

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1852.

---

No. II.

Wm. H. Goold

ART. I.—*The works of John Owen, D. D.* Edited by the Rev. William H. Goold, Edinburgh. New York: Carter and Brothers, 1850, 1851, 1852. 8vo.

THAT this is the best edition of Owen's works, we do not doubt for a moment. It is identical as to every letter and point with the Edinburgh edition of Messrs. Johnstone and Hunter, everywhere known for the beautiful impressions which they have produced, under the auspices of the Free Church. The series of volumes is rapidly coming out, and five have already appeared. For such a book, the price is surprisingly low. What is of more importance, the edition is a critical one, under the eye and hand of a clergyman of Edinburgh, Mr. Goold, who unites for his task several admirable qualities; extensive reading, accurate scholarship, a turn for minute collation, indefatigable labour, and a thorough acquiescence in the theology of the seventeenth century.

It was fit that the great Puritan champion should be introduced to our generation by a Calvinist and a Presbyterian, rather than by any laxer descendant of the nonconformists, who, if they should revisit their old haunts, would scarcely recognize their ancient Independency among the Congregationalists of England.

ART. IV.—*The Prophet Obadiah, Expounded by Charles Paul Caspari.* Leipzig, 1842, pp. 145.

THE name of Caspari, at present Licentiat and Lector of Theology in the University of Christiania, has been more than once mentioned, and his labours referred to in our pages: but we are desirous of introducing him more fully to the acquaintance of our readers. The treatise, whose title we have placed at the head of this article, is not the most recent of his publications—in fact, it is one of the earliest; but it is the one which best answers our purpose, being at once brief and complete in itself. Though Obadiah is the shortest book in the Old Testament, it yet presents questions enough in the way of criticism and exposition, to furnish a fair field for the abilities of him that undertakes to solve them, while it cannot fail to bring out, as clearly as a book of larger compass, the method which he pursues, and the system which he adopts. The volume before us was announced as the first of a series of commentaries on the prophets, to be prepared by himself, in concert with his fellow student and intimate friend, Delitzsch, whose exposition of Habakkuk appeared the next year. But as we know of no commentary since from the pen of Caspari, and as that most recently issued by Delitzsch is not upon one of the prophets, and as meanwhile they have both left Leipsic, Caspari to go to Christiania, and Delitzsch to become Professor of Theology in the University of Rostock, it is probable that their original project may have been abandoned, at least for a time.

Another series of publications, which they commenced to issue together, appeared under the name of “Biblico-theological, and Apologetico-critical Studies.” The first of these was the “Biblico-prophetic Theology” of Delitzsch, containing an account of Christian Crusius and his labours in that field, together with a discussion of the principles advanced in the recent works of Hofmann and Baumgarten. The second contained Contributions to the Introduction to Isaiah by Caspari, in which he examines various questions relating to the first six chapters of that prophecy, as preliminary to the commentary which he is preparing. He has published besides,

another treatise of kindred character on the Syro-Ephraimitic War under Jotham and Ahaz, and an Arabic Grammar, designed for students of the language, who want something less copious than the grammars of De Sacy and Ewald, yet not so meager as the generality of the manuals previously in use.

Of Obadiah, as of some others of the minor prophets, nothing is recorded but the name, and that only in the title to his prophecy. The traditionary notices which variously identify him with the governor of Ahab's house, 1 Kings xviii. 3; with the captain of fifty spared by Elijah, 2 Kings i. 13; or with the husband of the woman mentioned, 2 Kings iv. 1; or which declare him to have been a proselyte from Edom, are entirely unreliable, and owe their origin to an endeavour to elicit by conjectural combination a knowledge of the prophet which authentic accounts did not furnish. The very period in which he lived, is matter of dispute. As might have been anticipated, this furnished a fine opportunity for German criticism to display itself, which is never more confident in its conclusions, than when it has least evidence on which to base them. Unfortunately, however, its varying results are calculated to inspire any thing but confidence in lookers on. Obadiah has been pronounced with equal positiveness to be the very earliest and the very latest of the prophets, whose writings form part of the canon, while almost every assignable intermediate position has been allotted to him, by one or other of those who have undertaken to speak oracularly upon the subject. Caspari has been content to take the less ambitious, but not less safe method of acquiescing in a date already furnished, rather than inventing a new one. The only external evidence which bears upon the point, is the position which this prophecy occupies in the collection of the minor prophets, according to which Obadiah succeeds Amos and precedes Jonah and Micah. The correctness of this, our author strenuously defends; and if he has not rigidly proved it, he has certainly shown that no sufficient reason exists in the present case for departing from it. It is on all hands admitted, as is indeed evident on a bare inspection, that in the arrangement of the minor prophets some respect was had, at least in the general, to the chronological order; the only question that

can possibly arise, is whether this was carried out strictly in detail. Those of the earliest period come first; those shortly before the exile, next; those succeeding the exile, last. All of them that have their dates indicated in the title appear in their proper order. The analogy of the arrangement of the greater prophets, and the former prophets of the Hebrew canon, also favours the conclusion that the succession is a chronological one. So does the traditional testimony preserved by Jerome.\* And as for the internal proofs which have been alleged as at variance with it, Caspari maintains (and this is also the view taken of the same subject by Hengstenberg, Hövernick and other eminent scholars) that in no case is there a necessity of supposing the chronological order to have been departed from; that the presumption in favour of its having been adhered to throughout, is heightened by the impossibility of assigning any reasons of a topical kind, which could have led to its abandonment in the cases adduced; and that the assumption of the collector himself being in error, and especially of our competency to correct it if he were, is wholly inadmissible.

Among the internal grounds relied upon for the determination of the period to which Obadiah is to be assigned, the first concerns the relation which this prophecy bears to a parallel one in Jeremiah, chap. xlix. The coincidence in thought, and even language, (comp. Obad. *vs.* 1—4, with Jer. xlix. 14—16; Obad. *vs.* 5, 6, with Jer. xlix. 9, 10; Obad. *v.* 8, with Jer. xlix. 7;) is too great to have been a casual resemblance in the utterance of thoughts, independently conceived by different minds. There are in this, as in all similar cases of Scripture criticism, but three supposable ways of accounting for the fact; and here, as in every other instance, all three have had their advocates. Either Jeremiah borrowed from Obadiah, or Obadiah from Jeremiah, or both alike from some preceding prophet. It would no doubt be thought by most persons out of Germany that the settlement of such a question as this, in the absence of all external proof, even though the passage disputed were far longer than it is, must be involved in great difficulty and

\* In quibus (prophetarum scriptis) tempus non profertur in titulo, sub illis eos regibus prophetasse, sub quibus et hi, qui ante eos habent titulos, prophetarunt. *Proh. in XII. Prophet. Min.*

uncertainty. Our brethren across the waters, however, have great skill in such matters. If two writers have a single sentence or even part of a sentence in common, we have scarcely seen the German commentator who would not undertake to say with positiveness, with which of them it was original, or whether it was so with either. The art has been practised so long and so generally, that it has come to be reduced to absolute rule. It seems to pass as an unquestioned principle with the dealers in this species of criticism, that the more brief, unusual, and difficult, and that which is better connected with what precedes and follows, must be the original from which the other is derived. While we might perhaps admit that there was truth or plausibility in this, considered in the general, we can hardly follow the surprising application which we find made of it to the minutest details. When the ground of argument is that Obadiah uses the first person plural in a certain case where Jeremiah has the first person singular, or that the latter inserts the word 'for' where the former does not, or says 'despised among men' where the former says 'greatly despised,' we must confess that our lack of discernment is such that we have to wait until the conclusion is drawn before we can suspect what it is going to be; and we cannot even then tell why it might not just as well have been the reverse. We doubt whether such arguments would be considered as going a great way toward settling the priority in the case of compositions that date from modern times. Decidedly the most preposterous thing, however, which has occurred in the endless argument on this subject, is Hitzig's attempt to show that Obadiah, in copying and endeavouring to simplify Jeremiah, (whom he decides by a single stroke of his pen to have been the earlier of the two,) *mistook his meaning*, being less skilled in the Hebrew, as we are left to infer, than his modern critic!!

Our author has gone very elaborately into this investigation, and has shown that there is no ground here for departing from the presumption as to Obadiah's age furnished by the criterion already mentioned; but that on the other hand if there were any stringency in these arguments as commonly adduced, they would establish Obadiah's priority, not the reverse. At the same time, he adduces a number of collateral arguments, which

certainly have the effect, taken together, of making the probabilities incline largely to the side of Obadiah being the original, and Jeremiah the copy.

The idea of both being derived from a common original may be at once dismissed as having nothing to support it. No one has ever heard of this supposed original; and the arguments adduced for it are of that completely subjective kind, which can be asserted or denied by different persons with equal ease. Thus Ewald asserts that the first ten verses of Obadiah are so different from the remainder of the prophecy in language and style, that they must have belonged to a different author and another age. Caspari replies, and most readers of the prophet could probably say the same, that he can see no difference whatever in the language of the two sections.

Regarding the question, then, as one lying simply between Obadiah and Jeremiah, Caspari urges the following considerations in favour of the originality of the former. 1. The prophecies of Jeremiah directed against foreign powers are almost without exception based on those of previous prophets; which renders it easy to suppose the like to have been the case in the present instance. 2. In those parts of Jeremiah's prediction against Edom, which are not common to him with Obadiah, are many expressions, which occur more or less frequently in the course of his book, and are characteristic of his style; but none such occur in Obadiah. 3. The verses in question form in Obadiah one connected passage, verses 1—8; in Jeremiah they are more dispersed. 4. They are more closely related to the context in Obadiah. 5. In his prophecy too, they are "in part more brief and rapid, in part more difficult and abrupt, in part bolder and more lively, in part more regular and rounded." If this argumentation is successful, it not only leaves the date previously arrived at undisturbed, but adds a confirmation in so far as it determines it not to have been later than the fourth year of Jehoiakim, at which time this prediction of Jeremiah seems to have been uttered.

Another point affecting the date of the prophecy, is found in verses 11—16. In those verses are described sore calamities brought upon Jerusalem by foreign powers, in which Edom insultingly exulted, and which they even aggravated by acts of

positive hostility. The question at once arises, what historical fact is here intended? and was it past or future at the time of the prophet? Three different opinions are here possible, and have been actually maintained:—1. That the event referred to was the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and that it is described as past. 2. That it was the capture by Nebuchadnezzar, but the description is prophetic; the event lay yet in the future. 3. That it describes one of the previous captures of Jerusalem, or calamities that befel its inhabitants before the final overthrow from incursions of hostile invaders, *e. g.* that recorded 2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17, or that 2 Chron. xxv. 23, 24, or that 2 Chron. xxviii. 17, 18. Of these suppositions only the first is inconsistent with the conclusion, to which we have already come, as to the period when Obadiah lived. Caspari adopts the second view stated above, and argues from the strength of the expressions employed, that nothing less than the utter overthrow of the city, as it took place under the Chaldeans, can be intended. That this was still future to the prophet, and not past, he considers as established, 1. by the exhortations, verses 12–14, which seem to be most naturally explained on the supposition of the actions being not yet performed;\* and 2. by the general terms in which the prophecy is couched and the absence of all that is specific and definite; “strangers” and “foreigners” destroy Jerusalem, the “nations” are summoned for the punishment of Edom. The Chaldeans are not once named, as it seems probable that they would have been, had this been written after their commission of the atrocities referred to. The use of the prophetic preterite in the case of events really future, but conceived of and represented by the prophet as past, is frequent and well known. There is no more difficulty in assuming this to be the case in verses 11 and 16, than in verses 3, 6, 7, where all admit it. Those, whose principles will not suffer them to believe in the reality of any supernatural prediction, cannot of course embrace this view. But it is hard to see why even thus they need find any more difficulty here than they do with those pas-

\* In order to appreciate this argument the Hebrew must be consulted, which reads, Look not—rejoice not—speak not proudly, &c.; not as in our version, Thou shouldst not have looked, &c.

sages in Hosea, where Judah's overthrow and exile are not only predicted, but presupposed, or with Micah iii. 12, where Jerusalem's utter desolation is announced as fully as it is here, or in fine with hundreds of passages found in every part of the prophets.

To these arguments touching the age of Obadiah may be added one drawn from verse 20, whence it appears that the captives of Judah in the time of the prophet were not at Babylon, but among the Canaanites and in the distant west, which agrees with the state of things before the exile, but not with that after it. Also the fact is observable that Obadiah contains references to the prophecies of Joel and Amos,\* but to those of no later prophet.

This prediction is readily divisible into three parts. After a title stating in the most concise manner the character of the composition and its author, it first announces Edom's destruction by the nations summoned of Jehovah for this purpose, verses 1-9; then sets forth the cause of this destruction, Edom's unbrotherly conduct in the day of Jerusalem's distress, verses 10-16; and finally places the future restoration and enlargement of Judah in contrast with the utter extinction to which Edom was doomed, verses 17-21.

The opening words "Thus saith the Lord GOD concerning Edom," are not intended to introduce what shall immediately follow, as the language of direct address from God to Edom; although the formula, "Thus saith the LORD," as often as it occurs elsewhere, is always so employed; but they characterize the whole of what follows as a divine communication, whoever may formally be the speaker, whether God, the prophet, or any one else. There is no necessity, therefore, of assuming that this clause is to be immediately connected with v. 2, where God is the speaker, and that the words intervening are to be regarded as parenthetical; nor even of supposing that there is a negligence in the construction; still less of adopting the violent procedure of those who, preferring to cut a knot rather than patiently untie it, are ready to imagine the words to be

\* Compare Obad. v. 11, with Joel iii. 3; Obad. v. 15 with Joel iii. 4, 7, 14; Obad. v. 17 with Joel ii. 32, iii. 17; Obad. v. 19 with Amos ix. 12.

spurious or a gloss, which in addition to the gratuitousness of the assumption, is here peculiarly unfortunate, for if this clause did not belong to the prophecy in its original form, there would be nothing to show against whom war was to be prepared, *v.* 1, nor who is addressed, *vs.* 2—5. There would be nothing to indicate the object of the prophecy until it was learned from *v.* 6.

This message, which the prophet received, came to him not as an isolated individual, but as a member and organ of Israel, for the sake of the whole. Accordingly, he does not say, I have heard, but “We,” *i. e.* Israel, in the prophet as their representative, or through him as their oracle, “have heard a rumour,” not an uncertain one, resting on the authority of man, but “from the Lord.” Or the prophet may have intended to associate with himself those who had previously received communications of similar import, “We,” *i. e.* not I alone, but other prophets also, “have heard,” &c. Either of these is preferable to regarding the plural as unmeaning, a mere enallage for the singular. It is evidently not correct to refer it, as some do, to the heathen, so that this would be coincident in meaning with the following clause, nor can it be designed to put Israel in opposition to the heathen mentioned immediately after as equally summoned with them to the war against Edom.

The rumour or news heard from the Lord, is of the sending of an ambassador among the nations, not that one is to be, but he has been already sent. The ambassador is sent not from Israel, nor from one nation to another, but from Jehovah. This figure drawn from the custom of nations soliciting the aid of others on engaging in a war, is designed simply to express the idea, that the Lord would, whether by some direct impulse, or by the orderings of his providence, certainly bring it about, that the nations should rise to execute his will. It is the same thought which is elsewhere conveyed under the image of calling distant nations by a hiss or whistle, or setting up a signal for them to congregate.

Then follow the words of the ambassador summoning the nations in the name of God to make common cause with him against Edom. The apparent strangeness of the expression by which the Lord stirs up the nations to act in concert with

himself, "let us rise up against her in battle," may be in a measure relieved by a comparison of others in which the Lord appears advancing at the head of the assembled instruments of his vengeance; so that it does not appear necessary to depart from this the most natural and obvious construction of the clause, by putting these words into the mouth of the nations as descriptive of the ready obedience they yield to the message received; or, which would be still farther from the design of the prophet, ascribing them to individual Israelites, exhorting each other to engage in a war to which the nations had already been divinely invited.

The ground of sending the ambassador and collecting the nations, is God's determination to break the power of Edom, which from the certainty of its accomplishment is spoken of as though it were already effected. "I have made thee small among the heathen." I have already done so in purpose, and shall certainly and speedily do so in the actual event. "Thou art" in consequence "greatly despised." It was only a deceit practised upon him by his proud heart, when he was led to conclude himself to be so secure in his high habitations and his clefts of the rocks, (admirably descriptive of Petra, of whose strength and almost inaccessible situation travellers give such surprising accounts,) that he could not be brought down to the ground. They had left out of the account one who was able and who was resolved to dislodge them, even though their habitations were loftier than they were, or loftier than any man could place them. Were they even on those lofty pinnacles where only the eagle can build her nest, or were they among the very stars, "thence will I bring thee down, saith the LORD."

It is an error with some interpreters to regard *v. 2*, as a historical statement designed by its contrast with what follows to exhibit the offensiveness of Edom's pride in a more glaring light; as though the meaning were, God has made them a small, despised people, but the pride of their heart has led them to suppose themselves invincible. A people against whom the nations are thus summoned, and who possess such almost impregnable seats in their mountain fastnesses, cannot be regarded as very contemptible.

The declaration just made, *v. 4*, in conformity with a purpose before announced, *v. 2*, to be executed by the gathered heathen, *v. 1*, appears now to the prophet as already accomplished. And he gives utterance to his feelings of amazement at a desolation so complete, and to which the ordinary causes and images of desolation were by no means adequate. Thieves and nocturnal marauders are satisfied without stripping their victims of every thing. Even grape-gatherers leave some gleanings. But the pillage of Esau was complete; not even his most secret treasures were spared.

From this view of the wholesale plunder of Edom, which is made thus emphatically prominent, because they were a rich people, and this was therefore a considerable item in their destruction—Petra being an important point on the route of the Syro-Arabian trade, and a depot of Arabian products—the prophet reverts to what had preceded it, and how it came about. “All the men of thy confederacy”—*i. e.* the nations without exception which were in league with thee, and which therefore might reasonably have been expected to furnish thee aid—“have brought thee to the border.” This is not to be taken exactly in the sense that some have understood it, as drawn from the custom of honouring the ambassadors of friendly nations with an escort to conduct them to the frontier, so that the meaning would be, they lavish great honour upon thee, and make fine promises but do nothing; for in that case the most essential thought of all, that these promises were not fulfilled, is not stated. Nor does it mean, they brought to their border the fugitives escaped from Edom’s overthrow, refusing them shelter; nor, they accompany thee to the borders of thy territory uniting their forces with thine as though they would assist thee in the battle against the foe, but intending then to desert thee and return; nor, they drive thee to the border of thy territory, *i. e.* expel thee from it. The best understanding of it is, they conduct thee in the person of thy representatives, the ambassadors sent to solicit their aid, to the border, *i. e.* refuse them the aid which they ask, and send them out of the country.

“The men of thy peace,” *i. e.* the nations at peace with thee, have also acted in a manner the opposite of what might have

been expected, they have deceived thee; and that not merely by withholding assistance; they have committed positive unlooked-for acts of hostility, and have prevailed against thee.

The next clause is best translated by the assumption of an ellipsis which is, it is true, an unusual one. But this is preferable to the violation of the accents with some interpreters, and to the forced constructions adopted by others. "The men of thy bread lay a snare under thee," *i. e.* those whom thou hast befriended, or who have derived their subsistence from thee, have requited thy kindness with perfidy and betrayal.

Thus forsaken and betrayed by all their allies and former friends, they should fall into utter perplexity and distraction of counsels. That "there is none understanding in him" is here stated, not as the cause of misfortunes just detailed, nor as a judgment based upon them (equivalent to saying, if they were as wise as they profess to be, they would not suffer themselves to be so imposed upon), but as in part at least their result. And to render their condition perfectly hopeless, their last dependence should be stricken from them by a direct divine infliction. The sagacity for which their wise men were famed, and the bravery of the warriors of Teman (a part of Idumea, so named from the grandson of Esau, or as being the southern district of the land, here used interchangeably with Esau and Edom as their poetic equivalent) God would himself destroy, in order that the entire people left thus defenceless might be "cut off by slaughter." The common rendering of these last words is preferable to the translation "without slaughter," *i. e.* they shall from mere faint-heartedness be vanquished without a battle; or "because of slaughter," *viz.* thy slaughter of Israel, whether the words be connected in this sense with the close of *v.* 9, or in imitation of the Vulgate, Septuagint and Peshito, but in opposition to the accents and the Masoretic division of the verses, with the beginning of *v.* 10, (For the slaughter and for the violence, &c.)

The second portion of the prophecy explains the reason of this terrible visitation. "For thy violence," in itself an atrocity, but aggravated by being committed against a brother, and that too Esau's twin-brother Jacob, "shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever," as already predicted.

Edom's enmity against Israel was not of recent origin, nor displayed merely in occasional acts of hostility. It began in the very earliest period of their history, and had its root in the jealousy felt on account of Israel's superior advantages. The most marked display of it was naturally in the time of Jerusalem's deepest humiliation. When it had fallen a prey to foreign invaders, and was suffering their barbarities, Edom insolently triumphed over its downfall, and lent their aid to complete its ruin. Hence, passing by less marked instances, the prophet portrays this in its aggravations, and denounces upon them in consequence the judgment of God.

The event described, *v.* 11, and Edom's conduct on that occasion, identifying himself with the foreign invaders, was yet future according to the view adopted by Caspari, but from the certainty with which it is foreseen, is spoken of as past. The exhortations that follow, *vs.* 12—14, he considers to have reference to the same event, now conceived of as future or as in progress, the identity being established by the similarity of the terms employed. Those who regard *v.* 11 as historically past, either refer these exhortations to a course of subsequent hostility, or suppose the prophet to conceive of the event which he had just mentioned as having taken place, with the vividness of an event passing before his eyes.

This dissuasion from the injurious treatment of Israel is enforced by an appeal to the approaching day of the Lord upon all the heathen. This day of the Lord is variously represented by the prophets as one of judgment, of punishment, and of battle. It is designed for the illustration of the attributes of the Most High, especially his righteousness in the destruction of his people's enemies and of his own. Although in prophetic representation "a day," it proves in actual fact to be not a single point of time, in which judgment shall be simultaneously executed upon all nations, but a continuous period, in the course of which all shall in succession receive the punishment that they merit. This day is "near," not from the historical position of Obadiah, but from the ideal prophetic one which he has taken in the future. When each nation has completed its deeds of iniquity, the time of retribution is not far distant. That which here appears as the matter to be avenged on that

day, is the hostilities which have been committed against the people of God. Viewed under one aspect, the destruction of Jerusalem and all that Israel suffered from other nations was the consequence of their own sins. Viewed under another aspect, it was a consequence of the hostile disposition cherished by the world toward them as the people of God, and in them toward God himself. This disposition, it is true, he uses as an instrument for the correction of his people's sins, but it finds in that fact no justification. It is under this latter aspect that Obadiah in this prophecy regards the sufferings of Jerusalem. Their own sins are not once referred to as concerned in the treatment they experience, but only the hostility of other nations, and particularly of Edom, the most unrelenting and inexcusable of all, and who appears here not in his individual character merely, but as the representative generally of all the enemies of God's people.

This coming day of retribution upon all nations affords a sure guaranty of Edom's doom; for if no deed of criminality against Israel from any quarter shall pass unavenged, theirs shall not. As they had done, it should be done to them. For as ye (Edom) have drunk upon my holy mountain, indulging in your profane revels over the scene of my people's overthrow, so shall all the heathen, and you of course among them, drink continually, but in another sense, drink the cup of divine wrath, and that in large, copious draughts, because forced so to do, and to their complete undoing: they shall be as though they had not been. That they shall drink "continually," does not imply that the same nations are to be for ever drinking, for the draughts are productive of speedy extinction. But one or another of the nations shall be always experiencing divine judgments.

The principal constructions in addition to that given above, which have been proposed for this passage, are the following.

1. As ye (Edomites) have drunk exulting over the ruin of Jerusalem, so shall all nations drink exulting over yours.
2. As ye (Edomites) have caroused upon my holy mountain, so shall all other nations inflict similar injuries upon Jerusalem, carouse there and perish.
3. As ye (Edomites) have drunk the cup of divine wrath for your treatment of God's people,

(their future punishment from its certainty spoken of as already experienced,) so shall all nations. 4. As ye (Jews) have in the destruction of Jerusalem drunk of the divine wrath, so shall all nations drink of the same, but more largely and for a longer term.

The last division of the prophecy opens with a contrast to the doom denounced upon Edom, and upon all nations. Mount Zion shall have a fate directly opposite to the fate of those who have desecrated and wasted it. The contrast here stated is not simply that in the time of the utter extinction of the nations, Israel, instead of being totally destroyed as they are, shall have still some survivors. The day of retribution which had been announced, was for the nations, not for Israel. The latter is already judged in the (ideal) present; and only the judgment on the nations for what they have done to Israel, lies yet in the future. The time in which the nations are visited for their sins, will be the time of Israel's security and triumph. The escaped from all past and present tribulations will then be found on Mount Zion, which is thenceforth to be a sanctuary and inviolable. The house of Jacob shall retake their former seats. Israel, no longer divided into two opposing kingdoms, but acting in concert, shall find Esau powerless to resist them. Their former coasts will prove too strait for them, such shall be the increase of their numbers. They shall spread southward over the territory of Esau, westward over that of the Philistines, northward into the possessions of Ephraim, to whom a district still farther north must consequently be assigned, and eastward beyond Jordan.

From the body of the nation, who after the calamities that awaited them, verse 11, should return to repeople and enlarge their ancient seats, the eye of the prophet turns to those in captivity in his own times, and he predicts for them also a return and a similar enlargement. This captive host of the children of Israel who are scattered up and down among the Canaanites as far as to Zarephath, and those in Sepharad shall occupy the cities of the south, where room will be made for them by the previous occupation of Edom by the inhabitants of these cities. Sepharad is not to be taken in its appellative sense as meaning dispersion, but the name of some definite

locality situated most probably in the distant west, (compare Joel iii. 6.) The Chaldee and Peshito render it Spain; and in modern Hebrew this is the name of that country.

Another construction of this passage is that this captive host of the children of Israel, *i. e.* those of the kingdom of the ten tribes carried captive to Assyria, shall on their return possess the land which belonged to the Canaanites as far as Zarephath.

And there shall go up, return out of exile, saviours (comp. Judges iii. 9,) for the defence of Israel, and the subjugation of their foes, and particularly of Edom. "And the kingdom shall be the LORD'S." By the protection and deliverance which he shall afford to his people, and by his destruction of their foes, he shall demonstrate to the world that he does indeed reign.

---

ART. V.—*The Jews at K'ae-fung-foo; being a Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jewish Synagogue at K'ae-fung-foo, on behalf of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews; with an introduction by the Right Rev. George Smith, D. D., Lord Bishop of Victoria. Shanghai: Printed at the London Missionary Society's Press, 1851, pp. 82.*

*Fac-similes of the Hebrew Manuscripts, obtained at the Jewish Synagogue in K'ae-fung-foo. Shanghai: Printed at the London Missionary Society's Press, 1851.*

THE interest naturally felt by the Christian public in the subject of these publications, leads us to suppose that we shall do our readers an acceptable service, if we extract from the pamphlet before us the substance of the information which it contains.

For the little previous knowledge which we possess respecting the Jews in China, we are almost exclusively indebted to the researches of the Roman Catholic missionaries in a former age. It was at the commencement of the seventeenth century, that the Jesuit missionary Ricci and his learned associates at