

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1860.

---

No. I.

---

---

ARTICLE I.—*The Elements of Political Science*. In two Books. Book I. On Method. Book II. On Doctrine. By PATRICK EDWARD DOVE. Author of the *Theory of Human Progression*. Edinburgh: Johnstone & Hunter, 1854.

THIS publication is not a very recent one; but it is quite new to us, and we have read it with considerable interest. The author is evidently a conscientious and religious man, and, we may add, a ready writer. He expresses very well what he clearly thinks, and his courage, in presenting his views, is much more obvious than his skill in ordering his thoughts, or his patience in reflecting on their correctness. We regard his book as a very useful study for those who wish to classify their ideas on many difficult portions of the form and substance of political philosophy; not, however, because of what is true in the book, for that is very simple; but because of the mental skill which may be obtained by seeking out and exposing to one's self its abounding logical vices, and its philosophical and political heresies. We cannot undertake to point these out in detail, for that can be more profitably done by each reader for himself; and our task can be much more acceptably performed by limiting ourselves chiefly to the fundamental conception of the whole work, its aprioral and abstract deductive method.

By Wm H. Green  
 ART. IV.—*Jeremias librorum sacrorum Interpres atque Vin-*  
*dex*: scripsit AUGUSTUS KUEPER. 8vo. pp. 202.

*De Jeremiae Versione Alexandrina*: scripsit JOANNES WICHEL-  
 HAUS. 8vo. pp. 188.

WHILE the unbelieving criticism of modern times has denied and to its own satisfaction disproved the genuineness of the Pentateuch, Daniel, large sections of Isaiah, and other books of the Bible, it is remarkable that Jeremiah has not been similarly assailed. This is, we confess, attributable solely to the forbearance of the critics, and they are entitled to all the credit which such unexpected generosity deserves. Jeremiah has no claim to any better treatment than his compeers. His writings are no more certainly his, than theirs belong to them. The external testimony to his authorship, and the internal evidence by which this is corroborated, though conclusive, have no peculiar weight in this case more than in the others. And grounds of cavil might as readily be found here as there. Indeed the great advantage of the mode of reasoning employed by our critical opponents is, that they are never at a loss for proofs whatever may be the conclusion that they wish to establish. This facility of argumentation is, it is true, attended with the inconvenience of setting the critics at irremediable strife with one another, each deducing with equal positiveness from the same premises his own foregone conclusion. And this might give rise to the suspicion that arguments so readily gathered on behalf of any cause and made to sustain the most opposite results, are of no great intrinsic worth. This variance, however, it is to be remarked, is an amicable one; being all agreed upon the main point of refusing credit to whatever establishes prophetic foresight or the reality of a supernatural revelation, the mode of compassing this end is esteemed of secondary importance, and the most irreconcilable diversities may here be tolerated as of small account.

Nor are there wanting sufficient motives for the application of the critical knife. If the mere love of novelty and paradox were not enough of itself, as it often is, there is much in

this book to awaken suspicion of its genuineness in any mind imbued with the principles of the modern school. According to the first chapter, Jeremiah foresaw at the outset of his ministry in the thirteenth year of Josiah, the character and subject of his future predictions and the opposition with which he would meet in their delivery. "This," says Hitzig, (*Der Prophet Jeremia erklärt* p. 2,) "is only conceivable as a deduction from actual experience, as a prediction *ex eventu*. He could not know this until the middle or the end of his course, and *therefore* the composition belongs to this later time." Fortunately for the genuineness of the chapter, this, like many other predictions of Jeremiah, was fulfilled during the prophet's own life. The great burden of his prophecies, in fact, as it was the grand lesson demanded at that period, was the approaching destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of the people. The application of the argument just recited will convince its author at least that a large majority of these prophecies could not have been originally delivered with the definiteness with which they are now recorded. But here again it is only necessary to suppose, that when the prophet committed his discourses to writing, after the destruction had occurred, or at least after things had gone so far that this issue was plain to ordinary sagacity, he consciously or unconsciously modified the form of his earlier anticipations so as to include his later knowledge and experience. Thus the maxim "prophecy is impossible" may be made to consist with Jeremiah's authorship. This to be sure would involve an imputation upon the honesty of the prophet and the sense of the people, which it might be difficult to explain, that he should claim to have predicted repeatedly, long in advance and with the utmost particularity what he never did predict at all, and that they who had been his constant hearers should admit the truth of his claim; still the ends of unbelief are answered, and its advocates are content.

When, however, predictions occur of so stubborn a sort that they cannot thus be compounded with, it might be expected that they would without further ceremony be declared fit subjects of the ban, which criticism stands ever ready to pronounce upon unmanageable cases. When, for example, Jeremiah

xxvi. 11, xxix. 10, fixes the duration of the captivity at seventy years, and chap. l. 51, announces the overthrow of Babylon by the Medes, combined with other Asiatic nations, there is a knot which no patience nor ingenuity can untie, which only the sword can sever. The fulfilment is too signal to be denied. The prophet did not outlive the event. The conclusion would seem to be inevitable, that these chapters did not come from Jeremiah, and yet the critics hold their hand! Hitzig himself, the very last from whom such a favour could have been looked for, enters (p. 391) into a formal argument to establish the genuineness of the prophecy against Babylon, remarking that there is not one spurious prophecy in the entire book.

It must, however, in justice to Hitzig and his fellows, be remarked here, that they have no idea in all this of abandoning their principles. This departure from their accustomed method of procedure elsewhere, is to be accounted for by the fact that the desired end is sought to be accomplished in another way. Each prophecy as a whole is suffered to stand unchallenged, but every passage which is irreconcilable with their ideas of what Jeremiah could have spoken, is set down as an interpolation, or a corruption of the text.

There are two external grounds from which it has been argued that there are errors in the existing Hebrew text of Jeremiah. One is found in the verbal discrepancies in parallel passages in the Hebrew itself, and the other from the comparison of the Septuagint translation of this book, which departs from the Hebrew to a remarkable extent. Before inquiring into the reality of the alleged disordered state of the text, however, it is important to observe that the amount of the corruption, if any exist, must be determined by the evidence, and is not to be assumed *ad libitum*. If the Hebrew requires correction from parallel passages and from the Septuagint, be it so: let the requisite correction be applied. But let it not be left at the mercy of the critics to expunge what they please, on the pretence of errors and interpolations, of whose existence there is not the shadow of a proof, and which there is no reason for suspecting, other than the maxims of unbelief. The interpolations most insisted upon, are in fact passages in which all external authorities concur in the exist-

ing text. Whether the readings of the Hebrew, the Septuagint or of the parallel passages, be adopted, no important evidence of prophetic foresight will be called in question.

The differences between the Septuagint and the Hebrew are, as has already been intimated, very considerable, and abound in all parts of the book. In a vast number of instances individual words, clauses, or sentences, are omitted, altered, or transposed; whole verses, and even paragraphs of considerable length, are not to be found in the Greek, e. g. x. 6—8. 10; xvii. 1—4; xxvii. 1. 21; xxix. 16—20; xxxiii. 14—26; xxxix. 4—13; xlvi. 45—47; li. 45—49; and the predictions respecting foreign nations, chapters xlvi. li., not only succeed each other in a different order, but the entire section containing them is in the Greek transferred to a different part of the book, so as to stand immediately after xxv. 13. The twofold arrangement of these predictions is as follows, viz.

<i>Hebrew.</i>	<i>Greek.</i>
1. Concerning Egypt.	Concerning Elam.
2. " the Philistines.	" Egypt.
3. " Moab.	" Babylon.
4. " Ammon.	" the Philistines.
5. " Edom.	" Edom.
6. " Damascus.	" Ammon.
7. " Kedar.	" Kedar.
8. " Elam.	" Damascus.
9. " Babylon.	" Moab.

These discrepancies are remarked upon by Origen and Jerome, the latter of whom, in addition to his frequent censures of the negligence or license of the translators, brings here the charge of carelessness against the transcribers. Buxtorf repeats, without adopting it, the opinion of R. Azarias, that the Septuagint version was made from a faulty manuscript. The idea of two varying texts of the original thus suggested, has given birth to numberless theories in which their existence is assumed, and various speculations indulged as to their origin and respective merits. Thus according to J. D. Michaelis, one edition of

the prophet's writings was prepared in Egypt after his death, which was followed by the Greek translator, and another in Chaldea, which was preserved in its original Hebrew form by the Jews of Palestine. The ingenious and complicated hypotheses of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Movers, will be presented with more detail hereafter. It will be sufficient here to say, that in the judgment of Eichhorn the Palestine edition, or the common Hebrew text, contains the writings of Jeremiah with his latest additions and emendations; while the Egyptian edition was drawn from his unrevised papers, which, as they consisted not of a connected roll but of separate sheets, were by some accident deranged to the extent that we now find them. Bertholdt attributes the differences of text mostly to the unscrupulousness of the Egyptian editor, whose taste was offended by the diffuseness and repetitions of Jeremiah, and who accordingly allowed himself great liberties in abbreviating. The prophecies against foreign powers he thinks to have been at first put into circulation singly, then separately collected and incorporated with the rest of the book both in Palestine and in Egypt, whence their various order and the different location assigned them. According to Movers two independent collations were made of the manuscripts of this book, one in Palestine by Nehemiah, and the other in Egypt, about B. C. 330, which resulted in the establishment of a distinct text in the two countries respectively. With regard to these he lays down the maxim, which is at variance with the evident characteristics of Jeremiah's style, that the briefer is in all cases to be regarded as the true reading. This rule leads him to the conclusion that neither edition was entirely accurate; most commonly he decides in favour of the Egyptian, though sometimes he prefers that of Palestine, and sometimes he thinks both to be erroneous.

The decisive objection to all these theories, and others like them, is that an Egyptian, or any other edition of the original differing from that represented in the common Hebrew Bible, is a figment unsupported by a particle of evidence. Movers, it is true, endeavours to prove a variant text from 2 Kings, Baruch and Josephus. He supposes that he has found in 2 Kings, chap. xxv. the primary form of the text by which the

corresponding verses in Jeremiah, chaps. xl., xli. and lii. may be judged, and he avers that the comparison establishes that the Septuagint has in the main followed the correct edition. But the verbal variations in these and other parallel passages of Scripture can be better accounted for than as errors in the text of one or both. There is no good reason for the assumption that they were at first coincident in every word and letter, and that the existing divergence between them is proof of want of care in their preservation. The differences, such as they are, are without doubt original. The similarity is such as to afford convincing proof that they were derived from a common source, and they may possibly have proceeded from the same pen. But as written in the books of Jeremiah and of Kings there is no reason to believe that the passages were ever more nearly identical than they are now. The general fact brought out by a minute comparison of them is that the language of Jeremiah is fuller even to redundancy, and that of Kings is more concise. Now as the Greek translator betrays the constant tendency to abbreviate and lop off what seemed to him a needless amplification and unessential to the sense, and as moreover he may have had the text of Kings in his thoughts, it has happened in four instances, but only in four, that the Greek version of Jeremiah agrees with Kings in opposition to the Hebrew text of Jeremiah. In other places, however, the translator departs from the text of Jeremiah where it is the same with that of Kings, or agrees with it where that of Kings diverges.

That Baruch, in which large use is made of the language of Jeremiah, mostly follows the Septuagint, is simply because that book was written in Greek. This, therefore, has no bearing upon the question of a Hebrew original with the readings of the Septuagint. The argument from Josephus is, if possible, feebler still. He almost always follows the Hebrew; but inasmuch as in Ant. x. 7, 4, he speaks of Jeremiah as threatening such as stayed in the city with famine and sword, the Hebrew adding in such passages, e. g. xxi. 9; xxvii. 9, 13, a third evil, the pestilence, which is omitted in the Greek, this is adduced as showing that he there drew from a manuscript exhibiting the same text as that from which the Septuagint version was

made. But apart from the fact that Josephus, who wrote in Greek, might readily have drawn from the version itself, he speaks in the very same paragraph of a pestilence prevailing in the city during the siege, which he could not have learned from the account in Kings, and Ezekiel who, in v. 12, vi. 11, etc. according to Movers himself, imitates the language of Jeremiah, names the three evils together, and consequently must have found them all in his Hebrew copy.

The entire subject of the relation of the Greek to the Hebrew text is examined in detail by Kueper, and still more elaborately and exhaustively by Wichelhaus, by the former in an appendix, and by the latter in the body of his treatise named at the head of this article. It is shown by them both conclusively, from the nature as well as the multitude of the variations, that they are not traceable to the ordinary liabilities to error in transcription. The changes have been purposely made, and from the general consistency of the principles on which this has been done they are in all probability the work of the same hand throughout: and they may be more naturally referred to the translator than to some editor of the original, inasmuch as there is no evidence that any Hebrew copy ever existed in which they were to be found. They consist of 1. Abbreviations; the omission or contraction of the customary formulas at the beginning or in the course of a prophecy, vii. 1, 2, xvi. 1; the omission of unimportant words, or of one of two synonymous words or parallel clauses, xxx. 19, xxxi. 28; of a passage which has occurred before, viii. 10—12: comp. vi. 13—15, xxvii. 12—14, (where *αὐτοὶ* of verse 14 has thus been deprived of its subject,) or one which the translator could not reconcile with his ideas, e. g. xxxiii. 14—26, where the perpetuity and multiplication promised to the house of David and of Levi appeared to him not to consist with the fact. 2. Additions; these are much less frequent than the preceding. Words which seem necessary to the sense are occasionally supplied from the connection, xlix. 4, and expressions are sometimes enlarged from parallel passages, xix. 3; comp. xvii. 20. 3. Alterations affecting either the matter or the form. There are many errors in translation, which appear to be due to the incompetency of the translator. Some words are rendered

differently every time that they occur, or nearly so, any sense being given to them apparently that would suit the connection; e. g. שָׁפָרָם, iii. 2, iv. 11, xii. 12, xiv. 6; for others the sense of some word which resembles it has been substituted, iv. 6, נָס *phéyete*, as if from נָס; or they are omitted entirely, xxv. 26. 34, תְּפוצוּתֵיכֶם יִשְׁתַּף. Some passages seem to be translated at random, iv. 15, xxix. 24, 25. Frequent changes are also made in number, person, and tense, xxx. 5; or, in the order of words or verses, xxxii. 35—37, 39. In like manner, as has been stated already, chaps. xlvi.—li. are removed from their true position and the prophecies which they contain are disposed in a different order. Chap. xxv. 13, speaks of what Jeremiah prophesied against all the nations. This seemed to the translator the appropriate place to introduce the predictions referred to, and he accordingly inserts them, although he is thereby led to drop verse 14 altogether. It is difficult to see upon what principle the re-arrangement of them has been made. It has the appearance of a purely artificial inversion. Each alternate prophecy is first transposed with the one before it. Egypt, which heads the list, is carried back before Babylon, Moab is set before the Philistines, Edan before Ammon, Kedar before Damascus. The three great powers, Elam, (or Persia,) Egypt, and Babylon, are then transferred to the beginning of the series, exchanging places with Moab, which, as the subject of the largest prediction relating to the minor powers, seemed to form the most fitting close.

That these discrepancies are due to the translator is further apparent, from the general character of the Septuagint, which nowhere confines itself to the original with the rigorous exactness demanded in a modern version. And in the various fidelity with which different portions have been executed, some other books have suffered as seriously as Jeremiah. The order is greatly disturbed in Exodus, chapters xxxvi., xxxix. The passage 1 Sam. xvii. 12—31 is omitted. In Proverbs chapter xxx. xxxi. 1—9 is removed from its proper place, and attached to chapter xxiv. Several entire chapters are added to Esther and Daniel; and the latter was besides so badly translated that a different version was substituted for it in ecclesiastical use. That the author of Chronicles had before

him the present Hebrew text of the book of Jeremiah may be inferred from the reference in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20 to Jer. xxvii. 7, a verse which has been dropped in the Greek.

The relation of the Septuagint version of this book to the Hebrew has been so complicated with the question as to the plan of this book itself, as to require some consideration of this topic in order to its proper exhibition. The manifest departures from the chronological order have led many commentators to complain of a confusion and an entire want of arrangement. Thus Lightfoot: "The prophecies of Jeremiah are either utterly undated, and so not easily if at all to be referred to their proper time, or those that are dated are most generally dislocated, and it is not easy to give the reason of their dislocation." And Blaney: "The disorder complained of is common to both the Hebrew and Greek arrangements, and consists in the preposterous jumbling together of the prophecies of the reigns of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, in the seventeen chapters which follow the twentieth according to the Hebrew copies; so that without any apparent reason many of the latter reign precede those of the former, and in the same reign the last delivered are put first, and the first last. As such an unnatural dislocation could not have been the result of judgment, nor scarcely of inattention in the compiler of these prophecies, it follows that the original order has most probably by some accident or other been disturbed." Blaney has consequently rearranged these chapters with the view of restoring their true order, in the following way, viz.

Chapters xx.	xxx.	xxxix. 15—18.
xxii.	xxxi.	xxxix. 1—14.
xxiii.	xxvii.	xl.
xxv.	xxviii.	xli.
xxvi.	xxi.	xlii.
xxxv.	xxxiv.	xliii.
xxxvi.	xxxvii.	xliv.
xl.	xxxii.	xlvi. etc.
xxiv.	xxxiii.	
xxix.	xxxviii.	

There has been no lack of hypotheses to account for this condition of the book. Spinoza fancied that the prophecies of

Jeremiah were brought together as they were gathered out of several different records of his life. Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Movers seek to explain, each in his own way, both the duplicate form of the text, and the supposed derangement of the book.

According to Eichhorn, Jeremiah's predictions were unwritten until the fourth year of Jehoiakim. The prophet then dictated to Baruch, xxxvi. 1, 2, what he had up to that time delivered, and after the destruction of that first copy, repeated the dictation, verse 32. As his discourses were thus drawn from memory, no strict order was observed in recording them. Some were recalled only in part, others were blended together, and no definite dates were given. His subsequent prophecies were written upon their delivery, and their dates recorded, these last like the first being preserved not on one connected roll, but upon detached pieces of paper. After the destruction of the city, he prepared an edition of his prophecies for the exiles, which was transcribed from his private papers, the casual order in which they were used upon this occasion being maintained ever after. At a later period, he revised this edition, and introduced numerous emendations and explanatory remarks; the book thus corrected has been perpetuated in the Masoretic or common Hebrew text. Subsequently after the prophet's death, his unrevised papers were transcribed in the order in which they were found, only the prophecies against foreign powers, which had accidentally become deranged, were transferred to the middle of chapter xxv. as their most appropriate place. This was the Egyptian edition afterwards translated into Greek. The agreement and the difference of these two editions seem thus to be explained; and the confusion existing alike in both is laid to the account of an imperfect memory and loose papers.

To all this Bertholdt objects that Jeremiah *read* יְקָרָא xxxvi. 18, his prophecies to Baruch; they must therefore have been already in writing, and a failure of memory can have had no share in deranging them. Besides the same confusion reigns in prophecies since that date, as is observable in those before it, which leads to the suspicion of a common cause. Baruch also wrote upon a single roll xxxvi. 2. 32, and not upon a

number of papers. Or if the prophecies were upon detached papers, as Eichhorn assumes, it would for that reason have been the easier to arrange them chronologically, and it is the less explicable that the first casual order was adhered to in spite of its manifest incorrectness. Nor is it easy to see why the revised form of the prophecies was not circulated among the Jews in Egypt as well as in Chaldea or Palestine.

Bertholdt's own hypothesis is that the prophecies of Jeremiah were put in circulation singly as they were delivered, but no collection of them was undertaken by him nor during his life. When at length this came to be thought of, the prophecies were so dispersed that it could only be accomplished by successive steps. Those concerning foreign powers, chapters xvi—li. were gathered first in Palestine. Some one who had seen this collection and consequently incorporated none of its contents in his own, succeeded in getting together chapters i.—xxiv. transcribing them upon his roll just as he happened to discover them without any regard to their proper order. This second collection finding its way into Egypt, incited some one who had not seen the first to a fresh search after Jeremiah's predictions respecting foreign nations; he found the same that his predecessor had done, but put them together in a different order. A further collection made in Egypt upon the hap-hazard principle embraced chapters xxvi.—xlv. This did not at first contain xxxiii. 14—19 and xxxix. 4—14; but these passages were afterwards discovered in Palestine and introduced into copies circulating there. Chapters xxv. 1—14 and xxv. 15—38 remained by themselves on separate manuscripts. The work of putting all these together was performed independently in Palestine and in Egypt, and resulted in the twofold form of the book as represented in the Hebrew and the Greek. The derangement common to both is upon this theory referred to the casual order in which the scattered prophecies were recovered; the differences of arrangement to independent collections, and the divergencies of text for the most part to the unscrupulousness of the Egyptian editor.

This notion of partial collections is pushed to still greater lengths by Movers, who fancies six successive publications by Jeremiah, each comprising a portion of his prophecies, and

each being in itself arranged in the true chronological order. 1. The prophecies written by Baruch in the fourth year of Jehoiakim in two parts; (*a*) chap. i.—xx. xxvi. xxxv. xxxvi. xlv.; (*b*) chap. xxv. xlvi.—xlix. 2. Chap. xxii.—xxiv.; and 3. Chap. xxvii.—xxix. in the beginning of Zedekiah's reign. 4. Chap. xxx. xxxi. xxxiii.; and 5. Chap. l. li. after the destruction of the city. 6. Chap. xxi. xxxiv. xxxvii. xxxii. xxxviii.—xliv. published in Egypt. The collection of Baruch forms the basis of the book in its present form; and the existing derangement arises from the fact that the subsequent collections were incorporated into this piece-meal upon no just principle, but according to some accidental association. Thus chap. xxi. was put next to chap. xx. because Pashur occurs in the first verse of both: and chap. xxxii. follows chap. xxxi. because of the resemblance of Hanameel xxxii. 7, and Hananeel xxxi. 38.

Hitzig seeks to account for the constitution of the book by a theory of its gradual accretion; but this is so complicated in its details, and so interwoven with his individual critical conclusions, that it could not here be made intelligible.

In regard to these various hypotheses, and others like them, it may be remarked, 1. That they are built upon a false assumption. The disorder, for which they are professedly framed to account, can be shown not to exist; of necessity, therefore, they fall to the ground. 2. They are mere figments of the brain. There is no external evidence in their favour. The only solution which they offer of the assumed fact of confusion and derangement is to resolve it into chance or accident; and thousands of other chances might be suggested equally plausible and equally unentitled to credit. 3. Nothing can be safely built upon the contents of the roll dictated to Baruch, chapter xxxvi; for the particular prophecies which were found in it are not known and cannot be ascertained. There is no reason to suppose that it was incorporated in that form in the present book, for the prophecies delivered up to that time are not preserved distinct from later ones; and Baruch's roll was prepared not for permanent preservation but for a special occasion, and it is distinctly stated that it embraced much upon the second writing which had not been contained in it before,

xxxvi. 32. 4. These theories regard the formation of the book as a purely mechanical affair. Pieces are thrown together at random in violation of any proper order; and this preposterous relation once established is retained inviolate, while other changes are freely made for much slighter cause. This excludes almost of necessity the participation of the prophet in the construction of the book in its existing form, and imputes such a method of procedure to the nameless and gratuitously assumed collector as no sane editor in ancient or in modern times was ever guilty of. It would be better frankly to confess the thing inexplicable than to rest in such explanations.

Germany itself has at last grown weary of these insipid theories, and Ewald, one of her acknowledged masters in hypotheses, has led the way in a wholesome reaction toward a more rational construction of the book. He enters upon the inquiry, which had been strangely enough overlooked by his predecessors, whether there is not after all an orderly distribution of the materials, and finds cause to answer it affirmatively. In this he is followed with some modifications by Hävernich, in his *Critical Introduction*, and Stähelin in an essay published in the third volume of the *Transactions of the German Oriental Society*. They all, however, assume a structure which is needlessly cumbrous and artificial. The most recent attempt which we have seen to exhibit the connection of the book of Jeremiah is that by Neumann in his *Commentary upon this book*. This is highly ingenious and sufficiently simple, but not adequately borne out by the facts of the case. He thinks that the two visions of the first chapter contain a summary of the entire after ministry of the prophet, which is therefore to be regarded as a simple expansion of these initial lessons. The vision of the almond tree is expanded in the first seventeen chapters; and after two symbolic actions significant of the people's rejection, the vision of the seething-pot is expanded in the chapters which follow. Without dwelling, however, upon the various views of these and other writers, we proceed to develop what we conceive to be the true state of the case.

That the book in its present form proceeded from the prophet's own hand, is shown among other things by the frequent use of the first person, not only in the body of various prophe-

cies, but in the headings and formulas of transition. This, in the extent to which it occurs, proves that he was not only the author of the individual discourses, but that he likewise collected and arranged them. This is particularly evident from xxvii. 12, where, after reciting a prophecy delivered in the reign of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah, speaking in the first person, assigns as a reason for adding in immediate connection, one delivered in the reign of Zedekiah, that it was upon the same subject. This affords us also the welcome hint from an authoritative source, that the guiding principle in the arrangement was topical rather than chronological.

In the fourth and fifth years of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah twice reduced the prophecies to writing, which he had delivered up to that date, xxxvi. 2, 32. He was again directed, xxx. 2, probably in the reign of Zedekiah, to write what had been communicated to him. That the present book could not have been produced upon any of these occasions is apparent from the fact that some of its contents bear a still later date. That it was not gradually prepared, receiving fresh accessions as new prophecies were delivered, but is in so far a single composition that it received its present written form about one time and under a single impulse, appears from several considerations. 1. Prophecies from different portions of his ministry are often put together, while those belonging to the same period are dispersed through the book. 2. Remarks are occasionally introduced which are manifestly of later date than the prophecies in connection with which they are found. Thus, xxvii. 1, introduces a prophecy from the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim; but that this was not recorded as we now have it until the reign of Zedekiah, appears from verse 3, which states that an injunction here made was carried into execution at that time. Chap. xxv. belongs to the fourth year of Jehoiakim, verse 1, but was not written until the prophet could speak of the desolation of Jerusalem as already accomplished, verse 18. 3. There are allusions in the course of the book to succeeding portions of it, which show that the prophet as he wrote had a definite conception of what was to follow. Thus, xxv. 13, refers to the prophecies against Babylon and against all the nations, which are "written in this book." These not only stand at its

close, chap. xlvi.—li., but some of them were delivered in the following reign of Zedekiah, and it would appear that this was the case with that against Babylon in particular, xlix. 34, li. 59. 4. The systematic disposition of the matter, as that is now to be exhibited, shows that the writer began his work with all his materials before him, and proceeded throughout upon one consistent plan.

Leaving out of view chapter lii., which is a historical appendix, the book divides itself into three parts, viz.

1. Chapters i.—xxxiii. Prediction of the judgment upon Judah, and the future restoration.

2. Chapters xxxiv.—xlv. The history of the judgment.

3. Chapters xlvi.—li. Predictions respecting foreign nations.

The first section is again divisible into four parts, viz.

(1.) Chapters i.—xx. General denunciation of the people as a whole.

(2.) Chapters xxi.—xxiii. Denunciation of their civil and spiritual leaders.

(3.) Chapters xxiv.—xxix. The design and duration of the judgment.

(4.) Chapters xxx.—xxxiii. The blessings which would succeed it.

In this whole section rebuke and threatening greatly preponderate, there being but a few words of promise in each division, except the last, which is entirely occupied with encouragement and consolation. The first division does not consist of separate discourses delivered upon different occasions, and in different reigns, as may be inferred from the absence of dates, or of anything to indicate the existence or mark the limits of such discourses. The same predictions substantially were uttered by him from the beginning to the end of his ministry, and there was consequently no reason for keeping what he said at one time separate from what he said at another. Only one date is given, viz. iii. 6, "In the days of Josiah the king," in order to show that these warnings were uttered even at that early period, and under the reign of so pious a monarch. The substance of all that he

delivered upon the subject of this first division is wrought up into a connected form, in which he follows a definite train of thought, and the only partition to be made is that which arises from the logical distribution of his theme. Promises are here made to Israel, iii. 12—iv. 2, whom Judah regarded as utterly apostate and cut off, and to the gentiles, xii. 14—17, who were thought to be excluded from the covenant of mercy, but there is scarcely a word to break the heavy and reiterated denunciations upon Judah. The only words which bear the semblance of a promise to this branch of the people, iii. 18, xvi. 14, 15, respect the distant future, and contain an implication of the woe which was just at hand. If they are to be brought back from their captivity, they must first be carried into captivity.

In the second division sentence is passed upon the unrighteous leaders of the people, who are guilty of their ruin, and in contrast the reign of a better prince is promised, xxiii. 3—8. In the third division the true intent of the judgment thus far denounced is declared to be to separate the people. The abandoned portion are left in Jerusalem to be extirpated; the better portion are carried into exile. And with the heavy doom pronounced upon the former, and the protracted sentence which even the latter must bear, are mingled a few words of promise to the exiles, xxiv. 4—7, xxix. 10—14. These denunciatory chapters are followed, and the entire section closed, by the fourth division, in which upon the eve of the catastrophe the assurance was given, that amidst the apparent wreck, nothing which was really precious should be lost. The covenant which secured it was as unalterable as that of day and night.

The second main section of the book, in which the history of the judgment is traced, may be subdivided as follows, viz.

(1.) Chapters xxxiv.—xxxviii. Evidences of ripeness for judgment.

(2.) Chapter xxxix. The destruction of the city.

(3.) Chapters xl.—xlv. The fortunes of the surviving remnant.

Before reporting the grand catastrophe, it is justified in the

first division of this section, by the recital of various facts adduced as specimens and evidences of the universal corruption and the desert of judgment. Their reprobation was proved by their persistence in transgression in the prospect of the divine retribution, and by the evident hypocrisy and hollow-heartedness of the seeming submission which was extorted from them. Chapter xxxiv. In the extremity of the siege the people had solemnly bound themselves to set their Hebrew servants free, but upon the siege being temporarily relaxed, they reduced them to bondage again, in palpable violation of the law of Moses, and their relation to them as brethren equally in covenant with God. Chapter xxxv. The Rechabites obey generation after generation the arbitrary requirements of their ancestor, but Judah, even with the enemy at their gates, verse 11, will not hearken unto God. Chapter xxxvi. Jehoiakim, instead of heeding the divine warnings read before him on the day of the public fast, commemorative of the recent capture of the city, verses 6—9, showed his contempt and defiance of them, by deliberately cutting up the roll on which they were written, and throwing it into the fire, and seeking to take the prophet's life. Chapters xxxvii. xxxviii., Jeremiah's instructions are unheeded by Zedekiah and his princes, and the prophet himself is cast into prison, and his life is repeatedly in peril.

Then upon the account of the destruction of the city and the captivity of the people, follows in the third division, the sequel to this sad history, in which the fortunes of the surviving remnant and Jeremiah's ministry among them are traced to its abrupt termination. The slight reviving under Gedaliah's administration was soon extinguished by his murder, chapters xl. xli. In opposition to the divine mandate, the people remove into Egypt, chapters xlii., xliii., deserting of their own accord the Holy Land, distrusting God's protection, and preferring that of a heathen power. There they, chapter xliv., openly and boldly renounce the worship of God, and declare their determination to serve instead the queen of heaven. Whereupon the curtain drops upon the prophet's labours, his last recorded utterance being the Lord's solemn oath of their utter rejection and extirpation. They have by this

avowal of apostasy cut themselves off from being the Lord's people, and they shall be dealt with accordingly.

There is not in all these chapters a single promise to the people as a whole, only three promises to individuals are in each division, that they should be preserved amidst the general ruin, to the Rechabites, xxxv. 18, 19, to Ebed-melech, xxxix. 15—18, and to Baruch, chapter xlv.

The other quarter from which unfavourable conclusions have been drawn respecting the text of Jeremiah is parallel passages. Mention has already been made of the deductions of Movers from the slight verbal discrepancies between this book and Kings in a section common to them both. There have been inferences of a like character from the numerous phrases and expressions borrowed by Jeremiah from earlier writers. Every discrepancy in a word or letter has been charged to inaccuracy of transcription, whereas these diversities are properly to be regarded as original. In transferring or alluding to the language of other inspired writers, Jeremiah is in the habit of introducing slight alterations, in place of making exact citations. The allusion remains evident, though a different turn is frequently given to the thought or form of expression; and the seal of inspiration rests upon it in the shape in which it proceeded from his pen, no less than in that which was employed by his predecessor. Thus for קרקר, Num. xxiv. 17, Jeremiah substitutes קרקר, xlvi. 45; for גרועה, Isa. xv. 2, גרועה, Jer. xlvi. 37; for אשישי, Isa. xvi. 7, אנשי, Jer. xlvi. 31; for במררם, Hab. i. 8, נשרים, Jer. iv. 13.

A more serious and sweeping charge, however, has been based not upon the discrepancies, but the correspondences of this class of passages. It is alleged as the result of a recondite investigation, that many of them are interpolations, and it is contended on this ground that certain chapters must have been wrought over again by a later writer. Some elucidation is needed to discover the secret spring of this conclusion.

The dependence of the sacred penmen upon their predecessors in thought and language was denied by some of the older writers, under the impression that such an admission would be to the prejudice of their plenary inspiration. They

preferred to assume in all cases of coincidence of language, even where this was continued through considerable paragraphs, as in Isa. ii. 2—4, Micah iv. 1—3, that the words were independently suggested to each writer by the Holy Ghost. But while this assumption is plainly unnecessary, it is quite as foreign from the truth to regard these coincidences as indolent appropriations of the language of their predecessors, or as evidencing a lack of original and independent thought, or a period of declining taste. They serve to mark the unity of the book of revelation. Each writer by adopting and repeating what had been uttered before, both recognizes the inspiration and authority of his predecessors, and gathers confirmation from them for his own announcements. This is done not only by intentional citation and direct appeal to antecedent revelations, but incidentally likewise, and perhaps even unconsciously by the frequent employment of language shaped by intimate familiarity with those writings, which were at once the standard authority in religion and models of good composition.

This conscious or unconscious relation of the sacred writers to those who went before them, is attended to us with the incidental advantage of establishing the existence of the books referred to, and the manner in which they were understood at the time that the citation or allusion was made. And hence these references from Scripture to Scripture, found throughout the sacred volume, interpose a formidable barrier in the way of those who would bring the genuineness of any of its parts into discredit, or who would impose upon them a false interpretation. Hengstenberg was one of the first to exhibit this in its true importance and bearings in respect to the Pentateuch, and to add to the other proofs of its Mosaic origin, that derived from the fact that its existence is recognized or pre-supposed in the entire subsequent history and literature of the Israelitish people. And what is of special significance, its binding obligation was confessed not in Judah alone, but in the schismatical kingdom of the ten tribes, who were from their fundamental organization under the strongest temptation to reject it if that were possible: yet its institutions and laws were still perpetuated amongst them, in spite of their apostasy, with only such

modifications as their severance from Jerusalem and their worship of the calves compelled them to make, and even these were made with a consciousness of their sin. This is abundantly proved from the history of the disruption in Kings, and from the books of the two prophets of that kingdom, Hosea and Amos.

Kueper, as the title of his treatise indicates, has undertaken to exhibit what the prophecy of Jeremiah contains toward vindicating the genuineness or establishing the correct interpretation of earlier books of Scripture. All the coincidences of expression between him and other Old Testament writers are carefully examined in detail with a view to the light shed upon the points referred to. At the time of Jeremiah's ministry a great crisis in the affairs of Judah was just at hand. The cup of the people's transgressions was almost full, and the punishment long ago foretold, was about to be meted out to them. The prophet Jeremiah in labouring to arouse the besotted people, plants himself upon these ancient predictions, and reiterates them with the greater earnestness, as the period of their accomplishment was approaching. Hence the great abundance of his allusions and appeals to the earlier Scriptures, particularly to the Pentateuch, especially the book of Deuteronomy with its solemn recapitulation of the law and words of warning, and to the books of the preceding prophets. It is conclusively shown by Kueper, among other interesting and important consequences, that Jeremiah performs the same service in relation to the book of Isaiah, which, as has been already mentioned, Hosea and Amos perform in relation to the Pentateuch. The use which he makes of Isaiah, and the frequent expressions which he borrows from him, prove him to have been in possession of the book of his prophecies, and that the book was of the same compass then as now. His references to the book in all its parts are abundant and undeniable, not only to those portions which modern criticism allows to pass as genuine, but quite as frequently to those which have been pronounced spurious, and alleged to proceed from some nameless author at or near the close of the exile. So that to the other evidence by which all the prophecies found in the book accredited to him

are proved to be the production of Isaiah, is added the proof that they were actually in existence, and were used by Jeremiah before the exile had begun.

But then forsooth the conclusion from which neological criticism revolts, will be established. The Babylonish exile, and the deliverance by Cyrus will have been predicted not only before Cyrus was born, but before the empire of Babylon itself had attained to separate and independent existence. This must not be admitted. Hypothesis must be brought to sustain hypothesis; the baselessness of both is nothing in the account, if they afford escape from so unwelcome a conclusion. The allegation of the spuriousness of the suspected writings of Isaiah must therefore stand at every cost, and in spite of any conclusiveness of evidence. If Jeremiah quotes them, his own writings must in consequence fall under the ban. The forger of Isaiah's prophecies has had the book of Jeremiah, and re-written some of its chapters, introducing passages here and there in his own peculiar style. Everything which looks like a testimony to Isaiah's genuineness is straightway dismissed as an interpolation. "Die Schreibart ist pseudo-jesaianisch"; and this settles the matter. It might not be difficult upon the same method to maintain that the American Declaration of Independence was a forgery produced within the last decennium; and when confronted with proof that it had been mentioned, quoted, and referred to long before, the reply would be always ready, that all such allusions prior to the date assumed were interpolations, made by the forger himself in these various works. Such proofs of an erroneous text may be estimated at what they are worth.