all objects of worship and practices in his view improper in the service of God.[1] Without these considerations the history would not be intelligible; for a falling away of a whole people to Baal, and then a conversion to Jehovah, to be followed by a falling away again twenty years after, is not according to the operations of the human mind. The author's general conception, however, that

[1] Hosea already calls the calf-images of Jehovah, Baalim, and later the word received even a wider and more general application. Wellhausen makes merry over the fact that the author says that Israel worshipped the Asheras, "which are no divinities at all, but only sacred trees or poles" (*Hist.*, p. 235). We are slow to believe that an O. T. writer did not know what an Ashera was. In his less jocular moods W. treats the question differently, whether correctly or not (*Bleek*, p. 245). W. is equally unjust to the writer when he blames him for speaking of Israel as a unity, for the same conception appears in Deborah (see below). Again W. charges the writer with ignorance when he says that the children of Israel made Baal Berith their god (viii. 33), whereas the next chapter informs us that Baal Berith "was only the patron god of Shechem and some other cities belonging to the Canaanites." Much fairer is the suggestion of Reuss: "Baal Berith (Covenant Baal) indicates an affiliation of several tribes or septs, *possibly such an affiliation of Israelites and Canaanites*" (*Gesch. d. Alt. Test.*, p. 122). The pet passage, chap. xi. 24, figures of course in W., as it does everywhere since Vatke (p. 258). In the original histories of the Judges, "Israel is a people just like other people, nor is even his relation to Jehovah otherwise conceived of than is, for example, that of Moab to Chemosh" (*Hist.*, p. 235). Elsewhere, however, W. regards the whole passage Jud. xi. 12–29, with the allusion to Chemosh, as a later intepolation founded on Num. xx. 21 (*Bleek*, p. 195). The supposed pretensions of Chemosh in the eyes of Israel are likely to suffer from this judgment, for the passage cannot be earlier than well down in the age of the canonical prophets. The truth is that such references to Chemosh and other heathen gods prove nothing, because they would prove that even Jeremiah regarded Chemosh as a real divinity (Jer. xlviii. 7).

defection from Jehovah was followed by subjection to the neighbouring nations, has profound truth. For that which created Israel's self-consciousness was its deliverance from Egypt by Jehovah. That which made it a people was its God; its feeling of Him made it feel itself a people. The antithesis between it and the nations lay in Him. When therefore it fell into the worship of the nations around it or of the tribes within it which it had absorbed, its self-consciousness as a people was, so to speak, obscured. That which made it a nation, and was the bond of its unity and spring of its strength, was broken, its high idea as a people departed, and it fell into fragments, and became the prey of the peoples among whom it dwelt. Only when its miseries turned its thoughts back to Him who was its strength, and when its faith in Him awakened again its consciousness of itself—in the words of the writer, when it cried unto the Lord—did its power return, and it was able, in the feeling of Jehovah's presence with it, to resist and vanquish its oppressors.

The histories preserved in the Book of Judges are for the most part external; they are probably traditions preserved among the individual tribes who played the chief part in the events described. That in some instances we have duplicates, exhibiting divergences in details, is natural, and does not detract from the general historical worth of the whole. The Story of Deborah is given in a prose form (ch. iv.) as well as in the poem, and the divergences can be accounted for only on the supposition that chap. iv. is an independent tradition. The picture presented by the Book as a whole is rough, but there are traits of tenderness here and there in it. The histories exhibit the occurrences, and show how men dealt with the hard facts of life; the poem breathes the higher spirit that animated them.

First, in regard to the political situation. We observe that the high spirit created in the tribes by their redemp-

tion from Egypt, which fused them for the time into a unity and enabled them to overcome the strongest combinations against them, has departed. We are introduced to the generation that succeeded the generation led by Joshua (Jud. ii. 7), and the old unity appears almost completely dissolved. No general expulsion of the native races was attempted. The ideal division of the land by lot under Joshua remained ideal.

In ch. i., a very valuable historical record, we read: "The children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites that dwelt in Jerusalem; but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin unto this day. Manasseh did not drive out the inhabitants of Beth-shean and her towns: . . . but the Canaanites would dwell in that land. Ephraim drave not out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer; but the Canaanites dwelt among them. Zebulun, . . . the Canaanites dwelt among them. Asher, . . . the Asherites dwelt among the Canaanites. Naphtali, . . . he dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land." And so the story runs. The Israel of the Judges and henceforth was not the Israel that came out of Egypt, it was a new and larger nation, having absorbed into it a vast native population, with a civilization which it largely adopted, with modes of thought with which it could not but become inoculated, and with religious practices which in many cases it accepted. The Israel of Moses and the Israel with which history and the prophets deal are different both in quantity, and even more in quality.

Consequently we observe a disintegration going on in the unity of the people. The tribes appear little interested in each other; each of them is settling down in earnest to secure his own footing and to provide for his own preservation. The judges that arise belong to the individual tribes, and rarely secure the adhesion of more than two or three

others in the warfare. Ehud the Benjamite avenges Benjamin, Jephthah of Gilead leads the transjordanic tribes, and Gideon pursues the Midianites with an army of his own family of Abiezer.

Nevertheless, though there is no union of the tribes in fact, the nearest approach to it being the coalition secured by Deborah, there is an ideal unity. Even when a single tribe acts, or when a judge delivers a single district, it is "Israel" that is saved. And it is not in the prose only that this conception prevails, in which a view arising after the existence of the kingdom might be reflected—the Song of Deborah is pervaded by the same idea: "For that the chiefs came forward in Israel, for that the people offered themselves willingly, praise ye Jehovah" (*v.* 2); "my heart is toward the governors of Israel that offered themselves willingly among the people" (*v.* 9); "Was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?" (*v.* 8); "the rulers ceased in Israel, they ceased, until that I Deborah arose, a mother in Israel" (*v.* 7). In spite of actual disintegration, the conception of a people Israel, forming a unity, the people of Jehovah (*v.* 11), everywhere appears. In one remarkable point indeed, extremely significant in regard to subsequent history, the unity is incomplete. The tribe of Judah does not appear to be comprehended in the "Israel" of Deborah; she does not expect Judah to join the confederacy of the North, the term Israel already is appropriated by the northern half of the nation. The date of the Song is not certain, though it must be early—before the tribe of Dan migrated to the north (ch. xvii.-xviii.), for Dan is still a seaboard tribe (*v.* 17). The two powerful tribes of Judah and Ephraim had already begun each to pursue its own course, and the smaller tribes were attracted around the latter, which early aspired to the leadership.

In regard to religion, apart from the later framework not much prominence is given to it. The central sanctuary was

no doubt at Shilo, though the place is mentioned only once, in connexion with dances, which took place probably at the feasts. It is to be supposed that the same practical disintegration manifested itself in the sphere of religion as appeared in the political sphere. The individual tribes probably provided each for itself its religious institutions. They adopted the places of worship existing among the Canaanites. Both Deuteronomy and Ezekiel suggest that the "high places" were original Canaanitish shrines. The syncretism could not stop with the adoption of the places of worship, many also of the religious rites would be assumed into the service of Jehovah. Here and there, where the two peoples coalesced by intermarriage (Jud. iii. 6), particularly where the aborigines outnumbered the Israelites, as at Shechem, the worship of Baal and the Astartes might supersede the worship of Jehovah. It was not, however, so much in this direction that the danger lay, but rather in the direction of debasing the ostensible service of Jehovah by assimilating it to the Canaanitish worship, and thus effacing in the people's minds the distinction between their God and the Baals of the native population. It is probable that the practice of making images of Jehovah was borrowed or imitated from the Canaanites, for no images were ever set in the central temple, whether at Shilo or elsewhere.

Yet in spite of this practical declension in religion, the ideal unity was still preserved. Jehovah was the God of Israel; it was to Him that the people belonged. It was to Him that Jephthah made his fatal vow—before the Lord in Mizpeh (Jud. xi. 11, 30). It was to Jehovah that Gideon dedicated the spoils of Midian, out of which he framed an image, or at least an "oracle" of Jehovah, which he set up in his house. It was to Jehovah that Micah made his "house of God," and the image which the Danites ultimately placed in Dan—another forestalment in this early

age of subsequent proceedings. But it is in Deborah that the ideal unity of the worship and the higher conceptions of Jehovah appear most clearly. If we possessed a few more utterances of the prophetic mind in this age, in place of the external histories of rude soldiers, we should probably be led to form a higher conception even of the religious condition of the people under the Judges. She says: "I will sing, I will sing unto Jehovah, I will sing praise unto Jehovah, the God of Israel" (*v.* 3). It is Jehovah who fights Israel's battles: "They shall rehearse the righteous acts of Jehovah, the righteous acts of His rule in Israel. Then the people of Jehovah went down to the gates" (*v.* 11). His angel, that is, probably Himself in personal presence, leads Israel's armies and pursues His foes: "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of Jehovah, because they came not to the help of Jehovah among the mighty" (*v.* 23). The enemies of Israel are the enemies of Jehovah: "So let all Thine enemies perish, Jehovah: but let them that *love* Him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might" (*v.* 31)—a singular and lofty expression in so early an age. When we recall the vow of Jephthah and the acts of Gideon, we might suppose that the conceptions entertained of Jehovah were not very elevated; yet in the Song He appears to rule in heaven and on earth, commanding the stars in their courses and the rivers in their flood: "The stars fought from heaven, they fought in their courses against Sisera. The river Kishon swept them away, that rushing river, the river Kishon" (*v.* 20).

The lack of materials of the class to which the Song belongs prevents us from getting a clearer view of the higher side of the national mind at this epoch, and the histories reveal great rudeness of manners, and in many instances debased religious conceptions. The period, however, is the creative epoch of historical Israel; the workshop in which the nation, as we know it, was fashioned. We

observe the origin of that complication which the canonical prophets seek to unravel; the knot is being tied which they use all their efforts to unloose. There is going on a mixture of elements which produces the fermentation familiar to us in later times. The higher spirit and faith of the nation has presented for its assimilation a mass of conceptions and elements which it is unable at once to overcome and dominate. Yet it does not allow itself to lose courage. It is assured of eventual victory.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

NOTES ON DIFFICULT TEXTS.

1 Sam. i. 5. וּלְחַנָּה יִתֵּן מָנָה אַחַת אַפַּיִם, "and to Hannah he used to give one portion אַפַּיִם." What is the meaning of this Hebrew word? It is rendered (1) "heavily." So, for instance, the Vulgate (*tristis*), several mediæval authorities (e.g. the Great Bible: "a portion with an heavy cheer"), and amongst moderns, Böttcher and Thenius. For this sense of אַפַּיִם, however, there is no support in the known usage of the language: בְּאַפַּיִם occurs with the meaning "in anger" in Dan. xi. 20; but that would be unsuitable here, and the expressions נפלו פניך (Gen. iv. 6) and פניה לא היו לה עוד (1 Sam. i. 18) are not sufficient to justify the sense of a *dejected* countenance being assigned to אפים.

It is rendered (2), in connexion with מָנָה אַחַת, *one portion of two faces* (=two persons), i.e. a double portion. So Keil and even Gesenius. It is true that the Syriac ܦܰܢܶܝܢ corresponds generally in usage with the Hebrew פנים; but, to say nothing of the fact that a Syriasm is unexpected in Samuel, there is nothing in the use of the Syriac word to suggest that the *dual* would, in Hebrew, denote *two* persons: ܦܰܢܶܝܢ (like פנים) is used of *one* person, the singular not occurring. If אַפַּיִם means *two* persons, it must be implied that the singular אף might denote *one* person, which the