

# THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

---

No. 2.—April, 1880.

---

## I.

### THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

SMITH'S Dictionary of the Bible, in the article on the First and Second Books of Kings, by Lord Arthur C. Hervey, publishes a good many statements like the following :

"It must, however, be admitted that the chronological details expressly given in the books of Kings form a remarkable contrast with their striking historical accuracy."

"When, therefore, we find that the very first date introduced is erroneous, and that numerous other dates are also certainly wrong, because contradictory, it seems a not unfair conclusion that such dates are the work of an interpolator trying to bring the history within his own chronological system ; a conclusion somewhat confirmed by the alterations and omissions of these dates in the LXX. As regards these chronological difficulties, it must be observed they are of two essentially different kinds. One kind is merely the want of the data necessary for chronological exactness. Such is the absence, apparently, of any uniform rule for dealing with the fragments of years at the beginning and end of the reigns." "And this class of difficulties may probably have belonged to these books in their original state, in which exact scientific chronology was not aimed at. But the other kind of difficulty is of a totally different character, and embraces dates which are *very exact* in their mode of expression, but are erroneous and contradictory. Some of these are pointed out below, and it is such which it seems reasonable to ascribe to the interpolation of later professed chronologists."

"Now, when to all this we add that the pages of Josephus are full in like manner of a multitude of inconsistent chronological schemes, which prevent his being of any use, in spite of Hales' praises, in clearing up chronological difficulties, the proper inference seems to be that no authoritative, correct, systematic chronology was originally contained in the books of Kings, and that the attempts to supply such afterwards led to the introduction of many erroneous dates, and probably to the corruption of some true ones which were originally there. Certainly the present text contains what are either conflicting calculations of antagonistic chronologists, or errors of careless copyists, with no learning or ingenuity has ever been able to reduce to the consistency of truth."

Abundant similar statements, in regard to either the chronology of the Israelite and Judaite kings as a whole, or to particular dates in this chronology, may be found in other ar-

on Romans from competent hands, that aim to vindicate Paul's profound production, showing that it is what Paul claimed that all his preaching was, viz: "*The Gospel which he received by the revelation of Jesus Christ,*" (Gal. i. 11, 12).

S. T. L.

ERKLÄRUNG DER KORINTHIERBRIEFE. Erster Band: Das erste Sendschreiben u. s. w. erklärt von DR. C. F. GEORG HEINRICI. 8vo, pp. 574. Wilhelm Hertz, Berlin, 1880. [B. Westermann & Co., New York].

This is not a purely exegetical commentary. Its object is specifically historical; the reconstruction of the congregational life and relations of the Corinthians—as a contribution toward the history of early gentile Christianity. This object affects, of course, the whole plan and execution. It demands a long historical introduction—69 pages—learned, acute, and apart from the acceptance of some of the results of modern negative criticism, in the main, sober. It also determines the form of the exposition. The conventional form of commentary is laid aside, and all technical matter thrown into foot-notes. The body of the book is thus made readable; the words of the apostle are only the woof of the discourse, into which is wrought in a very pleasant way every notice—gathered from all kinds of sources—which could throw light on the life of the first Christian congregations on Hellenic ground. The notes supply the sources of the matter used, and the proofs of the statements made in the text, and enable the author to be critical at the same time that he is agreeable. But though the historical purpose is dominant, the general exposition is yet honestly undertaken and executed in detail. The text used is Tischendorf's VIII., freely handled as the author's critical canons demanded—the chief of which is that the concurrence of ancient versions and citations overbears the concurrence of codices. Nor are linguistic questions shunned. Early classical analogies are not, however, esteemed valuable; the author holding that the usage of the N. T., LXX. and O. T. Apocrypha alone can be confidently appealed to. Homer and Herodotus required glossaries in the Hellenistic age and bear about the same relation to the N. T. as say Wolfram von Eschenbach to Goethe.

The Epistle is regarded as the most elegant of Paul's letters—because, though written in anxious love, it is yet written in firm confidence of victory. Paul is, in a word, master of the situation. His style is, therefore, rich and beautiful, calm and unbroken. Though thus comparatively free from difficulties of construction, it is yet full of historical difficulties. These are of great importance from the standpoint of the author. It would be interesting to exhibit his treatment of them. Take an example—the *parties* of Chap. I. He determines on grammatical grounds that *four* parties are mentioned, and adds some very fine remarks on the connection of verses 13 *sq.* with verse 12—unwarrantably assuming, however (with Keim), that verses 13–16 refer to abuses arising from the teaching of Apollos, on the ground that as John's disciple he laid great stress on baptism. Out of this is also explained xv. 29. Baptism being viewed as the only means of union with Christ, it was natural that if a believer died unbaptized, another should receive the rite in his behalf, in order that he might still be saved. This is not a new interpretation; but since the germs of at least three heresies lurk in such a custom, it is new to hear from Heinrici that Paul looked at it with indifference.

The book is a substantive addition to the literature of the Epistle. B. B. W.

LEHRBUCH DER BIBLISCHEN THEOLOGIE DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS. Von Dr. B. WEISS, 3te umgearbeitete Auflage. 8vo, pp. 708. W. Hertz, Berlin. [B. W. & Co., N. Y.] 1880.

This able, as we may say, masterly work of Weiss, has received increasing attention since its first issue in 1868, when it had to compete with the popular, though posthumous work of Schmid. Taking an intermediate position between the schools of Neander and Baur, he differs somewhat from both in his methods, distinguishing