

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

fit to receive truths which for the present are unutterable. He will need a personality symmetrical, uncrippled, royally upright and complete to address in the new communion of relationship into which He will call us. He will ask us then to be self-possessed, and He is teaching us the alphabet of that duty now.

T. G. SELBY.

PROFESSOR G. A. SMITH'S "HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND."

IN venturing to write a review of Prof. G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, I feel somewhat like "the man in the street" attempting to criticise a work of fine scholarship. But the wish that I should do so has been expressed by those whom I am unwilling to disappoint; and perhaps the impression made by the book on a bystander who is interested in the game of Old Testament study, though not himself able to play, may possess some slight interest, and warrant the following paragraphs in appearing before the public. Besides having myself studied with some minuteness the *Historical Geography* of another part of Western Asia, I have had the advantage of frequently talking about the early history of the Hebrew people with my friend Prof. Robertson Smith, and of reading under his guidance in 1878 everything that he thought most valuable on the criticism and interpretation of the Mosaic books and the historical books of the Old Testament—a long piece of work which afterwards proved a most valuable education for the problems that face the historical investigator in Asia Minor. Naturally, after such a course as was marked out by Robertson Smith, one retains a permanent interest in the subject; and this interest has made me welcome most heartily a book which

attacks that fascinating problem in a new way, bringing new methods of analysis to the investigation, and applying them with a union of boldness and caution and free, wide view that is most refreshing after the niggling way in which many of the recent investigations about Asia Minor (over which I have had to spend too much time) are composed. Here we have an investigator who sets himself to master the problem as a whole, who tries to conceive clearly the general disposition and character of the land about which he is to treat, to view it always in association with man and with history, and to understand the interrelation of its parts, and then proceeds to take his readers along the same path that he has trod. He has seen the places with the reconstructive eye and the warm, creative imagination of the historian; he has inhaled the atmosphere with the love and enthusiasm that breathe through his pages, and make the reader fancy that he can catch the same breath.

A writer on Historical Geography could get nowhere else so favourable a field as Prof. G. A. Smith has found. Not only does an eternal interest cling to it; it is also a land of singularly well-marked features, easy to understand and easy to bring home to the reader's understanding; and further, it is a small land, which can be pictured with that breadth and fulness of treatment that are necessary to make the scenes and facts live before the reader—and yet within reasonable compass. And, having a good subject, the author uses his advantage to the full, giving us a book which is of the first importance as opening up a fresh path of study. It applies the modern methods of united historical and geographical investigation to the department where prepossessions and inherited prejudices were strongest, and where methods too purely literary absorbed the energy of the more free and unprejudiced scholars. It applies them, too, with a spirit of free, lofty, and generous enthusiasm, that makes it fascinating from the first to the

last page. It is, of course, far from completing its task ; it is really only the first opening up of what will hereafter prove a fruitful field of study. No one appreciates that fact better than Prof. Smith himself ; and when the critic tries to estimate the future that is opened up before us by this book—in other words, the problems that it leaves unattempted or unsolved,—he feels that the author himself would be best able to look out over the vista in front.

There remain many sites which have to be localized much more precisely before the full bearing of the incidents connected with them becomes plain. This important part of the subject Prof. Smith has avoided—wisely and rightly for his immediate purpose—but it must be faced hereafter either by him or by others. See, for example, pp. 221–2, where Prof. Smith brings out very clearly both the local character and vividness of the tale of Samson, and also the obscurity in which it must remain involved until the localities are more fully identified.

Book II., Western Palestine, nearly 400 pages in length, is the main part of the volume, and shows Prof. Smith at his best. He is most familiar with this part of the country, and he has put forth all his strength on the elucidation of the many incidents which he has to introduce. Every page, almost, seems more interesting than the preceding ; one must go through it steadily with the map and the authorities by one's side in order to appreciate the character of the book. The only criticism which one can make on it in reasonable compass is—read it.

Book III., on Eastern Palestine, seemed to me less satisfactory than any other part of the book. The questions which have to be treated here are not so purely Hebrew, but take us into a wider range of history. Perhaps it is due to the necessity of bringing the book, already a long one, to an end ; perhaps it arises from the fact that much of the history of the East country appeals to a different class

of readers; but the treatment as a whole is thinner in this part; the subject has not naturally the same interest as that of Book II., and is, I think, not handled with so sure a touch as the main part of the work. To take one example: there are on p. 635 several statements from which I must express dissent. Prof. Smith is here giving examples of the difference of tone between Christian and pagan epitaphs in the Hauran; and contrasts the hopelessness of the latter with the "quiet confidence" of the former. Such a contrast is often obvious in literature; but I doubt whether it can fairly be traced in the epitaphs of either the Hauran or of Asia Minor.

He says "*καὶ σὺ*, Even thou, is a common *memento mori*." I have always thought that this is the supposed reply of the deceased to the greeting presumed to be uttered by the passer-by; it occurs sometimes in the fully expressed form, *χαῖρε χαῖρε καὶ σὺ*, *i.e.* "Farewell," "Fare-thou-well also." Again we read that "'thou hast finished' is a common epitaph." But the verb *τελευτάω* had come to be used regularly in the sense of "to die" from the fifth century B.C. downwards.; and no such connotation as Prof. Smith supposes could, I think, have been present to the epitaph-writers of the Hauran. Hence the epitaph which he next quotes must be translated "Titus, Malchus' son, farewell! Thou hast died ere thy prime (at the age) of twelve years—Farewell." The last word is the reply of Titus to the greeting, and the epitaph is far from favouring the contrast which Prof. Smith draws. Still less do his next examples support his case: "the dead are told that theirs is the inevitable fate, no one is immortal." But the formula on which he relies, *οὐδεὶς ἀθάνατος*, is, as I believe, Christian, and not, as Prof. Smith argues, pagan. Once or twice it occurs in doubtful cases, but Waddington 2032, 2050, and Ewing 163,<sup>1</sup> are epitaphs containing the common and

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Ewing's inscriptions will be published in the ensuing *Quarterly State-*

typical Christian formula, ἐνθάδε κείται, Here lies—; while Waddington 2459 is, as the editor remarks, clearly Christian (being one of the most interesting Christian epitaphs of Eastern Palestine, belonging probably to the third century, and being engraved while Christian formulæ were still fluid, and had not yet become fixed and stereotyped). Waddington 1897 is also almost certainly Christian; the name Domitilla is one of the most interesting of early Christian names. The formula θάρσει, Be of good cheer, which often precedes οὐδεις ἀθάνατος, would alone be sufficient to mark the whole as Christian, and to show that the hopelessness which Prof. Smith finds in the phrase is not really there: the precise sense in which it is to be taken is probably "no one is free from death," rather than, as he maintains, "no one is immortal."<sup>1</sup> It is quite probable that the phrase was adopted from pagan epitaphs by the Christians, as many other forms were, but most of the cases in which it occurs are clearly Christian, and the contrast which Prof. Smith founds on it cannot be maintained.

In another interesting little inscription, mentioned on the same page, Prof. Smith restores μετὰ πάντα τά(φος), After all things a tomb; but on the analogy of common formulæ, such as ὁ βίος ταῦτα, Life is—this, I should prefer μετὰ πάντα τα(ῦτα), After all—this.<sup>2</sup>

I have dwelt on this page at some length, because the line of demarcation between Christian and non-Christian epitaphs is a very delicate one, and there is no point in

ment of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Mr. A. A. G. Wright and Mr. A. Souter, two of my recent pupils in Aberdeen.

<sup>1</sup> In n. 4 he quotes Wadd. 1986 as pagan, but Waddington considers it as Christian (in my opinion rightly). In n. 5 "Wadd. 2429" seems to be a wrong reference.

<sup>2</sup> An excellent parallel in thought and in expression occurs in an inscription of the Phrygian Hierapolis, which seems to Waddington No. 1687 (as well as to myself) to be Christian, εἰδὼς ὅτι τὸ τέλος ὑμῶν τοῦ βίου ταῦτα. It is given more accurately in many points as No. 28 in my forthcoming *Local History of Phrygia*.

antiquity on which more mistakes are made, while it is of peculiar interest and even of importance to notice the gradual steps by which the Christians separated themselves from the customs and ways of ordinary society around them, and created a code of manners and forms distinctive of themselves.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps some readers may find the discussion of general principles contained in Book I., *The Land as a Whole*, the least interesting part of this fascinating volume; but for my own part, it appeals to me with almost greater interest than Books II. or III. The descriptive part of Book I. is luminous and most successful, but I confess to being rather disappointed with the general reflections on the bearing which Historical Geography has on the criticism of the Hebrew authorities. These are rather vaguely and slightly indicated; they seem to express the general ideas with which one might approach the subject for the first time rather than the cream of the results which one gathers from the doing of the work; and I should imagine that chapter v., in which they are contained, was written before Book II., and did not spring from a mind filled with the facts and the method applied in that part.

The first four chapters of Book I. deal with "the place of Syria in the world's history," and with the form, climate, and scenery of the land; and, finally, chapter vi. places the reader at two points of view from which to acquire a general idea of the effect produced by the characteristics described in the preceding chapters, viz., on the deck of a steamer<sup>2</sup> and on the top of Mount Ebal beside Shechem. The relation of Arabia to Syria (including Palestine) and of

<sup>1</sup> I notice also that on p. 544 Prof. Smith remarks that Tacitus (whom I had quoted on my side in a discussion of the name *Ituræi*) is against me: he must have made some mistake, for the MSS. and all good editions are with me.

<sup>2</sup> On p. 119 there is a harshness of expression. The steamer is sailing *north* from Jaffa, but the places seen are enumerated as going south. Should we read *south* for *north*?

Syria to the outer world are set before us very suggestively in chapter i. The Arabian tribes, always in process of growing too numerous for their bare and barren land, are ever also in process of forcing themselves into the surrounding countries, sometimes in peaceful emigration, generally in the guise of marauders or conquerors; but of the four paths open to them, the path of Syria is the easiest, and the one most trodden by them throughout history. The frontier tribes of the Arabian wilderness have been constantly pressing in on the fertile lands of Syria. So long as Syria has been held by strong, energetic rulers the nomads are kept back, or are allowed to enter only as peaceful emigrants or as useful mercenaries in the service of the Syrian Government; for, while their warlike and restless character makes them a terror to the settled Syrian peoples, who become steadily less fit for war by continuance of peace, it also makes them excellent soldiers to recruit the Syrian armies. Thus it is impossible for any Arabian tribe to continue very long a frontier-tribe; an unvarying law pushes on each in succession towards and over the frontier; and this constant immigration tends to invigorate the Syrian population and keep it from stagnating in Oriental peasant life. So the Hebrews forced their way into Canaan. So also the Ituræans, whom we first hear about in the late period when Chronicles was composed<sup>1</sup> as warring on the eastern frontier against Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, gradually forced their way on towards Anti-Lebanon (in the position where they are represented in the maps attached to Prof. Smith's work) and even penetrated in part across Anti-Lebanon into the fertile valley of "Hollow Syria," taking advantage of the disorganization caused by the decay of the Seleucid Empire after 190 B.C. Had

<sup>1</sup> While these wars are projected into a remoter period by the writer, it is probable that he took the name of this nomad tribe from the facts of his own time. The Septuagint reads *Ἰτρουαῖοι* in 1 Chron. v. 19.

not the Seleucid power been soon replaced by the strong hand of Rome, in all probability the Ituræi would have overrun Syria entirely, in pursuance of that eternal law of succession by which the effete dynasties and peoples of the East are swept away by fresh vigorous conquerors, a process which the support of Europe, propping up the worn-out stock of Turkish or Hindu or other dynasties, has sometimes stopped, always to the great detriment of their subjects.

There seems to be a curious and deep-seated variation between two different points of view as regards the religion and development of Israel. We read, *e.g.*, "Monotheism was born, not, as M. Renan says, in Arabia, but in Syria" (p. 113); and Prof. Smith goes on to argue that, as the character of Syria and its peoples is so opposed to monotheism, we are driven to "the belief that the monotheism which appeared upon it was ultimately due to direct superhuman revelation." So also on p. 90, "those spiritual forces which, in spite of the opposition of nature, did create upon Syria the monotheistic creed of Israel."

Such passages as these are quite in accordance with that view of Hebrew history which sees in it a gradual rise towards a loftier and purer conception of God and of the Divine nature, as the people under the guidance of its prophets disengaged itself step by step from the grosser religion which was once shared by the Hebrews with the other Semitic races. On that theory it would be quite natural to assert positively that the Hebrew monotheism arose in Syria, not in Arabia. But alongside of this view, sometimes even in the same paragraph with it, we find another, which seems—so far as I can venture to judge—to be inconsistent with it, and to involve an opposite view of the character of Hebrew history, *viz.*, the traditional view that the lofty character of Hebrew religion was impressed on it, once for all, in Arabia, not in Syria, that

constant lapses from the purity of this religion occurred amid the seductions and temptations of Syrian surroundings, that the prophets resisted these lapses and recalled the people to the original purity of their faith, expounding and unfolding in detail the character of that faith, and applying it to each new political and social situation that arose, but not making it loftier or purer, for it was absolutely lofty and pure from the first. Take, for example, the words on page 89: "the conception of Israel's early history which prevails in Deuteronomy, viz., that the nation suffered a declension from a pure and simple estate of life and religion to one which was gross and sensuous, from the worship of their own deity to the worship of many local gods, is justified in the main—I do not say in details, but in the main—by the geographical data, and by what we know to have been the influence of these at all periods in history."

But, in truth, what are called the moderate critics seem all—in the rough judgment of ignorant outsiders, such as the present writer—to be involved in the same double point of view, and to be attempting to combine two different (and I would add irreconcilable) theories in their attitude towards the history of Israel. I am, of course, not speaking about the recognition of the composite nature of the law-books and the older class of historical records: those who do not recognise that fact occupy a position so diametrically opposite to mine that we can see nothing alike, and there can be no profitable discussion between us. But to those who recognise that fact there remains the further, and, I think, far more important question, viz., as to the relation between the various component parts of these books—one might say between the different *strata*, were it not that the very word *strata* implies and presupposes a settled opinion in regard to the question which is put before us for settlement. That question has been answered by almost all critics in one way,

viz., the relation between the components is one of time, and the differences between them are due to gradual development of religious feeling and organization in the nation. Those critics who carry out that principle logically and consistently form the extreme critical school; those who accept it but shrink with wise caution from the full consequences of their own position are the moderate critics. Professor Driver puts the point in his usual clear, well-defined, and unmistakable way, in his *Introduction*, page 80: "Can any one read the injunctions respecting sacrifices and feasts in Exodus xxiii. 14-19 beside those in P (Lev. i.-vii., Num. xxviii.-xxix., for instance), and not feel that some centuries must have intervened between the simplicity which marks the one and the minute specialization which is the mark of the other?" Any one who feels compelled to give to that question the answer that Dr. Driver desires is making the assumption that the principle of the extreme critical school is right, though his natural practical sense makes him shrink from carrying it out with ruthless logic. Neither the wise statesman nor the wise scholar can permit himself to be thoroughly consistent in carrying into practice the one-sided and incomplete principles from which occasionally he does not shrink in their general form. It is a fair answer to Dr. Driver's question to say that other reasons besides lapse of time have been found sufficient to cause differences of this class,<sup>1</sup> and that no sufficient reasons have yet been brought forward to prove that no other cause except progressive

<sup>1</sup> For example, if in A.D. 1860 two able American statesmen, deep in practical politics, but of opposite parties, had been set separately to the task of formulating the principles of the American constitution, they would have produced very different books, at variance on many most fundamental points. Of course the many centuries of organized civilization that lay behind them would have forced on them a great amount of similarity in other points; whereas no causes existed to produce such similarity in the case of the Hebrew tribes, bringing with them, as we assume, a lofty religion and moral law, which none of them had fully comprehended and worked into their nature, much less developed into a practical working system of ritual and life.

development can account for the great difference which all of us wish to understand. I entertain no opinion on the point: I am merely seeking for information; and I do not find any one who faces fairly the question as a whole. All seem to me to start with their faces set determinedly towards one side of it alone.

When I say "no sufficient reasons" for the answer expected have been given as yet, it is necessary to except the thorough and "advanced" critics, whose position is quite logical and complete. They carry out thoroughly their view that a gradual, progressive, and perfectly natural development took place on the soil of Syria, and infer that those parts of the Hebrew documents which imply a declension from a primitive revelation spring from a late misrepresentation of early history, in which the steps of ascent were described as successive recoveries from lapses and errors. Prof. Smith seems in some places to use this principle, and yet on the whole to declare that geographical study is opposed to it. But it would lead us too far to exemplify and make clear the results which, if I may venture to criticise his method, seem to me to spring from this unconscious inconsistency in principle.<sup>1</sup> I may however say that, if a fuller discussion of the subject were possible, I should take exception to Prof. Smith's fundamental contrast between most of the Semitic religions on the one hand as being purely polytheistic, and the three<sup>2</sup> monotheistic religions

<sup>1</sup> A few slips of expression may be noticed here, which it would be well to correct in a later edition: p. 25, l. 5, Africa was not made a Roman province till 146 B.C.; pp. 22-3, *note*, read Kronos for Chronos, and βατρυλοι for βερυλαι (a form which is not given in the *Thesaurus* of Stephanus) twice; p. 17, *note*, it is too vague to quote "Porphyry in the *Acta Sanctorum*," for there are over sixty folio volumes of that work; p. 35, l. 13, the number fifteen is too small (I notice often a tendency to state numbers rather low), Nazareth is decidedly more than that from Cæsarea, and is not within fifteen miles of any point on the coast, if the maps are right. The accentuation of Greek words is often incorrect or wholly wanting (see, e.g., pp. 4, 22, 23, 356, 406, 415, 442, 455, 483).

<sup>2</sup> "Three" on p. 28, "two" on p. 29, by a natural variation in the thought.

on the other hand, which arose among the Semites. I cannot agree with the view that the character of the other Semitic religions is adequately expressed by calling them "polytheistic": the term "multiplicity-in-unity" seems to express their nature better. I have attempted in a work that will appear almost immediately<sup>1</sup> to collect, point by point, all the facts that can be found about the ancient religion of Asia Minor, *i.e.*, the religion of the Hittites; and if my results be right, Prof. Smith's contrast would have to be modified. I hope he will subject the work to the same rigorous criticism which I have applied to his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*.

W. M. RAMSAY.

## *JEREMIAH: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE.*

### I. HIS CALL.

IN ordinary biographies no part is more fascinating than the first—if details are given of the childhood of the hero or heroine—for in the sayings and adventures of a gifted child there are singular prognostications of future greatness, and the very beginning of life is a miniature of all that is to follow. The Scripture is not lavish of such details. Of Jeremiah, for example, before his appearance as a public character, we receive hardly any information, except that he was a native of Anathoth, a town a mile or two to the north of Jerusalem, and that he belonged to a priestly family.

But on one particular of what may be called the ante-public life of its heroes the Bible is wonderfully communicative: it describes with great fulness how they were led to abandon private life and come forward as public witnesses

<sup>1</sup> *The Local History of Phrygia*, of which Vol. I. will be ready probably next month.