

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1850.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The relations of Religion to what are called Diseases of the Mind.*

Our attention has been particularly directed to this subject by an elaborate and somewhat ingenious article in a foreign periodical of great respectability.* In a cursory examination of the article upon its first appearance we were disposed to question some of its positions, but, in hope that it would be better and more quickly done elsewhere, the purpose was dismissed, and casually revived by a reference to some of the cases which it records in support or illustration of the author's views. A more particular examination reveals to us a vein of error running through the body of the argument, and tinging all the doctrines and inferences which it sets forth.

No one can contemplate the present provision for the comfort and cure of the insane without gratitude to God, nor without admiration of the philanthropy and science which have together

* Winslow's Journal of Psychological Medicine and Mental Pathology. April, 1848. London.

To every Christian man who had been led into these secret associations we would therefore with all earnestness say: "Brother, you have made a mistake in 'carrying out the principles of Christ,' as you call them. His principles require us to 'do good to all men as we have opportunity, especially to them who are of the household of faith;' but you have allied yourself to a society which requires you to aid and assist all men in distress, and especially those who understand the *secret grip*. Christ never acted upon or inculcated such a principle as that. He enjoins upon his followers that while they do good to all men, they should especially feel compassion, not for those who can give a secret sign, but for those who love and follow Him. Beware, then, my brother, how you transfer your sympathies from your brethren in the church to a society which makes religion no test of membership, and bind yourself by rules which to you are contrary to the inspired word."

ART. III.—*A Commentary on the Book of Joshua.* By Charles Frederick Keil, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, Professor of Exegesis and Oriental Languages in the Imperial University at Dorpat, and Member of the German Oriental Society. Erlangen: 1847. Svo. pp. 411.*

THE book of Joshua contains one of the most interesting and important portions of Israelitish history. Treating of the period of their establishment as a nation, it contains the grand denouement of which Genesis was prophetic and the rest of the Pentateuch immediately preparatory. The books of Moses without Joshua would resemble an unfinished building; the plan, the dimensions all visible, much of the work accomplished, enough to lead one to anticipate precisely what is to follow, yet never

tion to its leading object must do much to do away denominational prejudices, and draw closer the bonds of Christian love and sympathy which exist in every Christian heart, but which are so often chilled for want of light and sunshine, that they wither and die, and cease to be known as distinguishing traits of Christian character."

* Commentar über das Buch Josua. Von Karl Friedrich Keil u. s. w.

completed. It would be an imposing commencement with no corresponding conclusion. And as this book is the top stone of the Pentateuch, so it is the foundation of the books that follow. It presents us with the ripened fruit of seed sown ages before, itself containing the seeds of events for ages to come. A failure to have recorded the events of this period would therefore have left a gap in the sacred history, which nothing could supply. Without it what precedes would have been imperfect, what follows unexplained. The sacred writer was directed under the guidance of inspiration to fill this chasm; and in so doing there was given him as his theme the Conquest and the Division of Canaan. It is not the life of Joshua, which he undertakes to record; not Joshua's public acts or military exploits; not the history of Israel during Joshua's life; but simply the conquest and the division of Canaan. If this be kept distinctly in mind it will explain fully and satisfactorily the selection and arrangement of the materials; we can then understand why he records what he does; why he relates some events with extreme particularity and minuteness, merely glances at others, and then again passes over whole years in silence. It is not because nothing occurred then, nor because he did not know what occurred, but simply because he was writing with a definite plan before his mind, and related whatever fell into that plan; what did not he omitted. There can be no greater mistake than that which refers the chasms of the scripture history to chance, or to caprice, or to the writer's having lived at a time when all knowledge of what happened in the period of which he fails to give an account had been lost. The historians of the Bible were not mere journalists or chroniclers writing at random, or with the view of telling everything which they could recollect; they did not write for the sake of gratifying those who in future ages might be fond of historical research, nor for the sake of detailing interesting and memorable events to their contemporaries. They are theocratical historians; their object is to trace the development and progress of the kingdom of God, to mark its epochs, and to record events important to their own and to coming generations in a religious aspect. Thus in the book before us; take as the plan of it what we have stated it to be, and everything as to the choice or rejection of materials is clear. All that the book contains

ranges itself about that plan; what is omitted would have been plainly irrelevant. The book opens with the divine direction to Joshua, who had already been designated Moses' successor, to go over Jordan and take the land which God had sworn to their fathers to give to them, and divide it to the people for an inheritance, with the promise that if he faithfully observed the laws given by Moses, God would be with him as he had been with Moses, and not a man should be able to stand before him all the days of his life. These introductory verses furnish the key to the whole book. Joshua's execution of these commands in obedience to the divine direction, and God's gracious bestowal of his promised assistance, are the sum of what it contains. The first twelve chapters embrace the conquest; not a detailed account of all the marches of every campaign, but the prominent particulars only are seized upon to be minutely related, those which really mark the progress of events, those which bring most clearly to view God's miraculous help and how necessary the condition of obedience was to its being furnished. Other events belonging to the conquest, the battles, the capture of cities, and even long expeditions, which had nothing remarkable about them, are only mentioned summarily, in such a way as not to weary with a recital of what is unimportant, and yet at the same time so as to give a general view of the whole line of operations with their ultimate success. In chapters xiii—xxi we have the division of the land among the several tribes. In chapter xxii the two tribes and a half, who had assisted their brethren in the conquest, and stood by them in the division of Canaan, return in peace to their own respective possessions. Then we pass over an interval of several years, during which Israel was settled in the land, and which consequently fell not within the scope of the writer until we come to the closing scene of Joshua's life, when that great and good man gathered Israel once more around him by their representatives, to rehearse to them what God had done for them in giving them that goodly land, and to engage them to renewed pledges of obedience to him. And thus the book closes with this solemn recapitulation of what the Lord had done in faithfulness to the promise with which it had opened, and a public covenant engagement of the people to serve the Lord who had

driven out the Amorite and all those other nations from before them.

Joshua receives the divine command to possess the land. He immediately sends out two spies as preparatory to the execution. The book minutely records what befell them, not from the interest attaching to their hazardous adventure and lucky escape, but vividly to represent how in conformity with the divine promise the terror of Israel had fallen on the Canaanites. The anxious precautions of the king of Jericho, the pursuit of the spies, the language of Rahab to the spies and of the spies to Joshua on their return—all bear on this point. Then follows the passage of the Jordan, whose waters, though unusually high, were supernaturally dried up before them. What, it may be asked, was the design of this miracle? There are no trifling, frivolous miracles in the Bible. God does not suspend the established order of nature without just reason, not unless some important end is to be answered by it. Where, then, was the necessity of emptying the bed of the Jordan in order to get the people to the other side? The same thing could have been accomplished by natural means, without requiring the interference of omnipotence. Though the river was too high then to admit of its being forded, especially by women and children, boats might have been prepared or bridges constructed, by which they could have crossed the stream in the same manner as other armies have both before and since, with only the unimportant delay of a few days. The same inquiry may be made as to the necessity of dividing the Red Sea, bringing water from the rock, giving manna from heaven, &c. There was no need of their going through the Red Sea, penetrating so deeply into the desert, or crossing the Jordan at all in order to pass from Egypt into Canaan. There is a route vastly more expeditious, as well as practicable by natural means, which travellers are every day passing over. These questions are instantly answered, however, as soon as we gain a correct view of the design of these miracles. Their necessity, and indeed that of every other miracle recorded in the Bible, was not a physical, but a moral one. The object of them is the revelation of God's power and grace. The laws of nature, which God established in the beginning, are sufficient to accomplish every important physical end; it is only to meet our

moral necessities that they are interfered with. Israel could have been taken into Canaan without a miracle; but then there would have been no such striking displays to them of God's omnipotence, of his grace, of his nearness to them. The stupendous miracles wrought in Egypt, in the wilderness, and in the subjugation of Canaan, were to teach Israel and to teach all nations, that while the gods of the heathen were no Gods, and could neither do good nor do evil, Jehovah was the living and the Almighty God of the whole earth. They were to be made sensible of his power and grace and of their own dependence. Therefore they were brought into straits from which they could not extricate themselves, in order that they might see it to be God who delivered them. They were to be made to see that it was neither their own sword nor their own bow which saved them, but the Lord's right hand and his mighty arm had gotten them the victory; Canaan was not their conquest, but God's gift. But besides this general aim of all the miracles, of which this period, as one that specially needed them, was so full, and this general solution of their stupendous character as contrasted for instance with the milder type and the more contracted scale of our Saviour's miracles, there seems a special fitness in this particular miracle, in God's interfering visibly on their behalf at this particular time. God opens by it, as it were, the doors of the land, which he had promised to give them and conducts them in. He pledges by it the subjugation of the land, which followed. At the same time, as this was the first public act of Joshua, in his new capacity as leader of the people, it gave divine legitimacy to his office in their eyes, and was, in comparison with the precisely similar miracle under Moses, a striking attestation to the divine word: 'As I have been with Moses, so will I be with thee.'

The circumcising of the people and the celebration of the passover follows next; these belong to the history of the conquest, for the conquest was conditioned on the punctilious observance of all that Moses had commanded. But how came it to pass that the people were not circumcised? Their migratory condition, to which some have referred it, does not furnish an adequate explanation. Nor can we find the reason in the sinful neglect of the people. Bad as the character of the adult generation that left Egypt undoubtedly was, frequent as were

their murmurings and their rebellions against the Lord, repeatedly as they fell into even gross idolatry in the desert, we cannot charge them with so thorough and so continued a disregard of God's worship as it would have evinced for them thus to have given up entirely the very badge of the covenant during the whole of these forty successive years. Or if this might possibly have been the case with a part of the people, would not the rest, the less wicked portion, would not at any rate the pious among them have perpetuated it in their families? And why did Moses never rebuke the people for this great sin of neglecting the covenant seal? Why did not the new and more godly generation attend to it sooner themselves? Or why did not Joshua direct it in the plains of Moab without its being deferred until the people were passed over Jordan?

The true reason seems to be that the seal of the covenant shared the fate of the covenant itself. When Israel after repeated provocations at length consummated their rebellion by despising the promised land and refusing to enter it, God swore that none but two of that generation should be permitted to enter Canaan. All were condemned to fall in the wilderness; and their children should wander about bearing their father's iniquities until the whole of them had perished. While this sentence lasted, therefore, they were a rejected people and had no right to the seals of the covenant. They were not now God's people, and had no right to mark themselves as such. A gracious God, it is true, did not utterly withdraw from them every token of his favour. The manna, the pillar of cloud, the tabernacle, were still continued to them as so many tokens that the Lord had not finally abandoned them; that though he was angry with them for a season, his favour would again return; that though he had cast off the fathers he would deal mercifully with their children. Hence we see why this ordinance was not resumed until Israel had crossed the Jordan. Then first the period of the sentence was complete. The mighty miracle then wrought gave assurance that God was again with them, and again regarded them as his people. They were now, therefore, once more fit subjects for the covenant seal. And thus the reproach of Egypt was rolled away. During the years of Israel's rejection there seemed some ground for the Egyptians' reproaches, that the Lord had brought Israel out for mischief to

consume them, (Ex. xxxii. 12). But now all occasion for such reproaches was taken away by the Lord's returning to them again, restoring to them the lost seal of his gracious covenant, and recommencing his mighty wonders in the midst of them.

To the cavils that so great a multitude of people could not have been circumcised in so short a time, and that if circumcised on the 11th of the month, that is, the day after passing the river, they would not have recovered from it by the 14th when the passover was celebrated, and that circumcising the entire host at once would have left the camp for a period defenceless, it is very easy to reply. It would take no longer to circumcise all the people, than it would a single family: for the head of each family would attend to the circumcising of his house. And even if they were not perfectly healed by the fourteenth of the month, that would not hinder them from participating in the solemnities of the passover then observed. And as to its leaving the camp defenceless, even if it were not enough to say that the Lord would be their protector, there was no insignificant number of the people, who had been already circumcised. Keil presents us with a calculation, founded on the known laws of human life, from which it appears that among the million of males who entered Canaan, there must have been 338,000 of those who left Egypt under 20 years of age and were consequently circumcised; or even if there was as great mortality among them as among the generation condemned to perish in the wilderness, there would still be 270,000 of them living.

On the morrow after the passover they did eat of the corn (not 'the *old* corn', as it stands in our version) of the land, ch. v. 11. This also was agreeable to the law. Lev. xxiii. 5-14: on the morrow after the Sabbath or first day of the passover feast, the priest was required to wave a sheaf of the first fruits before the Lord: then Israel could partake of the harvest themselves, but not before. From this time forth the manna ceased. It is not to be supposed from this that the manna was the sole food of the Israelites from the time it began to fall up to this moment, and that now it suddenly gave place to the natural products of the earth. This miracle of giving bread from heaven was wrought for the supply of their need, and consequently was only wrought to the extent that need required, and during the period that it lasted. That the children of Israel had

other food in the desert at certain times at least, besides that miraculously furnished them, is apparent from the narrative. We read of their being encamped by palm trees; their riotous feasting about the golden calf implied something more than mere bread and water; when they passed the borders of Edom, they bought food of them: when they destroyed the cities and possessed the land of Sihon, Og and other kings, they no doubt found much provision among the spoils; a large portion of the thirty-eight years of their sentence in the wilderness seems to have been spent very much in one place, and they may during that period have raised much from the soil for their subsistence; when they came to the banks of Jordan three days were spent in providing victuals: they had, besides, large possessions of flocks and herds, whose flesh and milk they could use. It would be needless to have the manna fall about them merely to be wasted, when they could supply themselves from such sources as these. It was when natural supplies fell short or failed altogether, that this bread of heaven was sent them in sufficient quantities to make up their deficiency. When they needed more, more came. When they were where no other provision could be obtained, enough fell to feed the entire host. As their necessities were greater or less, just the quantity fell which they required. And now that they had arrived in Canaan and an abundant harvest lay before them, all need of the manna ceased and it consequently fell no longer.

Next follows the capture of Jericho, then that of Ai, then the submission of the men of Gibeon, then the two grand expeditions to the south and to the north, in which the land was finally subdued. And to conclude the first part of the book, chap. xii. contains a recapitulation of the entire conquest, as effected both by Moses and by Joshua.

Keil coincides with some other eminent scholars in giving an exposition of the passage, x. 12-15, different from that commonly entertained. Most interpreters have found there the literal stoppage of the sun in his course for an entire day. The volume before us presents quite another view of it, for which a sufficient array of reasons is given to entitle it at the least to a respectful consideration. Keil does not belong to that school of critics, who look upon miracles as difficulties in the narrative, and manifest a constant disposition to unburden it of

as many as possible. He never hesitates to admit a miracle, wherever we have the authority of the scriptures that one took place. But if it was not the design of the inspired writer to describe a literal miracle here, reverence for his authority does not require us to suppose that there was one. The ordinary objections to this miracle on the ground that it was too grand a display of power for so trifling a reason, or that it would have disturbed the harmony of the celestial bodies, or by the violence of its shock have displaced everything upon the surface of the earth, or that the nations of antiquity make no mention of the occurrence of such a phenomenon, he justly sets aside as perfectly futile. He rests the whole case upon the question as to the design of the inspired writer in this passage. Did he mean us to understand that the sun actually delayed his course in the heavens? Keil supposes not. In his view the account of the battle and the miraculous victory at Gibeon is interrupted at the end of the 11th verse, which speaks of the miraculous fall of hail stones, and that then vs. 12-15 contain not the account of another event, which took place that same day, viz. the standing still of the sun, which the writer both states in his own words and for confirmation of the fact appeals to the book of Jasher, citing from it a passage in which this was recorded, which is the common view; but these verses contain none of the writer's own words at all. They consist wholly of a verbatim extract from the book of Jasher, the source from which they are taken being indicated neither at the beginning, nor at the end, but in the middle of the citation; and they describe no new event, no literal standing still of the sun, but are a highly figurative and poetical description of the miraculous victory already described in the immediately preceding verses. The author of the sacred lyric from which this quotation is made, is celebrating the praises of God for having granted so glorious a victory to Israel and by such miraculous means. He conceives of Joshua as calling upon the Lord that the sun might wait upon Gibeon until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies; or in other words that the day might not be brought to a close until Israel had gained a complete victory. And in the liveliness of the figure he conceives of it as though the sun had actually delayed his course and waited in the midst of heaven, while the people should pursue their flying foes. If

this were the language of prose, if these were the words of the writer of the book himself, there would then be no question about their being literally understood. But they are a quotation from a triumphal song; and it is, according to the view which we are now presenting, to mistake altogether the nature of poetical language to understand this as though it were designed for literal description; as much as if, when Deborah says in her song, "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," any one should understand her to mean that the stars actually exerted an influence in procuring his defeat: or when the Lord is said to rend the heavens and come down and the mountains to flow down at his presence, this should be taken for literal description instead of poetical imagery. It was all the same whether God lengthened one day into two, or enabled the people to accomplish the work of two days in one: and the truth of poetry is preserved if its language convey the former, though it was the latter which actually occurred.

That the verses 12-15 have been taken word for word as they stand from the book of Jasher, is argued from the intimate connexion between v. 16 and v. 11, showing that all between is parenthetical; from the note of time in v. 12, "when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel," which sounds more like the words of a different author, than a continuation of the previously begun account; and because the return of Joshua to the camp at Gilgal, spoken of in the 15th verse, did not take place until all the remaining events recorded in this chapter had occurred (see v. 43). The 15th verse belongs not to the narrative, therefore, but is part of the quotation. It states in the general, that after the great event there celebrated, Joshua and Israel returned to the camp without saying whether anything else occurred in the interval or not. Then in the 15th verse the narrative commences again, where it had been interrupted by this quotation, and goes on to detail what took place before this return, the flight and concealment of the five kings, their execution, and the capture of various cities.

It is regarded as confirmatory of this view that the moon is called upon to delay its course as well as the sun, which manifestly belongs only to the poetic parallelism; for if the sun continued to shine what need would they have of the moon? And yet further it is alleged that from the relative position of

Gibeon and the valley of Ajalon, Joshua's command to the sun and moon could not have been uttered when the day was declining, and apprehensions began to be excited that darkness would come on too soon, as has commonly been assumed by those who hold the prevalent view of a literal miracle in the case: that the only time of day, when the sun could have appeared over Gibeon, and the moon at the same time over Ajalon, was in the morning when the whole day was still before them, and the necessity could not yet have made itself felt of having the day protracted.

The book of Jasher spoken of here, is but once more referred to in the scriptures, 2 Sam. i. 18, where that beautiful lament of David over Saul and Jonathan is extracted from it. From this some have drawn the conclusion that the book of Jasher could not have existed before the time of David, since it contained a piece of his composition; and hence they have argued that the book of Joshua which contains a quotation from that of Jasher could not have been written until the reign of David. Those arguments, however, are not so easily set aside, by which, as we shall hereafter see, its composition by Joshua himself, or at least by a contemporary and a participant in the events which it records may be proved. And there is no difficulty in the way of assuming what agrees with the scanty notices we have of this book, that it was a compilation of sacred lyrics, increased from time to time as new ones were composed and added to it. In the days of Joshua, it could not of course contain a poem written by David. But it had in it the ode upon Israel's victory at Gibeon which is here cited. When David wrote his lament, that was added to the existing collection; how many others had been added before, or were added afterwards. or how large the collection may have been at any given time, whether that of Joshua or that of David, we have no means of knowing. The only conjecture, which we can form as to its contents is derived from the two citations made from it, and from its name, "the book of Jasher," which means the book of the upright, i. e. written to celebrate the deeds of the chosen or peculiar people.

After seven years had been thus occupied in conquering the land, Joshua proceeds, by divine direction, to execute the other part of his commission, the division of the land among the tribes.

Moses having already assigned to two and a half tribes their possessions beyond the Jordan, in addition to the tribe of Levi, who were to receive no inheritance, nine and a half remained to be provided for by Joshua. As in the summary of the conquest (chap. xi.) the places taken by Moses are given as well as those taken by Joshua; so in the account of the division, we have in pursuance of the same plan first the territories assigned by Moses to Reuben, Gad, and one half of Manasseh, then those assigned by Joshua to the remaining tribes. Their various possessions were determined by lot, not only in order to cut off all occasion for dissatisfaction and complaint, but that each tribe might thankfully receive their portion as the immediate gift of God to them. The lot, however, seems to have determined only the position of the tribes, not the extent of their territory; this was proportioned to the size of the tribe and was enlarged or diminished after the division as circumstances rendered necessary (ch. xvii. 4. xix. 9.)

It may create surprise that the division, instead of being completed at once for all the tribes, was interrupted upon Judah and Joseph receiving their inheritance; and the remaining seven tribes show so little desire to have it continued that Joshua has to reprove them for their slackness. It is a matter of some difficulty to assign a sufficient reason for this interruption. Some have assumed dissensions among the tribes, or a gradual division advancing as the land was wrested in successive portions from the hands of the Canaanites. Keil adopts the following view of the matter, in which are skilfully combined the various facts of the history. The land had at first, in order to its allotment, been separated into nine or ten parts without previously taking an accurate description of it but simply from the general knowledge gained in their various campaigns and marches. The allotment was begun upon these data, leaving the more precise determination of the extent of each one's territory to be afterwards settled according to the size of the tribe. The tribe upon whom the lot first fell entered at once into their inheritance and occupied themselves with taking possession of it and fixing accurately its boundaries. This necessarily occupied some time; then another lot was cast determining the position of a second tribe, and they pursued the same course. Thus after the lapse of a considerable period Judah, Ephraim, and

half Manasseh had successively received their inheritance. Meanwhile the tabernacle was set up at Shiloh, in the territory of Ephraim, and the camp of Israel was removed thither from Gilgal. The remaining tribes manifested little anxiety to be settled. It was easier for them, accustomed to a nomadic life in the desert, to wander about among the Canaanites as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had done, seeking a subsistence for themselves and their cattle, especially as the inhabitants of the land were so far subdued that they had nothing to fear from them, than it would be to enter into a fixed inheritance and attempt their extermination. But Joshua, true to the task imposed upon him, urges the sluggish tribes to their duty, and enjoins it upon them to make preparation for completing the division. And as the tribe of Joseph had complained of the territory they received being inadequate, as that given to Judah proved too large, a commission was sent to take survey of the land which might furnish the basis of greater accuracy in its distribution. It was hereupon found that Judah and Joseph had taken more than their fair proportion: but as their position had been assigned them by the decision of God through the lot, they could not be disturbed in their inheritance. The only resource remaining was to leave them in their allotted places, and detach portions from the territory, which with that still unoccupied was distributed among the rest of the tribes.

There are, as it was natural to expect, many obscurities in the geographical portion of this book, and it is found extremely difficult, if not impossible to lay down with precision the boundaries of all the tribes. This arises in part, from the imperfect knowledge as yet possessed of the localities of Palestine; but even if that were more perfect, a great number of the places that are mentioned could not now be identified, for many of these names never appear again in subsequent history; they were places it may be, of little note, or destroyed perhaps and never rebuilt, or else called by other names. It is wonderful that at such a distance of time we are able to identify so many as we can.

The discrepancies in some minor details found between Joshua and Chronicles (e. g. Josh. xxi. 13-39, compared with 1 Chron. vi. 37-81) are readily explained, without the credibility of either book suffering, by supposing that the same place may

have had two names; or that in the lapse of a thousand years, which intervened between the composition of the two books, names may have been altered; or that old places may have fallen to decay and new ones sprung up; or that a city may have come into the possession of a different tribe from that to which it originally belonged; or finally, that an error may have occurred in the transcription, which in the case of such long lists of names is very possible.

The few instances where a sum is given which does not correspond with the previously enumerated particulars (c. g. xv. 21-32,) admit also of being variously explained. In this case, the cities that were subsequently taken from Judah to be given to Simeon may not have been reckoned; or the names of some villages may be given as well as those of cities, and yet only the cities counted; or here and there in the list two names may belong together as the designation of one place; or the list may originally have contained but twenty-nine names, and the writer may have afterwards inserted others of less note, without altering the amount which he had already placed at its close; or if no other explanation be deemed satisfactory, there is the last resort of assuming a corruption the number. They who deny the inspiration and even the credibility of this book, must themselves admit that any supposition is here preferable to that of an original error, unless they can believe that the author was not able to count.

That we find in different parts of the book the capture of the same place differently described, as to its time and circumstances, (c. g. compare ch. x. 36-39. xi. 21. xiv. 12-14,) does not arise, as has been sometimes alleged, from varying or contradictory accounts of the same event. They are different events: there is no difficulty in the supposition of successive captures of the same city. The places were taken once; and then, when Joshua and Israel were absent in another part of the land subduing it, the Canaanites returned, re-occupied and fenced them again; and Israel was compelled once more to drive them out.

When and by whom this book was written, we are nowhere explicitly told, either in the book itself or in any other part of scripture, and can only gather a conclusion from incidental notices in the book itself. In ch. xvi. 10 we read that the Canaanites were not driven out that dwelt in Gezer; but the Canaan-

ites dwelt among the Ephraimites unto this day. Now in the days of Solomon, as we learn from 1 Kings ix. 16, Pharaoh king of Egypt went up and took Gezer and burnt it with fire, and slew the Canaanites that dwelt in the city and gave it for a present unto his daughter, Solomon's wife. It must have been before that, therefore, that this book was written. Again, in xv. 63, we read, As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out; but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day. Now we know that it was in the early part of the reign of David that Jerusalem was wrested out of the hands of the Jebusites and that it was thenceforth the seat of his kingdom. See also ch. xi. 8 and xix. 28, "great Zidon," whereas Tyre not Zidon was the principal city in David's time. In ix. 27 we are told that Joshua made the Gibeonites hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and for the altar of the Lord unto this day, in the place which he should choose. From this passage we learn not only that at the time, when this book was written, the Lord had not yet chosen a place for the temple, which was done in the days of David, but that the Gibeonites still continued to perform service near the altar. Now Saul slew the Gibeonites in his reign (2 Sam. xxi. 1): consequently the composition of the book cannot be referred to a later date than this. There are other data, however, which carry us much further back. In ch. vi. 25 we read of Rahab the harlot, "she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day," and in ch. xiv. 14, "Hebron became the inheritance of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, unto this day:" from which it appears that Rahab and Caleb were still living, when this was written. From the expressions in v. 1, "the Lord dried up the waters of Jordan from before the children of Israel until *we* were passed over," and v. 6 "the land, which the Lord sware unto their fathers, that he would give *us*," we learn that its author was present at the original passage of the Jordan and the taking possession of the land.

The Jewish Talmud asserts and probably the most common belief is that Joshua himself was its author; which opinion has in its favour the analogy of Moses having written what it was thought proper to record of the events of his days, and in which he was a principal actor, so that it seems natural to expect that his successor would do the same. This conjecture receives

apparently some confirmation from ch. xxiv. 26 where we are told of the events related in that chapter, that Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God. That book of the law could not well be any other than that which contained the Pentateuch; and if Joshua wrote this closing chapter of the book bearing his name there, the presumption is that the previous chapters were written by him also. Then the closing verses, which record his death would be added by another after that event took place, just as an account of the death of Moses was appended to the Pentateuch. It may also be suggested as, though a small matter in itself, yet pointing to the same conclusion, that Joshua first receives the title 'the servant of the Lord' in these closing verses; while through the body of the work he is called simply Joshua or else Joshua, Moses' minister. The only thing which throws doubt upon Joshua's being its author is its relating events, which seem to be spoken of in the book of Judges as having occurred after Joshua was dead. Comp. ch. xv. 13-10. xv. 63. xvi. 10. xvii. 11, 12, with the parallel accounts in Judges ch. i., and ch. xix. 47 with Judges ch. xviii. Here all depends upon the manner in which the dates are to be reconciled. If we consider the first verse of Judges as establishing that everything related in the book took place after Joshua's death, then the book of Joshua could not have been written until after that event, and must consequently have been the work of some contemporary who survived him. If on the other hand, the date in Judges i. 1 strictly refers only to the event recorded Judges i. 1-8, and the following particulars to which no date is prefixed may really have happened sooner, the book of Joshua may still have been written before Joshua's death, and for aught we know by Joshua himself.

To one who is at all familiar with the history of theological opinion in Germany in recent times, it is not a matter of surprise to find the integrity and early date as well as the credibility of this book vehemently assailed; the two former indeed chiefly for the sake of bringing the last into discredit, for although the truth of its contents is not necessarily dependent upon the period of its composition, yet if Joshua or a contemporary was its author, the other marks of credibility are so manifest that the truth of its recitals cannot be denied. There are three things about this book, any one of which is sufficient

to procure its unqualified condemnation at the hands of a certain school of critics; its miracles, its predictions, and the testimony it renders to the truth and Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. Miracles can in their eyes never be more than fabulous legends; predictions must have been written after the event; and as the Pentateuch is necessarily condemned by the same laws, whatever testifies to its truth must fall with it. These principles are assumed by them as indisputably true, the book sentenced accordingly, and then searched with microscopic accuracy, if perchance anything may be discovered to support their foregone conclusions. To a believer in the existence or even possibility of a divine revelation, these first principles are inconclusive and worthless; to the critic and scholar their additional arguments are equally so. The alleged contradictions when examined in detail will be found no contradictions, and become positive arguments in favour of the truth of the book, when it is seen that beneath their seeming inconsistency there is a real argument. That the citation from the book of Jasher does not prove its composition later than the time of Joshua, we have already seen. The arguments from the occurrence of the name Jerusalem (ch. x. l. xviii. 28), and from the distinction of the southern range of Canaan into the mountains of Judah and the mountains of Israel (ch. xi. 16, 21), have now been given up by their authors. The assumption that the name Jerusalem was first bestowed on the city after its capture by David is destitute of all historical proof: and the distinction into Judah and Israel did not first arise after the separation of the two kingdoms; that separation was rather induced by the distinction already existing. The germ of it may be found as far back as the patriarchal period (Gen. xlix. 1 Chron. v. 2); it was gradually augmented by the predominance which Judah acquired in the Mosaic period by its numbers and otherwise (Num. i. 27. x. 14). But apart from this, its occurrence here is sufficiently explained by the facts of our book itself. Judah had taken possession of the south of the land; all Israel lay encamped at Shiloh; what could be more natural than that the part of the range occupied by Judah should be called the mountain of Judah, and that where all the rest of Israel lay the mountain of Israel, or inasmuch as it lay within the territory of Ephraim, the mountain of Ephraim (ch. xx. 7).

The extraordinary hypothesis, which has found so much favour among the unbelieving critics of Germany, as to the fragmentary structure of this book, might be applied with equal success and equal reason to any other book that ever has been written. Ewald has discovered that no less than five different writers have had a hand in its composition. He tells us exactly when each of them lived, and the special bias under which he wrote, and singles out in every chapter with undoubting accuracy the verses which belong to each. The utter groundlessness of such a hypothesis is a sufficient refutation, even if the impossibility of bringing it into accordance with the phenomena which the book presents did not afford an ample contradiction. The evident and consistent plan of the book, as above developed, is wholly at variance with it. There could be neither order nor consistency in such a chaos of fragments as it supposes. The theory of two writers, one distinguished by the unvarying use of the divine name God, and the other by that of Lord, whose writings became somehow blended, breaks down here most signally; and it is confessed, even by those who adopt it, that the occurrence of one or the other of these names is not of itself sufficient to decide to which author the supposed fragment belongs. And every attempt to establish a criterion by other assumed characteristic words or phrases has proved equally unsuccessful. The alleged contradictions, even were they such in reality, would prove nothing in favour of this hypothesis, unless on the supposition of an unaccountable forgetfulness or stupidity on the part of him who strung these fragments together, to whom, however, they are compelled to attribute great skill and shrewdness. The occurrence of occasional repetitions, and of sections with a formal introduction and close, has been confidently brought forward as proof of a fragmentary character; but as Ewald himself has conclusively shown in one of his earlier productions, these are peculiarities of the oriental style generally, arising in fact out of the simplicity of their language and of their mode of narration.

The morality of scarcely any book in the Bible has been more assailed by the enemies of revelation than that of the book of Joshua. It has been represented as unworthy of God, as sanctioning what is abhorrent to all just ideas of his nature, and as diametrically opposed to the mild and benevolent prin-

ciples of Christianity. The Israelites have been represented as a horde of lawless wanderers, who, having broken loose from bondage in Egypt, fell upon the inoffensive Canaanites, forcibly wrested from them their just possessions, and wantonly and mercilessly butchered them without distinction of age or sex. And when this horrible picture of injustice and inhumanity has been drawn, we are asked, Can a holy and merciful Being, can the Christian's God, sanction such proceedings? Had we space, we should have been pleased here to discuss this point, with the view of vindicating the book against such aspersions, showing the right by which Israel took possession of Palestine, and the just reasons, why God directed the extermination of its former inhabitants, at the same time inquiring into the relation in which our holy and peaceful religion stands to war. We need as much to pray to be delivered from some of the professed friends of revelation here as from its more open and undisguised enemies: for there have been those, who by undertaking to defend this point on insufficient or ill-chosen grounds have seemed to cast the mantle of Christianity over the iniquities and barbarities of modern warfare, and to justify the wholesale murders with which the civilized and Christian nations of modern times are reeking, though they call him Master and Lord who said 'Love your enemies.' These topics we are unwilling wholly to pass over without consideration. But we shall be able to do no more than in the most hurried manner indicate the line of argument which we should wish to pursue. And we should defend the right of Israel to Canaan, not on the ground of the prior occupancy of it by the patriarchs, as though a claim had then been formed to the territory, which their descendants now reasserted; nor on the ground that Israel having no land of their own after leaving Egypt could not be bound to remain forever in the barren wilderness, and if the Canaanites would not give them peaceable possession among them, they were at liberty, from the natural right of all men to life and to the means of its support, to seize upon land wherever they could find it to live upon; nor should we, calling to our aid the maxim that might makes right, defend it on what is by a grievous misnomer called the *right* of conquest. They had no right to the land founded on any

natural claim to its possession, nor any derived from the conventional usages of men. But it was theirs by divine gift. God promised Abraham to give it to his seed; that promise was reiterated to his descendants and it was in fulfilment of it that they received the land. They entered Canaan and took possession of it by the immediate command of God. The perfect legitimacy of a right thus obtained none can question, who are not prepared to deny altogether the interference of God in human affairs. It is he who appoints to nations as to individuals the bounds of their habitations. This goodly land in the exercise of his righteousness he took from the Canaanites, who had forfeited it by their sins, and in his grace he gave it to Israel with the distinct understanding that they likewise were to be deprived of it, if they proved unfaithful and disobedient stewards.

But why were the Canaanites to be utterly destroyed? The reason is repeatedly given in connexion with the command. It is not to be explained from the usual bloody character of wars in that barbarous age. But it was because of the abominations and gross idolatries of the Canaanites for which the Lord would thus punish them. God would glorify his justice by the destruction of those who would not glorify him by a willing service. Refusing to comply with this, the end of their creation, they were forced to subserve it by their utter destruction. In the days of Abraham their iniquity was not yet full; and therefore the land though promised to him was not taken from them nor given to him in present possession. The Israelites were not acting under an impulse of their own when they made war upon Canaan. They were guided neither by ambition nor by lust of conquest. They were simply the executors of the divine vengeance; just as the flood, the pestilence, and the earthquake, are commissioned by heaven to cut off those, who provoke God's judgments. Why may He not at his pleasure employ men to do his bidding in this respect as well as he may the elements? He does thus employ men constantly in his providence as the unconscious executioners of his judgments. Babylon chastises the sins of Judea, Persia humbles the pride of Babylon, Greece is the rod in God's hand against Persia, and is in its turn scourged by Rome, which itself falls before the irruptions of barbarous invaders. Where now are the nations

of antiquity? Which of them has not been made at one time the executioner of divine judgments upon others, then itself in turn punished for its own guilty excesses? And if sinful nations thus unwittingly accomplish the righteous will of a holy God, why may not an elect and godly nation be employed as the conscious instruments of his just vengeance? There is no door left open here for fanaticism, the fancying a divine commission, and under its pretended sanction putting to death and plundering all of a different faith, or whomsoever their religious frenzy might lead them to encounter. Israel was evidently under divine guidance. Miraculous power attended them every foot of the way, and proved the commands which they received to be no fanatical ravings but the mandates of the God of the whole earth. He fed them from the skies, gave them drink from the rock, opened a passage through Jordan, threw down the walls of Jericho, slew their enemies with hailstones. There could be no mistake that the living God was in the midst of them and directed all their proceedings. And there was a special reason too why Israel should be the executioner of the divine will in this instance, rather than that the land should be first depopulated by pestilence or by some other natural agent, and the people be brought into the land thus emptied for them. In that case they would not have felt so sensibly their own weakness and dependence on the power of God. They would have forgotten the agency of God in giving them the land, attributing all to the second causes, which he might have employed as his instruments; nor could in that case the Canaanites be, as the residue of them proved, a constant trial to Israel, whether or no they would be faithful to the service of the Lord.

But why, it has been asked, were the Canaanites thus singled out for punishment? Were they the only idolaters? Were they so much worse than others? And why punished by the Israelites, whom the enemies of religion delight in representing to be as bad if not worse than the nations they destroyed? The Canaanites were not, as is here supposed, singled out. The righteous providence of God extends over all nations, and each is punished when its cup of iniquity is full, not all to the same extent indeed, nor by the same means, but punished as he sees fit. Besides, the Canaanites were addicted to the vilest, and

most abominable practices, such as were regarded with detestation and horror by the heathen themselves. It is a slander upon Israel too to speak of the generation under Joshua otherwise than as a pious, godly race. That there were individuals among them, who were not truly pious, is of course to be supposed. But the whole tenor of the history in this book, shows them to have been scrupulously obedient to the divine will, and regardful of the divine honour. We find none of the murmurings which characterized the generation that left Egypt under Moses, none of those relapses into idolatry that fill their history in the period of the kings. They were a people in covenant with God, and mindful of that covenant, which they repeatedly and solemnly renewed. They looked upon themselves as only the organs of the divine will in this matter; they burned with the same zeal against the sin of Achan among themselves, and against the supposed transgression of certain tribes, as they did against the idolatrous Canaanites; and they were informed that the judgment, which they now by divine direction executed upon others, would be executed as terribly upon themselves, if they were unfaithful to the covenant of their God.

After what has been said, we need scarcely add that this furnishes no precedent, no justification whatever, in favour of modern wars of conquest. Where Israel's example is claimed, let the same evidences be shown of divine guidance, the same miraculous indications that such is the will of God.

Much has been written and said very loosely about the literal sense and the historical sense of the scriptures. That there is a spiritual sense to the whole bible, that is to say, that the whole bible was intended for our spiritual improvement, is obvious. It could not be what it is, in all its parts the word of God, it could not be even a religious book, unless this were the case. If there be any part of it that admits of no such use, that part is exclusively secular and has no place in the Bible. Setting out, however, with this obvious principle, some have run absolutely wild in their so-called spiritual interpretations. Some mystics have gone to the extent of affirming that there are seven distinct senses in every passage of Holy Writ, all of which they pretend to be able to discover. Some have adopted what is commonly known as the allegorical mode of interpreting scripture, and find some hidden, mostly typical meaning in every verse, too often

despising or giving up altogether its plain and natural signification. Others have gone to the opposite extreme of treating the narratives of the bible as they would mere uninspired productions, as though they stood simply upon a parallel with profane history, and were nothing more to us than a record of what had been transacted in ages long since past. A few simple principles seem to us to govern this whole matter, and to be sufficient to preserve us from the extremes on either hand. The danger on one side is that of arbitrary and fanciful exposition, which foists in meanings upon the scriptures, which the spirit of inspiration never intended, and which puts it completely within the power of the interpreter to make anything or nothing of any passage at his option, by assuming some mystical sense without reason or necessity, and parading it to the obscuration of its just and direct meaning. Under such a system of interpretation it is not the scriptures but men's own vagaries, which form their rule of faith. There is no difficulty of any man's thus making scripture teach just what he pleases. The danger on the other side is, as we have already said, that of degrading a large portion of the scriptures from the word of God, and a book designed for our spiritual improvement, to a mere secular history, finding in it nothing about Christ or eternal salvation, no new illustrations of the character of God, no fresh motives for trust in his mercy, or strenuous obedience to his holy will. Both these extremes are to be deprecated. The middle path is the true one; and the direction in which that lies remains now to be pointed out. This we can perhaps best do under three particulars.

The special intervention of God in the history of ancient Israel is to be kept in view. God interferences in all history of every age and nation; and no history is read aright unless the agency of God is sought for in it, and how the various events which occur enter into his plan of governing the world and bringing about his wise and righteous ends. But this is true in a very peculiar sense of all that befell his ancient people. They were under the particular care and the immediate government of God, as no other nation ever was. And not only so but their history was written by the pen of inspiration with the view of unfolding this special relation, in which they stood to God, and the duties, the privileges, and the responsibilities,

which it brought with it. This history shows how God dealt with his people, and how they dealt with him. Now God is the same in every age; what he was to them, he is now. He who removed every obstacle out of the way of his faithful people, even to the opening of a passage through the Red Sea, the dividing of Jordan; or casting down the impregnable walls of Jericho, will not fail to make their path clear before them now. He who supplied all their necessities, giving them bread from heaven and water out of the flinty rock, will not suffer those to famish who hunger and thirst after righteousness, nor will he permit them who fear him to lack any good thing. He who heard them ever in their hour of need and caused all their enemies to flee before them, will grant his people deliverance now from all their inward and outward foes. He who punished Israel's sins, will ever visit the transgressions of his people with the rod; yet he who graciously returned to them when they again sought his face will show himself always merciful to his repentant though backsliding people.

"As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." The men of one age live over again in those of every other. We may see ourselves portrayed in the character of Israel. We see there the workings of the natural and of the imperfectly sanctified heart under the means which God employs for its conversion and salvation. Their waywardness and disobedience, their murmurings, their hasty ill-timed zeal, their negligent remissness, all find their counterpart in us; and well is it, if the hearty penitence and the sincere obedience, which they manifested at other periods, find likewise in us their parallel. The instruction thus gained we shall for brevity's sake call the inferential use of history. This is in every case a legitimate deduction from the narrative, and the spiritual instruction thus gained is by the fairest construction a part of the meaning of the inspired record.

Next to this we shall mention what may be called the analogical use of scripture. This is done when we trace resemblances between natural and spiritual objects, and illustrate the latter through the medium of the former. There is no logical deduction here, as in the former case. We find in it not proof but illustration. Where the resemblance is striking, and especially where it extends to many particulars, it often enables the mind

easily and distinctly to apprehend what otherwise perhaps it could scarcely grasp, and even if it does not positively confirm the truth, it performs a valuable service in obviating objections. With many minds an apt analogy has all the force of a rigid proof, or is perhaps more effective because more intelligible and impressive than such a proof would be to them. It is to all a pleasing as well as an instructive way of conveying truth. We make use of analogies from the works of God in nature the better to set forth spiritual relations; and why may we not make a similar use of his word? especially as we can claim for it the example of inspired apostles, who not unfrequently drew such analogies from the Old Testament for the instruction of their hearers or readers. The propriety and the advantages of it are so obvious that it is constantly done by all Christians; and some of these analogies are so true and striking that they have stamped themselves upon our current devotional language and upon our most ordinary conception of things, to such an extent indeed, that in employing them we scarcely think that we are using figures. The wilderness world, the Jordan of death, the heavenly Canaan, are as familiar in our religious language as any literal expression we can employ. The only caution necessary in connexion with this use of scripture, is that we should remember analogies are not proofs, and even the best analogies are not perfect. They should therefore not be pressed too far; it does not follow that, because there is a resemblance however striking in some points, there must be a corresponding similarity in every other. Neither does one analogy exclude another; but the same thing may have a resemblance on different sides to various spiritual truths, and may be rightfully employed in illustration of them all. In order to learn what is the truth, we must go to those parts of scripture, where it is plainly and directly conveyed. But when the truth has first been discovered and proved from other sources, we may then resort to analogies to aid in its distinct conception and to impress it more vividly on the mind; while of course, the use of any passage by way of analogy is never to be understood as superseding or invalidating its proper historical sense.

A third use of these parts of scripture may be called their suggestive use, by which we mean the taking its language in detached portions and without any particular attention to its

connexion or to the precise sense which it must have in the place where it occurs, allowing it to suggest any profitable sense which the words may be capable of bearing, or awaken any train of devout thought which may casually connect itself with them. This of course is not interpreting scripture; the meanings or the thoughts thus suggested are never to be put forward as the true sense of the passage, with which they may be connected; and yet, we think that if indulged in sparingly, and by a person already well instructed and of sound judgment, it may not only be allowable but very profitable. It is well to have devout thoughts and important truths frequently in our minds, whatever may be the immediate occasion of their introduction. As we walk by the way or sit in the house, as we look abroad upon the works of God or upon the handicraft of man, it is of service to let every thing be an occasion of suggesting such thoughts, however remote or even fanciful the association that introduces them. Especially, then, it seems to us that when we are reading the word of God, about which every sacred association spontaneously clusters, we may at times, with profit, instead of anxiously confining ourselves to the strict and proper sense of the passage; allow our thoughts to have loose rein and yield ourselves up to any pious reflection that strikes us in connexion with it. The only danger here arises from its excessive use, tending to the neglect of that more solid study of the Bible, by which alone we can learn what it truly teaches; and from its injudicious use allowing thoughts to be suggested, which are themselves erroneous or of an improper kind. Of course these suggestions are not proved to be true from their having arisen in connexion with scripture; they form no part of the actual sense of the passage; and yet they are sometimes so easily connected with it, the language which the sacred writer employs upon his own immediate subject often admits of so ready and apt an application to some higher subject, that it would almost seem as if the language had been carefully framed to admit of both applications, and it is scarcely possible for a pious and reflecting mind to read the one without instantly recurring to the other. Thus when we read "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him," who can avoid thinking of the heavenly glory, though that is not the subject originally

contemplated by the sacred writer? When it is said of Samson, "the dead, which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life," how can we help connecting it in thought with Him, who triumphed, when he fell, over all the powers of darkness? Different minds are differently affected by suggestions of this sort; so that no one can prescribe an absolute rule for the government of another. Much depends upon the turn of mind and habit of thought. What seems to one a fanciful and incongruous association may afford rich and profitable meditation to another. We should not absolutely condemn all associations of this sort, therefore, in the gross, or even in all cases those, which may seem insipid and profitless to us; they may appear differently to others. Some eminently pious and judicious men have made frequent use of the Old Testament in this way. and with the limitations we have above prescribed to it, it does not seem as though it could do any harm. Indeed the apostles themselves, not so frequently as some have alleged, yet occasionally made a similar use of the Old Testament, accommodating its language to some new idea; not thus expounding scripture in a sense foreign to the intent of the original writer, but using its familiar words as an apt vehicle of their own thoughts.

In our remarks thus far we have had primarily in view the spiritual sense, that may be elicited from or connected with scripture in order to a practical application of it to our hearts and consciences. The historical types of the Old Testament, or those persons and events in the former dispensation, which are to be considered as typical, either specifically of Christ and his work, or more generally of persons and events in the present dispensation, may be explained in the same way. And though it would savour of presumption in us to assert positively that we have a perfectly satisfactory solution of a question so much debated and on which there has been and still is so great a diversity of views even among sound and learned divines, we may venture to express our opinion that the three uses of scripture above described, the inferential, the analogical, and the suggestive, will go very far in explaining this subject. There are types in all these senses more or less explicit; some of them stated to be types by the inspired writers: others which we argue to be types, proceeding upon the same principles, which they seem to have followed. Thus to illustrate our

meaning by the case of Joshua ; no one, we presume, would be disposed to doubt that he was a distinguished type of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is not expressly called so in the New Testament, it is true ; but from the instances of types that we do find there it is plain that he is to be so regarded. And he may be considered as a type in all three of the senses, which have been spoken of. As the divinely constituted, divinely qualified and successful leader of God's people, he is a type of which the inferential use may be made to point to Christ ; for the gracious God, who raised up the leader suited to that emergency of his people, attended him by his divine aid, by him subdued their foes and fulfilled his promises of good, thereby pledged himself to raise up at the fit time, one who should supply every other real need of his people, and who should be at once divinely appointed and qualified to bring in upon them every spiritual good which he promised and intended for them. Looking upon Joshua, therefore, they could strengthen their faith in the coming of the predicted Shiloh, and from what God had mercifully given them in the one, they could form some kind of expectation as to what he designed for them in the other. In this manner Joshua could have been regarded as a type of the coming Saviour before he actually appeared.

The suggestive use of the life and character of Joshua in its typical relation to Christ could on the other hand only be made after the great antitype had come. Now that we have learned all about Christ from actual manifestation, we can again turn back and take a fresh survey of the type, and new points of contact never observed before will be discovered between them. Thus that he should bear the name of Joshua, which is the Hebrew form of Jesus ; that he should be in Egypt in his infancy, and in his infancy be endangered by the murderous edict of a cruel tyrant ; that he should be forty years in the wilderness and Jesus forty days in the same ; accidental resemblances like these, if we call them such, may suggest reflections more or less profitable to us, and may connect more closely in our minds the life of Joshua with that of him whom he typified ; but it could never have reasonably occurred to the mind of any one to anticipate these coincidences before the Saviour had actually come.

The analogical use of this type might be made both before

Christ came and after; but only as his character and the nature of his work were known from other sources independent of the history wherein the type is found, as for instance, from the prophecies respecting Christ or his recorded life. Analogies between what one did in natural and the other in spiritual things are so obvious and abundant that we need not delay to point them out. Here again, let it be borne in mind, that it is the inferential only which strictly teaches; the analogical illustrates what is elsewhere learned; while the suggestive pleasingly and impressively carries our thoughts, though it be by trivial ways, to Him, whom we cannot too frequently contemplate.

We have thought it more conducive to the edification of the general reader to present our own views of this interesting subject than to give a more particular account of the work which has immediately suggested them, and the title of which is prefixed to this article. We desire, however, in conclusion, to invite attention to it, as a sample of an interesting and important class of German works, for which we are indebted to a wholesome reaction from the skeptical excesses of the modern school of criticism and interpretation. We desire to see the growing taste for German literature in this department directed not merely to innocuous but to salutary objects, and we therefore take pleasure in calling the attention of our biblical students to the works which have been called into existence within a few years by the example and authority of Hengstenberg. One of the earliest of these writers is the one before us, Keil of Dorpat, who has done good service to the cause of truth, not only in this work on Joshua, but in a later one on Kings and an earlier one on Chronicles. To the same general class, but with less direct dependence upon Hengstenberg, belong Kurtz, the author of several valuable works upon the Pentateuch and the Old Testament History, and Delitzsch, the author of a kindred work on the interpretation of prophecy. As co-workers, more or less directly and successfully, in the promotion of the same end, the names of Ranke, Hävernick, and Drechsler, are already familiar to our German-reading students of the Bible.