

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

C. F. KEIL AND F. DELITZSCH

This new, updated edition of *Commentary on the Old Testament*, by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, is based on the English edition originally published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. There have been no material alterations of the contents. The publishers have, however, made improvements, making this a more accurate and useful commentary. In this edition all Greek and Hebrew has been proofread, and some century-old errors have been corrected. Abbreviations have been modernized, and Bible references are easier for the modern reader to follow, since roman numerals in biblical references have been translated to arabic. Arabic words, originally in arabic characters, have been transliterated for the benefit of English readers. Since the verses discussed in each paragraph are listed at the start of the paragraphs and in the running heads, readers can now quickly find the section discussing the text in which they are interested, as well as any cross-referenced texts.

This edition uses a more efficient and readable font designed especially for this reprint. Formerly the formatting of each volume varied, but in this edition the formatting of all ten volumes has been standardized. Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther is now contained in volume 4 rather than volume 3, making all volumes approximately the same length. Long and unwieldy paragraphs have been broken into more manageable units. Rather than having tables of contents hidden within the volumes, each volume now has continuous pagination and a single table of contents; it is now a simple matter to locate the text or passage in question. All of these changes make this edition of Keil and Delitzsch's *Commentary on the Old Testament* easier to read and use.

The publisher is confident that long-time fans of Keil and Delitzsch's *Commentary on the Old Testament* will welcome this refurbished old friend and that those just beginning to explore the riches of Keil and Delitzsch will find a vast wealth of knowledge that is unimimidating and readily accessible.

Preface

The Old Testament is the basis of the New. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets, hath spoken unto us by His only-begotten Son." The Church of Christ is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. For Christ came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil. As He said to the Jews, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me;" so also, a short time before His ascension, He opened the understanding of His disciples, that they might understand the Scriptures, and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. With firm faith in the truth of this testimony of our Lord, the fathers and teachers of the Church in all ages have studied the Old Testament Scriptures, and have expounded the revelations of God under the Old Covenant in learned and edifying works, unfolding to the Christiana community the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God which they contain, and impressing them upon the heart, for doctrine, for reproof, for improvement, for instruction in righteousness. It was reserved for the Deism, Naturalism, and Rationalism which became so prevalent in the closing quarter of the eighteenth century, to be the first to undermine the belief in the inspiration of the first covenant, and more and more to choke up this well of saving truth; so that at the present day depreciation of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament is as widely spread as ignorance of what they really contain. At the same time, very much has been done during the last thirty years on the part of believers in divine revelation, to bring about a just appreciation and correct understanding of the Old Testament Scriptures.

May the Lord grant His blessing upon our labours, and assist with His own Spirit and power a work designed to promote the knowledge of His holy Word.

F. KEIL

THE FIRST BOOK OF MOSES (GENESIS)

TRANSLATED BY
JAMES MARTIN

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES

§1. Prolegomena on the Old Testament and Its Leading Divisions

The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament contain the divine revelations which prepared the way for the redemption of fallen man by Christ. The revelation of God commenced with the creation of the heaven and the earth, when the triune God called into existence a world teeming with organized and living creatures, whose life and movements proclaimed the glory of their Creator; whilst, in the person of man, who was formed in the image of God, they were created to participate in the blessedness of the divine life. But when the human race, having yielded in its progenitors to the temptation of the wicked one, and forsaken the path appointed by its Creator, had fallen a prey to sin and death, and involved the whole terrestrial creation in the effects of its fall; the mercy of God commenced the work of restoration and redemption, which had been planned in the counsel of the triune love before the foundation of the world. Hence, from the very beginning, God not only manifested His eternal power and godhead in the creation, preservation, and government of the world and its inhabitants, but also revealed through His Spirit His purpose and desire for the well-being of man. This manifestation of the personal God upon and in the world assumed, in consequence of the fall, the form of a plan of *salvation*, rising above the general providence and government of the world, and filling the order of nature with higher powers of spiritual life, in order that the evil, which had entered through sin into the nature of man and passed from man into the whole world, might be overcome and exterminated, the world be transformed into a kingdom of God in which all creatures should follow His holy will, and humanity glorified into the likeness of God by the complete transfiguration of its nature. These manifestations of divine grace, which made the history of the world “a development of humanity into a kingdom of God under the educational and judicial superintendence of the living God,” culminated in the incarnation of God in Christ to reconcile the world unto Himself.

This act of unfathomable love divides the whole course of the world's history into two periods — the times of preparation, and the times of accomplishment and completion. The former extend from the fall of Adam to the coming of Christ, and have their culminating point in the economy of the first covenant. The latter commence with the appearance of the Son of God on earth in human form and human nature, and will last till His return in glory, when He will change the kingdom of grace into the kingdom of glory through the last judgment and the creation of a new heaven and new earth out of the elements of the old world, “the heavens and the earth which are now.” The course of the universe will then be completed and closed, and time exalted into eternity (1Co. 15:23-28; Revelation 20 and 21).

If we examine the revelations of the first covenant, as they have been handed down to us in the sacred scriptures of the Old Testament, we can distinguish three stages of progressive development: preparation for the kingdom of God in its Old Testament form; its establishment through the mediatorial office of Moses; and its development and extension through the prophets. In all these periods God revealed Himself and His salvation to the human race by words and deeds. As the Gospel of the New Covenant is not limited to the truths and moral precepts taught by Christ and His apostles, but the fact of the incarnation of God in Christ Jesus, and the work of redemption completed by the God-man through deeds and sufferings, death and resurrection, constitute the quintessence of the Christian religion; so also the divine revelations of the Old Covenant are not restricted to the truths proclaimed by Moses, and by the patriarchs before him and prophets after him, as to the real nature of God, His relation to the world, and the divine destiny of man, but consist even more of the historical events by which the personal and living God manifested Himself to men in His infinite love, in acts of judgment and righteousness, of mercy and grace, that He might lead them back to Himself as the only source of life. Hence all the acts of God in history, by which the rising tides of iniquity have been stemmed, and piety and morality promoted, including not only the judgments of God which have fallen upon the earth and its inhabitants, but the calling of individuals to be the upholders of His salvation and the miraculous guidance afforded them, are to be regarded as essential elements of the religion of the Old Testament, quite as much as the verbal revelations, by which God made known His will and saving counsel through precepts and promises to holy men, sometimes by means of higher and supernatural light within them, at other times, and still more frequently, through supernatural dreams, and visions, and theophanies in which the outward senses apprehended the sounds and words of human language. Revealed religion has not only been introduced into the world by the special interposition of God, but is essentially a history of what God has done to establish His kingdom upon the earth; in other words, to restore a real personal fellowship between God whose omnipresence fills the

world, and man who was created in His image, in order that God might renew and sanctify humanity by filling it with His Spirit, and raise it to the glory of living and moving in His fulness of life.

The way was opened for the establishment of this kingdom in its Old Testament form by the call of Abraham, and his election to be the father of that nation, with which the Lord was about to make a covenant of grace as the source of blessing to all the families of the earth. The *first stage* in the sacred history commences with the departure of Abraham, in obedience to the call of God, from his native country and his father's house, and reaches to the time when the posterity promised to the patriarch had expanded in Egypt into the twelve tribes of Israel. The divine revelations during this period consisted of promises, which laid the foundation for the whole future development of the kingdom of God on earth, and of that special guidance, by which God proved Himself, in accordance with these promises, to be the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

The *second stage* commences with the call of Moses and the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and embraces the establishment of the Old Testament kingdom of God, not only through the covenant which God made at Sinai with the people of Israel, whom He had redeemed with mighty deeds out of Egypt, but also through the national constitution, which He gave in the Mosaic law to the people whom He had chosen as His inheritance, and which regulated the conditions of their covenant relation. In this constitution the eternal trust and essential characteristics of the real, spiritual kingdom are set forth in earthly forms and popular institutions, and are so far incorporated in them, that the visible forms shadow forth spiritual truths, and contain the germs of that spiritual and glorified kingdom in which God will be all in all. In consequence of the design of this kingdom being merely to prepare and typify the full revelation of God in His kingdom, its predominant character was that of law, in order that, whilst producing a deep and clear insight into human sinfulness and divine holiness, it might excite an earnest craving for deliverance from sin and death, and for the blessedness of living in the peace of God. But the laws and institutions of this kingdom not only impressed upon the people the importance of consecrating their whole life to the Lord God, they also opened up to them the way of holiness and access to the grace of God, whence power might be derived to walk in righteousness before God, through the institution of a sanctuary which the Lord of heaven and earth filled with His gracious presence, and of a sacrificial altar which Israel might approach, and there in the blood of the sacrifice receive the forgiveness of its sins and rejoice in the gracious fellowship of its God.

The *third stage* in the Old Testament history embraces the progressive development of the kingdom of God established upon Sinai, from the death of

Moses, the lawgiver, till the extinction of prophecy at the close of the Babylonian captivity. During this lengthened period God revealed Himself as the covenant God and the monarch in His kingdom, partly by the special protection which He afforded to His people, so long as they were faithful to Him, or when they returned to Him after a time of apostasy and sought His aid, either by raising up warlike heroes to combat the powers of the world, or by miraculous displays of His own omnipotence, and partly by the mission of prophets endowed with the might of His own Spirit, who kept His law and testimony before the minds of the people, denounced judgment upon an apostate race, and foretold to the righteous the Messiah's salvation, attesting their divine mission, wherever it was necessary, by the performance of miraculous deeds. In the first centuries after Moses there was a predominance of the direct acts of God to establish His kingdom in Canaan, and exalt it to power and distinction in comparison with the nations round about. But after it had attained its highest earthly power, and when the separation of the ten tribes from the house of David had been followed by the apostasy of the nation from the Lord, and the kingdom of God was hurrying rapidly to destruction, God increased the number of prophets, and thus prepared the way by the word of prophecy for the full revelation of His salvation in the establishment of a new covenant.

Thus did the works of God go hand in hand with His revelation in the words of promise, of law, and of prophecy, in the economy of the Old Covenant, not merely as preparing the way for the introduction of the salvation announced in the law and in prophecy, but as essential factors of the plan of God for the redemption of man, as acts which regulated and determined the whole course of the world, and contained in the germ the consummation of all things; — the law, as a “schoolmaster to bring to Christ,” by training Israel to welcome the Saviour; and prophecy, as proclaiming His advent with growing clearness, and even shedding upon the dark and deadly shades of a world at enmity against God, the first rays of the dawn of that coming day of salvation, in which the Sun of Righteousness would rise upon the nations with healing beneath His wings.

As the revelation of the first covenant may be thus divided into three progressive stages, so the documents containing this revelation, the sacred books of the Old Testament, have also been divided into three classes — the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Hagiographa* of holy writings. But although this triple classification of the Old Testament canon has reference not merely to three stages of canonization, but also to three degrees of divine inspiration, the three parts of the Old Testament do not answer to the three historical stages in the development of the first covenant. The only division sustained by the historical facts is that of *Law* and *Prophets*. These two contain all that was

objective in the Old Testament revelation, and so distributed that the *Thorah*, as the five books of Moses are designated even in the Scriptures themselves, contains the groundwork of the Old Covenant, or that revelation of God in words and deeds which laid the foundation of the kingdom of God in its Old Testament form, and also those revelations of the primitive ages and the early history of Israel which prepared the way for this kingdom; whilst the *Prophets*, on the other hand, contain the revelations which helped to preserve and develop the Israelitish kingdom of God, from the death of Moses till its ultimate dissolution. The Prophets are also subdivided into two classes. The first of these embraces the so-called *earlier prophets* (*prophetae priores*), i.e., the prophetic books of history (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the Kings), which contain the revelation of God as fulfilled in the historical guidance of Israel by judges, kings, high priests, and prophets; the second, the *later prophets* (*prophetae posteriores*), i.e., the prophetic books of prediction (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets), which contain the progressive testimony to the counsel of God, delivered in connection with the acts of God during the period of the gradual decay of the Old Testament kingdom. The former, or historical books, are placed among the Prophets in the Old Testament canon, not merely because they narrate the acts of prophets in Israel, but still more, because they exhibit the development of the Israelitish kingdom of God from a prophet's point of view, and, in connection with the historical development of the nation and kingdom, set forth the progressive development of the revelation of God. The predictions of the later prophets, which were not composed till some centuries after the division of the kingdom, were placed in the same class with these, as being "the national records, which contained the pledge of the heavenly King, that the fall of His people and kingdom in the world had not taken place in opposition to His will, but expressly in accordance with it, and that He had not therefore given up His people and kingdom, but at some future time, when its inward condition allowed, would restore it again in new and more exalted power and glory" (*Auberlen*).

The other writings of the Old Covenant are all grouped together in the third part of the Old Testament canon under the title of *γραφῆα*, *Scripta*, or *Hagiographa*, as being also composed under the influence of the Holy Ghost. The *Hagiographa* differ from the prophetic books both of history and prediction in their peculiarly subjective character, and the individuality of their representations of the facts and truths of divine revelation; a feature common to all the writings in this class, notwithstanding their diversities in form and subject-matter. They include,

(1) the *poetical books*: Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, — which bear witness

of the spiritual fruits already brought to maturity in the faith, the thinking, and the life of the righteous by the revealed religion of the Old Covenant; —

(2) the *book of Daniel*, who lived and laboured at the Chaldean and Persian court, with its rich store of divinely inspired dreams and vision, prophetic of the future history of the kingdom of God; —

(3) the *historical books* of Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, which depict the history of the government of David and his dynasty, with special reference to the relation in which the kings stood to the Levitical worship in the temple, and the fate of the remnant of the covenant nation, which was preserved in the downfall of the kingdom of Judah, from the time of its captivity until its return from Babylon, and its re-establishment in Jerusalem and Judah.

§2. Title, Contents, and Plan of the Books of Moses

The five books of Moses (ἡ Πεντάτευχος sc., Βίβλος, *Pentateuchus* sc., *liber*, the book in five parts) are called in the Old Testament *Sepher hattorah*, the *Law-book* (Deu. 31:26; Jos. 1: 8, etc.), or, more concisely still, *Hattorah*, ὁ νόμος, the *Law* (Neh. 8: 2, 7, 13, etc.), — a name descriptive both of the contents of the work and of its importance in relation to the economy of the Old Covenant. The word תּוֹרָה, a Hiphil noun from הִוִּירָה, *demonstrare*, *docere*, denotes instruction. The *Thorah* is the book of instruction, which Jehovah gave through Moses to the people of Israel, and is therefore called *Torath Jehovah* (2Ch. 17: 9; 34:14; Neh. 9: 3) and *Torath Mosheh* (Jos. 8:31; 2Ki. 14: 6; Neh. 8: 1), or *Sepher Mosheh*, the book of Moses (2Ch. 25: 4; 35:12; Ezr. 6:18; Neh. 13: 1). Its contents are a divine revelation in words and deeds, or rather *the* fundamental revelation, through which Jehovah selected Israel to be His people, and gave to them their rule of life (νομός), or theocratical constitution as a people and kingdom.

The entire work, though divided into five parts, forms both in plan and execution one complete and carefully constructed whole, commencing with the creation, and reaching to the death of Moses, the mediator of the Old Covenant. The foundation for the divine revelation was really laid in and along with the creation of the world. The world which God created is the scene of a history embracing both God and man, the site for the kingdom of God in its earthly and temporal form. All that the *first* book contains with reference to the early history of the human race, from Adam to the patriarchs of Israel, stands in a more or less immediate relation to the kingdom of God in Israel, of which the other books describe the actual establishment. The *second* depicts the inauguration of this kingdom at Sinai. Of the *third* and *fourth*, the former narrates the spiritual, the latter the political, organization of the kingdom by

facts and legal precepts. The *fifth* recapitulates the whole in a hortatory strain, embracing both history and legislation, and impresses it upon the hearts of the people, for the purpose of arousing true fidelity to the covenant, and securing its lasting duration. The economy of the Old Covenant having been thus established, the revelation of the law closes with the death of its mediator.

The division of the work into five books was, therefore, the most simple and natural that could be adopted, according to the contents and plan which we have thus generally described. The three middle books contain the history of the establishment of the Old Testament kingdom; the first sketches the preliminary history, by which the way was prepared for its introduction; and the fifth recapitulates and confirms it. This fivefold division was not made by some later editor, but is founded in the entire plan of the law, and is therefore to be regarded as original. For even the three central books, which contain a continuous history of the establishment of the theocracy, are divided into three by the fact, that the middle portion, the third book of the Pentateuch, is separated from the other two, not only by its contents, but also by its introduction, Gen. 1: 1, and its concluding formula, Gen. 27:34.

§3. Origin and Date of the Books of Moses.

The five books of Moses occupy the first place in the canon of the Old Testament, not merely on account of their peculiar character as the foundation and norm of all the rest, but also because of their actual date, as being the oldest writings in the canon, and the groundwork of the whole of the Old Testament literature; all the historical, prophetic, and poetical works of the Israelites subsequent to the Mosaic era pointing back to the law of Moses as their primary source and type, and assuming the existence not merely of the law itself, but also of a book of the law, of precisely the character and form of the five books of Moses. In all the other historical books of the Old Testament not a single trace is to be found of any progressive expansion of, or subsequent additions to, the statutes and laws of Israel; for the account contained in 2 Kings 22 and 2 Chronicles 34. of the discovery of the book of the law, i.e., of the copy placed by the side of the ark, cannot be construed, without a wilful perversion of the words, into a historical proof, that the Pentateuch or the book of Deuteronomy was composed at that time, or that it was then brought to light for the first time. ^{fi}

On the contrary, we find that, from the time of Joshua to the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, the law of Moses and his book of the law were the only valid and unalterable code by which the national life was regulated, either in its civil or its religious institutions. Numerous cases undoubtedly occur, in which different commands contained in the law were broken, and particular ordinances were neglected; but even in the anarchical and troubled times of the

Judges, public worship was performed in the tabernacle at Shiloh by priests of the tribe of Levi according to the directions of the *Thorah*, and the devout made their periodical pilgrimages to the house of God at the appointed feasts to worship and sacrifice before Jehovah at Shiloh (Jud. 18:31, cf. Jos. 18: 1; 1Sa. 1: 1-4: 4). On the establishment of the monarchy (1 Samuel 8-10), the course adopted was in complete accordance with the laws contained in Deu. 17:14 ff. The priesthood and the place of worship were reorganized by David and Solomon in perfect harmony with the law of Moses. Jehoshaphat made provision for the instruction of the people in the book of the law, and reformed the jurisdiction of the land according to its precepts (2Ch. 17: 7 ff., 19: 4 ff.). Hezekiah and Josiah not only abolished the idolatry introduced by their predecessors, as Asa had done, but restored the worship of Jehovah, and kept the Passover as a national feast, according to the regulations of the Mosaic law (2 Chronicles 29-31; 2 Kings 23; and 2 Chronicles 34 and 35). Even in the kingdom of the ten tribes, which separated from the Davidic kingdom, the law of Moses retained its force not merely in questions of civil law, but also in connection with the religious life of the devout, in spite of the worship established by Jeroboam in opposition to the law, as we may clearly see from the labours of Elijah and Elisha, of Hosea and Amos, within that kingdom. Moreover, all the historical books are richly stored with unmistakable allusions and references to the law, which furnish a stronger proof than the actual mention of the book of the law, how deeply the *Thorah* of Moses had penetrated into the religious, civil, and political life of Israel. (For proofs, see my Introduction to the Old Test. § 34, i.)

In precisely the same way *prophecy* derived its authority and influence throughout from the law of Moses; for all the prophets, from the first to the last, invariably kept the precepts and prohibitions of the law before the minds of the people. They judged, reprov'd, and punished the conduct, the sins, the crimes of the people according to its rules; they resumed and expanded its threats and promises, proclaiming their certain fulfilment; and finally, they employed the historical events of the books of Moses for the purpose of reproof or consolation, frequently citing the very words of the *Thorah*, especially the threats and promises of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28, to give force and emphasis to their warnings, exhortations, and prophecies. And, lastly, the *poetry*, that flourished under David and Solomon, had also its roots in the law, which not only scans, illumines, and consecrates all the emotions and changes of a righteous life in the Psalms, and all the relations of civil life in the Proverbs, but makes itself heard in various ways in the book of Job and the Song of Solomon, and is even commended in Ecclesiastes (Ecc. 12:13) as the sum and substance of true wisdom.

Again, the internal character of the book is in perfect harmony with this indisputable fact, that the *Thorah*, as *Delitzsch* says, “is as certainly presupposed by the whole of the post-Mosaic history and literature, as the root is by the tree.” For it cannot be shown to bear any traces of post-Mosaic times and circumstances; on the contrary, it has the evident stamp of Mosaic origin both in substance and in style. All that has been adduced in proof of the contrary by the so-called modern criticism is founded either upon misunderstanding and misinterpretation, or upon a misapprehension of the peculiarities of the Semitic style of historical writing, or lastly upon doctrinal prejudices, in other words, upon a repudiation of all the supernatural characteristics of divine revelation, whether in the form of miracle or prophecy. The evidence of this will be given in the Commentary itself, in the exposition of the passages which have been supposed to contain either allusions to historical circumstances and institutions of a later age, or contradictions and repetitions that are irreconcilable with the Mosaic origin of the work. The *Thorah* “answers all the expectations which a study of the personal character of Moses could lead us justly to form of any work composed by him. He was one of those master-spirits, in whose life the rich maturity of one historical period is associated with the creative commencement of another, in whom a long past culminates, and a far-reaching future strikes its roots. In him the patriarchal age terminated, and the period of the law began; consequently we expect to find him, as a sacred historian, linking the existing revelation with its patriarchal and primitive antecedents. As the mediator of the law, he was a prophet, and, indeed, the greatest of all prophets: we expect from him, therefore, an incomparable, prophetic insight into the ways of God in both past and future. He was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; a work from his hand, therefore, would show, in various intelligent allusions to Egyptian customs, laws, and incidents, the well-educated native of that land” (*Delitzsch*). In all these respects, not only does the *Thorah* satisfy in a general manner the demands which a modest and unprejudiced criticism makes upon a work of Moses; but on a closer investigation of its contents, it presents so many marks of the Mosaic age and Mosaic spirit, that it is *a priori* probable that Moses was its author. How admirably, for example, was the way prepared for the revelation of God at Sinai, by the revelations recorded in Genesis of the primitive and patriarchal times! The same God who, when making a covenant with Abram, revealed Himself to him in a vision as JEHOVAH who had brought him out of Ur of the Chaldees (Gen. 15: 7), and who afterwards, in His character of EL SHADDAI, i.e., the omnipotent God, maintained the covenant which He had made with him (Gen. 17: 1 ff.), giving him in Isaac the heir of the promise, and leading and preserving both Isaac and Jacob in their way, appeared to Moses at Horeb, to manifest Himself to the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the full significance of His name JEHOVAH, by redeeming

the children of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and by accepting them as the people of His possession (Exo. 6: 2 ff.). How magnificent are the prophetic revelations contained in the *Thorah*, embracing the whole future history of the kingdom of God till its glorious consummation at the end of the world! Apart from such promises as Gen. 12: 1-3, Exo. 19: 5, 6, and others, which point to the goal and termination of the ways of God from the very commencement of His work of salvation; not only does Moses in the ode sung at the Red Sea behold his people brought safely to Canaan, and Jehovah enthroned as the everlasting King in the sanctuary established by Himself (Exo. 15:13, 17, 18), but from Sinai and in the plains of Moab he surveys the future history of his people, and the land to which they are about to march, and sees the whole so clearly in the light of the revelation received in the law, as to foretell to a people just delivered from the power of the heathen, that they will again be scattered among the heathen for their apostasy from the Lord, and the beautiful land, which they are about for the first time to take possession of, be once more laid waste (Leviticus 26; Deuteronomy 28-30, but especially 28). And with such exactness does he foretell this, that all the other prophets, in their predictions of the captivity, base their prophecies upon the words of Moses, simply extending the latter in the light thrown upon them by the historical circumstances of their own times. ^{r2}

How richly stored, again, are all five books with delicate and casual allusions to Egypt, its historical events, its manners, customs, and natural history! *Hengstenberg* has accumulated a great mass of proofs, in his "Egypt and the Books of Moses," of the most accurate acquaintance on the part of the author of the *Thorah*, with Egypt and its institutions. To select only a few — and those such as are apparently trivial, and introduced quite incidentally into either the history or the laws, but which are as characteristic as they are conclusive, — we would mention the thoroughly Egyptian custom of men carrying baskets upon their heads, in the dream of Pharaoh's chief baker (Gen. 40:16); the shaving of the beard (Gen. 41:14); prophesying with the cup (Gen. 44: 5); the custom of embalming dead bodies and placing them in sarcophagi (Gen. 50: 2, 3, and 26); the basket made of the papyrus and covered with asphalt and pitch (Exo. 2: 3), the prohibition against lying with cattle (Exo. 22:19; Lev. 18:23; 20:15, 16), and against other unnatural crimes which were common in Egypt; the remark that Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt (Num. 13:22); the allusion in Num. 11: 5 to the ordinary and favourite food of Egypt; the Egyptian mode of watering (Deu. 11:10, 11); the reference to the Egyptian mode of whipping (Deu. 25: 2, 3); the express mention of the eruptions and diseases of Egypt (Deu. 7:15; 28:27, 35, 60), and many other things, especially in the account of the plagues, which tally so closely with the natural history of that country (Exo. 7: 8-10:23).

In its general form, too, the *Thorah* answers the expectations which we are warranted in entertaining of a work of Moses. In such a work we should expect to find “the unity of a magnificent plan, comparative indifference to the mere details, but a comprehensive and spirited grasp of the whole and of salient points; depth and elevation combined with the greatest simplicity. In the magnificent unity of plan, we shall detect the mighty leader and ruler of a people numbering tens of thousands; in the childlike simplicity, the shepherd of Midian, who fed the sheep of Jethro far away from the varied scenes of Egypt in the fertile clefts of the mountains of Sinai” (*Delitzsch*). The unity of the magnificent plan of the *Thorah* we have already shown in its most general outlines, and shall point out still more minutely in our commentary upon the separate books. The childlike *naiveté* of the shepherd of Midian is seen most distinctly in those figures and similes drawn from the immediate contemplation of nature, which we find in the more rhetorical portions of the work. To this class belong such poetical expressions as “covering the eye of the earth” (Exo. 10: 5, 15; Num. 22: 5, 11); such similes as these: “as a nursing father beareth the suckling” (Num. 11:12); “as a man doth bear his son” (Deu. 1:31); “as the ox licketh up the grass of the field” (Num. 22: 4); “as sheep which have no shepherd” (Num. 27:17); “as bees do” (Deu. 1:44); “as the eagle flieth” (Deu. 28:49); — and again the figurative expressions “borne on eagles’ wings” (Exo. 19: 4, cf. Deu. 32:11); “devouring fire” (Exo. 24:17; Deu. 4:24; 9: 3); “head and tail” (Deu. 28:13, 44); “a root that beareth gall and wormwood” (Deu. 29:18); “wet to dry” (Deu. 29:19), and many others.

To this we may add the antiquated character of the style, which is common to all five books, and distinguishes them essentially from all the other writings of the Old Testament. This appears sometimes in the use of words, of forms, or of phrases, which subsequently disappeared from the spoken language, and which either do not occur again, or are only used here and there by the writers of the time of the captivity and afterwards, and then are taken from the Pentateuch itself; at other times, in the fact that words and phrases are employed in the books of Moses in simple prose, which were afterwards restricted to poetry alone; or else have entirely changed their meaning. For example, the pronoun **הוא** and the noun **נַעַר** are used in the Pentateuch for both genders, whereas the forms **היא** and **נַעֲרָה** were afterwards employed for the feminine; whilst the former of these occurs only eleven times in the Pentateuch, the latter only once. The demonstrative pronoun is spelt **הואל**, afterwards **הואלה**; the infinitive construct of the verbs **ל"ה** is often written **ה** or **ו** without **ת**, as **עשו** Gen. 31:38, **עשהו** Exo. 18:18, **ראה** Gen. 48:11; the third person plural of verbs is still for the most part the full form **וַי**, not merely in the imperfect, but also here and there in the perfect, whereas afterwards it was softened into **י**.

Such words, too, as אָבִיב an ear of corn; אֲמַתַּחַת a sack; בָּתֵּר *dissecuit* *hostias*; בֶּתֵּר a piece; גֹּזֵל a young bird; זָבַד a present; זָבַד to present; חֶרֶם־שֵׁ a sickle; מִנָּה a basket; הִיְקוּם an existing, living thing; מַסְוֵה a veil, covering; עֵקֶר a sprout (applied to men); שָׂרָא a blood-relation; such forms as זָכוֹר for זָכַר *mas*, כֶּשֶׁב for כָּבַשׁ a lamb; phrases like נֶאֱסַף אֶל-עַמּוֹ, “gathered to his people;” and many others which I have given in my Introduction, — you seek in vain in the other writings of the Old Testament, whilst the words and phrases, which are used there instead, are not found in the books of Moses.

And whilst the contents and form of the *Thorah* bear witness that it belongs to the Mosaic age, there are express statements to the effect that it was written by Moses himself. Even in the central books, certain events and laws are said to have been written down. After the defeat of the Amalekites, for example, Moses received orders from God to write the command to exterminate Amalek, for a memorial, *in the book* (i.e., a book appointed for a record of the acts of the Lord in Israel: Exo. 17:14). According to Exo. 24: 3, 4, 7, Moses wrote the words of the covenant (Exo. 20: 2-17) and the laws of Israel (Exodus 21-23) in the book of the covenant, and read them to the people. Again, in Exo. 34:27, Moses is commanded to write the words of the renewed covenant, which he no doubt did. And lastly, it is stated in Num. 33: 2, that he wrote on account of the different encampments of the Israelites in the desert, according to the commandment of God. It is true that these statements furnish no direct evidence of the Mosaic authorship of the whole *Thorah*; but from the fact that the covenant of Sinai was to be concluded, and actually was concluded, on the basis of a written record of the laws and privileges of the covenant, it may be inferred with tolerable certainty, that Moses committed all those laws to writing, which were to serve the people as an inviolable rule of conduct towards God. And from the record, which God commanded to be made, of the two historical events already mentioned, it follows unquestionably, that it was the intention of God, that all the more important manifestations of the covenant fidelity of Jehovah should be handed down in writing, in order that the people in all time to come might study and lay them to heart, and their fidelity be thus preserved towards their covenant God. That Moses recognised this divine intention, and for the purpose of upholding the work already accomplished through his mediatorial office, committed to writing not merely the whole of the law, but the entire work of the Lord in and for Israel, — in other words, that he wrote out the whole *Thorah* in the form in which it has come down to us, and handed over the work to the nation before his departure from this life, that it might be preserved and obeyed, — is distinctly stated at the conclusion of the *Thorah*, in Deu. 31: 9, 24. When he had delivered his last address to the people, and appointed Joshua to lead them into their promised inheritance, “he wrote *this Thorah*, and delivered it unto

the priests, the sons of Levi, and unto all the elders of Israel” (Deu. 31: 9), with a command that it was to be read to the people very seven years at the feast of Tabernacles, when they came to appear before the Lord at the sanctuary. Thereupon, it is stated (vv. 24 ff.) that “it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, to the very close, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying: Take this book of the law, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee,” etc. This double testimony to the Mosaic authorship of the Torah is confirmed still further by the command in Deu. 17:18, that the king to be afterwards chosen should cause a copy of this law to be written in a book by the Levitical priests, and should read therein all the days of his life, and by the repeated allusions to “the words of this law, which are written in this book,” or “in the book of the law” (Deu. 28:58, 61; 29:21; 30:10; 31:26); for the former command that the latter allusions are not intelligible on any other supposition, than that Moses was engaged in writing the book of the law, and intended to hand it over to the nation in a complete form previous to his death; though it may not have been finished when the command itself was written down and the words in question were uttered, but, as Deu. 31: 9 and 24 distinctly affirm, may have been completed after his address to the people, a short time before his death, by the arrangement and revision of the earlier portions, and the addition of the fifth and closing book.

The validity of this evidence must not be restricted, however, to the fifth book of the Torah, viz., Deuteronomy, alone; it extends to all five books, that is to say, to the whole connected work. For it cannot be exegetically proved from Deuteronomy, that the expression, “this law,” in every passage of the book from Deu. 1: 5 to 31:24 relates to the so-called *Deuterosis* of the law, i.e., to the fifth book alone, or that Deuteronomy was written before the other four books, the contents of which it invariably presupposes. Nor can it be historically proved that the command respecting the copy of the law to be made for the future king, and the regulations for the reading of the law at the feast of Tabernacles, were understood by the Jews as referring to Deuteronomy only. *Josephus* says nothing about any such limitation, but speaks, on the contrary, of the reading of the law generally (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ... ἀναγινωσκέτω τοὺς νόμους πᾶσι, Ant. 4: 8, 12). The Rabbins, too, understand the words “this law,” in Deu. 31: 9 and 24, as relating to the whole Torah from Gen. 1 to Deu. 34, and only differ in opinion as to the question whether Moses wrote the whole work at once after his last address, or whether he composed the earlier books gradually, after the different events and the publication of the law, and then completed the whole by writing Deuteronomy and appending it to the four books in existence already ³

Still less can this evidence be set aside or rendered doubtful by the objection, offered by *Vaihinger*, that “Moses cannot have related his own death and burial (Deuteronomy 34); and yet the account of these forms an essential part of the work as we possess it now, and in language and style bears a close resemblance to Num. 27:12-23.” The words in Gen. 31:24, “When Moses had finished writing the words of this law in a book to the end,” are a sufficient proof of themselves that the account of his death was added by a different hand, without its needing to be distinctly stated. ^{f4}

The argument, moreover, retains all its force, even if not only Genesis 34, the blessing of Moses in Genesis 33, whose title proves it to be an appendix to the Torah, and the song in Genesis 32, are included in the supplement added by a different hand, but if the supplement commences at Gen. 31:24, or, as *Delitzsch* supposes, at Gen. 31: 9. For even in the latter case, the precepts of Moses on the reading of the Torah at the feast of Tabernacles of the year of release, and on the preservation of the copy by the side of the ark, would have been inserted in the original prepared by Moses himself before it was deposited in the place appointed; and the work of Moses would have been concluded, after his death, with the notice of his death and burial. The supplement itself was undoubtedly added, not merely by a contemporary, but by a man who was intimately associated with Moses, and occupied a prominent position in the Israelitish community, so that his testimony ranks with that of Moses.

Other objections to the Mosaic authorship we shall notice, so far as they need any special refutation, in our commentary upon the passages in question. At the close of our exposition of the whole five books, we will review the modern hypotheses, which regard the work as the resultant of frequent revisions.

§4. Historical Character of the Books of Moses

Acknowledgment of the historical credibility of the facts recorded in the books of Moses requires a previous admission of the reality of a supernatural revelation from God. The widespread naturalism of modern theologians, which deduces the origin and development of the religious ideas and truths of the Old Testament from the nature of the human mind, must of necessity remit all that is said in the Pentateuch about direct or supernatural manifestations or acts of God, to the region of fictitious sagas and myths, and refuse to admit the historical truth and reality of miracles and prophecies. But such an opinion must be condemned as neither springing from the truth nor leading to the truth, on the simple ground that it is directly at variance with what Christ and His apostles have taught in the New Testament with reference to the Old, and also as leading either to an unspiritual Deism or to a comfortless Pantheism, which ignores the working of God on the one hand, and the inmost nature of the

human mind on the other. Of the reality of the divine revelations, accompanied by miracles and prophecies, the Christian, i.e., the believing Christian, has already a pledge in the miracle of regeneration and the working of the Holy Spirit within his own heart. He who has experienced in himself this spiritual miracle of divine grace, will also recognise as historical facts the natural miracles, by which the true and living God established His kingdom of grace in Israel, wherever the testimony of eye-witnesses ensures their credibility. Now we have this testimony in the case of all the events of Moses' own time, from his call downwards, or rather from his birth till his death; that is to say, of all the events which are narrated in the last four books of Moses. The legal code contained in these books is now acknowledged by the most naturalistic opponents of biblical revelation to have proceeded from Moses, so far as its most essential elements are concerned; and this is in itself a simple confession that the Mosaic age is not a dark and mythical one, but falls within the clear light of history. The events of such an age might, indeed, by possibility be transmuted into legends in the course of centuries; but only in cases where they had been handed down from generation to generation by simple word of mouth. Now this cannot apply to the events of the Mosaic age; for even the opponents of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch admit, that the art of writing had been learned by the Israelites from the Egyptians long before that time, and that not merely separate laws, but also memorable events, were committed to writing. To this we must add, that the historical events of the books of Moses contain no traces of legendary transmutation, or mythical adornment of the actual facts. Cases of discrepancy, which some critics have adduced as containing proofs of this, have been pronounced by others of the same theological school to be quite unfounded. Thus *Bertheau* says, with regard to the supposed contradictions in the different laws: "It always appears to me rash, to assume that there are contradictions in the laws, and to adduce these as evidence that the contradictory passages must belong to different periods. The state of the case is really this: even if the Pentateuch did gradually receive the form in which it has come down to us, whoever made additions must have known what the existing contents were, and would therefore not only admit nothing that was contradictory, but would erase anything contradictory that might have found its way in before. The liberty to make additions does not appear to me to be either greater, or more involved in difficulties, than that to make particular erasures." And on the supposed discrepancies in the historical accounts, *C. v. Lengerke* himself says: "The discrepancies which some critics have discovered in the historical portions of Deuteronomy, as compared with the earlier books, have really no existence." Throughout, in fact, the pretended contradictions have for the most part been introduced into the biblical text by the critics themselves, and have so little to sustain them in the narrative itself, that on closer research they resolve themselves into mere appearance, and the

differences can for the most part be easily explained. — The result is just the same in the case of the repetitions of the same historical events, which have been regarded as legendary reduplications of things that occurred but once. There are only two miraculous occurrences mentioned in the Mosaic era which are said to have been repeated; only two cases, therefore, in which it is possible to place the repetition to the account of legendary fiction: viz., the feeding with quails, and bringing of water from a rock. But both of these are of such a character that the appearance of identity vanishes entirely before the distinctness of the historical accounts, and the differences in the attendant circumstances. The first feeding with quails took place in the desert of Sin, before the arrival of the Israelites at Sinai, in the second month of the first year; the second occurred after their departure from Sinai, in the second month of the second year, at the so-called graves of lust. The latter was sent as a judgment or plague, which brought the murmurers into the graves of their lust; the former merely supplied the deficiency of animal food. The water was brought from the rock the first time in Rephidim, during the first year of their journey, at a spot which was called in consequence *Massah and Meribah*; the second time, at Kadesh, in the fortieth year, — and on this occasion Moses and Aaron sinned so grievously that they were not allowed to enter Canaan.

It is apparently different with the historical contents of the book of Genesis. If Genesis was written by Moses, even between the history of the patriarchs and the time of Moses there is an interval of four or five centuries, in which the tradition might possibly have been corrupted or obscured. But to infer the reality from the bare possibility would be a very unscientific proceeding, and at variance with the simplest rules of logic. Now, if we look at the history which has been handed down to us in the book of Genesis from the primitive times of the human race and the patriarchal days of Israel, the traditions from the primitive times are restricted to a few simple incidents naturally described, and to genealogies which exhibit the development of the earliest families, and the origin of the different nations, in the plainest possible style. These transmitted accounts have such a genuine historical stamp, that no well-founded question can be raised concerning their credibility; but, on the contrary, all thorough historical research into the origin of different nations only tends to their confirmation. This also applies to the patriarchal history, in which, with the exception of the divine manifestations, nothing whatever occurs that could in the most remote degree call to mind the myths and fables of the heathen nations, as to the lives and deeds of their heroes and progenitors. There are three separate accounts, indeed, in the lives of Abraham and Isaac of an abduction of their wives; and modern critics can see nothing more in these, than three different mythical embellishments of one single event. But on a close and unprejudiced examination of the three accounts, the attendant circumstances in all three cases are so peculiar, and correspond so

exactly to the respective positions, that the appearance of a legendary multiplication vanishes, and all three events must rest upon a good historical foundation.

“As the history of the world, and of the plan of salvation, abounds not only in repetitions of wonderful events, but also in wonderful repetitions, critics had need act modestly, lest in excess of wisdom they become foolish and ridiculous” (*Delitzsch*).

Again, we find that in the guidance of the human race, from the earliest ages downwards, more especially in the lives of the three patriarchs, God prepared the way by revelations for the covenant which He made at Sinai with the people of Israel. But in these preparations we can discover no sign of any legendary and unhistorical transference of later circumstances and institutions, either Mosaic or post-Mosaic, to the patriarchal age; and they are sufficiently justified by the facts themselves, since the Mosaic economy cannot possibly have been brought into the world, like a *deus ex machina*, without the slightest previous preparation. The natural simplicity of the patriarchal life, which shines out in every narrative, is another thing that produces on every unprejudiced reader the impression of a genuine historical tradition. This tradition, therefore, even though for the most part transmitted from generation to generation by word of mouth alone, has every title to credibility, since it was perpetuated within the patriarchal family,

“in which, according to divine command (Gen. 18:19), the manifestations of God in the lives of the fathers were handed down as an heirloom, and that with all the greater ease, in proportion to the longevity of the patriarchs, the simplicity of their life, and the closeness of their seclusion from foreign and discordant influences. Such a tradition would undoubtedly be guarded with the greatest care. It was the foundation of the very existence of the chosen family, the bond of its unity, the mirror of its duties, the pledge of its future history, and therefore its dearest inheritance” (*Delitzsch*).

But we are by no means to suppose that all the accounts and incidents in the book of Genesis were dependent upon oral tradition; on the contrary, there is much which was simply copied from written documents handed down from the earliest times. Not only the ancient genealogies, which may be distinguished at once from the historical narratives by their antique style, with its repetitions of almost stereotyped formularies, and by the peculiar forms of the names which they contain, but certain historical sections — such, for example, as the account of the war in Genesis 14, with its superabundance of genuine and exact accounts of a primitive age, both historical and geographical, and its old words, which had disappeared from the living language before the time of

Moses, as well as many others — were unquestionably copied by Moses from ancient documents. (See *Hävernicks* Introduction.)

To all this must be added the fact, that the historical contents, not of Genesis only, but of all the five books of Moses, are pervaded and sustained by the spirit of true religion. This spirit has impressed a seal of truth upon the historical writings of the Old Testament, which distinguishes them from all merely human historical compositions, and may be recognised in the fact, that to all who yield themselves up to the influence of the Spirit which lives and moves in them, it points the way to the knowledge of that salvation which God Himself has revealed.

Introduction

CONTENTS, DESIGN, AND PLAN OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS

The first book of Moses, which has the superscription **בראשית** in the original, **Γένεσις Κόσμου** in the *Cod. Alex.* of the LXX, and is called *liber creationis* by the Rabbins, has received the name of Genesis from its entire contents.

Commencing with the creation of the heaven and the earth, and concluding with the death of the patriarchs Jacob and Joseph, this book supplies us with information with regard not only to the first beginnings and earlier stages of the world and of the human race, but also to those of the divine institutions which laid the foundation for the kingdom of God. Genesis commences with the creation of the world, because the heavens and the earth form the appointed sphere, so far as time and space are concerned, for the kingdom of God; because God, according to His eternal counsel, appointed the world to be the scene both for the revelation of His invisible essence, and also for the operations of His eternal love within and among His creatures; and because in the beginning He created the world to be and to become the kingdom of God. The creation of the heaven and the earth, therefore, receives as its centre, paradise; and in paradise, man, created in the image of God, is the head and crown of all created beings. The history of the world and of the kingdom of God begins with him. His fall from God brought death and corruption into the whole creation (Gen. 3:17 ff.; Rom. 8:19 ff.); his redemption from the fall will be completed in and with the glorification of the heavens and the earth (Isa. 65:17; 66:22; 2Pe. 3:13; Rev. 21: 1). By sin, men have departed and separated themselves from God; but God, in His infinite mercy, has not cut himself off from men, His creatures. Not only did He announce redemption along with punishment immediately after the fall, but from that time forward He continued to reveal Himself to them, that He might draw them back to Himself, and lead them from the path of destruction to the way of salvation. And through these operations of God upon the world in theophanies, or

revelations by word and deed, the historical development of the human race became a history of the plan of salvation. The book of Genesis narrates that history in broad, deep, comprehensive sketches, from its first beginning to the time of the patriarchs, whom God chose from among the nations of the earth to be the bearers of salvation for the entire world. This long space of 2300 years (from Adam to the flood, 1656; to the entrance of Abram into Canaan, 365; to Joseph's death, 285; in all, 2306 years) is divisible into two periods. The *first period* embraces the development of the human race from its first creation and fall to its dispersion over the earth, and the division of the one race into many nations, with different languages (Gen. 2: 4-11:26); and is divided by the flood into two distinct ages, which we may call the primeval age and the preparatory age. All that is related of the *primeval age*, from Adam to Noah, is the history of the fall; the mode of life, and longevity of the two families which descended from the two sons of Adam; and the universal spread of sinful corruption in consequence of the intermarriage of these two families, who differed so essentially in their relation to God (Gen. 2: 4-6: 8). The primeval history closes with the flood, in which the old world perished (Gen. 6: 9-8:19). Of the *preparatory age*, from Noah to Terah the father of Abraham, we have an account of the covenant which God made with Noah, and of Noah's blessing and curse; the genealogies of the families and tribes which descended from his three sons; an account of the confusion of tongues, and the dispersion of the people; and the genealogical table from Shem to Terah (Gen. 8:20-11:26).

The *second period* consists of the patriarchal era. From this we have an elaborate description of the lives of the three patriarchs of Israel, the family chosen to be the people of God, from the call of Abraham to the death of Joseph (Gen. 11:27-50). Thus the history of humanity is gathered up into the history of the one family, which received the promise, that God would multiply it into a great people, or rather into a multitude of peoples, would make it a blessing to all the families of the earth, and would give it the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession.

This general survey will suffice to bring out the *design* of the book of Genesis, viz., to relate the early history of the Old Testament kingdom of God. By a simple and unvarnished description of the development of the world under the guidance and discipline of God, it shows how God, as the preserver and governor of the world, dealt with the human race which He had created in His own image, and how, notwithstanding their fall and through the misery which ensued, He prepared the way for the fulfillment of His original design, and the establishment of the kingdom which should bring salvation to the world.

Whilst by virtue of the blessing bestowed in their creation, the human race was increasing from a single pair to families and nations, and peopling the earth; God stemmed the evil, which sin had introduced, by words and deeds, by the

announcement of His will in commandments, promises, and threats, and by the infliction of punishments and judgments upon the despisers of His mercy. Side by side with the law of expansion from the unity of a family to the plurality of nations, there was carried on from the very first a law of separation between the ungodly and those that feared God, for the purpose of preparing and preserving a holy seed for the rescue and salvation of the whole human race. This double law is the organic principle which lies at the root of all the separations, connections, and dispositions which constitute the history of the book of Genesis. In accordance with the law of reproduction, which prevails in the preservation and increase of the human race, the genealogies show the historical bounds within which the persons and events that marked the various epochs are confined; whilst the law of selection determines the arrangement and subdivision of such historical materials as are employed.

So far as the *plan* of the book is concerned, the historical contents are divided into ten groups, with the uniform heading, "*These are the generations*" (with the exception of Gen. 5: 1: "This is the book of the generations"); the account of the creation forming the substratum of the whole. These groups consist of the *Tholedoth*:

1. of the heavens and the earth (Gen. 2: 4-4:26);
2. of Adam (Gen. 5: 1-6: 8);
3. of Noah (Gen. 6: 9-9:29);
4. of Noah's sons (Gen. 10: 1-11: 9);
5. of Shem (Gen. 11:10-26);
6. of Terah (Gen. 11:27-25:11);
7. of Ishmael (Gen. 25:12-18);
8. of Isaac (Gen. 25:19-35:29);
9. of Esau (Genesis 26); and
10. of Jacob (Genesis 37-50).

There are five groups in the first period, and five in the second. Although, therefore, the two periods differ considerably with regard to their scope and contents, in their historical importance to the book of Genesis they are upon a par; and the number *ten* stamps upon the entire book, or rather upon the early history of Israel recorded in the book, the character of completeness. This arrangement flowed quite naturally from the contents and purport of the book. The two periods, of which the early history of the kingdom of God in Israel consists, evidently constitute two great divisions, so far as their internal character is concerned. All that is related of the first period, from Adam to Terah, is obviously connected, no doubt, with the establishment of the kingdom of God in Israel, but only in a remote degree. The account of paradise exhibits the primary relation of man to God and his position in the world. In

the fall, the necessity is shown for the interposition of God to rescue the fallen. In the promise which followed the curse of transgression, the first glimpse of redemption is seen. The division of the descendants of Adam into a God-fearing and an ungodly race exhibits the relation of the whole human race to God. The flood prefigures the judgment of God upon the ungodly; and the preservation and blessing of Noah, the protection of the godly from destruction. And lastly, in the genealogy and division of the different nations on the one hand, and the genealogical table of Shem on the other, the selection of one nation is anticipated to be the recipient and custodian of the divine revelation. The special preparations for the training of this nation commence with the call of Abraham, and consist of the care bestowed upon Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their posterity, and of the promises which they received. The leading events in the first period, and the prominent individuals in the second, also furnished, in a simple and natural way, the requisite points of view for grouping the historical materials of each under a fivefold division. The proof of this will be found in the exposition. Within the different groups themselves the arrangement adopted is this: the materials are arranged and distributed according to the law of divine selection; the families which branched off from the main line are noticed first of all; and when they have been removed from the general scope of the history, the course of the main line is more elaborately described, and the history itself is carried forward. According to this plan, which is strictly adhered to, the history of Cain and his family precedes that of Seth and his posterity; the genealogy of Japhet and Ham stands before that of Shem; the history of Ishmael and Esau, before that of Isaac and Jacob; and the death of Terah, before the call and migration of Abraham to Canaan. In this regularity of composition, according to a settled plan, the book of Genesis may clearly be seen to be the careful production of one single author, who looked at the historical development of the human race in the light of divine revelation, and thus exhibited it as a complete and well arranged introduction to the history of the Old Testament kingdom of God.

EXPOSITION

The Creation of the World

GEN. 1: 1-2: 3

Gen. 1: 1-2: 3. The account of the creation, its commencement, progress, and completion, bears the marks, both in form and substance, of a historical document in which it is intended that we should accept as actual truth, not only the assertion that God created the heavens, and the earth, and all that lives and moves in the world, but also the description of the creation itself in all its several stages. If we look merely at the *form* of this document, its place at the

beginning of the book of Genesis is sufficient to warrant the expectation that it will give us history, and not fiction, or human speculation. As the development of the human family has been from the first a historical fact, and as man really occupies that place in the world which this record assigns him, the creation of man, as well as that of the earth on which, and the heaven for which, he is to live, must also be a work of God, i.e., a fact of objective truth and reality. The grand simplicity of the account is in perfect harmony with the fact. "The whole narrative is sober, definite, clear, and concrete. The historical events described contain a rich treasury of speculative thoughts and poetical glory; but they themselves are free from the influence of human invention and human philosophizing" (*Delitzsch*). This is also true of the arrangement of the whole. The work of creation does not fall, as *Herder* and others maintain, into two triads of days, with the work of the second answering to that of the first. For although the creation of the light on the first day seems to correspond to that of the light-bearing stars on the fourth, there is no reality in the parallelism which some discover between the second and third days on the one hand, and the third and fourth on the other. On the second day the firmament or atmosphere is formed; on the fifth, the fish and fowl. On the third, after the sea and land are separated, the plants are formed; on the sixth, the animals of the dry land and man. Now, if the creation of the fowls which fill the air answers to that of the firmament, the formation of the fish as the inhabitants of the waters ought to be assigned to the sixth day, and not to the fifth, as being parallel to the creation of the seas. The creation of the fish and fowl on the same day is an evident proof that a parallelism between the first three days of creation and the last three is not intended, and does not exist. Moreover, if the division of the work of creation into so many days had been the result of human reflection; the creation of man, who was appointed lord of the earth, would certainly not have been assigned to the same day as that of the beasts and reptiles, but would have been kept distinct from the creation of the beasts, and allotted to the seventh day, in which the creation was completed, — a meaning which *Richers* and *Keerl* have actually tried to force upon the text of the Bible. In the different acts of creation we perceive indeed an evident progress from the general to the particular, from the lower to the higher orders of creatures, or rather a steady advance towards more and more concrete forms. But on the fourth day this progress is interrupted in a way which we cannot explain. In the transition from the creation of the plants to that of sun, moon, and stars, it is impossible to discover either a "well-arranged and constant progress," or "a genetic advance," since the stars are not intermediate links between plants and animals, and, in fact, have no place at all in the scale of earthly creatures.

If we pass on to the *contents* of our account of the creation, they differ as widely from all other cosmogonies as truth from fiction. Those of heathen nations are either hylozoistical, deducing the origin of life and living beings

from some primeval matter; or pantheistical, regarding the whole world as emanating from a common divine substance; or mythological, tracing both gods and men to a chaos or world-egg. They do not even rise to the notion of a creation, much less to the knowledge of an almighty God, as the Creator of all things. ^{f5} Even in the Etruscan and Persian myths, which correspond so remarkably to the biblical account that they must have been derived from it, the successive acts of creation are arranged according to the suggestions of human probability and adaptation. ^{f6}

In contrast with all these mythical inventions, the biblical account shines out in the clear light of truth, and proves itself by its contents to be an integral part of the revealed history, of which it is accepted as the pedestal throughout the whole of the sacred Scriptures. This is not the case with the Old Testament only; but in the New Testament also it is accepted and taught by Christ and the apostles as the basis of the divine revelation. The select only a few from the many passages of the Old and New Testaments, in which God is referred to as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and the almighty operations of the living God in the world are based upon the fact of its creation: In Exo. 20: 9-11; 31:12-17, the command to keep the Sabbath is founded upon the fact that God rested on the seventh day, when the work of creation was complete; and in Psa. 8 and 104, the creation is depicted as a work of divine omnipotence in close adherence to the narrative before us. From the creation of man, as described in Gen. 1:27 and 2:24, Christ demonstrates the indissoluble character of marriage as a divine ordinance (Mat. 19: 4-6); Peter speaks of the earth as standing out of the water and in the water by the word of God (2Pe. 3: 5); and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,

“starting from Gen. 2: 2, describes it as the motive principle of all history, that the Sabbath of God is to become the Sabbath of the creature” (*Delitzsch*).

The biblical account of the creation can also vindicate its claim to be true and actual history, in the presence of the doctrines of philosophy and the established results of natural science. So long, indeed, as philosophy undertakes to construct the universe from general ideas, it will be utterly unable to comprehend the creation; but ideas will never explain the existence of things. Creation is an act of the personal God, not a process of nature, the development of which can be traced to the laws of birth and decay that prevail in the created world. But the work of God, as described in the history of creation, is in perfect harmony with the correct notions of divine omnipotence, wisdom and goodness. The assertion, so frequently made, that the course of the creation takes its form from the Hebrew week, which was already in existence, and the idea of God’s resting on the seventh day, from the institution of the Hebrew Sabbath, is entirely without foundation. There is no allusion in

Gen. 2: 2, 3 to the Sabbath of the Israelites; and the week of seven days is older than the Sabbath of the Jewish covenant. Natural research, again, will never explain the origin of the universe, or even of the earth; for the creation lies beyond the limits of the territory within its reach. By all modest naturalists, therefore, it is assumed that the origin of matter, or of the original material of the world, was due to an act of divine creation. But there is no firm ground for the conclusion which they draw, on the basis of this assumption, with regard to the formation or development of the world from its first chaotic condition into a fit abode for man. All the theories which have been adopted, from *Descartes* to the present day, are not the simple and well-established inductions of natural science founded upon careful observation, but combinations of partial discoveries empirically made, with speculative ideas of very questionable worth. The periods of creation, which modern geology maintains with such confidence, that not a few theologians have accepted them as undoubted and sought to bring them into harmony with the scriptural account of the creation, if not to deduce them from the Bible itself, are inferences partly from the successive strata which compose the crust of the earth, and partly from the various fossil remains of plants and animals to be found in those strata. The former are regarded as proofs of successive formation; and from the difference between the plants and animals found in a fossil state and those in existence now, the conclusion is drawn, that their creation must have preceded the present formation, which either accompanied or was closed by the advent of man. But it is not difficult to see that the former of these conclusions could only be regarded as fully established, if the process by which the different strata were formed were clearly and fully known, or if the different formations were always found lying in the same order, and could be readily distinguished from one another. But with regard to the origin of the different species of rock, geologists, as is well known, are divided into two contending schools: the Neptunists, who attribute all the mountain formations to deposit in water; and the Plutonists, who trace all the non-fossiliferous rocks to the action of heat. According to the Neptunists, the crystalline rocks are the earliest or primary formations; according to the Plutonists, the granite burst through the transition and stratified rocks, and were driven up from within the earth, so that they are of later date. But neither theory is sufficient to account in this mechanical way for all the phenomena connected with the relative position of the rocks; consequently, a third theory, which supposes the rocks to be the result of chemical processes, is steadily gaining ground. Now if the rocks, both crystalline and stratified, were formed, not in any mechanical way, but by chemical processes, in which, besides fire and water, electricity, galvanism, magnetism, and possibly other forces at present unknown to physical science were at work; the different formations may have been produced contemporaneously and laid one upon another. Till natural science has

advanced beyond mere opinion and conjecture, with regard to the mode in which the rocks were formed and their positions determined; there can be no ground for assuming that conclusions drawn from the successive order of the various strata, with regard to the periods of their formation, must of necessity be true. This is the more apparent, when we consider, on the one hand, that even the principal formations (the primary, transitional, stratified, and tertiary), not to mention the subdivisions of which each of these is composed, do not always occur in the order laid down in the system, but in not a few instances the order is reversed, crystalline primary rocks lying upon transitional, stratified, and tertiary formations (granite, syenite, gneiss, etc., above both Jura-limestone and chalk); and, on the other hand, that not only do the different leading formations and their various subdivisions frequently shade off into one another so imperceptibly, that no boundary line can be drawn between them and the species distinguished by *oryctognosis* are not sharply and clearly defined in nature, but that, instead of surrounding the entire globe, they are all met with in certain localities only, whilst whole series of intermediate links are frequently missing, the tertiary formations especially being universally admitted to be only partial.

The second of these conclusions also stands or falls with the assumptions on which they are founded, viz., with the three propositions:

- (1) that each of the fossiliferous formations contains an order of plants and animals peculiar to itself;
- (2) that these are so totally different from the existing plants and animals, that the latter could not have sprung from them;
- (3) that no fossil remains of man exist of the same antiquity as the fossil remains of animals.

Not one of these can be regarded as an established truth, or as the unanimously accepted result of geognosis. The assertion so often made as an established fact, that the transition rocks contain none but fossils of the lower orders of plants and animals, that mammalia are first met with in the Trias, Jura, and chalk formations, and warm-blooded animals in the tertiary rocks, has not been confirmed by continued geognostic researches, but is more and more regarded as untenable. Even the frequently expressed opinion, that in the different forms of plants and animals of the successive rocks there is a gradual and to a certain extent progressive development of the animal and vegetable world, has not commanded universal acceptance. Numerous instances are known, in which the remains of one and the same species occur not only in two, but in several successive formations, and there are some types that occur in nearly all. And the widely spread notion, that the fossil types are altogether different from the existing families of plants and animals, is one of the unscientific exaggerations

of actual facts. All the fossil plants and animals can be arranged in the orders and classes of the existing flora and fauna. Even with regard to the genera there is no essential difference, although many of the existing types are far inferior in size to the forms of the old world. It is only the species that can be shown to differ, either entirely or in the vast majority of cases, from species in existence now. But even if all the species differed, which can by no means be proved, this would be no valid evidence that the existing plants and animals had not sprung from those that have passed away, so long as natural science is unable to obtain any clear insight into the origin and formation of species, and the question as to the extinction of a species or its transition into another has met with no satisfactory solution. Lastly, even now the occurrence of fossil human bones among those of animals that perished at least before the historic age, can no longer be disputed, although Central Asia, the cradle of the human race, has not yet been thoroughly explored by palaeontologists.

If then the premises from which the geological periods have been deduced are of such a nature that not one of them is firmly established, the different theories as to the formation of the earth also rest upon two questionable assumptions, viz.,

(1) that the immediate working of God in the creation was restricted to the production of the chaotic matter, and that the formation of this primary matter into a world peopled by innumerable organisms and living beings proceeded according to the laws of nature, which have been discovered by science as in force in the existing world; and

(2) that all the changes, which the world and its inhabitants have undergone since the creation was finished, may be measured by the standard of changes observed in modern times, and still occurring from time to time. But the Bible actually mentions two events of the primeval age, whose effect upon the form of the earth and the animal and vegetable world no natural science can explain. We refer to the curse pronounced upon the earth in consequence of the fall of the progenitors of our race, by which even the animal world was made subject to **φθορά** (Gen. 3:17, and Rom. 8:20); and the flood, by which the earth was submerged even to the tops of the highest mountains, and all the living beings on the dry land perished, with the exception of those preserved by Noah in the ark. Hence, even if geological doctrines do contradict the account of the creation contained in Genesis, they cannot shake the credibility of the Scriptures.

But if the biblical account of the creation has full claim to be regarded as historical truth, the question arises, whence it was obtained. The opinion that the Israelites drew it from the cosmogony of this or the other ancient people, and altered it according to their own religious ideas, will need no further

refutation, after what we have said respecting the cosmogonies of other nations. Whence then did Israel obtain a pure knowledge of God, such as we cannot find in any heathen nation, or in the most celebrated of the wise men of antiquity, if not from divine revelation? This is the source from which the biblical account of the creation springs. God revealed it to men, — not first to Moses or Abraham, but undoubtedly to the first men, since without this revelation they could not have understood either their relation to God or their true position in the world. The account contained in Genesis does not lie, as *Hofmann* says, “within that sphere which was open to man through his historical nature, so that it may be regarded as the utterance of the knowledge possessed by the first man of things which preceded his own existence, and which he might possess, without needing any special revelation, if only the present condition of the world lay clear and transparent before him.” By simple intuition the first man might discern what nature had effected, viz., the existing condition of the world, and possibly also its causality, but not the fact that it was created in six days, or the successive acts of creation, and the sanctification of the seventh day. Our record contains not merely religious truth transformed into history, but the true and actual history of a work of God, which preceded the existence of man, and to which he owes his existence. Of this work he could only have obtained his knowledge through divine revelation, by the direct instruction of God. Nor could he have obtained it by means of a vision. The seven days’ works are not so many “propheticohistorical tableaux,” which were spread before the mental eye of the seer, whether of the historian or the first man. The account before us does not contain the slightest marks of a vision, is no picture of creation, in which every line betrays the pencil of a painter rather than the pen of a historian, but is obviously a historical narrative, which we could no more transform into a vision than the account of paradise or of the fall. As God revealed Himself to the first man not in visions, but by coming to him in a visible form, teaching him His will, and then after his fall announcing the punishment (Gen. 2:16, 17; 3: 9 ff.); as He talked with Moses “face to face, as a man with his friend,” “mouth to mouth,” not in vision or dream: so does the written account of the Old Testament revelation commence, not with visions, but with actual history. The manner in which God instructed the first men with reference to the creation must be judged according to the intercourse carried on by Him, as Creator and Father, with these His creatures and children. What God revealed to them upon this subject, they transmitted to their children and descendants, together with everything of significance and worth that they had experienced and discovered for themselves. This tradition was kept in faithful remembrance by the family of the godly; and even in the confusion of tongues it was not changed in its substance, but simply transferred into the new form of the language spoken by the Semitic tribes, and thus handed down from generation

to generation along with the knowledge and worship of the true God, until it became through Abraham the spiritual inheritance of the chosen race. Nothing certain can be decided as to the period when it was committed to writing; probably some time before Moses, who inserted it as a written record in the Torah of Israel.

Gen. 1: 1. “*In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.*” — Heaven and earth have not existed from all eternity, but had a beginning; nor did they arise by emanation from an absolute substance, but were created by God. This sentence, which stands at the head of the records of revelation, is not a mere heading, nor a summary of the history of the creation, but a declaration of the primeval act of God, by which the universe was called into being. That this verse is not a heading merely, is evident from the fact that the following account of the course of the creation commences with ו (and), which connects the different acts of creation with the fact expressed in v. 1, as the primary foundation upon which they rest. בְּרֵאשִׁית (in the beginning) is used absolutely, like ἐν ἀρχῇ in Joh. 1: 1, and מְרֵאשִׁית in Isa. 46:10. The following clause cannot be treated as subordinate, either by rendering it, “in the beginning when God created..., the earth was,” etc., or “in the beginning when God created...(but the earth was then a chaos, etc.), God said, Let there be light” (*Ewald and Bunsen*). The first is opposed to the grammar of the language, which would require v. 2 to commence with וַיְהִי הָאָרֶץ; the second to the simplicity of style which pervades the whole chapter, and to which so involved a sentence would be intolerable, apart altogether from the fact that this construction is invented for the simple purpose of getting rid of the doctrine of a *creatio ex nihilo*, which is so repulsive to modern Pantheism. רֵאשִׁית in itself is a relative notion, indicating the commencement of a series of things or events; but here the context gives it the meaning of the very first beginning, the commencement of the world, when time itself began. The statement, that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, not only precludes the idea of the eternity of the world *a parte ante*, but shows that the creation of the heaven and the earth was the actual beginning of all things. The verb בָּרָא, indeed, to judge from its use in Jos. 17:15, 18, where it occurs in the *Piel* (to hew out), means literally “to cut, or new,” but in *Kal* it always means *to create*, and is only applied to a divine creation, the production of that which had no existence before. It is never joined with an accusative of the material, although it does not exclude a pre-existent material unconditionally, but is used for the creation of man (v. 27, Gen. 5: 1, 2), and of everything new that God creates, whether in the kingdom of nature (Num. 16:30) or of that of grace (Exo. 34:10; Psa. 51:10, etc.). In this verse, however, the existence of any primeval material is precluded by the object created: “the heaven and the

earth.” This expression is frequently employed to denote the world, or universe, for which there was no single word in the Hebrew language; the universe consisting of a twofold whole, and the distinction between heaven and earth being essentially connected with the notion of the world, the fundamental condition of its historical development (vid., Gen. 14:19, 22; Exo. 31:17). In the earthly creation this division is repeated in the distinction between spirit and nature; and in man, as the microcosm, in that between spirit and body. Through sin this distinction was changed into an actual opposition between heaven and earth, flesh and spirit; but with the complete removal of sin, this opposition will cease again, though the distinction between heaven and earth, spirit and body, will remain, in such a way, however, that the earthly and corporeal will be completely pervaded by the heavenly and spiritual, the new Jerusalem coming down from heaven to earth, and the earthly body being transfigured into a spiritual body (Rev. 21: 1, 2; 1Co. 15:35 ff.). Hence, if in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, “there is nothing belonging to the composition of the universe, either in material or form, which had an existence out of God prior to this divine act in the beginning” (*Delitzsch*). This is also shown in the connection between our verse and the one which follows: “*and the earth was without form and void,*” not before, but when, or after God created it. From this it is evident that the void and formless state of the earth was not uncreated, or without beginning. At the same time it is obvious from the creative acts which follow (vv. 3-18), that the heaven and earth, as God created them in the beginning, were not the well-ordered universe, but the world in its elementary form; just as *Euripides* applies the expression οὐρανὸς καὶ γαῖα to the undivided mass (μορφή μία), which was afterwards formed into heaven and earth.

Gen. 1: 2-5. The First Day. —

Though treating of the creation of the heaven and the earth, the writer, both here and in what follows, describes with minuteness the original condition and progressive formation of the earth alone, and says nothing more respecting the heaven than is actually requisite in order to show its connection with the earth. He is writing for inhabitants of the earth, and for religious ends; not to gratify curiosity, but to strengthen faith in God, the Creator of the universe. What is said in v. 2 of the chaotic condition of the earth, is equally applicable to the heaven, “for the heaven proceeds from the same chaos as the earth.”

“*And the earth was (not became) waste and void.*” The alliterative nouns *tohu vabohu*, the etymology of which is lost, signify waste and empty (barren), but not laying waste and desolating. Whenever they are used together in other places (Isa. 34:11; Jer. 4:23), they are taken from this passage; but *tohu* alone is frequently employed as synonymous with חָלָה, non-existence, and הָבֵל,

nothingness (Isa. 40:17, 23; 49: 4). The coming earth was at first waste and desolate, a formless, lifeless mass, *rudis indigestaque moles*, ὕλη ἄμορφος (Wisdom 11:17) or χάος.

“*And darkness was upon the face of the deep.*” רָחַח, from רוּחַ, to roar, to rage, denotes the raging waters, the roaring waves (Psa. 42: 7) or flood (Exo. 15: 5; Deu. 8: 7); and hence the depths of the sea (Job. 28:14; 38:16), and even the abyss of the earth (Psa. 71:20). As an old traditional word, it is construed like a proper name without an article (*Ewald, Gramm.*). The chaotic mass in which the earth and the firmament were still undistinguished, unformed, and as it were unborn, was a heaving deep, an abyss of waters (ἄβυσσος, LXX), and this deep was wrapped in darkness. But it was in process of formation, for the Spirit of God moved upon the waters, רַחַו (breath) denotes wind and spirit, like πνεῦμα from πνέω. *Ruach Elohim* is not a breath of wind caused by God (*Theodoret, etc.*), for the verb does not suit this meaning, but the creative Spirit of God, the principle of all life (Psa. 33: 6; 104:30), which worked upon the formless, lifeless mass, separating, quickening, and preparing the living forms, which were called into being by the creative words that followed. רָחַח in the *Piel* is applied to the hovering and brooding of a bird over its young, to warm them, and develop their vital powers (Deu. 32:11). In such a way as this the Spirit of God moved upon the deep, which had received at its creation the germs of all life, to fill them with vital energy by His breath of life. The three statements in our verse are parallel; the substantive and participial construction of the second and third clauses rests upon the רוּחַ of the first. All three describe the condition of the earth immediately after the creation of the universe. This suffices to prove that the theosophic speculation of those who “make a gap between the first two verses, and fill it with a wild horde of evil spirits and their demoniacal works, is an arbitrary interpolation” (*Ziegler*).

Gen. 1: 3. The word of God then went forth to the primary material of the world, now filled with creative powers of vitality, to call into being, out of the germs of organization and life which it contained, and in the order pre-ordained by His wisdom, those creatures of the world, which proclaim, as they live and move, the glory of their Creator (Psalm 8). The work of creation commences with the words, “*and God said.*” The words which God speaks are existing things. “He speaks, and it is done; He commands, and it stands fast.” These words are deeds of the essential Word, the λόγος, by which “all things were made.” Speaking is the revelation of thought; the creation, the realization of the thoughts of God, a freely accomplished act of the absolute Spirit, and not an emanation of creatures from the divine essence. The first thing created by the divine Word was “*light,*” the elementary light, or light-material, in

distinction from the “*lights*,” or light-bearers, bodies of light, as the sun, moon, and stars, created on the fourth day, are called. It is now a generally accepted truth of natural science, that the light does not spring from the sun and stars, but that the sun itself is a dark body, and the light proceeds from an atmosphere which surrounds it. Light was the first thing called forth, and separated from the dark chaos by the creative mandate, “*Let there be*,” — the first radiation of the life breathed into it by the Spirit of God, inasmuch as it is the fundamental condition of all organic life in the world, and without light and the warmth which flows from it no plant or animal could thrive.

Gen. 1: 4. The expression in v. 4, “*God saw the light that it was good*,” for “*God saw that the light was good*,” according to a frequently recurring *antiptosis* (cf. Gen. 6: 2; 12:14; 13:10), is not an anthropomorphism at variance with enlightened thoughts of God; for man’s seeing has its type in God’s, and God’s seeing is not a mere expression of the delight of the eye or of pleasure in His work, but is of the deepest significance to every created thing, being the seal of the perfection which God has impressed upon it, and by which its continuance before God and through God is determined. The creation of light, however, was no annihilation of darkness, no transformation of the dark material of the world into pure light, but a separation of the light from the primary matter, a separation which established and determined that interchange of light and darkness, which produces the distinction between day and night.

Gen. 1: 5. Hence it is said in v. 5, “*God called the light Day, and the darkness Night*,” for, as *Augustine* observes, “*all light is not day, nor all darkness night; but light and darkness alternating in a regular order constitute day and night.*” None but superficial thinkers can take offence at the idea of created things receiving names from God. The name of a thing is the expression of its nature. If the name be given by man, it fixes in a word the impression which it makes upon the human mind; but when given by God, it expresses the reality, what the thing is in God’s creation, and the place assigned it there by the side of other things.

“*Thus evening was and morning was one day.*” ⲓⲛⲥ (*one*), like εἷς and *unus*, is used at the commencement of a numerical series for the ordinal *primus* (cf. Gen. 2:11; 4:19; 8: 5, 15). Like the numbers of the days which follow, it is without the article, to show that the different days arose from the constant recurrence of evening and morning. It is not till the sixth and last day that the article is employed (v. 31), to indicate the termination of the work of creation upon that day. It is to be observed, that the days of creation are bounded by the coming of evening and morning. The first day did not consist of the primeval darkness and the origination of light, but was formed after the creation of the

light by the first interchange of evening and morning. The first evening was not the gloom, which possibly preceded the full burst of light as it came forth from the primary darkness, and intervened between the darkness and full, broad daylight. It was not till after the light had been created, and the separation of the light from the darkness had taken place, that evening came, and after the evening the morning; and this coming of evening (lit., the obscure) and morning (the breaking) formed one, or the first day. It follows from this, that the days of creation are not reckoned from evening to evening, but from morning to morning. The first day does not fully terminate till the light returns after the darkness of night; it is not till the break of the new morning that the first interchange of light and darkness is completed, and a **ἡμερονύκτιον** has passed. The rendering, “out of evening and morning there came one day,” is at variance with grammar, as well as with the actual fact. With grammar, because such a thought would require **לַיּוֹם אֶחָד**; and with fact, because the time from evening to morning does not constitute a day, but the close of a day. The first day commenced at the moment when God caused the light to break forth from the darkness; but this light did not become a day, until the evening had come, and the darkness which set in with the evening had given place the next morning to the break of day. Again, neither the words **וַיְהִי בֹקֶר וַיְהִי עֶרֶב**, nor the expression **עֶרֶב בֹּקֶר**, evening-morning (= day), in Dan. 8:14, corresponds to the Greek **νυχθημέρον**, for morning is not equivalent to day, nor evening to night. The reckoning of days from evening to evening in the Mosaic law (Lev. 23:32), and by many ancient tribes (the pre-Mohammedan Arabs, the Athenians, Gauls, and Germans), arose not from the days of creation, but from the custom of regulating seasons by the changes of the moon. But if the days of creation are regulated by the recurring interchange of light and darkness, they must be regarded not as periods of time of incalculable duration, of years or thousands of years, but as simple earthly days. It is true the morning and evening of the first three days were not produced by the rising and setting of the sun, since the sun was not yet created; but the constantly recurring interchange of light and darkness, which produced day and night upon the earth, cannot for a moment be understood as denoting that the light called forth from the darkness of chaos returned to that darkness again, and thus periodically burst forth and disappeared. The only way in which we can represent it to ourselves, is by supposing that the light called forth by the creative mandate, “Let there be,” was separated from the dark mass of the earth, and concentrated outside or above the globe, so that the interchange of light and darkness took place as soon as the dark chaotic mass began to rotate, and to assume in the process of creation the form of a spherical body. The time occupied in the first rotations of the earth upon its axis cannot, indeed, be measured by our hour-glass; but even if they were slower at first, and did not attain their present velocity till the completion of our solar system,

this would make no essential difference between the first three days and the last three, which were regulated by the rising and setting of the sun. ¹⁷

Gen. 1: 6-8. The Second Day. —

When the light had been separated from the darkness, and day and night had been created, there followed upon a second fiat of the Creator, the division of the chaotic mass of waters through the formation of the firmament, which was placed as a wall of separation (מַבְדִּיל) in the midst of the waters, and divided them into upper and lower waters. רָקִיעַ, from רָקַע to stretch, spread out, then beat or tread out, means *expansum*, the spreading out of the air, which surrounds the earth as an atmosphere. According to optical appearance, it is described as a carpet spread out above the earth (Psa. 54: 2), a curtain (Isa. 40:22), a transparent work of sapphire (Exo. 24:10), or a molten looking-glass (Job. 37:18); but there is nothing in these poetical similes to warrant the idea that the heavens were regarded as a solid mass, a σιδήρεον, or χάλκεον or πολύχαλκον, such as Greek poets describe. The רָקִיעַ (rendered *Veste* by *Luther*, after the στερέωμα of the LXX and *firmamentum* of the Vulgate) is called *heaven* in v. 8, i.e., the vault of heaven, which stretches out above the earth. The waters *under* the firmament are the waters upon the globe itself; those *above* are not ethereal waters ¹⁸ beyond the limits of the terrestrial atmosphere, but the waters which float in the atmosphere, and are separated by it from those upon the earth, the waters which accumulate in clouds, and then bursting these their bottles, pour down as rain upon the earth. For, according to the Old Testament representation, whenever it rains heavily, the doors or windows of heaven are opened (Gen. 7:11, 12; Psa. 78:23, cf. 2Ki. 7: 2, 19; Isa. 24:18). It is in (or with) the upper waters that God layeth the beams of His chambers, from which He watereth the hills (Psa. 54: 3, 13), and the clouds are His tabernacle (Job. 36:29). If, therefore, according to this conception, looking from an earthly point of view, the mass of water which flows upon the earth in showers of rain is shut up in heaven (cf. 8: 2), it is evident that it must be regarded as above the vault which spans the earth, or, according to the words of Psa. 148: 4, “above the heavens.” ¹⁹

Gen. 1: 9-13. The Third Day. —

The work of this day was twofold, yet closely connected. At first the waters beneath the heavens, i.e., those upon the surface of the earth, were gathered together, so that the dry (הַיַּבֶּשֶׁת, the solid ground) appeared. In what way the gathering of the earthly waters in the sea and the appearance of the dry land were effected, whether by the sinking or deepening of places in the body of the globe, into which the water was drawn off, or by the elevation of the solid ground, the record does not inform us, since it never describes the process by

which effects are produced. It is probable, however, that the separation was caused both by depression and elevation. With the dry land the mountains naturally arose as the headlands of the mainland. But of this we have no physical explanations, either in the account before us, or in the poetical description of the creation in Psalm 54. Even if we render Psa. 54: 8, “the mountains arise, and they (the waters) descend into the valleys, to the place which Thou (Jehovah) hast founded for them,” we have no proof, in this poetical account, of the elevation-theory of geology, since the psalmist is not speaking as a naturalist, but as a sacred poet describing the creation on the basis of Genesis ch. 1. “*The dry*” God called *Earth*, and “*the gathering of the waters*,” i.e., the place into which the waters were collected, He called *Sea*. יַם, an intensive rather than a numerical plural, is the great ocean, which surrounds the mainland on all sides, so that the earth appears to be founded upon seas (Psa. 24: 2). Earth and sea are the two constituents of the globe, by the separation of which its formation was completed. The “seas” include the rivers which flow into the ocean, and the lakes which are as it were “detached fragments” of the ocean, though they are not specially mentioned here. By the divine act of naming the two constituents of the globe, and the divine approval which follows, this work is stamped with permanency; and the second act of the third day, the clothing of the earth with vegetation, is immediately connected with it. At the command of God “*the earth brought forth green* (דֶּשֶׁא), *seed yielding herb* (עֵשֶׂב), and *fruit-bearing fruit-trees* (עֵץ פֵּרִי).” These three classes embrace all the productions of the vegetable kingdom. דֶּשֶׁא, lit., the young, tender green, which shoots up after rain and covers the meadows and downs (2Sa. 23: 4; Job. 38:27; Joe. 2:22; Psa. 23: 2), is a generic name for all grasses and cryptogamous plants. עֵשֶׂב, with the epithet זֶרַע מְזַרֵּעַ, yielding or forming seed, is used as a generic term for all herbaceous plants, corn, vegetables, and other plants by which seed-pods are formed. פֵּרִי עֵץ: not only fruit-trees, but all trees and shrubs, bearing fruit in which there is a seed according to its kind, i.e., fruit with kernels. עַל הָאָרֶץ (upon the earth) is not to be joined to “fruit-tree,” as though indicating the superior size of the trees which bear seed above the earth, in distinction from vegetables which propagate their species upon or in the ground; for even the latter bear their seed above the earth. It is appended to דֶּשֶׁא, as a more minute explanation: the earth is to bring forth grass, herb, and trees, upon or above the ground, as an ornament or covering for it. לְמִינֵהוּ (after its kind), from מִין *species*, which is not only repeated in v. 12 in its old form לְמִינֵהוּ in the case of the fruit-tree, but is also appended to the herb. It indicates that the herbs and trees sprang out of the earth according to their kinds, and received, together with power to bear seed and fruit, the capacity to propagate and multiply their own kind. In the

case of the grass there is no reference either to different kinds, or to the production of seed, inasmuch as in the young green grass neither the one nor the other is apparent to the eye. Moreover, we must not picture the work of creation as consisting of the production of the first tender germs which were gradually developed into herbs, shrubs, and trees; on the contrary, we must regard it as one element in the miracle of creation itself, that at the word of God not only tender grasses, but herbs, shrubs, and trees, sprang out of the earth, each ripe for the formation of blossom and the bearing of seed and fruit, without the necessity of waiting for years before the vegetation created was ready to blossom and bear fruit. Even if the earth was employed as a medium in the creation of the plants, since it was God who caused it to bring them forth, they were not the product of the powers of nature, *generatio aequivoca* in the ordinary sense of the word, but a work of divine omnipotence, by which the trees came into existence before their seed, and their fruit was produced in full development, without expanding gradually under the influence of sunshine and rain.

Gen. 1:14-19. The Fourth Day. —

After the earth had been clothed with vegetation, and fitted to be the abode of living beings, there were created on the fourth day the sun, moon, and stars, heavenly bodies in which the elementary light was concentrated, in order that its influence upon the earthly globe might be sufficiently modified and regulated for living beings to exist and thrive beneath its rays, in the water, in the air, and upon the dry land. At the creative word of God the bodies of light came into existence in the firmament, as lamps. On **לָהֹטֹט**, the singular of the predicate before the plural of the subject, in v. 14; 5:23; 9:29, etc., vid., *Gesenius*, Heb. Gr. § 147. **מְאֹרוֹת**, bodies of light, light-bearers, then *lamps*. These bodies of light received a threefold appointment:

(1) They were “*to divide between the day and the night*,” of, according to v. 18, between the light and the darkness, in other words, to regulate from that time forward the difference, which had existed ever since the creation of light, between the night and the day.

(2) *They were to be* (or serve: **יְהִי** after an imperative has the force of a command), — (a) *for signs* (sc., for the earth), partly as portents of extraordinary events (Mat. 2: 2; Luk. 21:25) and divine judgments (Joe. 2:30; Jer. 10: 2; Mat. 24:29), partly as showing the different quarters of the heavens, and as prognosticating the changes in the weather; — (b) *for seasons*, or for fixed, definite times (**מְוֵעָדִים**, from **יָעַד** to fix, establish), — not for festal seasons merely, but “to regulate definite points and periods of time, by virtue of their periodical influence upon agriculture, navigation, and other human

occupations, as well as upon the course of human, animal, and vegetable life (e.g., the breeding time of animals, and the migrations of birds, Jer. 8: 7, etc.); — (c) *for days and years*, i.e., for the division and calculation of days and years. The grammatical construction will not allow the clause to be rendered as a *Hendiadys*, viz., “as signs for definite times and for days and years,” or as signs both for the times and also for days and years.

(3) They were to serve as lamps upon the earth, i.e., to pour out their light, which is indispensable to the growth and health of every creature. That this, the primary object of the lights, should be mentioned last, is correctly explained by *Delitzsch*:

“From the astrological and chronological utility of the heavenly bodies, the record ascends to their universal utility which arises from the necessity of light for the growth and continuance of everything earthly.”

This applies especially to the two great lights which were created by God and placed in the firmament; the greater to rule the day, the lesser to rule the night. “*The great*” and “*the small*” in correlative clauses are to be understood as used comparatively (cf. *Gesenius*, § 119, 1). That the sun and moon were intended, was too obvious to need to be specially mentioned. It might appear strange, however, that these lights should not receive names from God, like the works of the first three days. This cannot be attributed to forgetfulness on the part of the author, as *Tuch* supposes. As a rule, the names were given by God only to the greater sections into which the universe was divided, and not to individual bodies (either plants or animals). The man and the woman are the only exceptions (Gen. 5: 2). The sun and moon are called great, not in comparison with the earth, but in contrast with the stars, according to the amount of light which shines from them upon the earth and determines their rule over the day and night; not so much with reference to the fact, that the stronger light of the sun produces the daylight, and the weaker light of the moon illumines the night, as to the influence which their light exerts by day and night upon all nature, both organic and inorganic — an influence generally admitted, but by no means fully understood. In this respect the sun and moon are the two great lights, the stars small bodies of light; the former exerting great, the latter but little, influence upon the earth and its inhabitants.

This truth, which arises from the relative magnitude of the heavenly bodies, or rather their apparent size as seen from the earth, is not affected by the fact that from the standpoint of natural science many of the stars far surpass both sun and moon in magnitude. Nor does the fact, that in our account, which was written for inhabitants of the earth and for religious purposes, it is only the utility of the sun, moon, and stars to the inhabitants of the earth that is

mentioned, preclude the possibility of each by itself, and all combined, fulfilling other purposes in the universe of God. And not only is our record silent, but God Himself made no direct revelation to man on this subject; because astronomy and physical science, generally, neither lead to godliness, nor promise peace and salvation to the soul. Belief in the truth of this account as a divine revelation could only be shaken, if the facts which science has discovered as indisputably true, with regard to the number, size, and movements of the heavenly bodies, were irreconcilable with the biblical account of the creation. But neither the innumerable host nor the immeasurable size of many of the heavenly bodies, nor the almost infinite distance of the fixed stars from our earth and the solar system, warrants any such assumption. Who can set bounds to the divine omnipotence, and determine what and how much it can create in a moment? The objection, that the creation of the innumerable and immeasurably great and distant heavenly bodies in one day, is so disproportioned to the creation of this one little globe in six days, as to be irreconcilable with our notions of divine omnipotence and wisdom, does not affect the Bible, but shows that the account of the creation has been misunderstood. We are not taught here that on *one* day, viz., the fourth, God created all the heavenly bodies out of nothing, and in a perfect condition; on the contrary, we are told that in the beginning God created the *heaven* and the earth, and on the fourth day that He made the sun, the moon, and the stars (planets, comets, and fixed stars) in the firmament, to be lights for the earth. According to these distinct words, the primary material, not only of the earth, but also of the heaven and the heavenly bodies, was created in the beginning. If, therefore, the heavenly bodies were first made or created on the fourth day, as lights for the earth, in the firmament of heaven; the words can have no other meaning than that their creation was completed on the fourth day, just as the creative formation of our globe was finished on the third; that the creation of the heavenly bodies therefore proceeded side by side, and probably by similar stages, with that of the earth, so that the heaven with its stars was completed on the fourth day. Is this representation of the work of creation, which follows in the simplest way from the word of God, at variance with correct ideas of the omnipotence and wisdom of God? Could not the Almighty create the innumerable host of heaven at the same time as the earthly globe? Or would Omnipotence require more time for the creation of the moon, the planets, and the sun, or of Orion, Sirius, the Pleiades, and other heavenly bodies whose magnitude has not yet been ascertained, than for the creation of the earth itself? Let us beware of measuring the works of Divine Omnipotence by the standard of human power. The fact, that in our account the gradual formation of the heavenly bodies is not described with the same minuteness as that of the earth; but that, after the general statement in v. 1 as to the creation of the heavens, all that is mentioned is their completion on the fourth day, when for

the first time they assumed, or were placed in, such a position with regard to the earth as to influence its development; may be explained on the simple ground that it was the intention of the sacred historian to describe the work of creation from the standpoint of the globe: in other words, as it would have appeared to an observer from the earth, if there had been one in existence at the time. For only from such a standpoint could this work of God be made intelligible to all men, uneducated as well as learned, and the account of it be made subservient to the religious wants of all. ^{f10}

Gen. 1:20-23. The Fifth Day. —

“*God said: Let the waters swarm with swarms, with living beings, and let birds fly above the earth in the face* (the front, i.e., the side turned towards the earth) *of the firmament.*” וְיִשְׂרְצוּ and יְעוֹפְפֵן are imperative. Earlier translators, on the contrary, have rendered the latter as a relative clause, after the πετεινὰ πετόμενα of the LXX, “and with birds that fly;” thus making the birds to spring out of the water, in opposition to Gen. 2:19. Even with regard to the element out of which the water animals were created the text is silent; for the assertion that רָץ is to be understood “with a causative colouring” is erroneous, and is not sustained by Exo. 8: 3 or Psa. 105:30. The construction with the accusative is common to all verbs of multitude. שָׂרְצוּ and שָׂרְצוּ, to creep and swarm, is applied, “without regard to size, to those animals which congregate together in great numbers, and move about among one another.” נַפְשׁ חַיָּה, *anima viva*, living soul, animated beings (vid., Gen. 2: 7), is in apposition to שָׂרְצוּ, “swarms consisting of living beings.” The expression applies not only to fishes, but to all water animals from the greatest to the least, including reptiles, etc. In carrying out His word, God created (v. 21) *the great* “*tanninim*,” — lit., the long-stretched, from תָּנַן, to stretch, — whales, crocodiles, and other sea-monsters; and “*all moving living beings with which the waters swarm after their kind, and all (every) winged fowl after its kind.*” That the water animals and birds of every kind were created on the same day, and before the land animals, cannot be explained on the ground assigned by early writers, that there is a similarity between the air and the water, and a consequent correspondence between the two classes of animals. For in the light of natural history the birds are at all events quite as near to the mammalia as to the fishes; and the supposed resemblance between the fins of fishes and the wings of birds, is counterbalanced by the no less striking resemblance between birds and land animals, viz., that both have feet. The real reason is rather this, that the creation proceeds throughout from the lower to the higher; and in this ascending scale the fishes occupy to a great extent a lower place in the animal economy than birds, and both water animals and birds a lower place than land animals, more especially the mammalia. Again, it is not stated that only a

single pair was created of each kind; on the contrary, the words, “let the waters swarm with living beings,” seem rather to indicate that the animals were created, not only in a rich variety of genera and species, but in large numbers of individuals. The fact that but one human being was created at first, by no means warrants the conclusion that the animals were created singly also; for the unity of the human race has a very different signification from that of the so-called animal species. — (v. 22). As animated beings, the water animals and fowls are endowed, through the divine blessing, with the power *to be fruitful and multiply*. The word of blessing was the actual communication of the capacity to propagate and increase in numbers.

Gen. 1:24-31. The Sixth Day. —

Sea and air are filled with living creatures; and the word of God now goes forth to the earth, to produce living beings after their kind. These are divided into three classes. **בְּהֵמָה**, *cattle*, from **בָּהֵם**, *mutum, brutum esse*, generally denotes the larger domesticated quadrupeds (e.g., Gen. 47:18; Exo. 13:12, etc.), but occasionally the larger land animals as a whole. **רֶמֶשׂ** (*the creeping*) embraces the smaller land animals, which move either without feet, or with feet that are scarcely perceptible, viz., reptiles, insects, and worms. In v. 25 they are distinguished from the race of water reptiles by the term **חַיָּה אֲרֶזְרָא**: **חַיָּה אֲרֶזְרָא** (the old form of the construct state, for **חַיַּת אֲרֶזְרָא**), *the beast of the earth*, i.e., the freely roving wild animals.

“*After its kind:*” this refers to all three classes of living creatures, each of which had its peculiar species; consequently in v. 25, where the word of God is fulfilled, it is repeated with every class. This act of creation, too, like all that precede it, is shown by the divine word “good” to be in accordance with the will of God. But the blessing pronounced is omitted, the author hastening to the account of the creation of man, in which the work of creation culminated. The creation of man does not take place through a word addressed by God to the earth, but as the result of the divine decree, “*We will make man in Our image, after our likeness,*” which proclaims at the very outset the distinction and pre-eminence of man above all the other creatures of the earth. The plural “*We*” was regarded by the fathers and earlier theologians almost unanimously as indicative of the Trinity: modern commentators, on the contrary, regard it either as *pluralis majestatis*; or as an address by God to Himself, the subject and object being identical; or as *communicative*, an address to the spirits or angels who stand around the Deity and constitute His council. The last is *Philo’s* explanation: **διαλέγεται ὁ τῶν ὄλων πατήρ ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεσιν δυνάμεις** = angels). But although such passages as 1Ki. 22:19 ff., Psa. 89: 8, and Daniel 10, show that God, as King and Judge of the world, is surrounded by heavenly hosts, who stand around His throne and execute His commands,

the last interpretation founders upon this rock: either it assumes without sufficient scriptural authority, and in fact in opposition to such distinct passages as Gen. 2: 7, 22, Isa. 40:13 seq., 44:24, that the spirits took part in the creation of man; or it reduces the plural to an empty phrase, inasmuch as God is made to summon the angels to cooperate in the creation of man, and then, instead of employing them, is represented as carrying out the work alone. Moreover, this view is irreconcilable with the words “in our image, after our likeness;” since man was created in the image of God alone (v. 27, Gen. 5: 1), and not in the image of either the angels, or God and the angels. A likeness to the angels cannot be inferred from Heb. 2: 7, or from Luk. 20:36. Just as little ground is there for regarding the plural here and in other passages (Gen. 3:22; 11: 7; Isa. 6: 8; 41:22) as reflective, an appeal to self; since the singular is employed in such cases as these, even where God Himself is preparing for any particular work (cf. Gen. 2:18; Psa. 12: 5; Isa. 33:10). No other explanation is left, therefore, than to regard it as *pluralis majestatis*, — an interpretation which comprehends in its deepest and most intensive form (God speaking of Himself and with Himself in the plural number, not *reverentiae causa*, but with reference to the fullness of the divine powers and essences which He possesses) the truth that lies at the foundation of the trinitarian view, viz., that the potencies concentrated in the absolute Divine Being are something more than powers and attributes of God; that they are *hypostases*, which in the further course of the revelation of God in His kingdom appeared with more and more distinctness as persons of the Divine Being. On the words “*in our image, after our likeness*” modern commentators have correctly observed, that there is no foundation for the distinction drawn by the Greek, and after them by many of the Latin Fathers, between εἰκών (*imago*) and ὁμοίωσις (*similitudo*), the former of which they supposed to represent the physical aspect of the likeness to God, the latter the ethical; but that, on the contrary, the older Lutheran theologians were correct in stating that the two words are synonymous, and are merely combined to add intensity to the thought: “an image which is like Us” (*Luther*); since it is no more possible to discover a sharp or well-defined distinction in the ordinary use of the words between צֶלֶם and דְמוּת, than between בָּ and בְּ. צֶלֶם, from צָל, lit., a shadow, hence sketch, outline, differs no more from דְמוּת, likeness, portrait, copy, than the German words *Umriß* or *Abriss* (outline or sketch) from *Bild* or *Abbild* (likeness, copy). בָּ and בְּ are also equally interchangeable, as we may see from a comparison of this verse with Gen. 5: 1 and 3. (Compare also Lev. 6: 4 with Lev. 27:12, and for the use of בְּ to denote a norm, or sample, Exo. 25:40; 30:32, 37, etc.) There is more difficulty in deciding in what the likeness to God consisted. Certainly not in the bodily form, the upright position, or commanding aspect of the man, since God has no bodily form, and the man’s

body was formed from the dust of the ground; nor in the dominion of man over nature, for this is unquestionably ascribed to man simply as the consequence or effluence of his likeness to God. Man is the image of God by virtue of his spiritual nature. of the breath of God by which the being, formed from the dust of the earth, became a living soul. ^{fi1}

The image of God consists, therefore, in the spiritual personality of man, though not merely in unity of self-consciousness and self-determination, or in the fact that man was created a consciously free *Ego*; for personality is merely the basis and form of the divine likeness, not its real essence. This consists rather in the fact, that the man endowed with free self-conscious personality possesses, in his spiritual as well as corporeal nature, a creaturely copy of the holiness and blessedness of the divine life. This concrete essence of the divine likeness was shattered by sin; and it is only through Christ, the brightness of the glory of God and the expression of His essence (Heb. 1: 3), that our nature is transformed into the image of God again (Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:24).

“*And they* (אָדָם, a generic term for *men*) *shall have dominion over the fish,*” etc. There is something striking in the introduction of the expression “*and over all the earth,*” after the different races of animals have been mentioned, especially as the list of races appears to be proceeded with afterwards. If this appearance were actually the fact, it would be impossible to escape the conclusion that the text is faulty, and that אֲדָמָה has fallen out; so that the reading should be, “*and over all the wild beasts of the earth,*” as the Syriac has it. But as the identity of “every creeping thing that creepeth upon the *earth*” (הָאָרֶץ) with “every thing that creepeth upon the *ground*” (הָאָדָמָה) in v. 25 is not absolutely certain; on the contrary, the change in expression indicates a difference of meaning; and as the Masoretic text is supported by the oldest critical authorities (LXX, *Sam.*, *Onk.*), the Syriac rendering must be dismissed as nothing more than a conjecture, and the Masoretic text be understood in the following manner. The author passes on from the cattle to the entire earth, and embraces all the animal creation in the expression, “every moving thing (כָּל-הָרֹמֵשׁ) that moveth upon the earth,” just as in v. 28, “every living thing (כָּל-הַחַיָּוִת) upon the earth.” According to this, God determined to give to the man about to be created in His likeness the supremacy, not only over the animal world, but over the earth itself; and this agrees with the blessing in v. 28, where the newly created man is exhorted to replenish the earth and subdue it; whereas, according to the conjecture of the Syriac, the subjugation of the earth by man would be omitted from the divine decree. — V. 27. In the account of the accomplishment of the divine purpose the words swell into a jubilant song, so that we meet here for the first time with a *parallelismus membrorum*, the creation of man being celebrated in three parallel clauses. The distinction

drawn between אֱלֹהִים (in the image of God created He *him*) and אֱתָם (as man and woman created He *them*) must not be overlooked. The word אֱתָם, which indicates that God created the man and woman as two human beings, completely overthrows the idea that man was at first androgynous (cf. Gen. 2:18 ff.). By the blessing in v. 28, God not only confers upon man the power to multiply and fill the earth, as upon the beasts in v. 22, but also gives him dominion over the earth and every beast. In conclusion, the food of both man and beast is pointed out in vv. 29, 30, exclusively from the vegetable kingdom. Man is to eat of “*every seed-bearing herb on the face of all the earth, and every tree on which there are fruits containing seed,*” consequently of the productions of both field and tree, in other words, of corn and fruit; the animals are to eat of “*every green herb,*” i.e., of vegetables or green plants, and grass.

From this it follows, that, according to the creative will of God, men were not to slaughter animals for food, nor were animals to prey upon one another; consequently, that the fact which now prevails universally in nature and the order of the world, the violent and often painful destruction of life, is not a primary law of nature, nor a divine institution founded in the creation itself, but entered the world along with death at the fall of man, and became a necessity of nature through the curse of sin. It was not till after the flood, that men received authority from God to employ the flesh of animals as well as the green herb as food (Gen. 9: 3); and the fact that, according to the biblical view, no carnivorous animals existed at the first, may be inferred from the prophetic announcements in Isa. 11: 6-8; 65:25, where the cessation of sin and the complete transformation of the world into the kingdom of God are described as being accompanied by the cessation of slaughter and the eating of flesh, even in the case of the animal kingdom. With this the legends of the heathen world respecting the golden age of the past, and its return at the end of time, also correspond (cf. *Gesenius* on Isa. 11: 6-8). It is true that objections have been raised by natural historians to this testimony of Scripture, but without scientific ground. For although at the present time man is fitted by his teeth and alimentary canal for the combination of vegetable and animal food; and although the law of mutual destruction so thoroughly pervades the whole animal kingdom, that not only is the life of one sustained by the death of another, but “as the graminivorous animals check the overgrowth of the vegetable kingdom, so the excessive increase of the former is restricted by the beasts of prey, and of these again by the destructive implements of man;” and although, again, not only beasts of prey, but evident symptoms of disease are met with among the fossil remains of the aboriginal animals: all these facts furnish no proof that the human and animal races were originally constituted for death and destruction, or that disease and slaughter are older than the fall.

For, to reply to the last objection first, geology has offered no conclusive evidence of its doctrine, that the fossil remains of beasts of prey and bones with marks of disease belong to a pre-Adamite period, but has merely inferred it from the hypothesis already mentioned (pp. 25, 26) of successive periods of creation. Again, as even in the present order of nature the excessive increase of the vegetable kingdom is restrained, not merely by the graminivorous animals, but also by the death of the plants themselves through the exhaustion of their vital powers; so the wisdom of the Creator could easily have set bounds to the excessive increase of the animal world, without requiring the help of huntsmen and beasts of prey, since many animals even now lose their lives by natural means, without being slain by men or eaten by beasts of prey. The teaching of Scripture, that death entered the world through sin, merely proves that the human race was created for eternal life, but by no means necessitates the assumption that the animals were also created for endless existence. As the earth produced them at the creative word of God, the different individuals and generations would also have passed away and returned to the bosom of the earth, without violent destruction by the claws of animals or the hand of man, as soon as they had fulfilled the purpose of their existence. The decay of animals is a law of nature established in the creation itself, and not a consequence of sin, or an effect of the death brought into the world by the sin of man. At the same time, it was so far involved in the effects of the fall, that the natural decay of the different animals was changed into a painful death or violent end. Although in the animal kingdom, as it at present exists, many varieties are so organized that they live exclusively upon the flesh of other animals, which they kill and devour; this by no means necessitates the conclusion, that the carnivorous beasts of prey were created after the fall, or the assumption that they were originally intended to feed upon flesh, and organized accordingly. If, in consequence of the curse pronounced upon the earth after the sin of man, who was appointed head and lord of nature, the whole creation was subjected to vanity and the bondage of corruption (Rom. 8:20 ff.); this subjection might have been accompanied by a change in the organization of the animals, though natural science, which is based upon the observation and combination of things empirically discovered, could neither demonstrate the fact nor explain the process. And if natural science cannot boast that in any one of its many branches it has discovered all the phenomena connected with the animal and human organism of the existing world, how could it pretend to determine or limit the changes through which this organism may have passed in the course of thousands of years?

The creation of man and his installation as ruler on the earth brought the creation of all earthly beings to a close (v. 31). God saw His work, and *behold it was all very good*; i.e., everything perfect in its kind, so that every creature might reach the goal appointed by the Creator, and accomplish the purpose of

its existence. By the application of the term “good” to everything that God made, and the repetition of the word with the emphasis “very” at the close of the whole creation, the existence of anything evil in the creation of God is absolutely denied, and the hypothesis entirely refuted, that the six days’ work merely subdued and fettered an ungodly, evil principle, which had already forced its way into it. The sixth day, as being the last, is distinguished above all the rest by the article — **יוֹם הַשֵּׁשִׁי** “*a day, the sixth*” (*Gesenius*, § 111, 2a).

Gen. 2: 1-3. The Sabbath Of Creation. —

“*Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.*” **וְכָל־צְבָאֵי** here denotes the totality of the beings that fill the heaven and the earth: in other places (see especially *Neh. 9: 6*) it is applied to the host of heaven, i.e., the stars (*Deu. 4:19; 17: 3*), and according to a still later representation, to the angels also (*1Ki. 22:19; Isa. 24:21; Neh. 9: 6; Psa. 148: 2*). These words of v. 1 introduce the completion of the work of creation, and give a greater definiteness to the announcement in vv. 2, 3, that on the seventh day God ended the work which He had made, by ceasing to create, and blessing the day and sanctifying it. The completion or finishing (**בְּלָאָה**) of the work of creation on the seventh day (not on the sixth, as the LXX, *Sam.*, and *Syr.* erroneously render it) can only be understood by regarding the clauses vv. 2b and 3, which are connected with **וַיִּכַּל** by **וַ** *consec.* as containing the actual completion, i.e., by supposing the completion to consist, negatively in the cessation of the work of creation, and positively in the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day. The *cessation* itself formed part of the completion of the work (for this meaning of **שָׁבַת** vid., *Gen. 8:22, Job. 32: 1, etc.*). As a human artificer completes his work just when he has brought it up to his ideal and ceases to work upon it, so in an infinitely higher sense, God completed the creation of the world with all its inhabitants by ceasing to produce anything new, and entering into the rest of His all-sufficient eternal Being, from which He had come forth, as it were, at and in the creation of a world distinct from His own essence. Hence ceasing to create is called resting (**נִיחָה**) in *Exo. 20:11*, and being refreshed (**וַיִּנְפֹּשׂ**) in *Exo. 31:17*. The rest into which God entered after the creation was complete, had its own reality “in the reality of the work of creation, in contrast with which the preservation of the world, when once created, had the appearance of rest, though really a continuous creation” (*Ziegler*, p. 27). This rest of the Creator was indeed “the consequence of His self-satisfaction in the now united and harmonious, though manifold whole;” but this self-satisfaction of God in His creation, which we call His pleasure in His work, was also a spiritual power, which streamed forth as a blessing upon the creation itself, bringing it into the blessedness of the rest of God and filling it with His peace. This constitutes the positive element in the completion

which God gave to the work of creation, by blessing and sanctifying the seventh day, because on it He found rest from the work which He by making (לַעֲשׂוֹת *faciendo*: cf. *Ewald*, § 280d) had created. The divine act of blessing was a real communication of powers of salvation, grace, and peace; and sanctifying was not merely declaring holy, but “communicating the attribute of holy,” “placing in a living relation to God, the Holy One, raising to a participation in the pure clear light of the holiness of God.” On קָדוֹשׁ see Exo. 19: 6. The blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day had regard, no doubt, to the Sabbath, which Israel as the people of God was afterwards to keep; but we are not to suppose that the theocratic Sabbath was instituted here, or that the institution of that Sabbath was transferred to the history of the creation. On the contrary, the Sabbath of the Israelites had a deeper meaning, founded in the nature and development of the created world, not for Israel only, but for all mankind, or rather for the whole creation. As the whole earthly creation is subject to the changes of time and the law of temporal motion and development; so all creatures not only stand in need of definite recurring periods of rest, for the sake of recruiting their strength and gaining new power for further development, but they also look forward to a time when all restlessness shall give place to the blessed rest of the perfect consummation. To this rest the resting of God (ἡ κατάπαυσις) points forward; and to this rest, this divine σαββατισμός (Heb. 4: 9), shall the whole world, especially man, the head of the earthly creation, eventually come. For this God ended His work by blessing and sanctifying the day when the whole creation was complete. In connection with Hebrews 4, some of the fathers have called attention to the fact, that the account of the seventh day is not summed up, like the others, with the formula “evening was and morning was;” thus, e.g., *Augustine* writes at the close of his confessions: *dies septimus sine vespera est nec habet occasum, quia sanctificasti eum ad permansionem sempiternam*. But true as it is that the Sabbath of God has no evening, and that the σαββατισμός, to which the creature is to attain at the end of his course, will be bounded by no evening, but last for ever; we must not, without further ground, introduce this true and profound idea into the seventh creation-day. We could only be warranted in adopting such an interpretation, and understanding by the concluding day of the work of creation a period of endless duration, on the supposition that the six preceding days were so many periods in the world’s history, which embraced the time from the beginning of the creation to the final completion of its development. But as the six creation-days, according to the words of the text, were earthly days of ordinary duration, we must understand the seventh in the same way; and that all the more, because in every passage, in which it is mentioned as the foundation of the theocratic Sabbath, it is regarded as an ordinary day (Exo. 20:11; 31:17). We must conclude, therefore, that on the seventh *day*, on which God rested from His work, the world also, with all its

inhabitants, attained to the sacred rest of God; that the *κατάπαυσις* and *σαββατισμός* of God were made a rest and sabbatic festival for His creatures, especially for man; and that this day of rest of the new created world, which the forefathers of our race observed in paradise, as long as they continued in a state of innocence and lived in blessed peace with their God and Creator, was the beginning and type of the rest to which the creation, after it had fallen from fellowship with God through the sin of man, received a promise that it should once more be restored through redemption, at its final consummation.

I. History of the Heavens and the Earth

GEN. 2: 4-4:26

CONTENTS AND HEADING

Gen. 2: 4-4:26. The historical account of the world, which commences at the completion of the work of creation, is introduced as the “*History of the heavens and the earth*,” and treats in three sections, (a) of the original condition of man in paradise (Gen. 2: 5-25); (b) of the fall (Gen. 3); (c) of the division of the human race into two widely different families, so far as concerns their relation to God (Genesis ch. 4).

The words, “*these are the tholedoth of the heavens and the earth when they were created*,” form the heading to what follows. This would never have been disputed, had not preconceived opinions as to the composition of Genesis obscured the vision of commentators. The fact that in every other passage, in which the formula “these (and these) are the *tholedoth*” occurs (viz., ten times in Genesis; also in Num. 3: 1, Rut. 4:18, 1Ch. 1:29), it is used as a heading, and that in this passage the true meaning of *תולדות* precludes the possibility of its being an appendix to what precedes, fully decides the question. The word *תולדות*, which is only used in the plural, and never occurs except in the construct state or with suffixes, is a *Hiphil* noun from *הוליד*, and signifies literally the generation or posterity of any one, then the development of these generations or of his descendants; in other words, the history of those who are begotten or the account of what happened to them and what they performed. In no instance whatever is it the history of the birth or origin of the person named in the genitive, but always the account of his family and life. According to this use of the word, we cannot understand by the *tholedoth* of the heavens and the earth the account of the *origin* of the universe, since according to the biblical view the different things which make up the heavens and the earth can neither be regarded as generations or products of cosmogonic and geogonic evolutions, nor be classed together as the posterity of the heavens and the earth. All the creatures in the heavens and on earth were made by God, and

called into being by His word, notwithstanding the fact that He caused some of them to come forth from the earth. Again, as the completion of the heavens and the earth with all their host has already been described in Gen. 2: 1-3, we cannot understand by “the heavens and the earth,” in v. 4, the primary material of the universe in its elementary condition (in which case the literal meaning of הוֹלִיד would be completely relinquished, and the “*tholedoth* of the heavens and the earth” be regarded as indicating this chaotic beginning as the first stage in a series of productions), but the universe itself after the completion of the creation, at the commencement of the historical development which is subsequently described. This places its resemblance to the other sections, commencing with “these are the generations,” beyond dispute. Just as the *tholedoth* of Noah, for example, do not mention his birth, but contain his history and the birth of his sons; so the *tholedoth* of the heavens and the earth do not describe the origin of the universe, but what happened to the heavens and the earth after their creation. בְּהִבְרָאֵם does not preclude this, though we cannot render it “after they were created.” For even if it were grammatically allowable to resolve the participle into a pluperfect, the parallel expressions in Gen. 5: 1, 2, would prevent our doing so. As “the day of their creation” mentioned *there*, is not a day after the creation of Adam, but the day on which he was created; the same words, when occurring *here*, must also refer to a time when the heavens and the earth were already created: and just as in Gen. 5: 1 the creation of the universe forms the starting-point to the account of the development of the human race through the generations of Adam, and is recapitulated for that reason; so here the creation of the universe is mentioned as the starting-point to the account of its historical development, because this account looks back to particular points in the creation itself, and describes them more minutely as the preliminaries to the subsequent course of the world. הִבְרָאֵם is explained by the clause, “*in the day that Jehovah God created the earth and the heavens.*” Although this clause is closely related to what follows, the simplicity of the account prevents our regarding it as the *protasis* of a period, the *apodosis* of which does not follow till v. 5 or even v. 7. The former is grammatically impossible, because in v. 5 the noun stands first, and not the verb, as we should expect in such a case (cf. Gen. 3: 5). The latter is grammatically tenable indeed, since vv. 5, 6, might be introduced into the main sentence as conditional clauses; but it is not probable, inasmuch as we should then have a parenthesis of most unnatural length. The clause must therefore be regarded as forming part of the heading. There are two points here that are worthy of notice: first, the unusual combination, “earth and heaven,” which only occurs in Psa. 148:13, and shows that the *earth* is the scene of the history about to commence, which was of such momentous importance to the whole world; and secondly, the introduction of the name JEHOVAH in connection with ELOHIM. That the hypothesis, which traces the interchange in the two names in

Genesis to different documents, does not suffice to explain the occurrence of Jehovah Elohim in Gen. 2: 4-3:24, even the supporters of this hypothesis cannot possibly deny. Not only is God called Elohim alone in the middle of this section, viz., in the address to the serpent, a clear proof that the interchange of the names has reference to their different significations; but the use of the double name, which occurs here twenty times though rarely met with elsewhere, is always significant. In the Pentateuch we only find it in Exo. 9:30; in the other books of the Old Testament, in 2Sa. 7:22, 25; 1Ch. 17:16, 17; 2Ch. 4:41, 42; Psa. 84: 8, 11; and Psa. 50: 1, where the order is reversed; and in every instance it is used with peculiar emphasis, to give prominence to the fact that *Jehovah* is truly Elohim, whilst in Psa. 50: 1 the Psalmist advances from the general name *El* and *Elohim* to *Jehovah*, as the personal name of the God of Israel. In this section the combination *Jehovah Elohim* is expressive of the fact, that Jehovah is God, or one with Elohim. Hence Elohim is placed after Jehovah. For the constant use of the double name is not intended to teach that Elohim who created the world was Jehovah, but that Jehovah, who visited man in paradise, who punished him for the transgression of His command, but gave him a promise of victory over the tempter, was Elohim, the same God, who created the heavens and the earth.

The two names may be distinguished thus: *Elohim*, the plural of אֱלֹהִים, which is only used in the loftier style of poetry, is an infinitive noun from אָלַהּ to fear, and signifies awe, fear, then the object of fear, the highest Being to be feared, like פֶּחַד, which is used interchangeably with it in Gen. 31:42, 53, and מִוְרָא in Psa. 76:12 (cf. Isa. 8:12, 13). The plural is not used for the abstract, in the sense of divinity, but to express the notion of God in the fulness and multiplicity of the divine powers. It is employed both in a numerical, and also in an intensive sense, so that Elohim is applied to the (many) gods of the heathen as well as to the one true God, in whom the highest and absolute fulness of the divine essence is contained. In this intensive sense Elohim depicts the one true God as the infinitely great and exalted One, who created the heavens and the earth, and who preserves and governs every creature. According to its derivation, however, it is object rather than subject, so that in the plural form the concrete unity of the personal God falls back behind the wealth of the divine potencies which His being contains. In this sense, indeed, both in Genesis and the later, poetical, books, Elohim is used without the article, as a proper name for the true God, even in the mouth of the heathen (1Sa. 4: 7); but in other places, and here and there in Genesis, it occurs as an appellative *with* the article, by which prominence is given to the absoluteness of personality of God (Gen. 5:22; 6: 9, etc.).

The name Jehovah, on the other hand, was originally a proper name, and according to the explanation given by God Himself to Moses (Exo. 3:14, 15), was formed from the imperfect of the verb **הָיָה** = **הָיָה**. God calls Himself **אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּה**, then more briefly **אֲהִיָּה**, and then again, by changing the first person into the third, **יְהוָה**. From the derivation of this name from the imperfect, it follows that it was either pronounced **יְהוָה** or **יְהוֹה**, and had come down from the pre-Mosaic age; for the form **הָיָה** had been forced out of the spoken language by **הָיָה** even in Moses' time. The Masoretic pointing **יְהוָה** belongs to a time when the Jews had long been afraid to utter this name at all, and substituted **אֲדֹנָי**, the vowels of which therefore were placed as *Keri*, the word to be read, under the *Kethib* **יְהוָה**, unless **יְהוָה** stood in apposition to **אֲדֹנָי**, in which case the word was read **אֲדֹנָיִם** and pointed **יְהוָה** (a pure monstrosity.) ^{f12}

This custom, which sprang from a misinterpretation of Lev. 24:16, appears to have originated shortly after the captivity. Even in the canonical writings of this age the name Jehovah was less and less employed, and in the Apocrypha and the Septuagint version **ὁ Κύριος** (the Lord) is invariably substituted, a custom in which the New Testament writers follow the LXX (vid., *Oehler*).

If we seek for the meaning of **יְהוָה**, the expression **אֲהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּה**, in Exo. 3:14, is neither to be rendered **ἔσομαι δεῦξ ἔσομαι** (*Aq., Theodt.*), "I shall be that I shall be" (*Luther*), nor "I shall be that which I will or am to be" (*M. Baumgarten*). Nor does it mean, "He who will be because He is Himself, the God of the future" (*Hoffmann*). For in names formed from the third person imperfect, the imperfect is not a future, but an aorist. According to the fundamental signification of the imperfect, names so formed point out a person as distinguished by a frequently or constantly manifested quality, in other words, they express a distinctive characteristic (vid., *Ewald*, § 136; Gen. 25:26; 27:36, also 16:11 and 21: 6). The Vulgate gives it correctly: *ego sum qui sum*, "I am who I am." "The repetition of the verb in the same form, and connected only by the relative, signifies that the being or act of the subject expressed in the verb is determined only by the subject itself" (*Hofmann*). The verb **הָיָה** signifies "to be, to happen, to become;" but as neither happening nor becoming is applicable to God, the unchangeable, since the pantheistic idea of a becoming God is altogether foreign to the Scriptures, we must retain the meaning "to be;" not forgetting, however, that as the Divine Being is not a resting, or, so to speak, a dead being, but is essentially living, displaying itself as living, working upon creation, and moving in the world, the formation of **יְהוָה** from the imperfect precludes the idea of abstract existence, and points out the Divine Being as moving, pervading history, and manifesting Himself in

the world. So far then as the words **אֱהוּיָה אֲשֶׁר אֱהוּיָה** are condensed into a proper name in **יְהוָה**, and God, therefore, “is He who is,” inasmuch as in His being, as historically manifested, He is the self-determining one, the name JEHOVAH, which we have retained as being naturalized in the ecclesiastical phraseology, though we are quite in ignorance of its correct pronunciation,

“includes both the absolute independence of God in His historical movements,” and “the absolute constancy of God, or the fact that in everything, in both words and deeds, He is essentially in harmony with Himself, remaining always consistent” (*Oehler*).

The “I am who am,” therefore, is the absolute *I*, the absolute personality, moving with unlimited freedom; and in distinction from Elohim (the Being to be feared), He is the personal God in His historical manifestation, in which the fulness of the Divine Being unfolds itself to the world. This movement of the person God in history, however, has reference to the realization of the great purpose of the creation, viz., the salvation of man. Jehovah therefore is the God of the history of salvation. This is not shown in the etymology of the name, but in its historical expansion. It was as JEHOVAH that God manifested Himself to Abram (Gen. 15: 7), when He made the covenant with him; and as this name was neither derived from an attribute of God, nor from a divine manifestation, we must trace its origin to a revelation from God, and seek it in the declaration to Abram, “I am Jehovah.” Just as Jehovah here revealed Himself to Abram as the God who led him out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give him the land of Canaan for a possession, and thereby described Himself as the author of all the promises which Abram received at his call, and which were renewed to him and to his descendants, Isaac and Jacob; so did He reveal Himself to Moses (Exodus ch. 3) as the God of his fathers, to fulfil His promise to their seed, the people of Israel. Through these revelations Jehovah became a proper name for the God, who was working out the salvation of fallen humanity; and in this sense, not only is it used proleptically at the call of Abram (Genesis 12), but transferred to the primeval times, and applied to all the manifestations and acts of God which had for their object the rescue of the human race from its fall, as well as to the special plan inaugurated in the call of Abram. The preparation commenced in paradise. To show this, Moses has introduced the name *Jehovah* into the history in the present chapter, and has indicated the identity of Jehovah with Elohim, not only by the constant association of the two names, but also by the fact that in the heading (v. 4b) he speaks of the creation described in Gen. 1 as the work of JEHOVAH ELOHIM.

PARADISE. — CH. 2: 5-25

Gen. 2: 5-25. The account in vv. 5-25 is not a second, complete and independent history of the creation, nor does it contain mere appendices to the account in Gen. 1; but it describes the commencement of the history of the human race. This commencement includes not only a complete account of the creation of the first human pair, but a description of the place which God prepared for their abode, the latter being of the highest importance in relation to the self-determination of man, with its momentous consequences to both earth and heaven. Even in the history of the creation man takes precedence of all other creatures, as being created in the image of God and appointed lord of all the earth, though he is simply mentioned there as the last and highest link in the creation. To this our present account is attached, describing with greater minuteness the position of man in the creation, and explaining the circumstances which exerted the greatest influence upon his subsequent career. These circumstances were — the formation of man from the dust of the earth and the divine breath of life; the tree of knowledge in paradise; the formation of the woman, and the relation of the woman to the man. Of these three elements, the first forms the substratum to the other two. Hence the more exact account of the creation of Adam is subordinated to, and inserted in, the description of paradise (v. 7). In vv. 5 and 6, with which the narrative commences, there is an evident allusion to paradise:

“And as yet there was (arose, grew) no shrub of the field upon the earth, and no herb of the field sprouted; for Jehovah El had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no man to till the ground; and a mist arose from the earth and watered the whole surface of the ground.”

הָיָה in parallelism with צָמָח means to become, to arise, to proceed. Although the growth of the shrubs and sprouting of the herbs are represented here as dependent upon the rain and the cultivation of the earth by man, we must not understand the words as meaning that there was neither shrub nor herb before the rain and dew, or before the creation of man, and so draw the conclusion that the creation of the plants occurred either after or contemporaneously with the creation of man, in direct contradiction to Gen. 1:11, 12. The creation of the plants is not alluded to here at all, but simply the planting of the garden in Eden. The growing of the shrubs and sprouting of the herbs is different from the creation or first production of the vegetable kingdom, and relates to the growing and sprouting of the plants and germs which were called into existence by the creation, the natural development of the plants as it had steadily proceeded ever since the creation. This was dependent upon rain and human culture; their creation was not. Moreover, *the shrub and herb of the*

field do not embrace the whole of the vegetable productions of the earth. It is not a fact that *the field* is used in the second section in the same sense as *the earth* in the first.” שָׂדֶה is not “the widespread plain of the earth, the broad expanse of land,” but a field of arable land, soil fit for cultivation, which forms only a part of the “earth” or “ground.” Even the “beast of the field” in v. 19 and Gen. 3: 1 is not synonymous with the “beast of the earth” in Gen. 1:24, 25, but is a more restricted term, denoting only such animals as live upon the field and are supported by its produce, whereas the “beast of the earth” denotes all wild beasts as distinguished from tame cattle and reptiles. In the same way, the “shrub of the field” consists of such shrubs and tree-like productions of the cultivated land as man raises for the sake of their fruit, and the “herb of the field,” all seed-producing plants, both corn and vegetables, which serve as food for man and beast. — The mist (אָרַח, vapour, which falls as rain, Job. 36:27) is correctly regarded by *Delitzsch* as the creative beginning of the rain (הַמַּטֵּיר) itself, from which we may infer, therefore, that it rained before the flood.

Gen. 2: 7. “Then Jehovah God formed man from dust of the ground.” עֶפֶר is the accusative of the material employed (*Ewald* and *Gesenius*). The *Vav consec. imperf.* in vv. 7, 8, 9, does not indicate the order of time, or of thought; so that the meaning is not that God planted the garden in Eden after He had created Adam, nor that He caused the trees to grow after He had planted the garden and placed the man there. The latter is opposed to v. 15; the former is utterly improbable. The process of man’s creation is described minutely here, because it serves to explain his relation to God and to the surrounding world. He was formed from dust (not *de limo terrae*, from a clod of the earth, for עֶפֶר is not a solid mass, but the finest part of the material of the earth), and into his nostril a breath of life was breathed, by which he became an animated being. Hence the nature of man consists of a material substance and an immaterial principle of life. “*The breath of life*,” i.e., breath producing life, does not denote the spirit by which man is distinguished from the animals, or the soul of man from that of the beasts, but only the life-breath (vid., 1Ki. 17:17). It is true, נְשָׁמָה generally signifies the human soul, but in Gen. 7:22 נְשַׁמְתֵּי רוּחַ חַיִּים is used of men and animals both; and should any one explain this, on the ground that the allusion is chiefly to men, and the animals are connected *per zeugma*, or should he press the *ruach* attached, and deduce from this the use of *neshamah* in relation to men and animals, there are several passages in which *neshamah* is synonymous with *ruach* (e.g., Isa. 42: 5; Job. 32: 8; 33: 4), or רוּחַ חַיִּים applied to animals (Gen. 6:17; 7:15), or again *neshamah* used as equivalent to *nephesh* (e.g., (Jos. 10:40, cf. vv. 28, 30, 32). For *neshamah*, the breathing, πνοή, is “the *ruach* in action”

(*Auberlen*). Beside this, the man formed from the dust became, through the breathing of the “breath of life,” a **נִפְשׁ חַיָּה**, an animated, and as such a living being; an expression which is also applied to fishes, birds, and land animals (Gen. 1:20, 21, 24, 30), and there is no proof of pre-eminence on the part of man. As **נִפְשׁ חַיָּה**, *ψυχή ζῶσα*, does not refer to the soul merely, but to the whole man as an animated being, so **רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים** does not denote the spirit of man as distinguished from body and soul. On the relation of the soul to the spirit of man nothing can be gathered from this passage; the words, correctly interpreted, neither show that the soul is an emanation, an exhalation of the human spirit, nor that the soul was created before the spirit and merely received its life from the latter. The formation of man from dust and the breathing of the breath of life we must not understand in a mechanical sense, as if God first of all constructed a human figure from dust, and then, by breathing His breath of life into the clod of earth which he had shaped into the form of a man, made it into a living being. The words are to be understood *θεοπρεπῶς*. By an act of divine omnipotence man arose from the dust; and in the same moment in which the dust, by virtue of creative omnipotence, shaped itself into a human form, it was pervaded by the divine breath of life, and created a living being, so that we cannot say the body was earlier than the soul. The dust of the earth is merely the earthly substratum, which was formed by the breath of life from God into an animated, living, self-existent being. When it is said, “God breathed into his nostril the breath of life,” it is evident that this description merely gives prominence to the peculiar sign of life, viz., breathing; since it is obvious, that what God breathed into man could not be the air which man breathes; for it is not that which breathes, but simply that which is breathed. Consequently, breathing into the nostril can only mean, that

“God, through His own breath, produced and combined with the bodily form that principle of life, which was the origin of all human life, and which constantly manifests its existence in the breath inhaled and exhaled through the nose” (*Delitzsch*, *Psychol.* p. 62).

Breathing, however, is common to both man and beast; so that this cannot be the sensuous analogon of the supersensuous spiritual life, but simply the principle of the physical life of the soul. Nevertheless the vital principle in man is different from that in the animal, and the human soul from the soul of the beast. This difference is indicated by the way in which man received the breath of life from God, and so became a living soul. “The beasts arose at the creative word of God, and no communication of the spirit is mentioned even in Gen. 2:19; the origin of their soul was coincident with that of their corporeality, and their life was merely the individualization of the universal life, with which all matter was filled in the beginning by the Spirit of God.

On the other hand, the human spirit is not a mere individualization of the divine breath which breathed upon the material of the world, or of the universal spirit of nature; nor is his body merely a production of the earth when stimulated by the creative word of God. The earth does not bring forth his body, but God Himself puts His hand to the work and forms him; nor does the life already imparted to the world by the Spirit of God individualize itself in him, but God breathes directly into the nostrils of the one man, in the whole fulness of His personality, the breath of life, that in a manner corresponding to the personality of God he may become a living soul" (*Delitzsch*). This was the foundation of the pre-eminence of man, of his likeness to God and his immortality; for by this he was formed into a personal being, whose immaterial part was not merely soul, but a soul breathed entirely by God, since spirit and soul were created together through the inspiration of God. As the spiritual nature of man is described simply by the act of breathing, which is discernible by the senses, so the name which God gives him (Gen. 5: 2) is founded upon the earthly side of his being: ADAM, from אָדָמָה (*adamah*), earth, the earthly element, like *homo* from *humus*, or from χάμα χάμαί χαμᾶθεν, to guard him from self-exaltation, not from the red colour of his body, since this is not a distinctive characteristic of man, but common to him and to many other creatures. The name man (*Mensch*), on the other hand, from the Sanskrit *mānuscha*, *manuschja*, from *man* to think, *manas* = *mens*, expresses the spiritual inwardness of our nature.

Gen. 2: 8. The abode, which God prepared for the first man, was a "garden in Eden," also called "the garden of Eden" (v. 15, Gen. 3:23, 24; Joe. 2: 3), or Eden (Isa. 51: 3; Eze. 28:13; 31: 9). Eden (עֵדֵן, i.e., delight) is the proper name of a particular district, the situation of which is described in v. 10 ff.; but it must not be confounded with the Eden of Assyria (2Ki. 19:12, etc.) and Coelesyria (Amo. 1: 5), which is written with double seghol. The garden (lit., a place hedged round) was to the east, i.e., in the eastern portion, and is generally called Paradise from the Septuagint version, in which the word is rendered παράδεισος. This word, according to *Spiegel*, was derived from the Zendic *pairi-daêza*, a hedging round, and passed into the Hebrew in the form פַּרְדֵּיס (Can. 4:13; Ecc. 2: 5; Neh. 2: 8), a park, probably through the commercial relations which Solomon established with distant countries. In the garden itself God caused all kinds of trees to grow out of the earth; and among them were tow, which were called "the tree of life" and "the tree of knowledge of good and evil," on account of their peculiar significance in relation to man (see v. 16 and Gen. 3:22). הַדְּעַת, an infinitive, as Jer. 22:16 shows, has the article here because the phrase דַּעַת טוֹב ורַע is regarded as one word, and in Jeremiah from the nature of the predicate.

Gen. 2:10.

“And there was a river going out of Eden, to water the garden; and from thence it divided itself, and became four heads;”

i.e., the stream took its rise in Eden, flowed through the garden to water it, and on leaving the garden was divided into four heads or beginnings of rivers, that is, into four arms or separate streams. For this meaning of **רִאשֵׁי** see Eze. 16:25, Lam. 2:19. Of the four rivers whose names are given to show the geographical situation of paradise, the last two are unquestionably Tigris and Euphrates. *Hiddekel* occurs in Dan. 10: 4 as the Hebrew name for Tigris; in the inscriptions of Darius it is called *Tigrâ* (or the arrow, according to *Strabo*, *Pliny*, and *Curtius*), from the Zendic *tighra*, pointed, sharp, from which probably the meaning stormy (*rapidus Tigris*, *Hor. Carm.* 4, 14, 46) was derived. It flows before (**קִדְמָתָא**), in front of, Assyria, not to the east of Assyria; for the province of Assyria, which must be intended here, was on the eastern side of the Tigris: moreover, neither the meaning, “to the east of,” nor the identity of **קִדְמָתָא** and **מִקְדָּם** has been, or can be, established from Gen. 4:16, 1Sa. 13: 5, or Eze. 39:11, which are the only other passages in which the word occurs, as *Ewald* himself acknowledges. *P’rath*, which was not more minutely described because it was so generally known, is the Euphrates; in old Persian, *Ufrâta*, according to *Delitzsch*, or the good and fertile stream; *Ufrâtu*, according to *Spiegler*, or the well-progressing stream. According to the present condition of the soil, the sources of the Euphrates and Tigris are not so closely connected that they could be regarded as the commencements of a common stream which has ceased to exist. The main sources of the Tigris, it is true, are only 2000 paces from the Euphrates, but they are to the north of Diarbekr, in a range of mountains which is skirted on three sides by the upper course of the Euphrates, and separates them from this river. We must also look in the same country, the highlands of Armenia, for the other two rivers, if the description of paradise actually rests upon an ancient tradition, and is to be regarded as something more than a mythical invention of the fancy. The name *Phishon* sounds like the *Phasis* of the ancients, with which *Reland* supposed it to be identical; and *Chavilah* like *Cholchis*, the well-known gold country of the ancients. But the **Φάσις ὁ Κόλχος** (*Herod.* 4, 37, 45) takes its rise in the Caucasus, and not in Armenia. A more probable conjecture, therefore, points to the *Cyrus* of the ancients, which rises in Armenia, flows northwards to a point not far from the eastern border of Colchis, and then turns eastward in Iberia, from which it flows in a south-easterly direction to the Caspian Sea. The expression, “*which compasseth the whole land of Chavilah*,” would apply very well to the course of this river from the eastern border of Colchis; for **סָבַב** does not necessarily signify to surround, but to pass through with

different turns, or to skirt in a semi-circular form, and *Chavilah* may have been larger than modern *Colchis*. It is not a valid objection to this explanation, that in every other place Chavilah is a district of Southern Arabia. The identity of this Chavilah with the Chavilah of the Joktanites (Gen. 10:29; 25:18; 1Sa. 15: 7) or of the Cushites (Gen. 10: 7; 1Ch. 1: 9) is disproved not only by the article used here, which distinguishes it from the other, but also by the description of it as land where gold, bdolach, and the shohamstone are found; a description neither requisite nor suitable in the case of the Arabian Chavilah, since there productions are not to be met with there. This characteristic evidently shows that the Chavilah mentioned here was entirely distinct from the other, and a land altogether unknown to the Israelites.

What we are to understand by חֲלִילָהּ is uncertain. There is no certain ground for the meaning “pearls,” given in *Saad.* and the later Rabbins, and adopted by *Bochart* and others. The rendering βδέλλα or βδέλλιον, *bdellium*, a vegetable gum, of which *Cioscorus* says, οἱ δὲ μάδελκον οἱ δὲ βολχὸν καλοῦσι, and *Pliny*, “*alii brochon appellant, alii malacham, alii maldacon,*” is favoured by the similarity in the name; but, on the other side, there is the fact that *Pliny* describes this gum as *nigrum* and *hadrobolon*, and *Dioscorus* as ὑποπέλιον (blackish), which does not agree with Num. 11: 7, where the appearance of the white grains of the manna is compared to that of *bdolach*. — The stone *shoham*, according to most of the early versions, is probably the *beryl*, which is most likely the stone intended by the LXX (ὁ λίθος ὁ πράσινος, the leek-green stone), as *Pliny*, when speaking of beryls, describes those as *probatissimi, qui viriditatem puri maris imitantur*; but according to others it is the *onyx* or *sardonyx* (vid., *Ges. s.v.*).^{f13}

The *Gihon* (from גִּיחֹן to break forth) is the *Araxes*, which rises in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates, flows from west to east, joins the *Cyrus*, and falls with it into the Caspian Sea. The name corresponds to the Arabic *Jaihun*, a name given by the Arabians and Persians to several large rivers. The land of *Cush* cannot, of course, be the later *Cush*, or *Ethiopia*, but must be connected with the Asiatic Κοσσαία, which reached to the Caucasus, and to which the Jews (of *Shirwan*) still give this name. But even though these four streams do not now spring from one source, but on the contrary their sources are separated by mountain ranges, this fact does not prove that the narrative before us is a myth. Along with or since the disappearance of paradise, that part of the earth may have undergone such changes that the precise locality can no longer be determined with certainty.^{f14}

Gen. 2:15-17. After the preparation of the garden in Eden God placed the man there, to dress it and to keep it. גִּדְּלוּ וְשָׁמְרוּ not merely expresses removal thither, but the fact that the man was placed there to lead a life of repose, not

indeed in inactivity, but in fulfilment of the course assigned him, which was very different from the trouble and restlessness of the weary toil into which he was plunged by sin. In paradise he was to dress (*colere*) the garden; for the earth was meant to be tended and cultivated by man, so that without human culture, plants and even the different varieties of corn degenerate and grow wild. Cultivation therefore preserved (קמ to keep) the divine plantation, not merely from injury on the part of any evil power, either penetrating into, or already existing in the creation, but also from running wild through natural degeneracy. As nature was created for man, it was his vocation not only to ennoble it by his work, to make it subservient to himself, but also to raise it into the sphere of the spirit and further its glorification. This applied not merely to the soil beyond the limits of paradise, but to the garden itself, which, although the most perfect portion of the terrestrial creation, was nevertheless susceptible of development, and which was allotted to man, in order that by his care and culture he might make it into a transparent mirror of the glory of the Creator. — Here too the man was to commence his own spiritual development. To this end God had planted two trees in the midst of the garden of Eden; the one to train his spirit through the exercise of obedience to the word of God, the other to transform his earthly nature into the spiritual essence of eternal life. These trees received their names from their relation to man, that is to say, from the effect which the eating of their fruit was destined to produce upon human life and its development. The fruit of the tree of life conferred the power of eternal, immortal life; and the tree of knowledge was planted, to lead men to the knowledge of good and evil. The knowledge of good and evil was no mere experience of good and ill, but a moral element in that spiritual development, through which the man created in the image of God was to attain to the filling out of that nature, which had already been planned in the likeness of God. For not to know what good and evil are, is a sign of either the immaturity of infancy (Deu. 1:39), or the imbecility of age (2Sa. 19:35); whereas the power to distinguish good and evil is commended as the gift of a king (1Ki. 3: 9) and the wisdom of angels (2Sa. 14:17), and in the highest sense is ascribed to God Himself (Gen. 3: 5, 22). Why then did God prohibit man from eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, with the threat that, as soon as he ate thereof, he would surely die? (The inf. abs. before the finite verb intensifies the latter: vid., *Ewald*, § 312a). Are we to regard the tree as poisonous, and suppose that some fatal property resided in the fruit? A supposition which so completely ignores the ethical nature of sin is neither warranted by the antithesis, nor by what is said in Gen. 3:22 of the tree of life, nor by the fact that the eating of the forbidden fruit was actually the cause of death. Even in the case of the tree of life, the power is not to be sought in the physical character of the fruit. No earthly fruit possesses the power to give immortality to the life which it helps to sustain. Life is not rooted in man's corporeal

nature; it was in his spiritual nature that it had its origin, and from this it derives its stability and permanence also. It may, indeed, be brought to an end through the destruction of the body; but it cannot be exalted to perpetual duration, i.e., to immortality, through its preservation and sustenance. And this applies quite as much to the original nature of man, as to man after the fall. A body formed from earthly materials could not be essentially immortal: it would of necessity either be turned to earth, and fall into dust again, or be transformed by the spirit into the immortality of the soul. The power which transforms corporeality into immortality is spiritual in its nature, and could only be imparted to the earthly tree or its fruit through the word of God, through a special operation of the Spirit of God, an operation which we can only picture to ourselves as sacramental in its character, rendering earthly elements the receptacles and vehicles of celestial powers. God had given such a sacramental nature and significance to the two trees in the midst of the garden, that their fruit could and would produce supersensual, mental, and spiritual effects upon the nature of the first human pair. The tree of life was to impart the power of transformation into eternal life. The tree of knowledge was to lead man to the knowledge of good and evil; and, according to the divine intention, this was to be attained through his not eating of its fruit. This end was to be accomplished, not only by his discerning in the limit imposed by the prohibition the difference between that which accorded with the will of God and that which opposed it, but also by his coming eventually, through obedience to the prohibition, to recognise the fact that all that is opposed to the will of God is an evil to be avoided, and, through voluntary resistance to such evil, to the full development of the freedom of choice originally imparted to him into the actual freedom of a deliberate and self-conscious choice of good. By obedience to the divine will he would have attained to a godlike knowledge of good and evil, i.e., to one in accordance with his own likeness to God. He would have detected the evil in the approaching tempter; but instead of yielding to it, he would have resisted it, and thus have made good his own property acquired with consciousness and of his own free-will, and in this way by proper self-determination would gradually have advanced to the possession of the truest liberty. But as he failed to keep this divinely appointed way, and ate the forbidden fruit in opposition to the command of God, the power imparted by God to the fruit was manifested in a different way. He learned the difference between good and evil from his own guilty experience, and by receiving the evil into his own soul, fell a victim to the threatened death. Thus through his own fault the tree, which should have helped him to attain true freedom, brought nothing but the sham liberty of sin, and with it death, and that without any demoniacal power of destruction being conjured into the tree itself, or any fatal poison being hidden in its fruit.

Gen. 2:18-25. CREATION OF THE WOMAN. — As the creation of the man is introduced in Gen. 1:26, 27, with a divine decree, so here that of the woman is preceded by the divine declaration, *It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, a help of his like:* “ i.e., a helping being, in which, as soon as he sees it, he may recognise himself” (*Delitzsch*). Of such a help the man stood in need, in order that he might fulfil his calling, not only to perpetuate and multiply his race, but to cultivate and govern the earth. To indicate this, the general word עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ is chosen, in which there is an allusion to the relation of the sexes. To call out this want, God brought the larger quadrupeds and birds to the man, “*to see what he would call them (לוֹ lit., each one); and whatsoever the man might call every living being should be its name.*” The time when this took place must have been the sixth day, on which, according to Gen. 1:27, the man and woman were created: and there is no difficulty in this, since it would not have required much time to bring the animals to Adam to see what he would call them, as the animals of paradise are all we have to think of; and the deep sleep into which God caused the man to fall, till he had formed the woman from his rib, need not have continued long. In Gen. 1:27 the creation of the woman is linked with that of the man; but here the order of sequence is given, because the creation of the woman formed a chronological incident in the history of the human race, which commences with the creation of Adam. The circumstance that in v. 19 the formation of the beasts and birds is connected with the creation of Adam by the *imperf. c. 1 consec.*, constitutes to objection to the plan of creation given in Genesis ch. 1. The arrangement may be explained on the supposition, that the writer, who was about to describe the relation of man to the beasts, went back to their creation, in the simple method of the early Semitic historians, and placed this first instead of making it subordinate; so that our modern style of expressing the same thought would be simply this: “God brought to Adam the beasts which He had formed.” ^{f15}

Moreover, the allusion is not to the creation of all the beasts, but simply to that of the beasts living in the field (game and tame cattle), and of the fowls of the air, — to beasts, therefore, which had been formed like man from the earth, and thus stood in a closer relation to him than water animals or reptiles. For God brought the animals to Adam, to show him the creatures which were formed to serve him, that He might see what he would call them. Calling or naming presupposes acquaintance. Adam is to become acquainted with the creatures, to learn their relation to him, and by giving them names to prove himself their lord. God does not order him to name them; but by bringing the beasts He gives him an opportunity of developing that intellectual capacity which constitutes his superiority to the animal world.

“The man sees the animals, and thinks of what they are and how they look; and these thoughts, in themselves already inward words, take the form involuntarily of audible names, which he utters to the beasts, and by which he places the impersonal creatures in the first spiritual relation to himself, the personal being” (*Delitzsch*).

Language, as *W. v. Humboldt* says, is “the organ of the inner being, or rather the inner being itself as it gradually attains to inward knowledge and expression.” It is merely thought cast into articulate sounds or words. The thoughts of Adam with regard to the animals, to which he gave expression in the names that he gave them, we are not to regard as the mere results of reflection, or of abstraction from merely outward peculiarities which affected the senses; but as a deep and direct mental insight into the nature of the animals, which penetrated far deeper than such knowledge as is the simple result of reflecting and abstracting thought. The naming of the animals, therefore, led to this result, that there was not found a help meet for man. Before the creation of the woman we must regard the man (Adam) as being

“neither male, in the sense of complete sexual distinction, nor androgynous as though both sexes were combined in the one individual created at the first, but as created in anticipation of the future, with a preponderant tendency, a male in simple potentiality, out of which state he passed, the moment the woman stood by his side, when the mere *potentia* became an actual antithesis” (*Ziegler*).

Then God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man (v. 21). **נָרְדָמָה**, a deep sleep, in which all consciousness of the outer world and of one’s own existence vanishes. Sleep is an essential element in the nature of man as ordained by God, and is quite as necessary for man as the interchange of day and night for all nature besides. But this deep sleep was different from natural sleep, and God caused it to fall upon the man by day, that He might create the woman out of him.

“Everything out of which something new is to spring, sinks first of all into such a sleep” (*Ziegler*).

צֵלַע means the side, and, as a portion of the human body, the rib. The correctness of this meaning, which is given by all the ancient versions, is evident from the words, “*God took one of his צֵלַעוֹת*,” which show that the man had several of them. “*And closed up flesh in the place thereof;*” i.e., closed the gap which had been made, with flesh which He put in the place of the rib. The woman was created, not of dust of the earth, but from a rib of Adam, because she was formed for an inseparable unity and fellowship of life with the man, and the mode of her creation was to lay the actual foundation for

the moral ordinance of marriage. As the moral idea of the unity of the human race required that man should not be created as a genus or plurality,¹⁶ so the moral relation of the two persons establishing the unity of the race required that man should be created first, and then the woman from the body of the man. By this the priority and superiority of the man, and the dependence of the woman upon the man, are established as an ordinance of divine creation. This ordinance of God forms the root of that tender love with which the man loves the woman as himself, and by which marriage becomes a type of the fellowship of love and life, which exists between the Lord and His Church (Eph. 6:32). If the fact that the woman was formed from a rib, and not from any other part of the man, is significant; all that we can find in this is, that the woman was made to stand as a helpmate by the side of the man, not that there was any allusion to conjugal love as founded in the heart; for the text does not speak of the rib as one which was next the heart. The word **בָּנָה** is worthy of note: from the rib of the man God *builds* the female, through whom the human race is to be *built up* by the male (Gen. 16: 2; 30: 3).

Gen. 2:23, 24. The design of God in the creation of the woman is perceived by Adam, as soon as he awakes, when the woman is brought to him by God. Without a revelation from God, he discovers in the woman “*bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh.*” The words, “*this is now (הַפַּעַם lit., this time) bone of my bones,*” etc., are expressive of joyous astonishment at the suitable helpmate, whose relation to himself he describes in the words, “*she shall be called Woman, for she is taken out of man.*” **אִשָּׁה** is well rendered by Luther, “*Männin*” (a female man), like the old Latin *vira* from *vir*. The words which follow, “*therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall become one flesh,*” are not to be regarded as Adam’s, first on account of the **עַל-יָבֵן**, which is always used in Genesis, with the exception of Gen. 20: 6; 42:21, to introduce remarks of the writer, either of an archaeological or of a historical character, and secondly, because, even if Adam on seeing the woman had given prophetic utterance to his perception of the mystery of marriage, he could not with propriety have spoken of father and mother. They are the words of Moses, written to bring out the truth embodied in the fact recorded as a divinely appointed result, to exhibit marriage as the deepest corporeal and spiritual unity of man and woman, and to hold up monogamy before the eyes of the people of Israel as the form of marriage ordained by God. But as the words of Moses, they are the utterance of divine revelation; and Christ could quote them, therefore, as the word of God (Mat. 19: 5). By the leaving of father and mother, which applies to the woman as well as to the man, the conjugal union is shown to be a spiritual oneness, a vital communion of heart as well as of body, in which it finds its consummation. This union is of a totally different nature from that of parents

and children; hence marriage between parents and children is entirely opposed to the ordinance of God. Marriage itself, notwithstanding the fact that it demands the leaving of father and mother, is a holy appointment of God; hence celibacy is not a higher or holier state, and the relation of the sexes for a pure and holy man is a pure and holy relation. This is shown in v. 25: “*They were both naked* (עֲרוּמִים, with *dagesh* in the מ, is an abbreviated form of עֲרֻמָּם 3: 7, from עָרַר to strip), *the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.*” Their bodies were sanctified by the spirit, which animated them. Shame entered first with sin, which destroyed the normal relation of the spirit to the body, exciting tendencies and lusts which warred against the soul, and turning the sacred ordinance of God into sensual impulses and the lust of the flesh.

THE FALL. — CH. 3

Genesis ch. 3. The man, whom God had appointed lord of the earth and its inhabitants, was endowed with everything requisite for the development of his nature and the fulfilment of his destiny. In the fruit of the trees of the garden he had food for the sustenance of his life; in the care of the garden itself, a field of labour for the exercise of his physical strength; in the animal and vegetable kingdom, a capacious region for the expansion of his intellect; in the tree of knowledge, a positive law for the training of his moral nature; and in the woman associated with him, a suitable companion and help. In such circumstances as these he might have developed both his physical and spiritual nature in accordance with the will of God. But a tempter approached him from the midst of the animal world, and he yielded to the temptation to break the command of God. The *serpent* is said to have been the tempter. But to any one who reads the narrative carefully in connection with the previous history of the creation, and bears in mind that man is there described as exalted far above all the rest of the animal world, not only by the fact of his having been created in the image of God and invested with dominion over all the creatures of the earth, but also because God breathed into him the breath of life, and no help meet for him was found among the beasts of the field, and also that this superiority was manifest in the gift of speech, which enabled him to give names to all the rest — a thing which they, as speechless, were unable to perform, — it must be at once apparent that it was not from the serpent, as a sagacious and crafty animal, that the temptation proceeded, but that the serpent was simply the tool of that evil spirit, who is met with in the further course of the world’s history under the name of Satan (the opponent), or the Devil (ὁ διάβολος, the slanderer or accuser). ^{f17}

When the serpent, therefore, is introduced as speaking, and that just as if it had been entrusted with the thoughts of God Himself, the speaking must have emanated, not from the serpent, but from a superior spirit, which had taken

possession of the serpent for the sake of seducing man. This fact, indeed, is not distinctly stated in the canonical books of the Old Testament; but that is simply for the same educational reason which led Moses to transcribe the account exactly as it had been handed down, in the pure objective form of an outward and visible occurrence, and without any allusion to the causality which underlay the external phenomenon, viz., not so much to oppose the tendency of contemporaries to heathen superstition and habits of intercourse with the kingdom of demons, as to avoid encouraging the disposition to transfer the blame to the evil spirit which tempted man, and thus reduce sin to a mere act of weakness. But we find the fact distinctly alluded to in the book of Wisdom 2:24; and not only is it constantly noticed in the rabbinical writings, where the prince of the evil spirits is called the old serpent, or the serpent, with evident reference to this account, but it was introduced at a very early period into Parsism also. It is also attested by Christ and His apostles (Joh. 8:44; 2Co. 11: 3 and 14; Rom. 16:20; Rev. 12: 9; 20: 2), and confirmed by the temptation of our Lord. The temptation of Christ is the counterpart of that of Adam. Christ was tempted by the devil, not only like Adam, but because Adam had been tempted and overcome, in order that by overcoming the tempter He might wrest from the devil that dominion over the whole race which he had secured by his victory over the first human pair. The tempter approached the Saviour openly; to the first man he came in disguise. The serpent is not a merely symbolical term applied to Satan; nor was it only the form which Satan assumed; but it was a real serpent, perverted by Satan to be the instrument of his temptation (vv. 1 and 14). The possibility of such a perversion, or of the evil spirit using an animal for his own purposes, is not to be explained merely on the ground of the supremacy of spirit over nature, but also from the connection established in the creation itself between heaven and earth; and still more, from the position originally assigned by the Creator to the spirits of heaven in relation to the creatures of earth. The origin, force, and limits of this relation it is impossible to determine *a priori*, or in any other way than from such hints as are given in the Scriptures; so that there is no reasonable ground for disputing the possibility of such an influence. Notwithstanding his self-willed opposition to God, Satan is still a creature of God, and was created a good spirit; although, in proud self-exaltation, he abused the freedom essential to the nature of a superior spirit to purposes of rebellion against his Maker. He cannot therefore entirely shake off his dependence upon God. And this dependence may possibly explain the reason, why he did not come “disguised as an angel of light” to tempt our first parents to disobedience, but was obliged to seek the instrument of his wickedness among the beasts of the field. The trial of our first progenitors was ordained by God, because probation was essential to their spiritual development and self-determination. But as He did not desire that they should be tempted to their fall, He would not suffer Satan

to tempt them in a way which should surpass their human capacity. The tempted might therefore have resisted the tempter. If, instead of approaching them in the form of a celestial being, in the likeness of God, he came in that of a creature, not only far inferior to God, but far below themselves, they could have no excuse for allowing a mere animal to persuade them to break the commandment of God. For they had been made to have dominion over the beasts, and not to take their own law from them. Moreover, the fact that an evil spirit was approaching them in the serpent, could hardly be concealed from them. Its speaking alone must have suggested that; for Adam had already become acquainted with the nature of the beasts, and had not found one among them resembling himself — not one, therefore, endowed with reason and speech. The substance of the address, too, was enough to prove that it was no good spirit which spake through the serpent, but one at enmity with God. Hence, when they paid attention to what he said, they were altogether without excuse.

Gen. 3: 1-8. “*The serpent was more subtle than all the beasts of the field, which Jehovah God had made.*” — The serpent is here described not only as a beast, but also as a creature of God; it must therefore have been good, like everything else that He had made. Subtilty was a natural characteristic of the serpent (Mat. 10:16), which led the evil one to select it as his instrument. Nevertheless the predicate עָרוּם is not used here in the good sense of φρόνιμος (LXX), *prudens*, but in the bad sense of πανούργος, *callidus*. For its *subtilty* was manifested as the craft of a tempter to evil, in the simple fact that it was to the weaker woman that it turned; and *cunning* was also displayed in what it said: “*Hath God indeed said, Ye shall not eat of all the trees of the garden?*” אִי־כִי is an interrogative expressing surprise (as in 1Sa. 23: 3, 2Sa. 4:11): “*Is it really the fact that God has prohibited you from eating of all the trees of the garden?*” The Hebrew may, indeed, bear the meaning, “*hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree?*” but from the context, and especially the conjunction, it is obvious that the meaning is, “*ye shall not eat of any tree.*” The serpent calls God by the name of Elohim alone, and the woman does the same. In this more general and indefinite name the personality of the living God is obscured. To attain his end, the tempter felt it necessary to change the living personal God into a merely general *numen divinum*, and to exaggerate the prohibition, in the hope of exciting in the woman’s mind partly distrust of God Himself, and partly a doubt as to the truth of His word. And his words were listened to. Instead of turning away, the woman replied,

“We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.”

She was aware of the prohibition, therefore, and fully understood its meaning; but she added, “*neither shall ye touch it,*” and proved by this very exaggeration that it appeared too stringent even to her, and therefore that her love and confidence towards God were already beginning to waver. Here was the beginning of her fall:

“for doubt is the father of sin, and *skepsis* the mother of all transgression; and in this father and this mother, all our present knowledge has a common origin with sin” (Ziegler).

From doubt, the tempter advances to a direct denial of the truth of the divine threat, and to a malicious suspicion of the divine love (vv. 4, 5). “*Ye will by no means die*” (נִשְׁבַּח) is placed before the infinitive absolute, as in Psa. 49: 8 and Amo. 9: 8; for the meaning is not, “he will not die;” but, ye will positively *not* die). “*But* ^{f18} *God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, your eyes will be opened,* ^{f19} *and ye will be like God, knowing good and evil.*” That is to say, it is not because the fruit of the tree will injure you that God has forbidden you to eat it, but from ill-will and envy, because He does not wish you to be like Himself. “A truly satanic *double entendre*, in which a certain agreement between truth and untruth is secured!” By eating the fruit, man did obtain the knowledge of good and evil, and in this respect became like God (vv. 7 and 22). This was the truth which covered the falsehood “ye shall not die,” and turned the whole statement into a lie, exhibiting its author as the father of lies, who abides not in the truth (John 8:44). For the knowledge of good and evil, which man obtains by going into evil, is as far removed from the true likeness of God, which he would have attained by avoiding it, as the imaginary liberty of a sinner, which leads into bondage to sin and ends in death, is from the true liberty of a life of fellowship with God.

Gen. 3: 6. The illusive hope of being like God excited a longing for the forbidden fruit.

“*The woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a pleasure to the eyes, and to be desired to make one wise* (הַשְּׂבִיל) signifies to gain or show discernment or insight); and she took of its fruit and ate, and gave to her husband by her (who was present), *and he did eat.*”

As distrust of God’s command leads to a disregard of it, so the longing for a false independence excites a desire for the seeming good that has been prohibited; and this desire is fostered by the senses, until it brings forth sin. Doubt, unbelief, and pride were the roots of the sin of our first parents, as they have been of all the sins of their posterity. The more trifling the object of their sin seems to have been, the greater and more difficult does the sin itself

appear; especially when we consider that the first men “stood in a more direct relation to God, their Creator, than any other man has ever done, that their hearts were pure, their discernment clear, their intercourse with God direct, that they were surrounded by gifts just bestowed by Him, and could not excuse themselves on the ground of any misunderstanding of the divine prohibition, which threatened them with the loss of life in the event of disobedience” (*Delitzsch*). Yet not only did the woman yield to the seductive wiles of the serpent, but even the man allowed himself to be tempted by the woman.

Gen. 3: 7, 8. “Then the eyes of them both were opened” (as the serpent had foretold: but what did they see?), “and they knew that they were naked.” They had lost “that blessed blindness, the ignorance of innocence, which knows nothing of nakedness” (*Ziegler*). The discovery of their nakedness excited shame, which they sought to conceal by an outward covering. “They sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons.” The word **תְּאַסְתִּי** always denotes the fig-tree, not the pisang (*Musa paradisiaca*), nor the Indian banana, whose leaves are twelve feet long and two feet broad, for there would have been no necessity to sew them together at all. **תְּאַסְתִּי**, **περιζώματα**, are aprons, worn round the hips. It was here that the consciousness of nakedness first suggested the need of covering, not because the fruit had poisoned the fountain of human life, and through some inherent quality had immediately corrupted the reproductive powers of the body (as *Hoffmann* and *Baumgarten* suppose), nor because any physical change ensued in consequence of the fall; but because, with the destruction of the normal connection between soul and body through sin, the body ceased to be the pure abode of a spirit in fellowship with God, and in the purely natural state of the body the consciousness was produced not merely of the distinction of the sexes, but still more of the worthlessness of the flesh; so that the man and woman stood ashamed in each other’s presence, and endeavoured to hide the disgrace of their spiritual nakedness, by covering those parts of the body through which the impurities of nature are removed. That the natural feeling of shame, the origin of which is recorded here, had its root, not in sensuality or any physical corruption, but in the consciousness of guilt or shame before God, and consequently that it was the conscience which was really at work, is evident from the fact that the man and his wife hid themselves from Jehovah God among the trees of the garden, as soon as they heard the sound of His footsteps. **קוֹל יְהוָה** (the voice of Jehovah, v. 8) is not the voice of God speaking or calling, but the sound of God walking, as in 2Sa. 5:24, 1Ki. 14: 6, etc. — *In the cool of the day* (lit., in the wind of the day), i.e., towards the evening, when a cooling wind generally blows. The men have broken away from God, but God will not and cannot leave them alone. He comes to them as one man to another. This was the earliest form of divine revelation. God conversed with the first man in a visible

shape, as the Father and Instructor of His children. He did not adopt this mode for the first time after the fall, but employed it as far back as the period when He brought the beasts to Adam, and gave him the woman to be his wife (Gen. 2:19, 22). This human mode of intercourse between man and God is not a mere figure of speech, but a reality, having its foundation in the nature of humanity, or rather in the fact that man was created in the image of God, but not in the sense supposed by *Jakobi*, that “God *theomorphised* when creating man, and man therefore necessarily *anthropomorphises* when he thinks of God.” The anthropomorphies of God have their real foundation in the divine condescension which culminated in the incarnation of God in Christ. They are to be understood, however, as implying, not that corporeality, or a bodily shape, is an essential characteristic of God, but that God having given man a bodily shape, when He created him in His own image, revealed Himself in a manner suited to his bodily senses, that He might thus preserve him in living communion with Himself.

Gen. 3: 9-15. The man could not hide himself from God. “*Jehovah God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou?*” Not that He was ignorant of his hiding-place, but to bring him to a confession of his sin. And when Adam said that he had hidden himself through fear of his nakedness, and thus sought to hide the sin behind its consequences, his disobedience behind the feeling of shame; this is not to be regarded as a sign of peculiar obduracy, but easily admits of a psychological explanation, viz., that at the time he actually thought more of his nakedness and shame than of his transgression of the divine command, and his consciousness of the effects of his sin was keener than his sense of the sin itself. To awaken the latter God said, “*Who told thee that thou wast naked?*” and asked him whether he had broken His command. He could not deny that he had, but sought to excuse himself by saying, that the woman whom God gave to be with him had given him of the tree. When the woman was questioned, she pleaded as her excuse, that *the serpent had beguiled her* (or rather deceived her, *ἔξαπάτησεν*, 2Co. 11: 3). In offering these excuses, neither of them denied the fact. But the fault in both was, that they did not at once smite upon their breasts. “It is so still; the sinner first of all endeavours to throw the blame upon others as tempters, and then upon circumstances which God has ordained.”

Gen. 3:14, 15. The sentence follows the examination, and is pronounced first of all upon the serpent as the tempter: “*Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed before all cattle, and before every beast of the field.*” *יָרֵב*, literally *out of the beasts*, separate from them (Deu. 14: 2; Jud. 5:24), is not a comparative signifying *more than*, nor does it mean *by*; for the curse did not proceed from the beasts, but from God, and was not pronounced upon all the beasts, but upon the serpent alone. The *κτίσις*, it is true, including the whole

animal creation, has been “made subject to vanity” and “the bondage of corruption,” in consequence of the sin of man (Rom. 8:20, 21); yet this subjection is not to be regarded as the effect of the curse, which was pronounced upon the serpent, having fallen upon the whole animal world, but as the consequence of death passing from man into the rest of the creation, and thoroughly pervading the whole. The creation was drawn into the fall of man, and compelled to share its consequences, because the whole of the irrational creation was made for man, and made subject to him as its head; consequently the ground was cursed for man’s sake, but not the animal world for the serpent’s sake, or even along with the serpent. The curse fell upon the serpent for having tempted the woman, according to the same law by which not only a beast which had injured a man was ordered to be put to death (Gen. 9: 5; Exo. 21:28, 29), but any beast which had been the instrument of an unnatural crime was to be slain along with the man (Lev. 20:15, 16); not as though the beast were an accountable creature, but in consequence of its having been made subject to man, not to injure his body or his life, or to be the instrument of his sin, but to subserve the great purpose of his life.

“Just as a loving father,” as *Chrysostom* says, “when punishing the murderer of his son, might snap in two the sword or dagger with which the murder had been committed.” The proof, therefore, that the serpent was merely the instrument of an evil spirit, does not lie in the punishment itself, but in the manner in which the sentence was pronounced. When God addressed the animal, and pronounced a curse upon it, this presupposed that the curse had regard not so much to the irrational beast as to the spiritual tempter, and that the punishment which fell upon the serpent was merely a symbol of his own. The punishment of the serpent corresponded to the crime. It had exalted itself above the man; therefore upon its belly it should go, and dust it should eat all the days of its life. If these words are not to be robbed of their entire meaning, they cannot be understood in any other way than as denoting that the form and movements of the serpent were altered, and that its present repulsive shape is the effect of the curse pronounced upon it, though we cannot form any accurate idea of its original appearance. Going upon the belly (= creeping, Lev. 11:42) was a mark of the deepest degradation; also the eating of dust, which is not to be understood as meaning that dust was to be its only food, but that while crawling in the dust it would also swallow dust (cf. Mic. 7:17; Isa. 49:23). Although this punishment fell literally upon the serpent, it also affected the tempter if a figurative or symbolical sense. He became the object of the utmost contempt and abhorrence; and the serpent still keeps the revolting image of Satan perpetually before the eye. This degradation was to be perpetual. “While all the rest of creation shall be

delivered from the fate into which the fall has plunged it, according to Isa. 65:25, the instrument of man's temptation is to remain sentenced to perpetual degradation in fulfilment of the sentence, 'all the days of thy life.' and thus to prefigure the fate of the real tempter, for whom there is no deliverance" (*Hengstenberg*, *Christology* 1:15).

— The presumption of the tempter was punished with the deepest degradation; and in like manner his sympathy with the woman was to be turned into eternal hostility (v. 15). God established perpetual enmity, not only between the serpent and the woman, but also between the serpent's and the woman's seed, i.e., between the human and the serpent race. The seed of the woman would crush the serpent's head, and the serpent crush the heel of the woman's seed. The meaning, *terere, conterere*, is thoroughly established by the Chald., Syr., and Rabb. authorities, and we have therefore retained it, in harmony with the word συντριβειν in Rom. 16:20, and because it accords better and more easily with all the other passages in which the word occurs, than the rendering *inhiare*, to regard with enmity, which is obtained from the combination of שׂוֹף with שָׂאף. The verb is construed with a double accusative, the second giving greater precision to the first (vid., *Ges.* § 139, note, and *Ewald*, § 281). The same word is used in connection with both head and heel, to show that on both sides the intention is to destroy the opponent; at the same time, the expressions head and heel denote a *majus* and *minus*, or, as *Calvin* says, *superius et inferius*. This contrast arises from the nature of the foes. The serpent can only seize the heel of the man, who walks upright; whereas the man can crush the head of the serpent, that crawls in the dust. But this difference is itself the result of the curse pronounced upon the serpent, and its crawling in the dust is a sign that it will be defeated in its conflict with man. However pernicious may be the bite of a serpent in the heel when the poison circulates throughout the body (Gen. 49:17), it is not immediately fatal and utterly incurable, like the cursing of a serpent's head.

But even in this sentence there is an unmistakable allusion to the evil and hostile being concealed behind the serpent. That the human race should triumph over the serpent, was a necessary consequence of the original subjection of the animals to man. When, therefore, God not merely confines the serpent within the limits assigned to the animals, but puts enmity between it and the woman, this in itself points to a higher, spiritual power, which may oppose and attack the human race through the serpent, but will eventually be overcome. Observe, too, that although in the first clause the seed of the serpent is opposed to the seed of the woman, in the second it is not over the seed of the serpent but over the serpent itself that the victory is said to be gained. *It*, i.e., the seed of the woman will crush *thy* head, and *thou* (not thy seed) wilt crush its heel. Thus the seed of the serpent is hidden behind the unity of the serpent,

or rather of the foe who, through the serpent, has done such injury to man. This foe is Satan, who incessantly opposes the seed of the woman and bruises its heel, but is eventually to be trodden under its feet. It does not follow from this, however, apart from other considerations, that by the seed of the woman we are to understand *one* solitary person, one individual only. As the woman is the mother of all living (v. 20), her seed, to which the victory over the serpent and its seed is promised, must be the human race. But if a direct and exclusive reference to Christ appears to be exegetically untenable, the allusion in the word to Christ is by no means precluded in consequence. In itself the idea of זרע, the seed, is an indefinite one, since the posterity of a man may consist of a whole tribe or of one son only (Gen. 4:25; 21:12, 13), and on the other hand, an entire tribe may be reduced to one single descendant and become extinct in him. The question, therefore, who is to be understood by the “seed” which is to crush the serpent’s head, can only be answered from the history of the human race. But a point of much greater importance comes into consideration here. Against the natural serpent the conflict may be carried on by the whole human race, by all who are born of a woman, but not against Satan. As he is a foe who can only be met with spiritual weapons, none can encounter him successfully but such as possess and make use of spiritual arms. Hence the idea of the “seed” is modified by the nature of the foe. If we look at the natural development of the human race, Eve bore three sons, but only one of them, viz., *Seth*, was really the seed by whom the human family was preserved through the flood and perpetuated in Noah: so, again, of the three sons of Noah, *Shem*, the blessed of Jehovah, from whom Abraham descended, was the only one in whose seed all nations were to be blessed, and that not through Ishmael, but through Isaac alone. Through these constantly repeated acts of divine selection, which were not arbitrary exclusions, but were rendered necessary by differences in the spiritual condition of the individuals concerned, the “seed,” to which the victory over Satan was promised, was spiritually or ethically determined, and ceased to be co-extensive with physical descent. This spiritual seed culminated in Christ, in whom the Adamic family terminated, henceforward to be renewed by Christ as the second Adam, and restored by Him to its original exaltation and likeness to God. In this sense Christ is the seed of the woman, who tramples Satan under His feet, not as an individual, but as the head both of the posterity of the woman which kept the promise and maintained the conflict with the old serpent before His advent, and also of all those who are gathered out of all nations, are united to Him by faith, and formed into one body of which He is the head (Rom. 16:20). On the other hand, all who have not regarded and preserved the promise, have fallen into the power of the old serpent, and are to be regarded as the seed of the serpent, whose head will be trodden under foot (Mat. 23:33; Joh. 8:44; 1Jo. 3: 8). If then the promise culminates in Christ, the fact that the victory over the serpent

is promised to the posterity of the woman, not of the man, acquires this deeper significance, that as it was through the woman that the craft of the devil brought sin and death into the world, so it is also through the woman that the grace of God will give to the fallen human race the conqueror of sin, of death, and of the devil. And even if the words had reference first of all to the fact that the woman had been led astray by the serpent, yet in the fact that the destroyer of the serpent was born of a woman (without a human father) they were fulfilled in a way which showed that the promise must have proceeded from that Being, who secured its fulfilment not only in its essential force, but even in its apparently casual form.

Gen. 3:16-19. It was not till the prospect of victory had been presented, that a sentence of punishment was pronounced upon both the man and the woman on account of their sin. The woman, who had broken the divine command for the sake of earthly enjoyment, was punished in consequence with the sorrows and pains of pregnancy and childbirth.

“I will greatly multiply (הַרְבֵּה) is the inf. abs. for הָרַבָּה, which had become an adverb: vid., Ewald, § 240c, as in Gen. 16:10 and 22:17) thy sorrow and thy pregnancy: in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children.”

As the increase of conceptions, regarded as the fulfilment of the blessing to “be fruitful and multiply” (Gen. 1:28), could be no punishment, וְהָרַבְתְּ must be understood as in apposition to עֲצֻבוֹתֶיךָ thy sorrow (i.e., the sorrows peculiar to a woman’s life), and indeed (or more especially) thy pregnancy (i.e., the sorrows attendant upon that condition). The sentence is not rendered more lucid by the assumption of a *hendiadys*.

“That the woman should bear children was the original will of God; but it was a punishment that henceforth she was to bear them in sorrow, i.e., with pains which threatened her own life as well as that of the child” (Delitzsch).

The punishment consisted in an enfeebling of nature, in consequence of sin, which disturbed the normal relation between body and soul. — The woman had also broken through her divinely appointed subordination to the man; she had not only emancipated herself from the man to listen to the serpent, but had led the man into sin. For that, she was punished with a *desire* bordering upon disease (תְּשׁוּקָה from תִּשׁוּק to run, to have a violent craving for a thing), and with *subjection* to the man. “*And he shall rule over thee.*” Created for the man, the woman was made subordinate to him from the very first; but the supremacy of the man was not intended to become a despotic rule, crushing the woman into a slave, which has been the rule in ancient and modern Heathenism, and

even in Mahometanism also, — a rule which was first softened by the sin-destroying grace of the Gospel, and changed into a form more in harmony with the original relation, viz., that of a rule on the one hand, and subordination on the other, which have their roots in mutual esteem and love.

Gen. 3:17-19. “*And unto Adam:*” the noun is here used for the first time as a *proper name* without the article. In Gen. 1:26 and Gen. 2: 5, 20, the noun is appellative, and there are substantial reasons for the omission of the article. The sentence upon Adam includes a twofold punishment: first the cursing of the ground, and secondly death, which affects the woman as well, on account of their common guilt. By listening to his wife, when deceived by the serpent, Adam had repudiated his superiority to the rest of creation. As a punishment, therefore, nature would henceforth offer resistance to his will. By breaking the divine command, he had set himself above his Maker, death would therefore show him the worthlessness of his own nature.

“Cursed be the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat it (the ground by synecdoche for its produce, as in Isa. 1: 7) all the days of thy life: thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field.”

The curse pronounced on man’s account upon the soil created for him, consisted in the fact, that the earth no longer yielded spontaneously the fruits requisite for his maintenance, but the man was obliged to force out the necessaries of life by labour and strenuous exertion. The herb of the field is in contrast with the trees of the garden, and sorrow with the easy dressing of the garden. We are not to understand, however, that because man failed to guard the good creation of God from the invasion of the evil one, a host of demoniacal powers forced their way into the material world to lay it waste and offer resistance to man; but because man himself had fallen into the power of the evil one, therefore God cursed the earth, not merely withdrawing the divine powers of life which pervaded Eden, but changing its relation to man. As *Luther* says,

“primum in eo, quod illa bona non fert quae tulisset, si homo non esset lapsus, deinde in eo quoque, quod multa noxia fert quae non tulisset, sicut sunt infelix lolium, steriles avenae, zizania, urticae, spincae, tribuli, adde venena, noxias bestiolas, et si qua sunt alia hujus generis.”

But the curse reached much further, and the writer has merely noticed the most obvious aspect. ^{f20}

The disturbance and distortion of the original harmony of body and soul, which sin introduced into the nature of man, and by which the flesh gained the

mastery over the spirit, and the body, instead of being more and more transformed into the life of the spirit, became a prey to death, spread over the whole material world; so that everywhere on earth there were to be seen wild and rugged wastes, desolation and ruin, death and corruption, or **ματαιότης** and **φθορά** (Rom. 8:20, 21). Everything injurious to man in the organic, vegetable and animal creation, is the effect of the curse pronounced upon the earth for Adam's sin, however little we may be able to explain the manner in which the curse was carried into effect; since our view of the causal connection between sin and evil even in human life is very imperfect, and the connection between spirit and matter in nature generally is altogether unknown. In this causal link between sin and the evils in the world, the wrath of God on account of sin was revealed; since, as soon as the creation (**πάντα ἢ κτίσις**, Rom. 8:22) had been wrested through man from its vital connection with its Maker, He gave it up to its own ungodly nature, so that whilst, on the one hand, it has been abused by man for the gratification of his own sinful lusts and desires, on the other, it has turned against man, and consequently many things in the world and nature, which in themselves and without sin would have been good for him, or at all events harmless, have become poisonous and destructive since his fall. For in the sweat of his face man is to eat his bread (**ἄνη** the bread-corn which springs from the earth, as in Job. 28: 5; Psa. 104:14) until he return to the ground. Formed out of the dust, he shall return to dust again. This was the fulfilment of the threat, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," which began to take effect immediately after the breach of the divine command; for not only did man then become mortal, but he also actually came under the power of death, received into his nature the germ of death, the maturity of which produced its eventual dissolution into dust. The reason why the life of the man did not come to an end immediately after the eating of the forbidden fruit, was not that "the woman had been created between the threat and the fall, and consequently the fountain of human life had been divided, the life originally concentrated in one Adam shared between man and woman, by which the destructive influence of the fruit was modified or weakened." (v. *Hoffmann*), but that the mercy and long-suffering of God afforded space for repentance, and so controlled and ordered the sin of men and the punishment of sin, as to render them subservient to the accomplishment of His original purpose and the glorification of His name.

Gen. 3:20-24. As justice and mercy were combined in the divine sentence; justice in the fact that God cursed the tempter alone, and only punished the tempted with labour and mortality, mercy in the promise of eventual triumph over the serpent: so God also displayed His mercy to the fallen, before carrying the sentence into effect. It was through the power of divine grace that Adam believed the promise with regard to the woman's seed, and manifested

his faith in the name which he gave to his wife. **הַיְיָ** *Eve*, an old form of **הַיָּהּ**, signifying life (**ζωή**, LXX), or life-spring, is a substantive, and not a feminine adjective meaning “the living one,” nor an abbreviated form of **הַיְיָ מְחַיֶּה**, from **הַיָּהּ** = **הַיָּהּ** (Gen. 19:32, 34), the life-receiving one. This name was given by Adam to his wife, “*because*,” as the writer explains with the historical fulfilment before his mind, “*she became the mother of all living*,” i.e., because the continuance and life of his race were guaranteed to the man through the woman. God also displayed His mercy by clothing the two with coats of skin, i.e., the skins of beasts. The words, “God made coats,” are not to be interpreted with such bare literality, as that God sewed the coats with His own fingers; they merely affirm

“that man’s first clothing was the work of God, who gave the necessary directions and ability” (*Delitzsch*).

By this clothing, God imparted to the feeling of shame the visible sign of an awakened conscience, and to the consequent necessity for a covering to the bodily nakedness, the higher work of a suitable discipline for the sinner. By selecting the skins of beasts for the clothing of the first men, and therefore causing the death or slaughter of beasts for that purpose, He showed them how they might use the sovereignty they possessed over the animals for their own good, and even sacrifice animal life for the preservation of human; so that this act of God laid the foundation for the sacrifices, even if the first clothing did not prefigure our ultimate “clothing upon” (2Co. 5: 4), nor the coats of skins the robe of righteousness.

Gen. 3:22-24. Clothed in this sign of mercy, the man was driven out of paradise, to bear the punishment of his sin. The words of Jehovah, “*The man is become as one of Us, to know good and evil*,” contain no irony, as though man had exalted himself to a position of autonomy resembling that of God; for “irony at the expense of a wretched tempted soul might well befit Satan, but not the Lord.” Likeness to God is predicated only with regard to the knowledge of good and evil, in which the man really had become like God. In order that, after the germ of death had penetrated into his nature along with sin, he might not “*take also of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever*” (**חַי** contracted from **חַיִּי** = **חַיֶּה**, as in Gen. 5: 5; 1Sa. 20:31), *God sent him forth from the garden of Eden.*” With **וַיִּשְׁלַחְהוּ** (sent him forth) the narrative passes over from the words to the actions of God. From the **גַּם** (*also*) it follows that the man had not yet eaten of the tree of life. Had he continued in fellowship with God by obedience to the command of God, he might have eaten of it, for he was created for eternal life. But after he had fallen through sin into the power of death, the fruit which produced immortality could only do him harm.

For immortality in a state of sin is not the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, which God designed for man, but endless misery, which the Scriptures call “the second death” (Rev. 2:11; 20: 6, 14; 21: 8). The expulsion from paradise, therefore, was a punishment inflicted for man’s good, intended, while exposing him to temporal death, to preserve him from eternal death. To keep the approach to the tree of life, “*God caused cherubim to dwell (to encamp) at the east (on the eastern side) of the garden, and the (i.e., with the) flame of the sword turning to and fro*” (מַתְּהַפְּכֹת, moving rapidly). The word כְּרֻב cherub has no suitable etymology in the Semitic, but is unquestionably derived from the same root as the Greek γρύψυ or γρυπές, and has been handed down from the forefathers of our race, though the primary meaning can no longer be discovered. The *Cherubim*, however, are creatures of a higher world, which are represented as surrounding the throne of God, both in the visions of Ezekiel (Eze. 1:22 ff., 10: 1) and the Revelation of John (Rev. 4: 6); not, however, as throne-bearers or throne-holders, or as forming the chariot of the throne, but as occupying the highest place as living beings (חַיִּים, ζῶα) in the realm of spirits, standing by the side of God as the heavenly King when He comes to judgment, and proclaiming the majesty of the Judge of the world. In this character God stationed them on the eastern side of paradise, not “to inhabit the garden as the temporary representatives of man,” but “to keep the way of the tree of life,” i.e., to render it impossible for man to return to paradise, and eat of the tree of life. Hence there appeared by their side the flame of a sword, apparently in constant motion, cutting hither and thither, representing the devouring fire of the divine wrath, and showing the cherubim to be ministers of judgment. With the expulsion of man from the garden of Eden, paradise itself vanished from the earth. God did not withdraw from the tree of life its supernatural power, nor did He destroy the garden before their eyes, but simply prevented their return, to show that it should be preserved until the time of the end, when sin should be rooted out by the judgment, and death abolished by the Conqueror of the serpent (1Co. 15:26), and when upon the new earth the tree of life should flourish again in the heavenly Jerusalem, and bear fruit for the redeemed (Revelation 20 and 21).

THE SONS OF THE FIRST MAN. — CH. 4.

Gen. 4: 1-8. The propagation of the human race did not commence till after the expulsion from paradise. Generation in man is an act of personal free-will, not a blind impulse of nature, and rests upon a moral self-determination. It flows from the divine institution of marriage, and is therefore knowing (יָדַע) the wife. — At the birth of the first son Eve exclaimed with joy, “*I have gotten (קָנִיתִי) a man with Jehovah,*” wherefore the child received the name *Cain* (קַיִן from קָיָן = קָנָה, κτᾶσθαι). So far as the grammar is concerned, the

expression אֱתֵיְהוָה might be rendered, as in apposition to אִישׁ, “a man, the Lord” (*Luther*), but the sense would not allow it. For even if we could suppose the faith of Eve in the promised conqueror of the serpent to have been sufficiently alive for this, the promise of God had not given her the slightest reason to expect that the promised seed would be of divine nature, and might be Jehovah, so as to lead her to believe that she had given birth to Jehovah now. אֶת is a preposition in the sense of helpful association, as in Gen. 21:20; 39: 2, 21, etc. That she sees in the birth of this son the commencement of the fulfilment of the promise, and thankfully acknowledges the divine help in this display of mercy, is evident from the name *Jehovah*, the God of salvation. The use of this name is significant. Although it cannot be supposed that Eve herself knew and uttered this name, since it was not till a later period that it was made known to man, and it really belongs to the Hebrew, which was not formed till after the division of tongues, yet it expresses the feeling of Eve on receiving this proof of the gracious help of God.

Gen. 4: 2. But her joy was soon overcome by the discovery of the vanity of this earthly life. This is expressed in the name *Abel*, which was given to the second son (אֶבֶל, in pause אֶבֶל, i.e., nothingness, vanity), whether it indicated generally a feeling of sorrow on account of his weakness, or was a prophetic presentiment of his untimely death. The occupation of the sons is noticed on account of what follows. “*Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.*” Adam had, no doubt, already commenced both occupations, and the sons selected each a different department. God Himself had pointed out both to Adam, — the tilling of the ground by the employment assigned him in Eden, which had to be changed into agriculture after his expulsion; and the keeping of cattle in the clothing that He gave him (Gen. 3:21). Moreover, agriculture can never be entirely separated from the rearing of cattle; for a man not only requires food, but clothing, which is procured directly from the hides and wool of tame animals. In addition to this, sheep do not thrive without human protection and care, and therefore were probably associated with man from the very first. The different occupations of the brothers, therefore, are not to be regarded as a proof of the difference in their dispositions. This comes out first in the sacrifice, which they offered after a time to God, each one from the produce of his vocation. —

“*In process of time*” (lit., at the end of days, i.e., after a considerable lapse of time: for this use of יָמִים cf. Gen. 40: 4; Num. 9: 2) *Cain brought of the fruit of the ground a gift (מִנְחָה) to the Lord; and Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and indeed (vav in an explanatory sense, vid., Ges. § 155, 1) of their fat,*”

i.e., the fattest of the firstlings, and not merely the first good one that came to hand. חֲלֵבִים are not the *fat portions* of the animals, as in the Levitical law of sacrifice. This is evident from the fact, that the sacrifice was not connected with a sacrificial meal, and animal food was not eaten at this time. That the usage of the Mosaic law cannot determine the meaning of this passage, is evident from the word *minchah*, which is applied in Leviticus to bloodless sacrifices only, whereas it is used here in connection with Abel's sacrifice. "And Jehovah looked upon Abel and his gift; and upon Cain and his gift He did not look." The look of Jehovah was in any case a visible sign of satisfaction. It is a common and ancient opinion that fire consumed Abel's sacrifice, and thus showed that it was graciously accepted. *Theodotion* explains the words by καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν ὁ Θεός. But whilst this explanation has the analogy of Lev. 9:24 and Jud. 6:21 in its favour, it does not suit the words, "upon Abel and his gift." The reason for the different reception of the two offerings was the state of mind towards God with which they were brought, and which manifested itself in the selection of the gifts. Not, indeed, in the fact that Abel brought a bleeding sacrifice and Cain a bloodless one; for this difference arose from the difference in their callings, and each necessarily took his gift from the produce of his own occupation. It was rather in the fact that Abel offered the fattest firstlings of his flock, the best that he could bring; whilst Cain only brought a portion of the fruit of the ground, but not the first-fruits. By this choice Abel brought πλείονα θυσίαν παρὰ Κάιν, and manifested that disposition which is designated faith (πίστις) in Heb. 11: 4. The nature of this disposition, however, can only be determined from the meaning of the offering itself.

The sacrifices offered by Adam's sons, and that not in consequence of a divine command, but from the free impulse of their nature as determined by God, were the first sacrifices of the human race. The origin of sacrifice, therefore, is neither to be traced to a positive command, nor to be regarded as a human invention. To form an accurate conception of the idea which lies at the foundation of all sacrificial worship, we must bear in mind that the first sacrifices were offered after the fall, and therefore presupposed the spiritual separation of man from God, and were designed to satisfy the need of the heart for fellowship with God. This need existed in the case of Cain, as well as in that of Abel; otherwise he would have offered no sacrifice at all, since there was no command to render it compulsory. Yet it was not the wish for forgiveness of sin which led Adam's sons to offer sacrifice; for there is no mention of expiation, and the notion that Abel, by slaughtering the animal, confessed that he deserved death on account of sin, is transferred to this passage from the expiatory sacrifices of the Mosaic law. The offerings were expressive of gratitude to God, to whom they owed all that they had; and were

associated also with the desire to secure the divine favour and blessing, so that they are to be regarded not merely as thank-offerings, but as supplicatory sacrifices, and as propitiatory also, in the wider sense of the word. In this the two offerings are alike. The reason why they were not equally acceptable to God is not to be sought, as *Hofmann* thinks, in the fact that Cain merely offered thanks “for the preservation of this present life,” whereas Abel offered thanks “for the forgiveness of sins,” or “for the sin-forgiving clothing received by man from the hand of God.” To take the nourishment of the body literally and the clothing symbolically in this manner, is an arbitrary procedure, by which the Scriptures might be made to mean anything we chose. The reason is to be found rather in the fact, that Abel’s thanks came from the depth of his heart, whilst Cain merely offered his to keep on good terms with God, — a difference that was manifested in the choice of the gifts, which each one brought from the produce of his occupation. This choice shows clearly “that it was the pious feeling, through which the worshiper put his heart as it were into the gift, which made the offering acceptable to God” (*Oehler*); that the essence of the sacrifice was not the presentation of a gift to God, but that the offering was intended to shadow forth the dedication of the heart to God. At the same time, the desire of the worshiper, by the dedication of the best of his possessions to secure afresh the favour of God, contained the germ of that substitutionary meaning of sacrifice, which was afterwards expanded in connection with the deepening and heightening of the feeling of sin into a desire for forgiveness, and led to the development of the idea of expiatory sacrifice. — On account of the preference shown to Abel, “*it burned Cain sore* (the subject, ‘wrath,’ is wanting, as it frequently is in the case of **קָרָה**, cf. Gen. 18:30, 32; 31:36, etc.), *and his countenance fell*” (an indication of his discontent and anger: cf. Jer. 3:12; Job. 29:24). God warned him of giving way to this, and directed his attention to the cause and consequences of his wrath.

“*Why art thou wroth, and why is thy countenance fallen?*” The answer to this is given in the further question, “*Is there not, if thou art good, a lifting up*” (sc., of the countenance)? It is evident from the context, and the antithesis of falling and lifting up (**נָפַל** and **נָשָׂא**), that **פָּנִים** must be supplied after **שָׂאת**. By this God gave him to understand that his look was indicative of evil thoughts and intentions; for the lifting up of the countenance, i.e., a free, open look, is the mark of a good conscience (Job. 11:15). “*But if thou art not good, sin lieth before the door, and its desire is to thee* (directed towards thee); *but thou shouldst rule over it.*” The fem. **הַמָּאֵת** is construed as a masculine, because, with evident allusion to the serpent, sin is personified as a wild beast, lurking at the door of the human heart, and eagerly desiring to devour his soul (1Pe. 5: 8). **הַיֵּטִיב**, to make good, signifies here not good action, the performance of good in work and deed, but making the disposition good, i.e.,

directing the heart to what is good. Cain is to rule over the sin which is greedily desiring him, by giving up his wrath, not indeed that sin may cease to lurk for him, but that the lurking evil foe may obtain no entrance into his heart. There is no need to regard the sentence as interrogative, “Wilt thou, indeed, be able to rule over it?” (*Ewald*), nor to deny the allusion in בַּרְזַל to the lurking sin, as *Delitzsch* does. The words do not command the suppression of an inward temptation, but resistance to the power of evil as pressing from without, by hearkening to the word which God addressed to Cain in person, and addresses to us through the Scriptures. There is nothing said here about God appearing visibly; but this does not warrant us in interpreting either this or the following conversation as a simple process that took place in the heart and conscience of Cain. It is evident from vv. 14 and 16 that God did not withdraw His personal presence and visible intercourse from men, as soon as He had expelled them from the garden of Eden.

“God talks to Cain as to a wilful child, and draws out of him what is sleeping in his heart, and lurking like a wild beast before his door. And what He did to Cain He does to every one who will but observe his own heart, and listen to the voice of God” (*Herder*).

But Cain paid no heed to the divine warning.

Gen. 4: 8. He “*said to his brother Abel.*” What he said is not stated. We may either supply “*it,*” viz., what God had just said to him, which would be grammatically admissible, since אָמַר is sometimes followed by a simple accusative (*Gen. 22: 3; 44:16*), and this accusative has to be supplied from the context (as in *Exo. 19:25*); or we may supply from what follows some such expressions as “*let us go into the field,*” as the LXX, *Sam., Jonathan,* and others have done. This is also allowable, so that we need not imagine a gap in the text, but may explain the construction as in *Gen. 3:22, 23*, by supposing that the writer hastened on to describe the carrying out of what was said, without stopping to set down the words themselves. This supposition is preferable to the former, since it is psychologically most improbable that Cain should have related a warning to his brother which produced so little impression upon his own mind. In the field “*Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.*” Thus the sin of Adam had grown into fratricide in his son. The writer intentionally repeats again and again the words “*his brother,*” to bring clearly out the horror of the sin. Cain was the first man who let sin reign in him; he was “*of the wicked one*” (*1Jo. 3:12*). In him the seed of the woman had already become the seed of the serpent; and in his deed the real nature of the wicked one, as “*a murderer from the beginning,*” had come openly to light: so that already there had sprung up that contrast of two distinct

seeds within the human race, which runs through the entire history of humanity.

Gen. 4: 9-15. Defiance grows with sin, and punishment keeps pace with guilt. Adam and Eve fear before God, and acknowledge their sin; Cain boldly denies it, and in reply to the question, “*Where is Abel thy brother?*” declares, “*I know not, am I my brother’s keeper?*” God therefore charges him with his crime: “*What hast thou done! voice of thy brother’s blood crying to Me from the earth.*” The verb “*crying*” refers to the “*blood,*” since this is the principal word, and the *voice* merely expresses the adverbial idea of “*aloud,*” or “*listen*” (Ewald, § 317d). דָּמָא (drops of blood) is sometimes used to denote natural hemorrhage (Lev. 12: 4, 5; 20:18); but is chiefly applied to blood shed unnaturally, i.e., to murder. “Innocent blood has no voice, it may be, that is discernible by human ears, but it has one that reaches God, as the cry of a wicked deed demanding vengeance” (Delitzsch). Murder is one of the sins that cry to heaven.

“Primum ostendit Deus se de factis hominum cognoscere utcunque nullus queratur vel accuset; deinde sibi magis charam esse hominum vitam quam ut sanguinem innoxium impune effundi sinat; tertio curam sibi piorum esse non solum quamdiu vivunt sed etiam post mortem”
(Calvin).

Abel was the first of the saints, whose blood is precious in the sight of God (Psa. 116:15); and by virtue of his faith, he being dead yet speaketh through his blood which cried unto God (Heb. 11: 4).

Gen. 4:11, 12. “*And now* (sc., because thou hast done this) *be cursed from the earth.*” *From:* i.e., either *away from the earth,* driven forth so that it shall no longer afford a quiet resting-place (Gerlach, Delitzsch, etc.), or *out of the earth,* through its withdrawing its strength, and thus securing the fulfilment of perpetual wandering (Baumgarten, etc.). It is difficult to choose between the two; but the clause, “*which hath opened her mouth,*” etc. seems rather to favour the latter. Because the earth has been compelled to drink innocent blood, it rebels against the murderer, and when he tills it, withdraws its strength, so that the soil yields no produce; just as the land of Canaan is said to have spued out the Canaanites, on account of their abominations (Lev. 18:28). In any case, the idea that “the soil, through drinking innocent blood, became an accomplice in the sin of murder,” has no biblical support, and is not confirmed by Isa. 26:21 or Num. 35:33. The suffering of irrational creatures through the sin of man is very different from their participating in his sin. “*A fugitive and vagabond* (נָע וְנָדָד, i.e., banished and homeless) *shalt thou be in the earth.*” Cain is so affected by this curse, that his obduracy is turned into despair, “*My*

sin,” he says in v. 13, “*is greater than can be borne.*” נָשָׂא עוֹן signifies to take away and bear sin or guilt, and is used with reference both to God and man. God takes guilt away by forgiving it (Exo. 34: 7); man carries it away and bears it, by enduring its punishment (cf. Num. 5:31). *Luther*, following the ancient versions, has adopted the first meaning; but the context sustains the second: for Cain afterwards complains, not of the greatness of the sin, but only of the severity of the punishment.

“Behold, Thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from Thy face shall I be hid;...and it shall come to pass that every one that findeth me shall slay me.”

The *adamah*, from the face of which the curse of Jehovah had driven Cain, was Eden (cf. v. 16), where he had carried on his agricultural pursuits, and where God had revealed His face, i.e., His presence, to the men after their expulsion from the garden; so that henceforth Cain had to wander about upon the wide world, homeless and far from the presence of God, and was afraid lest any one who found him might slay him. By “*every one that findeth me*” we are not to understand *omnis creatura*, as though Cain had excited the hostility of all creatures, but every man; not in the sense, however, of such as existed apart from the family of Adam, but such as were aware of his crime, and knew him to be a murderer. For Cain is evidently afraid of revenge on the part of relatives of the slain, that is to say, of descendants of Adam, who were either already in existence, or yet to be born. Though Adam might not at this time have had “many grandsons and great-grandson,” yet according to v. 17 and Gen. 5: 4, he had undoubtedly other children, who might increase in number, and sooner or later might avenge Abel’s death. For, that blood shed demands blood in return, “is a principle of equity written in the heart of every man; and that Cain should see that earth full of avengers is just like a murderer, who sees avenging spirits (Ἐρινύες) ready to torture him on every hand.”

Gen. 4:15. Although Cain expressed not penitence, but fear of punishment, God displayed His long-suffering and gave him the promise,

“Therefore (לָכֵן) not in the sense of לֹא כֵן, but because it was the case, and there was reason for his complaint) whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold.”

כֶּלֶחֱרָג קַיִן, is *cas. absolut.* as in Gen. 9: 6; and הָקָם אָוֶן avenged, i.e., resented, punished, as Exo. 21:20, 21. The mark which God put upon Cain is not to be regarded as a mark upon his body, as the Rabbins and others supposed, but as a certain sign which protected him from vengeance, though of what kind it is impossible to determine. God granted him continuance of life, not because banishment from the place of God’s presence was the greatest possible

punishment, or because the preservation of the human race required at that time that the lives of individuals should be spared, — for God afterwards destroyed the whole human race, with the exception of one family, — but partly because the tares were to grow with the wheat, and sin develop itself to its utmost extent, partly also because from the very first God determined to take punishment into His own hands, and protect human life from the passion and wilfulness of human vengeance.

Gen. 4:16-24. The family of the Cainites. —

V. 16. The geographical situation of the land of *Nod*, in the front of Eden (קִדְמוֹת, see Gen. 2:14), where Cain settled after his departure from the place or the land of the revealed presence of God (cf. Jon. 1:3), cannot be determined. The name *Nod* denotes a land of flight and banishment, in contrast with Eden, the land of delight, where Jehovah walked with men. There Cain knew his wife. The text assumes it as self-evident that she accompanied him in his exile; also, that she was a daughter of Adam, and consequently a sister of Cain. The marriage of brothers and sisters was inevitable in the case of the children of the first men, if the human race was actually to descend from a single pair, and may therefore be justified in the face of the Mosaic prohibition of such marriages, on the ground that the sons and daughters of Adam represented not merely the family but the genus, and that it was not till after the rise of several families that the bands of fraternal and conjugal love became distinct from one another, and assumed fixed and mutually exclusive forms, the violation of which is sin. (Comp. Leviticus 18.) His son he named *Hanoch* (consecration), because he regarded his birth as a pledge of the renovation of his life. For this reason he also gave the same name to the city which he built, inasmuch as its erection was another phase in the development of his family. The construction of a city by Cain will cease to surprise us, if we consider that at the commencement of its erection, centuries had already passed since the creation of man, and Cain's descendants may by this time have increased considerably in numbers; also, that עִיר does not necessarily presuppose a large town, but simply an enclosed space with fortified dwellings, in contradistinction to the isolated tents of shepherds; and lastly, that the words וַיְהִי בְנָה, "he was building," merely indicate the commencement and progress of the building, but not its termination. It appears more surprising that Cain, who was to be a fugitive and a vagabond upon the earth, should have established himself in the land of Nod. This cannot be fully explained, either on the ground that he carried on the pursuits of agriculture, which lead to settled abodes, or that he strove against the curse. In addition to both the facts referred to, there is also the circumstance, that the curse, "the ground shall not yield to thee her strength," was so mollified by the grace of God, that Cain and

his descendants were enabled to obtain sufficient food in the land of his settlement, though it was by dint of hard work and strenuous effort; unless, indeed, we follow *Luther* and understand the curse, that he should be a fugitive upon the earth, as relating to his expulsion from Eden, and his removal *ad incertum locum et opus, non addita ulla vel promissione vel mandato, sicut avis quae in libero caelo incerta vagatur*. The fact that Cain undertook the erection of a city, is also significant. Even if we do not regard this city as “the first foundation-stone of the kingdom of the world, in which the spirit of the beast bears sway,” we cannot fail to detect the desire to neutralize the curse of banishment, and create for his family a point of unity, as a compensation for the loss of unity in fellowship with God, as well as the inclination of the family of Cain for that which was earthly.

The powerful development of the worldly mind and of ungodliness among the Cainites was openly displayed in Lamech, in the sixth generation. Of the intermediate links, the names only are given. (On the use of the passive with the accusative of the object in the clause “*to Hanoch was born* (they bore) *Irada*,” see Ges. § 143, 1.) Some of these names resemble those of the Sethite genealogy, viz., *Irada* and *Jared*, *Mehujael* and *Mahalaleel*, *Methusael* and *Methuselah*, also *Cain* and *Cainan*; and the names *Enoch* and *Lamech* occur in both families. But neither the recurrence of similar names, nor even of the same names, warrants the conclusion that the two genealogical tables are simply different forms of one primary legend. For the names, though similar in sound, are very different in meaning. *Irada* probably signifies the townsman, *Jared*, descent, or that which has descended; *Mehujael*, smitten of God, and *Mahalaleel*, praise of God; *Methusael*, man of prayer, and *Methuselah*, man of the sword or of increase. The repetition of the two names *Enoch* and *Lamech* even loses all significance, when we consider the different places which they occupy in the respective lines, and observe also that in the case of these very names, the more precise descriptions which are given so thoroughly establish the difference of character in the two individuals, as to preclude the possibility of their being the same, not to mention the fact, that in the later history the same names frequently occur in totally different families; e.g., *Korah* in the families of *Levi* (Exo. 6:21) and *Esau* (Gen. 36: 5); *Hanoch* in those of *Reuben* (Gen. 46: 9) and *Midian* (Gen. 25: 4); *Kenaz* in those of *Judah* (Num. 32:12) and *Esau* (Gen. 36:11). The identity and similarity of names can prove nothing more than that the two branches of the human race did not keep entirely apart from each other; a fact established by their subsequently intermarrying. — *Lamech* took two wives, and thus was the first to prepare the way for polygamy, by which the ethical aspect of marriage, as ordained by God, was turned into the lust of the eye and lust of the flesh. The names of the women are indicative of sensual attractions: *Adah*, the adorned; and *Zillah*, either the shady or the tinkling. His three sons are the authors of inventions which show

how the mind and efforts of the Cainites were directed towards the beautifying and perfecting of the earthly life. *Jabal* (probably = *jebul*, produce) became *the father of such as dwelt in tents*, i.e., of nomads who lived in tents and with their flocks, getting their living by a pastoral occupation, and possibly also introducing the use of animal food, in disregard of the divine command (Gen. 1:29). *Jubal* (sound), the father of all such as handle the harp and pipe, i.e., the inventors of stringed and wind instruments. **בְּנֹר** a guitar or harp; **עֹבֵב** the shepherd's reed or bagpipe. *Tubal-Cain*, "hammering all kinds of cutting things (the verb is to be construed as neuter) in brass and iron;" the inventor therefore of all kinds of edge-tools for working in metals: so that Cain, from **קָיַן** to forge, is probably to be regarded as the surname which Tubal received on account of his inventions. The meaning of Tubal is obscure; for the Persian *Tupal*, iron-scoria, can throw no light upon it, as it must be a much later word. The allusion to the sister of Tubal-Cain is evidently to be attributed to her name, *Naamah*, the lovely, or graceful, since it reflects the worldly mind of the Cainites. In the arts, which owed their origin to Lamech's sons, this disposition reached its culminating point; and it appears in the form of pride and defiant arrogance in the song in which Lamech celebrates the inventions of Tubal-Cain (vv. 23, 24):

“Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: Men I slay for my wound, and young men for my stripes. For sevenfold is Cain avenged, and Lamech seven and seventy-fold.”

The perfect **הִרְרֵנִי** is expressive not of a deed accomplished, but of confident assurance (Ges. § 126, 4; Ewald, § 135c); and the suffixes in **חִבְרֵתִי** and **פָּצְעִי** are to be taken in a passive sense. The idea is this: whoever inflicts a wound or stripe on me, whether man or youth, I will put to death; and for every injury done to my person, I will take ten times more vengeance than that with which God promised to avenge the murder of my ancestor Cain. In this song, which contains in its rhythm, its strophic arrangement of the thoughts, and its poetic diction, the germ of the later poetry, we may detect

“that Titanic arrogance, of which the Bible says that its power is its god (Hab. 1:11), and that it carries its god, viz., its sword, in its hand (Job. 12: 6)” (Delitzsch). —

According to these accounts, the principal arts and manufactures were invented by the Cainites, and carried out in an ungodly spirit; but they are not therefore to be attributed to the curse which rested upon the family. They have their roots rather in the mental powers with which man was endowed for the sovereignty and subjugation of the earth, but which, like all the other powers and tendencies of his nature, were pervaded by sin, and desecrated in its

service. Hence these inventions have become the common property of humanity, because they not only may promote its intended development, but are to be applied and consecrated to this purpose for the glory of God.

Gen. 4:25, 26. The character of the ungodly family of Cainites was now fully developed in Lamech and his children. The history, therefore, turns from them, to indicate briefly the origin of the godly race. After Abel's death a third son was born to Adam, to whom his mother gave the name of *Seth* (שֵׁת, from שֵׁת, a present participle, the appointed one, the compensation); "for," she said, "God hath appointed me another seed (descendant) for Abel, because Cain slew him." The words "because Cain slew him" are not to be regarded as an explanatory supplement, but as the words of Eve; and כִּי by virtue of the previous תָּחַת is to be understood in the sense of תָּחַת כִּי. What Cain (*human* wickedness) took from her, that has Elohim (*divine* omnipotence) restored. Because of this antithesis she calls the giver *Elohim* instead of *Jehovah*, and not because her hopes had been sadly depressed by her painful experience in connection with the first-born.

Gen. 4:26. "To Seth, to him also (גַּם הוּא, intensive, vid., Ges. § 121, 3) there was born a son, and he called his name Enosh." אֱנוֹשׁ, from אָנַשׁ to be weak, faint, frail, designates man from his frail and mortal condition (Psa. 8: 4; 90: 3; 103:15, etc.). In this name, therefore, the feeling and knowledge of human weakness and frailty were expressed (the opposite of the pride and arrogance displayed by the Canaanitish family); and this feeling led to God, to that invocation of the name of Jehovah which commenced under Enos. יְהוָה בְּשֵׁם קָרָא בְּשֵׁם, literally *to call in (or by) the name of Jehovah*, is used for a solemn calling of the name of God. When applied to men, it denotes invocation (here and Gen. 12: 8; 13: 4, etc.); to God, calling out or proclaiming His name (Exo. 33:19; 34: 5). The *name of God* signifies in general "the whole nature of God, by which He attests His personal presence in the relation into which He has entered with man, the divine self-manifestation, or the whole of that revealed side of the divine nature, which is turned towards man" (*Oehler*). We have here an account of the commencement of that worship of God which consists in prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, or in the acknowledgment and celebration of the mercy and help of Jehovah. While the family of Cainites, by the erection of a city, and the invention and development of worldly arts and business, were laying the foundation for the kingdom of this world; the family of the Sethites began, by united invocation of the name of God of grace, to found and to erect the kingdom of God.

II. History of Adam

GEN. 5-6: 8

GENERATIONS FROM ADAM TO NOAH. — CH. 5.

Gen. 5. The origin of the human race and the general character of its development having been thus described, all that remained of importance to universal or sacred history, in connection with the progress of our race in the primeval age, was to record the order of the families (Genesis ch. 5) and the ultimate result of the course which they pursued (Gen. 6: 1-8). — First of all, we have the genealogical table of Adam with the names of the first ten patriarchs, who were at the head of that seed of the woman by which the promise was preserved, viz., the posterity of the first pair through Seth, from Adam to the flood. We have also an account of the ages of these patriarchs before and after the birth of those sons in whom the line was continued; so that the genealogy, which indicates the line of development, furnishes at the same time a chronology of the primeval age. In the genealogy of the Cainites no ages are given, since this family, as being accursed by God, had no future history. On the other hand, the family of Sethites, which acknowledged God, began from the time of Enos to call upon the name of the Lord, and was therefore preserved and sustained by God, in order that under the training of mercy and judgment the human race might eventually attain to the great purpose of its creation. The genealogies of the primeval age, to quote the apt words of *M. Baumgarten*, are “memorials, which bear testimony quite as much to the faithfulness of God in fulfilling His promise, as to the faith and patience of the fathers themselves.” This testimony is first placed in its true light by the numbers of the years. The historian gives not merely the age of each patriarch at the time of the birth of the first-born, by whom the line of succession was continued, but the number of years that he lived after that, and then the entire length of his life. Now if we add together the ages at the birth of the several first-born sons, and the hundred years between the birth of Shem and the flood, we find that the duration of the first period in the world’s history was 1656 years. We obtain a different result, however, from the numbers given by the LXX and the Samaritan version, which differ in almost every instance from the Hebrew text, both in Genesis 5 and Genesis 11 (from Shem to Terah), as will appear from the table on the following page.

(18)The Fathers before the Flood. — Ch. 5

Names.	Hebrew Text.			Samaritan Text.			Septuagint.			Year of birth (from creation), Hebrew Text.	Year of death (from creation), Hebrew Text.
	Age at birth of first-born.	Rest of life.	Whole life.	Age at birth of first-born.	Rest of life.	Whole life.	Age at birth of first-born.	Rest of life.	Whole life.		
Adam, . . .	130	800	930	130	800	930	230	700	930	1	930
Seth, . . .	105	807	912	105	807	912	205	707	912	130	1042
Enos, . . .	90	815	905	90	815	905	190	715	905	235	1140
Cainan, . . .	70	840	910	70	840	910	170	740	910	325	1235
Mahalaleel,	65	830	895	65	830	895	165	730	895	395	1290
Jared, . . .	162	800	962	62	785	847	162	800	962	460	1422
Enoch, . . .	65	300	365	65	300	365	165	200	365	622	987
Methuselah,	187	782	969	67	653	720	167	802	969	687	1656
Lamech, . .	182	595	777	53	600	653	188	565	753	874	1651
Noah, . . .	500	450	950	500	450	950	500	450	950	1056	2066
To the flood,	100			100			100				
Total, . . .	1656			1307			2242				

f21

(20)The Fathers from the Flood to the call of Abram. — Gen. 11:10-26

Names.	Hebrew Text.			Samaritan Text.			Septuagint.			Year of birth (from creation), Hebrew Text.	Year of death (from creation), Hebrew Text.
	Age at birth of first-born.	Rest of life.	Whole life.	Age at birth of first-born.	Rest of life.	Whole life.	Age at birth of first-born.	Rest of life.	Whole life.		
Shem, . . .	100	500	600	100	500	600	100	500	600	1556	2156
Arphaxad, .	35	403	438	135	303	438	135	400	535	1656	2094
(Καϊνᾶν),	130	330	460		
Salah, . . .	30	403	433	130	303	433	130	330	460	1691	2124
Eber, . . .	34	430	464	134	270	404	134	270	404	1721	2185
Peleg, . . .	30	209	239	130	109	239	130	209	339	1755	1994
Regu, . . .	32	207	239	132	107	239	132	207	339	1785	2024
Serug, . . .	30	200	230	130	100	230	130	200	330	1817	2047
Nahor, . . .	29	119	148	79	69	148	179	125	304	1847	1995
Terah, . . .	70	135	205	70	75	145	70	135	205	1876	2081
Abram,	1946	2121
His call, . .	75			75			75				
Total, . . .	365			1015			1245			2021	

The principal deviations from the Hebrew in the case of the other two texts are these: in Genesis ch. 5 the Samaritan places the birth of the first-born of Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech 100 years earlier, whilst the Septuagint places the birth of the first-born of all the other fathers (except Noah) 100 years later than the Hebrew; in Genesis 11 the latter course is adopted in both texts in the case of all the fathers except Shem and Terah. In consequence of this, the interval from Adam to the flood is shortened in the Samaritan text by 349 years as compared with the Hebrew, and in the Septuagint is lengthened by 586 (*Cod. Alex.* 606). The interval from the flood to Abram is lengthened in both texts; in the *Sam.* by 650 years, in the *Sept.* by 880 (*Cod. Alex.* 780). In the latter, Cainan is interpolated between Arphaxad and Salah, which adds 130 years, and the age of the first-born of Nahor is placed 150 years later than in the

Hebrew, whereas in the former the difference is only 50 years. With regard to the other differences, the reason for reducing the lives of Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech in the Samaritan text after the birth of their sons, was evidently to bring their deaths within the time before the flood. The age of Methuselah, as given in the *Cod. Alex.* of the LXX, is evidently to be accounted for on the same ground, since, according to the numbers of the Vatican text, Methuselah must have lived 14 years after the flood. In the other divergences of these two texts from the Hebrew, no definite purpose can be detected; at the same time they are sufficient to show a twofold tendency, viz., to lengthen the interval from the flood to Abram, and to reduce the ages of the fathers at the birth of their first-born to greater uniformity, and to take care that the age of Adam at the birth of Seth should not be exceeded by that of any other of the patriarchs, especially in the time before the flood. To effect this, the *Sept.* adds 100 years to the ages of all the fathers, before and after the flood, whose sons were born before their 100th years; the *Sam.*, on the other hand, simply does this in the case of the fathers who lived after the flood, whilst it deducts 100 years from the ages of all the fathers before the flood who begot their first-born at a later period of their life than Adam and Seth. The age of Noah alone is left unaltered, because there were other data connected with the flood which prevented any arbitrary alteration of the text. That the principal divergences of both texts from the Hebrew are intentional changes, based upon chronological theories or cycles, is sufficiently evident from their internal character, viz., from the improbability of the statement, that whereas the average duration of life after the flood was about half the length that it was before, the time of life at which the fathers begot their first-born after the flood was as late, and, according to the Samaritan text, generally later than it had been before. No such intention is discernible in the numbers of the Hebrew text; consequently every attack upon the historical character of its numerical statements has entirely failed, and no tenable argument can be adduced against their correctness. The objection, that such longevity as that recorded in our chapter is inconceivable according to the existing condition of human nature, loses all its force if we consider

“that all the memorials of the old world contain evidence of gigantic power; that the climate, the weather, and other natural conditions, were different from those after the flood; that life was much more simple and uniform; and that the after-effects of the condition of man in paradise would not be immediately exhausted” (*Delitzsch*).

This longevity, moreover, necessarily contributed greatly to the increase of the human race; and the circumstance that the children were not born till a comparatively advanced period of life, — that is, until the corporeal and mental development of the parent was perfectly complete, — necessarily

favoured the generation of a powerful race. From both these circumstances, however, the development of the race was sure to be characterized by peculiar energy in evil as well as in good; so that whilst in the godly portion of the race, not only were the traditions of the fathers transmitted faithfully and without adulteration from father to son, but family characteristics, piety, discipline, and morals took deep root, whilst in the ungodly portion time was given for sin to develop itself with mighty power in its innumerable forms.

Gen. 5: 1. The heading in v. 1 runs thus: "This is the book (*sepher*) of the generations (*tholedoth*) of Adam." On *tholedoth*, see Gen. 2: 4. *Sepher* is a writing complete in itself, whether it consist of one sheet or several, as for instance the "bill of divorcement" in Deu. 24: 1, 3. The addition of the clause, "*in the day that God created man,*" etc., is analogous to Gen. 2: 4; the creation being mentioned again as the starting point, because all the development and history of humanity was rooted there.

Gen. 5: 3. As Adam was created in the image of God, so did he beget "*in his own likeness, after his image;*" that is to say, he transmitted the image of God in which he was created, not in the purity in which it came direct from God, but in the form given to it by his own self-determination, modified and corrupted by sin. The begetting of the son by whom the line was perpetuated (no doubt in every case the first-born), is followed by an account of the number of years that Adam and the other fathers lived after that, by the statement that each one begat (other) sons and daughters, by the number of years that he lived altogether, and lastly, by the assertion מָוֹת *"and he died."* This apparently superfluous announcement is "intended to indicate by its constant recurrence that death reigned from Adam downwards as an unchangeable law (vid., Rom. 5:14). But against this background of universal death, the power of life was still more conspicuous. For the man did not die till he had propagated life, so that in the midst of the death of individuals the life of the race was preserved, and the hope of the seed sustained, by which the author of death should be overcome." In the case of one of the fathers indeed, viz., Enoch (vv. 21 ff.), life had not only a different issue, but also a different form. Instead of the expression "*and he lived,*" which introduces in every other instance the length of life after the birth of the first-born, we find in the case of Enoch this statement, "*he walked with God (Elohim);*" and instead of the expression "*and he died,*" the announcement, "*and he was not, for God (Elohim) took him.*" The phrase "walked with God," which is only applied to Enoch and Noah (Gen. 6: 9), denotes the most confidential intercourse, the closest communion with the personal God, a walking as it were by the side of God, who still continued His visible intercourse with men (vid., Gen. 3: 8). It must be distinguished from "walking before God" (Gen. 17: 1; 24:40, etc.), and "walking after God" (Deu. 13: 4), both which phrases are used to indicate

a pious, moral, blameless life under the law according to the directions of the divine commands. The only other passage in which this expression “walk with God” occurs is Mal. 2: 6, where it denotes not the piety of the godly Israelites generally, but the conduct of the priests, who stood in a closer relation to Jehovah under the Old Testament than the rest of the faithful, being permitted to enter the Holy Place, and hold direct intercourse with Him there, which the rest of the people could not do. The article in [אלהים](#) gives prominence to the personality of Elohim, and shows that the expression cannot refer to intercourse with the spiritual world.

In Enoch, the seventh from Adam through Seth, godliness attained its highest point; whilst ungodliness culminated in Lamech, the seventh from Adam through Cain, who made his sword his god. Enoch, therefore, like Elijah, was taken away by God, and carried into the heavenly paradise, so that he did not see (experience) death (Heb. 11: 5); i.e., he was taken up from this temporal life and transfigured into life eternal, being exempted by God from the law of death and of return to the dust, as those of the faithful will be, who shall be alive at the coming of Christ to judgment, and who in like manner shall not taste of death and corruption, but be changed in a moment. There is no foundation for the opinion, that Enoch did not participate at his translation in the glorification which awaits the righteous at the resurrection. For, according to 1Co. 15:20, 23, it is not in glorification, but in the resurrection, that Christ is the first-fruits. Now the latter presupposes death. Whoever, therefore, through the grace of God is exempted from death, cannot rise from the dead, but reaches [ἀφθαρσία](#), or the glorified state of perfection, through being “changed” or “clothed upon” (2Co. 5: 4). This does not at all affect the truth of the statement in Rom. 5:12, 14. For the same God who has appointed death as the wages of sin, and given us, through Christ, the victory over death, possesses the power to glorify into eternal life an Enoch and an Elijah, and all who shall be alive at the coming of the Lord without chaining their glorification to death and resurrection. Enoch and Elijah were translated into eternal life with God without passing through disease, death, and corruption, for the consolation of believers, and to awaken the hope of a life after death. Enoch’s translation stands about half way between Adam and the flood, in the 987th year after the creation of Adam. Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, and Jared were still alive. His son Methuselah and his grandson Lamech were also living, the latter being 113 years old. Noah was not yet born, and Adam was dead. His translation, in consequence of his walking with God, was “an example of repentance to all generations,” as the son of Sirach says (Ecclus. 44:16); and the apocryphal legend in the book of Enoch 1: 9 represents him as prophesying of the coming of the Lord, to execute judgment upon the ungodly (Jude 1:14, 15). In comparison with the longevity of the other fathers, Enoch

was taken away young, before he had reached half the ordinary age, as a sign that whilst long life, viewed as a time for repentance and grace, is indeed a blessing from God, when the ills which have entered the world through sin are considered, it is also a burden and trouble which God shortens for His chosen. That the patriarchs of the old world felt the ills of this earthly life in all their severity, was attested by Lamech (vv. 28, 29), when he gave his son, who was born 69 years after Enoch's translation, the name of *Noah*, saying,

“This same shall comfort us concerning our work and the toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed.”

Noah, נֹחַ from נָח to rest and הִנֵּיחַ to bring rest, is explained by נַחַם to comfort, in the sense of helpful and remedial consolation. Lamech not only felt the burden of his work upon the ground which God had cursed, but looked forward with a prophetic presentiment to the time when the existing misery and corruption would terminate, and a change for the better, a redemption from the curse, would come. This presentiment assumed the form of hope when his son was born; he therefore gave expression to it in his name. But his hope was not realized, at least not in the way that he desired. A change did indeed take place in the lifetime of Noah. By the judgment of the flood the corrupt race was exterminated, and in Noah, who was preserved because of his blameless walk with God, the restoration of the human race was secured; but the effects of the curse, though mitigated, were not removed; whilst a covenant sign guaranteed the preservation of the human race, and therewith, by implication, his hope of the eventual removal of the curse (Gen. 9: 8-17).

The genealogical table breaks off with Noah; all that is mentioned with reference to him being the birth of his three sons, when he was 500 years old (v. 32; see Gen. 11:10), without any allusion to the remaining years of his life, — an indication of a later hand.

“The mention of three sons leads to the expectation, that whereas hitherto the line has been perpetuated through one member alone, in the future each of the three sons will form a new beginning (vid., 9:18, 19; 10: 1).” — M. Baumgarten.

MARRIAGE OF THE SONS OF GOD AND THE DAUGHTERS OF MEN. — GEN. 6: 1-8

Gen. 6: 1-8. The genealogies in Genesis ch. 4 and 5, which trace the development of the human race through two fundamentally different lines, headed by Cain and Seth, are accompanied by a description of their moral development, and the statement that through marriages between the “*sons of God*” (*Elohim*) and the “*daughters of men*,” the wickedness became so great,

that God determined to destroy the men whom He had created. This description applies to the whole human race, and presupposes the intercourse or marriage of the Cainites with the Sethites.

Gen. 6: 1. relates to the increase of men generally (אָדָם, without any restriction), i.e., of the whole human race; and whilst the moral corruption is represented as universal, the whole human race, with the exception of Noah, who found grace before God (v. 8), is described as ripe for destruction (vv. 3 and 5-8). To understand this section, and appreciate the causes of this complete degeneracy of the race, we must first obtain a correct interpretation of the expressions “sons of God” (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) and “daughters of men” (בָּנוֹת הָאָדָם). Three different views have been entertained from the very earliest times: the “sons of God” being regarded as (a) the sons of princes, (b) angels, (c) the Sethites or godly men; and the “daughters of men,” as the daughters (a) of people of the lower orders, (b) of mankind generally, (c) of the Cainites, or of the rest of mankind as contrasted with the godly or the children of God. Of these three views, the first, although it has become the traditional one in orthodox rabbinical Judaism, may be dismissed at once as not warranted by the usages of the language, and as altogether unscriptural. The second, on the contrary, may be defended on two plausible grounds: first, the fact that the “sons of God,” in Job. 1: 6; 2: 1, and 38: 7, and in Dan. 3:25, are unquestionably angels (also בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים in Psa. 29: 1 and 89: 7); and secondly, the antithesis, “sons of God” and “daughters of men.” Apart from the context and tenor of the passage, these two points would lead us most naturally to regard the “sons of God” as angels, in distinction from men and the daughters of men. But this explanation, though the first to suggest itself, can only lay claim to be received as the correct one, provided the language itself admits of no other. Now that is not the case. For it is not to angels only that the term “sons of Elohim,” or “sons of Elim,” is applied; but in Psa. 73:15, in an address to Elohim, the godly are called “the generation of Thy sons,” i.e., sons of Elohim; in Deu. 32: 5 the Israelites are called His (God’s) sons, and in Hos. 1:10, “sons of the living God;” and in Psa. 80:17, Israel is spoken of as the son, whom Elohim has made strong. These passages show that the expression “sons of God” cannot be elucidated by philological means, but must be interpreted by theology alone. Moreover, even when it is applied to the angels, it is questionable whether it is to be understood in a physical or ethical sense. The notion that “it is employed in a physical sense as *nomen naturae*, instead of angels as *nomen officii*, and presupposes generation of a physical kind,” we must reject as an unscriptural and gnostic error. According to the scriptural view, the heavenly spirits are creatures of God, and not begotten from the divine essence. Moreover, all the other terms applied to the angels are ethical in their character. But if the title “sons of God” cannot involve the notion of

physical generation, it cannot be restricted to celestial spirits, but is applicable to all beings which bear the image of God, or by virtue of their likeness to God participate in the glory, power, and blessedness of the divine life, — to men therefore as well as angels, since God has caused man to “want but little of Elohim,” or to stand but a little behind Elohim (Psa. 8: 5), so that even magistrates are designated “Elohim, and sons of the Most High” (Psa. 82: 6). When *Delitzsch* objects to the application of the expression “sons of Elohim” to pious men, because, “although the idea of a child of God may indeed have pointed, even in the O.T., beyond its theocratic limitation to Israel (Exo. 4:22; Deu. 14: 1) towards a wider ethical signification (Psa. 73:15; Pro. 14:26), yet this extension and expansion were not so completed, that in historical prose the terms ‘sons of God’ (for which ‘sons of Jehovah’ should have been used to prevent mistake), and ‘sons (or daughters) of men,’ could be used to distinguish the children of God and the children of the world,” — this argument rests upon the erroneous supposition, that the expression “sons of God” was introduced by Jehovah for the first time when He selected Israel to be the covenant nation. So much is true, indeed, that before the adoption of Israel as the first-born son of Jehovah (Exo. 4:22), it would have been out of place to speak of sons of Jehovah; but the notion is false, or at least incapable of proof, that there were not children of God in the olden time, long before Abraham’s call, and that, if there were, they could not have been called “sons of Elohim.” The idea was not first introduced in connection with the theocracy, and extended thence to a more universal signification. It had its roots in the divine image, and therefore was general in its application from the very first; and it was not till God in the character of Jehovah chose Abraham and his seed to be the vehicles of salvation, and left the heathen nations to go their own way, that the expression received the specifically theocratic signification of “son of Jehovah,” to be again liberated and expanded into the more comprehensive idea of $\nu\iota\omicron\theta\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (i.e., *Elohim*, not $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\acute{\rho}\iota\omicron\upsilon$ = *Jehovah*), at the coming of Christ, the Saviour of all nations. If in the olden time there were pious men who, like Enoch and Noah, walked with Elohim, or who, even if they did not stand in this close priestly relation to God, made the divine image a reality through their piety and fear of God, then there were sons (children) of God, for whom the only correct appellation was “sons of Elohim,” since sonship to Jehovah was introduced with the call of Israel, so that it could only have been proleptically that the children of God in the old world could be called “sons of Jehovah.” But if it be still argued, that in mere prose the term “sons of God” could not have been applied to children of God, or pious men, this would be equally applicable to “sons of Jehovah.” On the other hand, there is this objection to our applying it to angels, that the pious, who walked with God and called upon the name of the Lord, had been

mentioned just before, whereas no allusion had been made to angels, not even to their creation.

Again, the antithesis “sons of God” and “daughters of men” does not prove that the former were angels. It by no means follows, that because in v. 1 אֱלֹהִים denotes man as a genus, i.e., the whole human race, it must do the same in v. 2, where the expression “daughters of men” is determined by the antithesis “sons of God.” And with reasons existing for understanding by the sons of God and the daughters of men two species of the genus אֱלֹהִים, mentioned in v. 1, no valid objection can be offered to the restriction of אֱלֹהִים, through the antithesis Elohim, to all men with the exception of the sons of God; since this mode of expression is by no means unusual in Hebrew. “From the expression ‘daughters of *men*,’ “ as *Dettinger* observes, “it by no means follows that the sons of God were not men; any more than it follows from Jer. 32:20, where it is said that God had done miracles ‘in Israel, and among *men*,’ or from Isa. 43: 4, where God says He will give *men* for the Israelites, or from Jud. 16: 7, where Samson says, that if he is bound with seven green withs he shall be as weak as a *man*, for from Psa. 73: 5, where it is said of the ungodly they are not in trouble as *men*, that the Israelites, or Samson, or the ungodly, were not men at all. In all these passages אֱלֹהִים (men) denotes the remainder of mankind in distinction from those who are especially named.” Cases occur, too, even in simple prose, in which the same term is used, first in a general, and then directly afterwards in a more restricted sense. We need cite only one, which occurs in Jud. 19-21. In Gen. 19:30 reference is made to the coming of the children of Israel (i.e., of the twelve tribes) out of Egypt; and directly afterwards (Gen. 20: 1, 2) it is related that “*all* the children of Israel,” “all the tribes of Israel,” assembled together (to make war, as we learn from vv. 3 ff., upon Benjamin); and in the whole account of the war, Genesis 20 and 21, the tribes of Israel are distinguished from the tribe of Benjamin: so that the expression “tribes of Israel” really means the rest of the tribes with the exception of Benjamin. And yet the Benjamites were Israelites. Why then should the fact that the sons of God are distinguished from the daughters of men prove that the former could not be men? There is not force enough in these two objections to compel us to adopt the conclusion that the sons of God were angels.

The question whether the “sons of Elohim” were celestial or terrestrial sons of God (angels or pious men of the family of Seth) can only be determined from the context, and from the substance of the passage itself, that is to say, from what is related respecting the conduct of the sons of God and its results. That the *connection* does not favour the idea of their being angels, is acknowledged even by those who adopt this view. “It cannot be denied,” says *Delitzsch*, “that

the connection of Gen. 6: 1-8 with Genesis ch. 4 necessitates the assumption, that such intermarriages (of the Sethite and Cainite families) did take place about the time of the flood (cf. Mat. 24:38; Luk. 17:27); and the prohibition of mixed marriages under the law (Exo. 34:16; cf. Gen. 27:46; 28: 1 ff.) also favours the same idea.” But this “assumption” is placed beyond all doubt, by what is here related of the sons of God. In v. 2 it is stated that “the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose,” i.e., of any with whose beauty they were charmed; and these wives bare children to them (v. 4). Now לָקַח אִשָּׁה (to take a wife) is a standing expression throughout the whole of the Old Testament for the marriage relation established by God at the creation, and is never applied to πορνεία, or the simple act of physical connection. This is quite sufficient of itself to exclude any reference to angels. For Christ Himself distinctly states that the angels cannot marry (Mat. 22:30; Mark 12:25; cf. Luk. 20:34 ff.). And when Kurtz endeavours to weaken the force of these words of Christ, by arguing that they do not prove that it is impossible for angels so to fall from their original holiness as to sink into an unnatural state; this phrase has no meaning, unless by conclusive analogies, or the clear testimony of Scripture,¹²² it can be proved that the angels either possess by nature a material corporeality adequate to the contraction of a human marriage, or that by rebellion against their Creator they can acquire it, or that there are some creatures in heaven and on earth which, through sinful degeneracy, or by sinking into an unnatural state, can become possessed of the power, which they have not by nature, of generating and propagating their species. As man could indeed destroy by sin the nature which he had received from his Creator, but could not by his own power restore it when destroyed, to say nothing of implanting an organ or a power that was wanting before; so we cannot believe that angels, through apostasy from God, could acquire sexual power of which they had previously been destitute.

Gen. 6: 3. The sentence of God upon the “sons of God” is also appropriate to men only. “*Jehovah said: My spirit shall not rule in men for ever; in their wandering they are flesh.*” “The verb הָיָה = הָיָה signifies to rule (hence הָיָה the ruler), and to judge, as the consequence of ruling. רוּחַ is the divine spirit of life bestowed upon man, the principle of physical and ethical, natural and spiritual life. This His spirit God will withdraw from man, and thereby put an end to their life and conduct. בְּשָׂרָם is regarded by many as a particle, compounded of בָּ, שׁ a contraction of אֶשֶׁר, and גַּם (also), used in the sense of *quoniam*, because, (בְּשָׂרָם = בְּאֶשֶׁר, as שׁ or שׁ = אֶשֶׁר Jud. 5: 7; 6:17; Son. 1: 7). But the objection to this explanation is, that the גַּם, “because he *also* is flesh,” introduces an incongruous emphasis into the clause. We therefore prefer to

regard **שָׁנָה** as the *inf.* of **שָׁנָה = שָׁנָה** with the suffix: “*in their erring (that of men) he (man as a genus) is flesh;*” an explanation to which, to our mind, the extremely harsh change of number (*they, he*), is no objection, since many examples might be adduced of a similar change (vid., *Hupfeld* on Psa. 5:10). Men, says God, have proved themselves by their erring and straying to be flesh, i.e., given up to the flesh, and incapable of being ruled by the Spirit of God and led back to the divine goal of their life. **בְּשָׂר** is used already in its ethical signification, like **σάρξ** in the New Testament, denoting not merely the natural corporeality of man, but his materiality as rendered ungodly by sin. “*Therefore his days shall be 120 years:*” this means, not that human life should in future never attain a greater age than 120 years, but that a respite of 120 years should still be granted to the human race. This sentence, as we may gather from the context, was made known to Noah in his 480th year, to be published by him as “preacher of righteousness” (2Pe. 2: 5) to the degenerate race. The reason why men had gone so far astray, that God determined to withdraw His spirit and give them up to destruction, was that the sons of God had taken wives of such of the daughters of men as they chose. Can this mean, because angels had formed marriages with the daughters of men? Even granting that such marriages, as being unnatural connections, would have led to the complete corruption of human nature; the men would in that case have been the tempted, and the real authors of the corruption would have been the angels. Why then should judgment fall upon the tempted alone? The judgments of God in the world are not executed with such partiality as this. And the supposition that nothing is said about the punishment of the angels, because the narrative has to do with the history of man, and the spiritual world is intentionally veiled as much as possible, does not meet the difficulty. If the sons of God were angels, the narrative is concerned not only with men, but with angels also; and it is not the custom of the Scriptures merely to relate the judgments which fall upon the tempted, and say nothing at all about the tempters. For the contrary, see Gen. 3:14 ff. If the “sons of God” were not men, so as to be included in the term **בְּנֵי אָדָם**, the punishment would need to be specially pointed out in their case, and no deep revelations of the spiritual world would be required, since these celestial tempters would be living with men upon the earth, when they had taken wives from among their daughters. The judgments of God are not only free from all unrighteousness, but avoid every kind of partiality.

Gen. 6: 4.

“The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare

children to them: these are the heroes (הַגִּבּוֹרִים) who from the olden time (מֵעוֹלָם, as in Psa. 25: 6; 1Sa. 27: 8) are the men of name”

(i.e., noted, renowned or notorious men). נְפִילִים, from נָפַל to fall upon (Job. 1:15; Jos. 11: 7), signifies the invaders (ἐπιπτόντες Aq., βιάιοι Sym.). Luther gives the correct meaning, “tyrants:” they were called *Nephilim* because they fell upon the people and oppressed them. ^{f23}

The meaning of the verse is a subject of dispute. To an unprejudiced mind, the words, as they stand, represent the *Nephilim*, who were on the earth in those days, as existing before the sons of God began to marry the daughters of men, and clearly distinguish them from the fruits of these marriages. הָיוּ can no more be rendered “they became, or arose,” in this connection, than הָיָה in Gen. 1: 2. הָיוּ would have been the proper word. The expression “in those days” refers most naturally to the time when God pronounced the sentence upon the degenerate race; but it is so general and comprehensive a term, that it must not be confined exclusively to that time, not merely because the divine sentence was first pronounced after these marriages were contracted, and the marriages, if they did not produce the corruption, raised it to that fulness of iniquity which was ripe for the judgment, but still more because the words “after that” represent the marriages which drew down the judgment as an event that followed the appearance of the *Nephilim*. “*The same were mighty men:*” this might point back to the *Nephilim*; but it is a more natural supposition, that it refers to the children born to the sons of God. “*These,*” i.e., the sons sprung from those marriages, “*are the heroes, those renowned heroes of old.*”

Now if, according to the simple meaning of the passage, the *Nephilim* were in existence at the very time when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, the appearance of the *Nephilim* cannot afford the slightest evidence that the “sons of God” were angels, by whom a family of monsters were begotten, whether demigods, daemons, or angel-men. ^{f24}

Gen. 6: 5-8. Now when the wickedness of man became great, and “*every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil the whole day,*” i.e., continually and altogether evil, it repented God that He had made man, and He determined to destroy them. This determination and the motive assigned are also irreconcilable with the angel-theory.

“Had the godless race, which God destroyed by the flood, sprung either entirely or in part from the marriage of angels to the daughters of men, it would no longer have been the race first created by God in Adam, but a grotesque product of the Adamic factor created by God, and an entirely foreign and angelic factor” (*Phil.*) ^{f25}

The force of **נָחַם**, “it repented the Lord,” may be gathered from the explanatory **וַתַּעֲצֹב**, “it grieved Him at His heart.” This shows that the repentance of God does not presuppose any variableness in His nature or His purposes. In this sense God never repents of anything (1Sa. 15:29), “*quia nihil illi inopinatum vel non praevisum accidit*” (Calvin). The repentance of God is an anthropomorphic expression for the pain of the divine love at the sin of man, and signifies that

“God is hurt no less by the atrocious sins of men than if they pierced His heart with mortal anguish” (Calvin).

The destruction of all, “from man unto beast,” etc., is to be explained on the ground of the sovereignty of man upon the earth, the irrational creatures being created for him, and therefore involved in his fall. This destruction, however, was not to bring the human race to an end. “Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord.” In these words mercy is seen in the midst of wrath, pledging the preservation and restoration of humanity.

III. History of Noah

GEN. 6: 9-9:29

Gen. 6: 9-9:29. The important relation in which Noah stands both to sacred and universal history, arises from the fact, that he found mercy on account of his blameless walk with God; that in him the human race was kept from total destruction, and he was preserved from the all-destroying flood, to found in his sons a new beginning to the history of the world. The piety of Noah, his preservation, and the covenant through which God appointed him the head of the human race, are the three main points in this section. The first of these is dismissed in a very few words. The second, on the contrary, viz., the destruction of the old world by the flood, and the preservation of Noah, together with the animals enclosed in the ark, is circumstantially and elaborately described, “because this event included, on the one hand, a work of judgment and mercy of the greatest significance to the history of the kingdom of God” — a judgment of such universality and violence as will only be seen again in the judgment at the end of the world; and, on the other hand, an act of mercy which made the flood itself a flood of grace, and in that respect a type of baptism (1Pe. 3:21), and of life rising out of death.

“Destruction ministers to preservation, immersion to purification, death to new birth; the old corrupt earth is buried in the flood, that out of this grave a new world may arise” (Delitzsch).

PREPARATION FOR THE FLOOD. — GEN. 6: 9-22

Gen. 6: 9-22. Verses 9-12 contain a description of Noah and his contemporaries; vv. 13-22, the announcement of the purpose of God with reference to the flood.

Gen. 6: 9. “Noah, a righteous man, was blameless among his generations:” righteous in his moral relation to God; blameless (τέλειος, *integer*) in his character and conduct. דָּרֹוֹת, γενεαί, were the *generations* or families “which passed by Noah, the Nestor of his time.” His righteousness and integrity were manifested in his walking with God, in which he resembled Enoch (Gen. 5:22).

Gen. 6:10-12. In vv. 10-12, the account of the birth of his three sons, and of the corruption of all flesh, is repeated. This corruption is represented as corrupting the whole earth and filling it with wickedness; and thus the judgment of the flood is for the first time fully accounted for. “*The earth was corrupt before God (Elohim points back to the previous Elohim in v. 9),*” it became so conspicuous to God, that He could not refrain from punishment. The corruption proceeded from the fact, that “*all flesh*” — i.e., the whole human race which had resisted the influence of the Spirit of God and become flesh (see v. 3) — “*had corrupted its way.*” The term “flesh” in v. 12 cannot include the animal world, since the expression, “corrupted its way,” is applicable to man alone. The fact that in v. 13 and 17 this term embraces both men and animals is no proof to the contrary, for the simple reason, that in v. 19 “all flesh” denotes the animal world only, an evident proof that the precise meaning of the word must always be determined from the context.

Gen. 6:13. “*The end of all flesh is come before Me.*” בּוֹא אֵל, when applied to rumours, invariably signifies “to reach the ear” (vid., Gen. 18:21; Exo. 3: 9; Est. 9:11); hence בָּא לְפָנַי in this case cannot mean *a me constitutus est* (Ges.). קָץ, therefore, is not the end in the sense of destruction, but the end (extremity) of depravity or corruption, which leads to destruction. “*For the earth has become full of wickedness מִמִּפְנֵיהֶם,*” i.e., proceeding from them, “*and I destroy them along with the earth.*” Because all flesh had *destroyed* its way, it should be *destroyed* with the earth by God. The *lex talionis* is obvious here.

Gen. 6:14 ff. Noah was exempted from the extermination. He was to build an ark, in order that he himself, his family, and the animals might be preserved. תִּבְיָה, which is only used here and in Exo. 2: 3, 5, where it is applied to the ark in which Moses was placed, is probably an Egyptian word: the LXX render it κίβωτος here, and θίβη in Exodus; the Vulgate *arca*, from which our word *ark* is derived. *Gopher-wood* (*ligna bituminata*; Jerome) is most likely *cypress*.

The *ἀπ. λεγ. gopher* is related to **כִּפֹּר**, resin, and *κυπάρισσος*; it is no proof to the contrary that in later Hebrew the cypress is called *berosh*, for *gopher* belongs to the pre-Hebraic times. The ark was to be made cells, i.e., divided into cells, **קָנִים** (lit., nests, *niduli, mansiunculae*), and pitched (**כִּפֹּר** denom. from **כִּפֹּר**) within and without with *copher*, or asphalt (LXX *ἄσφαλτος*, *Vulg. bitumen*). On the supposition, which is a very probable one, that the ark was built in the form not of a ship, but of a chest, with flat bottom, like a floating house, as it was not meant for sailing, but merely to float upon the water, the dimensions, 300 cubits long, 50 broad, and 30 high, give a superficial area of 15,000 square cubits, and a cubic measurement of 450,000 cubits, probably to the ordinary standard, “after the elbow of a man” (Deu. 3:11), i.e., measured from the elbow to the end of the middle finger.

Gen. 6:16. “Light shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit from above shalt thou finish it.” As the meaning *light* for **צָהָר** is established by the word **צִהָרִים**, “double-light” or mid-day, the passage can only signify that a hole or opening for light and air was to be so constructed as to reach within a cubit of the edge of the roof. A window only a cubit square could not possibly be intended; for **צָהָר** is not synonymous with **חַלּוֹן** (Gen. 8: 6), but signifies, generally, a space for light, or by which light could be admitted into the ark, and in which the window, or lattice for opening and shutting, could be fixed; though we can form no distinct idea of what the arrangement was. The door he was to place in the side; and to make “*lower, second, and third* (sc., cells),” i.e., three distinct stories. ^{f26}

Gen. 6:17 ff. Noah was to build this ark, because God was about to bring a flood upon the earth, and would save him, with his family, and one pair of every kind of animal. **מַבּוּל**, (the flood), is an archaic word, coined expressly for the waters of Noah (Isa. 54: 9), and is used nowhere else except Psa. 29:10. **מַיִם עַל הָאָרֶץ** is in apposition to *mabbul*: “*I bring the flood, waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is a living breath*” (i.e., man and beast). With Noah, God made a covenant. On **בְּרִית** see Gen. 15:18. As not only the human race, but the animal world also was to be preserved through Noah, he was to take with him into the ark his wife, his sons and their wives, and of every living thing, of all flesh, two of every sort, a male and a female, to keep them alive; also all kinds of food for himself and family, and for the sustenance of the beasts.

Gen. 6:22. “*Thus did Noah, according to all that God commanded him*” (with regard to the building of the ark). Cf. Heb. 11: 7.

HISTORY OF THE FLOOD. — GEN. 7-8:19

Gen. 7-8:19. The account of the commencement, course, and termination of the flood abounds in repetitions; but although it progresses somewhat heavily, the connection is well sustained, and no link could be erased without producing a gap.

Gen. 7: 1-16. When the ark was built, and the period of grace (Gen. 6: 3) had passed, Noah received instructions from Jehovah to enter the ark with his family, and with the animals, viz., seven of every kind of clean animals, and two of the unclean; and was informed that within seven days God would cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights. The date of the flood is then given (v. 6): “*Noah was six hundred years old, and the flood was (namely) water upon the earth;*” and the execution of the divine command is recorded in vv. 7-9. There follows next the account of the bursting forth of the flood, the date being given with still greater minuteness; and the entrance of the men and animals into the ark is again described as being fully accomplished (vv. 10-16). — The fact that in the command to enter the ark a distinction is now made between clean and unclean animals, seven of the former being ordered to be taken, — i.e., three pair and a single one, probably a male for sacrifice, — is no more a proof of different authorship, or of the fusion of two accounts, than the interchange of the names Jehovah and Elohim. For the distinction between clean and unclean animals did not originate with Moses, but was confirmed by him as a long established custom, in harmony with the law. It reached back to the very earliest times, and arose from a certain innate feeling of the human mind, when undisturbed by unnatural and ungodly influences, which detects types of sin and corruption in many animals, and instinctively recoils from them (see my *biblische Archäologie* ii. p. 20). That the variations in the names of God furnish no criterion by which to detect different documents, is evident enough from the fact, that in Gen. 7: 1 it is *Jehovah* who commands Noah to enter the ark, and in v. 4 Noah does as *Elohim* had commanded, whilst in v. 16, in two successive clauses, *Elohim* alternates with *Jehovah* — the animals entering the ark at the command of *Elohim*, and *Jehovah* shutting Noah in. With regard to the entrance of the animals into the ark, it is worthy of notice, that in vv. 9 and 15 it is stated that “*they came two and two,*” and in v. 16 that “*the coming ones came male and female of all flesh.*” In this expression “*they came*” it is clearly intimated, that the animals collected about Noah and were taken into the ark, without his having to exert himself to collect them, and that they did so in consequence of an instinct produced by God, like that which frequently leads animals to scent and try to flee from dangers, of which man has no presentiment. The time when the flood commenced is said to have been the 600th year of Noah’s life, on the 17th day of the second month (v. 11). The months must be reckoned,

not according to the Mosaic ecclesiastical year, which commenced in the spring, but according to the natural of civil year, which commenced in the autumn at the beginning of sowing time, or the autumnal equinox; so that the flood would be pouring upon the earth in October and November.

“The same day were all the fountains of the great deep (תְּהוֹמוֹת the unfathomable ocean) broken up, and the sluices (windows, lattices) of heaven opened, and there was (happened, came) pouring rain (נָשַׁם in distinction from מְטַר) upon the earth 40 days and 40 nights.”

Thus the flood was produced by the bursting forth of fountains hidden within the earth, which drove seas and rivers above their banks, and by rain which continued incessantly for 40 days and 40 nights.

Gen. 7:13. “In the self-same day had Noah...entered into the ark:” בָּא, pluperfect “had come,” not came, which would require יָבֵא. The idea is not that Noah, with his family and all the animals, entered the ark on the very day on which the rain began, but that on that day he had entered, had completed the entering, which occupied the seven days between the giving of the command (v. 4) and the commencement of the flood (v. 10).

Gen. 7:17-24. Verses 17-24 contain a description of the flood: how the water increased more and more, till it was 15 cubits above all the lofty mountains of the earth, and how, on the one hand, it raised the ark above the earth and above the mountains, and, on the other, destroyed every living being upon the dry land, from man to cattle, creeping things, and birds. “The description is simple and majestic; the almighty judgment of God, and the love manifest in the midst of the wrath, hold the historian fast. The tautologies depict the fearful monotony of the immeasurable expanse of water: *omnia pontus erant et deerant litera ponto.*” The words of v. 17, “and the flood was (came) upon the earth for forty days,” relate to the 40 days’ rain combined with the bursting forth of the foundations beneath the earth. By these the water was eventually raised to the height given, at which it remained 150 days (v. 24). But if the water covered “*all the high hills under the whole heaven,*” this clearly indicates the universality of the flood. The statement, indeed, that it rose 15 cubits above the mountains, is probably founded upon the fact, that the ark drew 15 feet of water, and that when the waters subsided, it rested upon the top of Ararat, from which the conclusion would very naturally be drawn as to the greatest height attained. Now as Ararat, according to the measurement of *Perrot*, is only 16,254 feet high, whereas the loftiest peaks of the Himalaya and Cordilleras are as much as 26,843, the submersion of these mountains has been thought impossible, and the statement in v. 19 has been regarded as a rhetorical expression, like Deu. 2:25 and 4:19, which is not of universal application. But

even if those peaks, which are higher than Ararat, were not covered by water, we cannot therefore pronounce the flood merely partial in its extent, but must regard it as universal, as extending over every part of the world, since the few peaks uncovered would not only sink into vanishing points in comparison with the surface covered, but would form an exception not worth mentioning, for the simple reason that no living beings could exist upon these mountains, covered with perpetual snow and ice; so that *everything that lived upon the dry land, in whose nostrils there was a breath of life*, would inevitably die, and, with the exception of those shut up in the ark, neither man nor beast would be able to rescue itself, and escape destruction. A flood which rose 15 cubits above the top of Ararat could not remain partial, if it only continued a few days, to say nothing of the fact that the water was rising for 40 days, and remained at the highest elevation for 150 days. To speak of such a flood as partial is absurd, even if it broke out at only one spot, it would spread over the earth from one end to the other, and reach everywhere to the same elevation. However impossible, therefore, scientific men may declare it to be for them to conceive of a universal flood of such a height and duration in accordance with the known laws of nature, this inability on their part does not justify any one in questioning the possibility of such an event being produced by the omnipotence of God. It has been justly remarked, too, that the proportion of such a quantity of water to the entire mass of the earth, in relation to which the mountains are but like the scratches of a needle on a globe, is no greater than that of a profuse perspiration to the body of a man. And to this must be added, that, apart from the legend of a flood, which is found in nearly every nation, the earth presents unquestionable traces of submersion in the fossil remains of animals and plants, which are found upon the Cordilleras and Himalaya even beyond the limit of perpetual snow.^{f27} In v. 23, instead of **יָמָה** (*imperf.* *Niphal*) read **יָמָה** (*imperf. Kal*): “and He (Jehovah) destroyed every existing thing,” as He had said in v. 4.

Gen. 8: 1-5. With the words, “then God remembered Noah and all the animals...in the ark,” the narrative turns to the description of the gradual decrease of the water until the ground was perfectly dry. The fall of the water is described in the same pictorial style as its rapid rise. God’s “remembering” was a manifestation of Himself, an effective restraint of the force of the raging element. He caused a wind to blow over the earth, so that the waters sank, and shut up the fountains of the deep, and the sluices of heaven, so that the rain from heaven was restrained.

“Then the waters turned (**יָשְׁבוּ** i.e., flowed off) from the earth, flowing continuously (the inf. absol. **הָלֹךְ וְשׁוֹב** expresses continuation), and decreased at the end of 150 days.”

The decrease first became perceptible when the ark rested upon the mountains of Ararat on the 17th day of the seventh month; i.e., reckoning 30 days to a month, exactly 150 days after the flood commenced. From that time forth it continued without intermission, so that on the first day of the tenth month, probably 73 days after the resting of the ark, the tops of the mountains were seen, viz., the tops of the Armenian highlands, by which the ark was surrounded. *Ararat* was the name of a province (2Ki. 19:37), which is mentioned along with *Minni* (Armenia) as a kingdom in Jer. 51:27, probably the central province of the country of Armenia, which *Moses v. Chorene* calls *Arairad, Araratia*. The mountains of Ararat are, no doubt, the group of mountains which rise from the plain of the Araxes in two lofty peaks, the greater and lesser Ararat, the former 16,254 feet above the level of the sea, the latter about 12,000. This landing-place of the ark is extremely interesting in connection with the development of the human race as renewed after the flood. Armenia, the source of the rivers of paradise, has been called “a cool, airy, well-watered mountain-island in the midst of the old continent;” but Mount Ararat especially is situated almost in the middle, not only of the great desert route of Africa and Asia, but also of the range of inland waters from Gibraltar to the Baikal Sea — in the centre, too, of the longest line that can be drawn through the settlements of the Caucasian race and the Indo-Germanic tribes; and, as the central point of the longest land-line of the ancient world, from the Cape of Good Hope to the Behring Straits, it was the most suitable spot in the world, for the tribes and nations that sprang from the sons of Noah to descend from its heights and spread into every land (vid., *K. v. Raumer*, Paläst. pp. 456 ff.).

Gen. 8: 6-12. Forty days after the appearance of the mountain tops, Noah opened the window of the ark and let a raven fly out (lit., *the raven*, i.e., the particular raven known from that circumstance), for the purpose of ascertaining the drying up of the waters. The raven went out and returned until the earth was dry, but without being taken back into the ark, as the mountain tops and the carcasses floating upon the water afforded both resting-places and food. After that, Noah let a dove fly out three times, at intervals of seven days. It is not distinctly stated that he sent it out the first time seven days after the raven, but this is implied in the statement that he stayed yet *other* seven days before sending it out the second time, and the same again before sending it the third time (vv. 10 and 12). The dove, when first sent out, “*found no rest for the sole of its foot;*” for a dove will only settle upon such places and objects as are dry and clean. It returned to the ark and let Noah take it in again (vv. 8, 9). The second time it returned in the evening, having remained out longer than before, and brought a fresh (פֶּתִילִים freshly plucked) olive-leaf in its mouth. Noah perceived from this that the water must be almost gone, had “abated from off

the earth," though the ground might not be perfectly dry, as the olive-tree will put out leaves even under water. The fresh olive-leaf was the first sign of the resurrection of the earth to new life after the flood, and the dove with the olive-leaf a herald of salvation. The third time it did not return; a sign that the waters had completely receded from the earth. The fact that Noah waited 40 days before sending the raven, and after that always left an interval of seven days, is not to be accounted for on the supposition that these numbers were already regarded as significant. The 40 days correspond to the 40 days during which the rain fell and the waters rose; and Noah might assume that they would require the same time to recede as to rise. The seven days constituted the week established at the creation, and God had already conformed to it in arranging their entrance into the ark (Gen. 7: 4, 10). The selection which Noah made of the birds may also be explained quite simply from the difference in their nature, with which Noah must have been acquainted; that is to say, from the fact that the raven in seeking its food settles upon every carcase that it sees, whereas the dove will only settle upon what is dry and clean.

Gen. 8:13-19. Noah waited some time, and then, on the first day of the first month, in the 601st year of his life, removed the covering from the ark, that he might obtain a freer prospect over the earth. He could see that the surface of the earth was dry; but it was not till the 27th day of the second month, 57 days, therefore, after the removal of the roof, that the earth was completely dried up. Then God commanded him to leave the ark with his family and all the animals; and so far as the latter were concerned, He renewed the blessing of the creation (v. 17 cf. 1:22). As the flood commenced on the 17th of the second month of the 600th year of Noah's life, and ended on the 27th of the second month of the 601st year, it lasted a year and ten days; but whether a solar year of 360 or 365 days, or a lunar year of 352, is doubtful. The former is the more probable, as the first five months are said to have consisted of 150 days, which suits the solar year better than the lunar. The question cannot be decided with certainty, because we neither know the number of days between the 17th of the seventh month and the 1st of the tenth month, nor the interval between the sending out of the dove and the 1st day of the first month of the 601st year.

NOAH'S SACRIFICE, CURSE, AND BLESSING.

— GEN. 8:20-9:29

Two events of Noah's life, of world-wide importance, are recorded as having occurred after the flood: his sacrifice, with the divine promise which followed it (Gen. 8:20-9:17); and the prophetic curse and blessing pronounced upon his sons (Gen. 9:18-29).

Gen. 8:20-22. The first thing which Noah did, was to build an altar for burnt sacrifice, to thank the Lord for gracious protection, and pray for His mercy in time to come. This altar — מִזְבֵּחַ, lit., a place for the offering of slain animals, from מִזְבֵּחַ, like θυσιαστήριον from θύειν — is the first altar mentioned in history. The sons of Adam had built no altar for their offerings, because God was still present on the earth in paradise, so that they could turn their offerings and hearts towards that abode. But with the flood God had swept paradise away, withdrawn the place of His presence, and set up His throne in heaven, from which He would henceforth reveal Himself to man (cf. Gen. 9: 5, 7). In future, therefore, the hearts of the pious had to be turned towards heaven, and their offerings and prayers needed to ascend on high if they were to reach the throne of God. To give this direction to their offerings, heights or elevated places were erected, from which they ascended towards heaven in fire. From this the offerings received the name of עֹלָה from עֹלָה, the ascending, not so much because the sacrificial animals ascended or were raised upon the altar, as because they rose from the altar to haven (cf. Jud. 20:40; Jer. 48:15; Amo. 4:10). Noah took his offerings from every clean beast and every clean fowl — from those animals, therefore, which were destined for man’s food; probably the seventh of every kind, which he had taken into the ark. “*And Jehovah smelled the smell of satisfaction,*” i.e., He graciously accepted the feelings of the offerer which rose to Him in the odour of the sacrificial flame. In the sacrificial flame the essence of the animal was resolved into vapour; so that when man presented a sacrifice in his own stead, his inmost being, his spirit, and his heart ascended to God in the vapour, and the sacrifice brought the feeling of his heart before God. This feeling of gratitude for gracious protection, and of desire for further communications of grace, was well-pleasing to God. He

“said to His heart’ (to, or in Himself; i.e., He resolved), “I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake, because the image (i.e., the thought and desire) of man’s heart is evil from his youth up (i.e., from the very time when he begins to act with consciousness).”

This hardly seems an appropriate reason. As Luther says: “Hic inconstantiae videtur Deus accusari posse. Supra puniturus hominem causam consilii dicit, quia figmentum cordis humani malum est. Hic promissurus homini gratiam, quod posthac tali ira uti nolit, eandem causam allegat.” Both *Luther* and *Calvin* express the same thought, though without really solving the apparent discrepancy. It was not because the thoughts and desires of the human heart are *evil* that God would not smite any more every living thing, that is to say, would not exterminate it judicially; but because they are evil *from his youth up*, because evil is innate in man, and for that reason he needs the forbearance

of God; and also (and here lies the principal motive for the divine resolution) because in the offering of the righteous Noah, not only were thanks presented for past protection, and entreaty for further care, but the desire of man was expressed, to remain in fellowship with God, and to procure the divine favour. “*All the days of the earth;*” i.e., so long as the earth shall continue, the regular alternation of day and night and of the seasons of the year, so indispensable to the continuance of the human race, would never be interrupted again.

Gen. 9: 1-7. These divine purposes of peace, which were communicated to Noah while sacrificing, were solemnly confirmed by the renewal of the blessing pronounced at the creation and the establishment of a covenant through a visible sign, which would be a pledge for all time that there should never be a flood again. In the words by which the first blessing was transferred to Noah and his sons (v. 2), the supremacy granted to man over the animal world was expressed still more forcibly than in Gen. 1:26 and 28; because, inasmuch as sin with its consequences had loosened the bond of voluntary subjection on the part of the animals to the will of man, — man, on the one hand, having lost the power of the spirit over nature, and nature, on the other hand, having become estranged from man, or rather having rebelled against him, through the curse pronounced upon the earth, — henceforth it was only by force that he could rule over it, by that “fear and dread” which God instilled into the animal creation. Whilst the animals were thus placed in the hand (power) of man, permission was also given to him to slaughter them for food, the eating of the blood being the only thing forbidden.

Gen. 9: 3, 4. “*Every moving thing that liveth shall be food for you; even as the green of the herb have I given you all* (הַכֹּל = אֶת־כָּל).” These words do not affirm that man then first began to eat animal food, but only that God then for the first time authorized, or allowed him to do, what probably he had previously done in opposition to His will. “*Only flesh in its soul, its blood* (דָּמָו in apposition to בְּנִפְשׁוֹ), *shall ye not eat;*” i.e., flesh in which there is still blood, because the soul of the animal is in the blood. The prohibition applies to the eating of flesh with blood in it, whether of living animals, as is the barbarous custom in Abyssinia, or of slaughtered animals from which the blood has not been properly drained at death. This prohibition presented, on the one hand, a safeguard against harshness and cruelty; and contained, on the other, “an undoubted reference to the sacrifice of animals, which was afterwards made the subject of command, and in which it was the blood especially that was offered, as the seat and soul of life (see note on Lev. 17:11, 14); so that from this point of view sacrifice denotes the surrender of one’s own inmost life, of the very essence of life, to God” (Ziegler). Allusion is made to the first again in the still further limitation given in v. 5:

“and only (וְאַתָּה) your blood, with regard to your souls (לְנַפְשֵׁיכֶם) indicative of reference to an individual object, Ewald, § 310a), will I seek (demand or avenge, cf. Psa. 9:13) from the hand of every beast, and from the hand of man, from the hand of every one, his brother;”

i.e., from every man, whoever he may be, because he is his (the slain man's) brother, inasmuch as all men are brethren. The life of man was thus made secure against animals as well as men. God would avenge or inflict punishment for every murder, — not directly, however, as He promised to do in the case of Cain, but indirectly by giving the command, “Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,” and thus placing in the hand of man His own judicial power. “This was the first command,” says Luther, “having reference to the temporal sword. By these words temporal government was established, and the sword placed in its hand by God.” It is true the punishment of the murderer is enjoined upon “man” universally; but as all the judicial relations and ordinances of the increasing race were rooted in those of the family, and grew by a natural process out of that, the family relations furnished of themselves the norm for the closer definition of the expression “man.” Hence the command does not sanction revenge, but lays the foundation for the judicial rights of the divinely appointed “powers that be” (Rom. 13: 1). This is evident from the reason appended: “for in the image of God made He man.” If murder was to be punished with death because it destroyed the image of God in man, it is evident that the infliction of the punishment was not to be left to the caprice of individuals, but belonged to those alone who represent the authority and majesty of God, i.e., the divinely appointed rulers, who for that very reason are called *Elohim* in Psa. 82: 6. This command then laid the foundation for all civil government,^{f28} and formed a necessary complement to that unalterable continuance of the order of nature which had been promised to the human race for its further development. If God on account of the innate sinfulness of man would no more bring an exterminating judgment upon the earthly creation, it was necessary that by commands and authorities He should erect a barrier against the supremacy of evil, and thus lay the foundation for a well-ordered civil development of humanity, in accordance with the words of the blessing, which are repeated in v. 7, as showing the intention and goal of this new historical beginning.

Gen. 9: 8-17. To give Noah and his sons a firm assurance of the prosperous continuance of the human race, God condescended to establish a covenant with them and their descendants, and to confirm this covenant by a visible sign for all generations. **בְּרִית הַקַּיִם** is not equivalent to **בְּרִית בְּרִית**; it does not denote the formal conclusion of an actual covenant, but the “setting up of a covenant,” or the giving of a promise possessing the nature of a covenant. In summing up

the animals in v. 10, the prepositions are accumulated: first **כָּל** embracing the whole, then the partitive **מֵהֶם** restricting the enumeration to those which went out of the ark, and lastly **לְכָל**, “with regard to,” extending it again to every individual. There was a correspondence between the covenant (v. 11) and the sign which was to keep it before the sight of men (v. 12): “*I give (set) My bow in the cloud*” (v. 13). When God gathers (**קָבַץ** v. 14, lit., clouds) clouds over the earth, “*the bow shall be seen in the cloud,*” and that not for man only, but for God also, who will look at the bow, “*to remember His everlasting covenant.*” An “everlasting covenant” is a covenant “*for perpetual generations,*” i.e., one which shall extend to all ages, even to the end of the world. The fact that God Himself would look at the bow and remember His covenant, was

“a glorious and living expression of the great truth, that God’s covenant signs, in which He has put His promises, are real vehicles of His grace, that they have power and essential worth not only with men, but also *before God*” (*O. v. Gerlach*).

The establishment of the rainbow as a covenant sign of the promise that there should be no flood again, presupposes that it appeared then for the first time in the vault and clouds of heaven. From this it may be inferred, not that it did not rain before the flood, which could hardly be reconciled with Gen. 2: 5, but that the atmosphere was differently constituted; a supposition in perfect harmony with the facts of natural history, which point to differences in the climate of the earth’s surface before and after the flood. The fact that the rainbow, that “coloured splendour thrown by the bursting forth of the sun upon the departing clouds,” is the result of the reciprocal action of light, and air, and water, is no disproof of the origin and design recorded here. For the laws of nature are ordained by God, and have their ultimate ground and purpose in the divine plan of the universe which links together both nature and grace.

“Springing as it does from the effect of the sun upon the dark mass of clouds, it typifies the readiness of the heavenly to pervade the earthly; spread out as it is between heaven and earth, it proclaims peace between God and man; and whilst spanning the whole horizon, it teaches the all-embracing universality of the covenant of grace” (*Delitzsch*).

Gen. 9:18-29. The *second* occurrence in the life of Noah after the flood exhibited the germs of the future development of the human race in a threefold direction, as manifested in the characters of his three sons. As all the families and races of man descend from them, their names are repeated in v. 18; and in prospective allusion to what follows, it is added that “*Ham was the father of Canaan.*” From these three “*the earth (the earth’s population) spread itself*

out.” “*The earth*” is used for the population of the earth, as in Gen. 10:25 and 11: 1, and just as lands or cities are frequently substituted for their inhabitants. נִפְצָה: probably *Niphal* for נִפְצָה, from פִּיץ to scatter (Gen. 11: 4), to spread out. “*And Noah the husbandman began, and planted a vineyard.*” As הִאֲדָמָה אִשׁ cannot be the predicate of the sentence, on account of the article, but must be in apposition to Noah, וַיִּטַּע and וַיַּחַל must be combined in the sense of “began to plant” (*Ges.* § 142, 3). The writer does not mean to affirm that Noah resumed his agricultural operations after the flood, but that as a husbandman he began to cultivate the vine; because it was this which furnished the occasion for the manifestation of that diversity in the character of his sons, which was so eventful in its consequences in relation to the future history of their descendants. In ignorance of the fiery nature of wine, Noah drank and was drunken, and uncovered himself in his tent (v. 21). Although excuse may be made for this drunkenness, the words of *Luther* are still true:

“Qui excusant patriarcham, volentes hanc consolationem, quam Spiritus S. ecclesiis necessariam judicavit, abjuciant, quod scilicet etiam summi sancti aliquando labuntur.”

This trifling fall served to display the hearts of his sons. Ham saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. Not content with finding pleasure himself in his father’s shame,

“nunquam enim vino victum patrem filius resisset, nisi prius eiecisset animo illam reverentiam et opinionem, quae in liberis de parentibus ex mandato Dei existere debet” (*Luther*),

he just proclaimed his disgraceful pleasure to his brethren, and thus exhibited his shameless sensuality. The brothers, on the contrary, with reverential modesty covered their father with a garment (הַשְּׂמֹלָה the garment, which was at hand), walking backwards that they might not see his nakedness (v. 23), and thus manifesting their childlike reverence as truly as their refined purity and modesty. For this they receive their father’s blessing, whereas Ham reaped for his son Canaan the patriarch’s curse. In v. 24 Ham is called בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן “his (Noah’s) little son,” and it is questionable whether the adjective is to be taken as comparative in the sense of “the younger,” or as superlative, meaning “the youngest.” Neither grammar nor the usage of the language will enable us to decide. For in 1Sa. 17:14, where David is contrasted with his brothers, the word means not the youngest of the four, but the younger by the side of the three elder, just as in Gen. 1:16 the sun is called “the *great*” light, and the moon “the *little*” light, not to show that the sun is the greatest and the moon the least of all lights, but that the moon is the smaller of the two. If, on the other hand, on the ground of 1Sa. 16:11, where “the little one” undoubtedly means

the youngest of all, any one would press the superlative force here, he must be prepared, in order to be consistent, to do the same with *haggadol*, “the great one,” in Gen. 10:21, which would lead to this discrepancy, that in the verse before us Ham is called Noah’s youngest son, and in Gen. 10:21 Shem is called Japhet’s oldest brother, and thus *implicite* Ham is described as older than Japhet. If we do not wish lightly to introduce a discrepancy into the text of these two chapters, no other course is open than to follow the LXX, *Vulg.* and others, and take “the little” here and “the great” in Gen. 10:21 as used in a comparative sense, Ham being represented here as Noah’s younger son, and Shem in Gen. 10:21 as Japhet’s elder brother. Consequently the order in which the three names stand is also an indication of their relative ages. And this is not only the simplest and readiest assumption, but is even confirmed by Gen. 10, though the order is inverted there, Japhet being mentioned first, then Ham, and Shem last; and it is also in harmony with the chronological datum in Gen. 11:10, as compared with Gen. 5:32 (vid., Gen. 11:10).

To understand the words of Noah with reference to his sons (vv. 25-27), we must bear in mind, on the one hand, that as the moral nature of the patriarch was transmitted by generation to his descendants, so the diversities of character in the sons of Noah foreshadowed diversities in the moral inclinations of the tribes of which they were the head; and on the other hand, that Noah, through the Spirit and power of that God with whom he walked, discerned in the moral nature of his sons, and the different tendencies which they already displayed, the germinal commencement of the future course of their posterity, and uttered words of blessing and of curse, which were prophetic of the history of the tribes that descended from them. In the sin of Ham

“there lies the great stain of the whole Hamitic race, whose chief characteristic is sexual sin” (*Ziegler*);

and the curse which Noah pronounced upon this sin still rests upon the race. It was not Ham who was cursed, however, but his son Canaan. Ham had sinned against his father, and he was punished in his son. But the reason why Canaan was the only son named, is not to be found in the fact that Canaan was the youngest son of Ham, and Ham the youngest son of Noah, as *Hofmann* supposes. The latter is not an established fact; and the purely external circumstance, that Canaan had the misfortune to be the youngest son, could not be a just reason for cursing him alone. The real reason must either lie in the fact that Canaan was already walking in the steps of his father’s impiety and sin, or else be sought in the name *Canaan*, in which Noah discerned, through the gift of prophecy, a significant *omen*; a supposition decidedly favoured by the analogy of the blessing pronounced upon Japhet, which is also founded upon the name. *Canaan* does not signify lowland, nor was it transferred, as

many maintain, from the land to its inhabitants; it was first of all the name of the father of the tribe, from whom it was transferred to his descendants, and eventually to the land of which they took possession. The meaning of *Canaan* is “the submissive one,” from כָּנַע to stoop or submit, *Hiphil*, to bend or subjugate (Deu. 9: 3; Jud. 4:23, etc.). “Ham gave his son the name from the obedience which he required, though he did not render it himself. The son was to be the servant (for the name points to servile obedience) of a father who was as tyrannical towards those beneath him, as he was refractory towards those above. The father, when he gave him the name, thought only of submission to his own commands. But the secret providence of God, which rules in all such things, had a different submission in view” (Hengstenberg, *Christol.* i. 28, transl.). “Servant of servants (i.e., the lowest of slaves, vid., Ewald, § 313) let him become to his brethren.” Although this curse was expressly pronounced upon Canaan alone, the fact that Ham had no share in Noah’s blessing, either for himself or his other sons, was a sufficient proof that his whole family was included by implication in the curse, even if it was to fall chiefly upon Canaan. And history confirms the supposition. The Canaanites were partly exterminated, and partly subjected to the lowest form of slavery, by the Israelites, who belonged to the family of Shem; and those who still remained were reduced by Solomon to the same condition (1Ki. 9:20, 21). The Phoenicians, along with the Carthaginians and the Egyptians, who all belonged to the family of Canaan, were subjected by the Japhetic Persians, Macedonians, and Romans; and the remainder of the Hamitic tribes either shared the same fate, or still sigh, like the negroes, for example, and other African tribes, beneath the yoke of the most crushing slavery.

Gen. 9:26. In contrast with the curse, the blessings upon Shem and Japhet are introduced with a fresh “*and he said,*” whilst Canaan’s servitude comes in like a *refrain* and is mentioned in connection with both his brethren: *Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, and let Canaan be servant to them.*” Instead of wishing good to Shem, Noah praises the God of Shem, just as Moses in Deu. 33:20, instead of blessing Gad, blesses Him “that enlargeth Gad,” and points out the nature of the good which he is to receive, by using the name *Jehovah*. This is done

“propter excellentem benedictionem. Non enim loquitur de corporali benedictione, sed de benedictione futura per semen promissum. Eam tantam videt esse ut explicari verbis non possit, ideo se vertit ad gratiarum actionem” (Luther).

Because Jehovah is the God of Shem, Shem will be the recipient and heir of all the blessings of salvation, which God as Jehovah bestows upon mankind. לְמוֹ = לְהֵם neither stands for the singular לוֹ (*Ges.* § 103, 2), nor refers to Shem

and Japhet. It serves to show that the announcement does not refer to the person relation of Canaan to Shem, but applies to their descendants.

Gen. 9:27. “Wide let God make it to Japhet, and let him dwell in the tents of Shem.” Starting from the meaning of the name, Noah sums up his blessing in the word **יַפְתָּה** (*japht*), from **פָּתַח** to be wide (Pro. 20:19), in the *Hiphil* with **ל**, to procure a wide space for any one, used either of extension over a wide territory, or of removal to a free, unfettered position; analogous to **הִרְחִיב ל**, Gen. 26:22; Psa. 4: 1, etc. Both must be retained here, so that the promise to the family of Japhet embraced not only a wide extension, but also prosperity on every hand. This blessing was desired by Noah, not from *Jehovah*, the God of Shem, who bestows saving spiritual good upon man, but from *Elohim*, God as Creator and Governor of the world; for it had respect primarily to the blessings of the earth, not to spiritual blessings; although Japhet would participate in these as well, for he should come and dwell in the tents of Shem. The disputed question, whether God or Japhet is to be regarded as the subject of the verb “shall dwell,” is already decided by the use of the word *Elohim*. If it were God whom Noah described as dwelling in the tents of Shem, so that the expression denoted the gracious presence of God in Israel, we should expect to find the name *Jehovah*, since it was as *Jehovah* that God took up His abode among Shem in Israel. It is much more natural to regard the expression as applying to Japhet,

(a) because the *refrain*, “Canaan shall be his servant,” requires that we should understand v. 27 as applying to Japhet, like v. 26 to Shem;

(b) because the plural, *tents*, is not applicable to the abode of *Jehovah* in Israel, inasmuch as in the parallel passages “we read of God dwelling in His tent, on His holy hill, in Zion, in the midst of the children of Israel, and also of the faithful dwelling in the tabernacle or temple of God, but never of God dwelling in the tents of Israel” (*Hengstenberg*); and

(c) because we should expect that act of affection, which the two sons so delicately performed in concert, to have its corresponding blessing in the relation established between the two (*Delitzsch*). Japhet’s dwelling in the tents of Shem is supposed by *Bochart* and others to refer to the fact, that Japhet’s descendants would one day take the land of the Shemites, and subjugate the inhabitants; but even the fathers almost unanimously understand the words in a spiritual sense, as denoting the participation of the Japhetites in the saving blessings of the Shemites. There is truth in both views. Dwelling presupposes possession; but the idea of taking by force is precluded by the fact, that it would be altogether at variance with the blessing pronounced upon Shem. If history shows that the tents of Shem were conquered and taken by the

Japhetites, the dwelling predicted here still relates not to the forcible conquest, but to the fact that the conquerors entered into the possessions of the conquered; that along with them they were admitted to the blessings of salvation; and that, yielding to the spiritual power of the vanquished, they lived henceforth in their tents as brethren (Psa. 133: 1). And if the dwelling of Japhet in the tents of Shem presupposes the conquest of the land of Shem by Japhet, it is a blessing not only to Japhet, but to Shem also, since, whilst Japhet enters into the spiritual inheritance of Shem, he brings to Shem all the good of this world (Isaiah 60).

“The fulfilment,” as *Delitzsch* says, “is plain enough, for we are all Japhetites dwelling in the tents of Shem; and the language of the New Testament is the language of Javan entered into the tents of Shem.”

To this we may add, that by the Gospel preached in this language, Israel, though subdued by the imperial power of Rome, became the spiritual conqueror of the *orbis terrarum Romanus*, and received it into his tents. Moreover it is true of the blessing and curse of Noah, as of all prophetic utterances, that they are fulfilled with regard to the nations and families in question as a whole, but do not predict, like an irresistible fate, the unalterable destiny of every individual; on the contrary, they leave room for freedom of personal decision, and no more cut off the individuals in the accursed race from the possibility of conversion, or close the way of salvation against the penitent, than they secure the individuals of the family blessed against the possibility of falling from a state of grace, and actually losing the blessing. Hence, whilst a Rahab and an Araunah were received into the fellowship of Jehovah, and the Canaanitish woman was relieved by the Lord because of her faith, the hardened Pharisees and scribes had woes pronounced upon them, and Israel was rejected because of its unbelief.

In vv. 28, 29, the history of Noah is brought to a close, with the account of his age, and of his death.

IV. History of the Sons of Noah

GENESIS 10-11: 9

PEDIGREE OF THE NATIONS. — GENESIS 10

Gen. 10. Of the sons of Noah, all that is handed down is the pedigree of the nations, or the list of the tribes which sprang from them (Genesis 10), and the account of the confusion of tongues, together with the dispersion of men over the face of the earth (Gen. 11: 1-9); two events that were closely related to one another, and of the greatest importance to the history of the human race and of

the kingdom of God. The genealogy traces the origin of the tribes which were scattered over the earth; the confusion of tongues shows the cause of the division of the one human race into many different tribes with peculiar languages.

The genealogy of the tribes is not an ethnographical myth, nor the attempt of an ancient Hebrew to trace the connection of his own people with the other nations of the earth by means of uncertain traditions and subjective combinations, but a historical record of the genesis of the nations, founded upon a tradition handed down from the fathers, which, to judge from its contents, belongs to the time of Abraham (cf. Hävernicks Introduction to Pentateuch, pp. 118 ff. transl.), and was inserted by Moses in the early history of the kingdom of God on account of its universal importance in connection with sacred history. For it not only indicates the place of the family which was chosen as the recipient of divine revelation among the rest of the nations, but traces the origin of the entire world, with the prophetic intention of showing that the nations, although they were quickly suffered to walk in their own ways (Act. 14:16), were not intended to be for ever excluded from the counsels of eternal love. In this respect the genealogies prepare the way for the promise of the blessing, which was one day to spread from the chosen family to all the families of the earth (Gen. 12: 2, 3). — The historical character of the genealogy is best attested by the contents themselves, since no trace can be detected, either of any pre-eminence given to the Shemites, or of an intention to fill up gaps by conjecture or invention. It gives just as much as had been handed down with regard to the origin of the different tribes. Hence the great diversity in the lists of the descendants of the different sons of Noah. Some are brought down only to the second, others to the third or fourth generation, and some even further; and whilst in several instances the founder of a tribe is named, in others we have only the tribes themselves; and in some cases we are unable to determine whether the names given denote the founder or the tribe. In many instances, too, on account of the defects and the unreliable character of the accounts handed down to us from different ancient sources with regard to the origin of the tribes, there are names which cannot be identified with absolute certainty. ^{f29}

Gen. 10: 1-5. DESCENDANTS OF JAPHET. — In v. 1 the names of the three sons are introduced according to their relative ages, to give completeness and finish to the *Tholedoth*; but in the genealogy itself Japhet is mentioned first and Shem last, according to the plan of the book of Genesis as already explained at p. 21. In v. 2 seven sons of Japhet are given. The names, indeed, afterwards occur as those of tribes; but here undoubtedly they are intended to denote the tribe-fathers, and may without hesitation be so regarded. For even if in later times many nations received their names from the lands of which they

took possession, this cannot be regarded as a universal rule, since unquestionably the natural rule in the derivation of the names would be for the tribe to be called after its ancestor, and for the countries to receive their names from their earliest inhabitants. *Gomer* is most probably the tribe of the *Cimmerians*, who dwelt, according to *Herodotus*, on the Maeotis, in the Taurian Chersonesus, and from whom are descended the *Cumri* or *Cymry* in Wales and Brittany, whose relation to the Germanic *Cimbri* is still in obscurity. *Magog* is connected by *Josephus* with the *Scythians* on the Sea of Asof and in the Caucasus; but *Kiepert* associates the name with *Macija* or *Maka*, and applies it to Scythian nomad tribes which forced themselves in between the Arian or Arianized Medes, Kurds, and Armenians. *Madai* are the Medes, called *Mada* on the arrow-headed inscriptions. *Javan* corresponds to the Greek *Ἰάων*, from whom the Ionians (*Ἰάονες*) are derived, the parent tribe of the Greeks (in Sanskrit *Javana*, old Persian *Junâ*). *Tubal* and *Meshech* are undoubtedly the *Tibareni* and *Moschi*, the former of whom are placed by *Herodotus* upon the east of the *Thermodon*, the latter between the sources of the Phasis and Cyrus. *Tiras*: according to *Josephus*, the *Thracians*, whom *Herodotus* calls the most numerous tribe next to the Indian. As they are here placed by the side of Meshech, so we also find on the old Egyptian monuments *Mashuash* and *Tuirash*, and upon the Assyrian *Tubal* and *Misek* (*Rawlinson*).

Gen. 10: 3. Descendants of Gomer. Ashkenaz: according to the old Jewish explanation, the *Germani*; according to *Knobel*, the family of *Asi*, which is favoured by the German legend of *Mannus*, and his three sons, *Iscus* (*Ask*, *Ἀσκάνιος*), *Ingus*, and *Hermino*. *Kiepert*, however, and *Bochart* decide, on geographical grounds, in favour of the *Ascanians* in Northern Phrygia.

Riphath: in *Knobel's* opinion the Celts, part of whom, according to *Plutarch*, crossed the *ῥιπῆ ἴπαια*, *Montes Rhipaei*, towards the Northern Ocean to the furthest limits of Europe; but *Josephus*, whom *Kiepert* follows, supposed *Ἰβάρης* to be Paphlagonia. Both of these are very uncertain. *Togarmah* is the name of the Armenians, who are still called the house of *Thorgom* or *Torkomatsi*.

Gen. 10: 4. Descendants of Javan. Elishah suggests *Elis*, and is said by *Josephus* to denote the *Aeolians*, the oldest of the Thessalian tribes, whose culture was Ionian in its origin; *Kiepert*, however, thinks of Sicily. *Tarshish* (in the Old Testament the name of the colony of *Tartessus* in Spain) is referred by *Knobel* to the *Etruscans* or *Tyrsenians*, a Pelasgic tribe of Greek derivation; but *Delitzsch* objects, that the Etruscans were most probably of Lydian descent, and, like the Lydians of Asia Minor, who were related to the Assyrians, belonged to the Shemites. Others connect the name with *Tarsus* in Cilicia. But the connection with the Spanish *Tartessus* must be retained, although, so long as the origin of this colony remains in obscurity, nothing

further can be determined with regard to the name. *Kittim* embraces not only the *Citiaei*, *Citienses* in Cyprus, with the town *Cition*, but, according to *Knobel* and *Delitzsch*, probably “the *Carians*, who settled in the lands at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea; for which reason *Ezekiel* (Eze. 27: 6) speaks of the “isles of Chittim.” *Dodanim* (*Dardani*): according to *Delitzsch*, “the tribe related to the Ionians and dwelling with them from the very first, which the legend has associated with them in the two brothers Jasion and Dardanos;” according to *Knobel*, “the whole of the Illyrian or north Grecian tribe.”

Gen. 10: 5. “From these have the islands of the nations divided themselves in their lands;” i.e., from the Japhetites already named, the tribes on the Mediterranean descended and separated from one another as they dwell in their lands, “every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.” The islands in the Old Testament are the islands and coastlands of the Mediterranean, on the European shore, from Asia Minor to Spain.

Gen. 10: 6-20. DESCENDANTS OF HAM. — *Cush*: the *Ethiopians* of the ancients, who not only dwelt in Africa, but were scattered over the whole of Southern Asia, and originally, in all probability, settled in Arabia, where the tribes that still remained, mingled with Shemites, and adopted a Shemitic language. *Mizraim* is *Egypt*: the dual form was probably transferred from the land to the people, referring, however, not to the *double strip*, i.e., the two strips of land into which the country is divided by the Nile, but to the two Egypts, Upper and Lower, two portions of the country which differ considerably in their climate and general condition. The name is obscure, and not traceable to any Semitic derivation; for the term מִצְרַיִם in Isa. 19: 6, etc., is not to be regarded as an etymological interpretation, but as a significant play upon the word. The old Egyptian name is *Kemi* (Copt. *Chêmi*, *Kême*), which, *Plutarch* says, is derived from the dark ash-grey colour of the soil covered by the slime of the Nile, but which it is much more correct to trace to *Ham*, and to regard as indicative of the Hamitic descent of its first inhabitants. *Put* denotes the *Libyans* in the wider sense of the term (old Egypt. *Phet*; Copt. *Phaiat*), who were spread over Northern Africa as far as Mauritania, where even in the time of Jerome a river with the neighbouring district still bore the name of *Phut*; cf. *Bochart*, Phal. iv. 33. On *Canaan*, see ch. ix. 25.

Gen. 10: 7. *Descendants of Cush.* *Seba*: the inhabitants of *Meroë*; according to *Knobel*, the northern Ethiopians, the ancient *Blemmyer*, and modern *Bisharin*. *Havilah*: the Ἀβαλιται or Ἀβαλιται of the ancients, the Macrobian Ethiopians in modern Habesh. *Sabtah*: the Ethiopians inhabiting Hadhramaut, whose chief city was called *Sabatha* or *Sabota*. *Raamah*: ἐγμῶ, the inhabitants of a city and bay of that name in south-eastern Arabia (*Oman*). *Sabtecah*: the Ethiopians of Caramania, dwelling to the east of the Persian Gulf, where the

ancients mention a seaport town and a river *Σαυδάκη*. The descendants of Raamah, *Sheba* and *Dedan*, are to be sought in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf, “from which the Sabaean and Dedanitic Cushites spread to the north-west, where they formed mixed tribes with descendants of Joktan and Abraham.” See notes on v. 28 and Gen. 25: 3.

Gen. 10: 8-12. Besides the tribes already named, there sprang from Cush *Nimrod*, the founder of the first imperial kingdom, the origin of which is introduced as a memorable event into the genealogy of the tribes, just as on other occasions memorable events are interwoven with the genealogical tables (cf. 1Ch. 2: 7, 23; 4:22, 23, 39-41).^{f30} Nimrod “*began to be a mighty one in the earth.*” נִמְרוֹד is used here, as in Gen. 6: 4, to denote a man who makes himself renowned for bold and daring deeds. Nimrod was mighty in hunting, and that in opposition to Jehovah (ἐναντίον κυρίου, LXX); not before Jehovah in the sense of, according to the purpose and will of Jehovah, still less, like לְאֱלֹהִים in Jon. 3: 3, or τῷ Θεῷ in Act. 7:20, in a simply superlative sense. The last explanation is not allowed by the usage of the language, the second is irreconcilable with the context. The name itself, *Nimrod* from מְרֹד, “we will revolt,” points to some violent resistance to God. It is so characteristic that it can only have been given by his contemporaries, and thus have become a proper name.^{f31}

In addition to this, Nimrod as a mighty hunter founded a powerful kingdom; and the founding of this kingdom is shown by the verb נִתְּחַד with ו consec. to have been the consequence or result of his strength in hunting, so that the hunting was most intimately connected with the establishment of the kingdom. Hence, if the expression “a mighty hunter” relates primarily to hunting in the literal sense, we must add to the literal meaning the figurative signification of a “hunter of men” (“trapper of men by stratagem and force,” *Herder*); *Nimrod* the hunter became a tyrant, a powerful hunter of men. This course of life gave occasion to the proverb, “like Nimrod, a mighty hunter against the Lord,” which immortalized not his skill in hunting beasts, but the success of his hunting of men in the establishment of an imperial kingdom by tyranny and power. But if this be the meaning of the proverb, לְפָנֵי יְהוָה “in the face of Jehovah” can only mean in defiance of Jehovah, as *Josephus* and the *Targums* understand it. And the proverb must have arisen when other daring and rebellious men followed in Nimrod’s footsteps, and must have originated with those who saw in such conduct an act of rebellion against the God of salvation, in other words, with the possessors of the divine promises of grace.^{f32}

Gen. 10:10. “*And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel,*” the well-known city of Babylon on the Euphrates, which from the time of Nimrod downwards

has been the symbol of the power of the world in its hostility to God; — “*and Erech*” (Ὠρέχ, LXX), one of the seats of the Cutheans (Samaritans), Ezr. 4: 9, no doubt *Orchoë*, situated, according to *Rawlinson*, on the site of the present ruins of *Warka*, thirty hours’ journey to the south-east of Babel; — and *Accad* (Ἀρχάδ, LXX), a place not yet determined, though, judging from its situation between *Erech* and *Calneh*, it was not far from either, and *Pressel* is probably right in identifying it with the ruins of *Niffer*, to the south of Hillah; — “*and Calneh*.” this is found by early writers on the cite of *Ctesiphon*, now a great heap of ruins, twenty hours north-east of Babel. These four cities were in the land of *Shinar*, i.e., of the province of Babylon, on the Lower Euphrates and Tigris.

Gen. 10:11, 12. From Shinar Nimrod went to Assyria (אַשּׁוּר is the accusative of direction), the country on the east of the Tigris, and there built four cities, or probably a large imperial city composed of the four cities, or probably a large imperial city composed of the four cities named. As three of these cities — *Rehoboth-Ir*, i.e., city markets (not “street-city,” as *Bunsen* interprets it), *Chelach*, and *Resen* — are not met with again, whereas *Nineveh* was renowned in antiquity for its remarkable size (vid., Jon. 3: 3), the words “*this is the great city*” must apply not to Resen, but to Nineveh. This is grammatically admissible, if we regard the last three names as subordinate to the first, taking as the sign of subordination (*Ewald*, § 339a), and render the passage thus: “he built Nineveh, with Rehoboth-Ir, Cheloch, and Resen between Nineveh and Chelach, this is the great city.” From this it follows that the four places formed a large composite city, a large range of towns, to which the name of the (well-known) great city of *Nineveh* was applied, in distinction from Nineveh in the more restricted sense, with which Nimrod probably connected the other three places so as to form one great capital, possibly also the chief fortress of his kingdom on the Tigris. These four cities most likely correspond to the ruins on the east of the Tigris, which *Layard* has so fully explored, viz., *Nebbi Yûnus* and *Kouyunjik* opposite to Mosul, *Khorsabad* five hours to the north, and *Nimrud* eight hours to the south of Mosul. ^{f33}

Gen. 10:13, 14. From Mizraim descended *Ludim*: not the Semitic Ludim (v. 22), but, according to *Movers*, the old tribe of the *Lewâtah* dwelling on the Syrtea, according to others, the Moorish tribes collectively. Whether the name is connected with the *Laud flumen* (*Plin.* v. 1) is uncertain; in any case *Knobel* is wrong in thinking of Ludian Shemites, whether Hyksos, who forced their way to Egypt, or Egyptianized Arabians. *Ananim*: inhabitants of the Delta, according to *Knobel*. He associates the Ἐνεμετιεῖμ of the LXX with *Sanemhit*, or Northern Egypt: “*isanemhit*, i.e., *pars, regio septentrionis*.” *Lehabim* (= *Lubim*, Nah. 3: 9) are, according to Josephus, the Ἀίβυες or Ἀύβιες, not the great Libyan tribe (*Phut*, v. 6), which Nahum distinguishes from them, but the

Libyaegyptii of the ancients. *Naphtuchim*: in *Knobel's* opinion, the Middle Egyptians, as the nation of *Pthah*, the god of Memphis; but *Bochart* is more probably correct in associating the name with *Νέφθους* in *Plut. de Is.*, the northern coast line of Egypt. *Pathrusim*: inhabitants of *Pathros*, *Παθούρης*, Egypt. *Petrês*, land of the south; i.e., Upper Egypt, the *Thebais* of the ancients. *Casluchim*: according to general admission the *Colchians*, who descended from the Egyptians (Herod. ii. 104), though the connection of the name with *Cassiotis* is uncertain. "From thence (i.e., from *Casluchim*, which is the name of both people and country) proceeded the *Philistines*." *Philistim*, LXX *Φυλιστιεῖμ* or *Ἀλλόφυλοι*, lit., emigrants or immigrants from the Ethiopic *fállása*. This is not at variance with Amo. 9: 7 and Jer. 47: 4, according to which the *Philistines* came from *Caphtor*, so that there is no necessity to transpose the relative clause after *Philistim*. The two statements may be reconciled on the simple supposition that the *Philistian* nation was primarily a *Casluchian* colony, which settled on the south-eastern coast line of the Mediterranean between *Gaza* (v. 19) and *Pelusium*, but was afterwards strengthened by immigrants from *Caphtor*, and extended its territory by pressing out the *Avim* (Deu. 2:23, cf. Jos. 13: 3). *Caphtorim*: according to the old Jewish explanation, the *Cappadocians*; but according to *Lakemacher's* opinion, which has been revived by *Ewald*, etc., the *Cretans*. This is not decisively proved, however, either by the name *Cherethites*, given to the *Philistines* in 1Sa. 30:14, Zep. 2: 5, and Eze. 25:16, or by the expression "isle of *Caphtor*" in Jer. 47: 4.

Gen. 10:15 ff. From *Canaan* descended "*Zidon his first-born, and Heth.*" Although *Zidon* occurs in v. 19 and throughout the Old Testament as the name of the oldest capital of the *Phoenicians*, here it must be regarded as the name of a person, not only because of the apposition "*his first-born,*" and the verb *בָּרַךְ*, "*begat,*" but also because the name of a city does not harmonize with the names of the other descendants of *Canaan*, the analogy of which would lead us to expect the *nomen gentile* "*Sidonian*" (Jud. 3: 3, etc.); and lastly, because the word *Zidon*, from *צִיד* to hunt, to catch, is not directly applicable to a sea-port and commercial town, and there are serious objections upon philological grounds to *Justin's* derivation, "*quam a piscium ubertate Sidona appellaverunt, nam pisces Phoenices Sidon vocant*" (var. hist. 18, 3). *Heth* is also the name of a person, from which the term *Hittite* (Gen. 25: 9; Num. 13:29), equivalent to "*sons of Heth*" (Gen. 23: 5), is derived. "*The Jebusite:*" inhabitants of *Jebus*, afterwards called *Jerusalem*. "*The Amorite:*" not the inhabitants of the mountain or heights, for the derivation from *אֲמֹר*, "*summit,*" is not established, but a branch of the *Canaanites*, descended from *Emor* (*Amor*), which was spread far and wide over the mountains of *Judah* and beyond the *Jordan* in the time of *Moses*, so that in Gen. 15:16; 48:22, all the

Canaanites are comprehended by the name. “*The Girgashites*,” Γεργεσαῖος (LXX), are also mentioned in Gen. 15:21, Deu. 7: 1, and Jos. 24:11; but their dwelling-place is unknown, as the reading Γεργεσηνοί in Mat. 8:28 is critically suspicious. “*The Hivites*” dwelt in Sichem (Gen. 34: 2), at Gibeon (Jos. 9: 7), and at the foot of Hermon (Jos. 11: 3); the meaning of the word is uncertain. “*The Arkites*,” inhabitants of Ἀρκή, to the north of Tripolis at the foot of Lebanon, the ruins of which still exist (vid., *Robinson*). “*The Sinite*,” the inhabitants of *Sin* or *Sinna*, a place in Lebanon not yet discovered. “*The Arvadite*,” or *Aradians*, occupied from the eighth century before Christ, the small rocky island of *Arados* to the north of Tripolis. “*The Zemarite*,” the inhabitants of Simyra in Eleutherus. “*The Hamathite*,” the inhabitants or rather founders of *Hamath* on the most northerly border of Palestine (Num. 13:21; 34: 8), afterwards called *Epiphania*, on the river Orontes, the present *Hamâh*, with 100,000 inhabitants. The words in v. 18, “*and afterward were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad*,” mean that they all proceeded from one local centre as branches of the same tribe, and spread themselves over the country, the limits of which are given in two directions, with evident reference to the fact that it was afterwards promised to the seed of Abraham for its inheritance, viz., from north to south, — “*from Sidon, in the direction* (lit., as thou comest) *towards Gerar* (see Gen. 20: 1), *unto Gaza*,” the primitive Avvite city of the Philistines (Deu. 2:23), now called *Guzzeh*, at the S.W. corner of Palestine, — and thence from west to east, *in the direction towards Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim* (see 19.24) *to Lesha*,” i.e., *Calirrhoe*, a place with sulphur baths, on the eastern side of the Dead Sea, in Wady *Serka Maein* (*Seetzen* and *Ritter*).

Gen. 10:21-32. DESCENDANTS OF SHEM. — V. 21. For the construction, vid., Gen. 4:26. *Shem* is called the father of all the sons of *Eber*, because two tribes sprang from Eber through Peleg and Joktan, viz., the Abrahamides, and also the Arabian tribe of the Joktanides (vv. 26 ff.). — On the expression, “*the brother of Japhet*” הַגִּבּוֹרִי, see Gen. 9:24. The names of the five sons of Shem occur elsewhere as the names of the tribes and countries; at the same time, as there is no proof that in any single instance the name was transferred from the country to its earliest inhabitants, no well-grounded objection can be offered to the assumption, which the analogy of the other descendants of Shem renders probable, that they were originally the names of individuals. As the name of a people, *Elam* denotes the *Elymaeans*, who stretched from the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea, but who are first met with as Persians no longer speaking a Semitic language. *Asshur*: the *Assyrians* who settled in the country of *Assyria*, Ἀσουρία, to the east of the Tigris, but who afterwards spread in the direction of Asia Minor. *Arphaxad*: the inhabitants of Ἀρραπαχίτις in northern Assyria. The explanation given of the name, viz., “*fortress of the Chaldeans*” (*Ewald*),

“highland of the Chaldeans” (*Knobel*), “territory of the Chaldeans” (*Dietrich*), are very questionable. *Lud*: the *Lydians* of Asia Minor, whose connection with the Assyrians is confirmed by the names of the ancestors of their kings. *Aram*: the ancestor of the *Aramaeans* of Syria and Mesopotamia.

Gen. 10:23. *Descendants of Aram.* *Uz*: a name which occurs among the *Nahorides* (Gen. 22:21) and *Horites* (Gen. 36:28), and which is associated with the *Ἀῖσιται* of Ptolemy, in *Arabia deserta* towards Babylon; this is favoured by the fact that *Uz*, the country of Job, is called by the LXX *χώρα Ἀῖσιτις*, although the notion that these *Aesites* were an Aramaean tribe, afterwards mixed up with *Nahorides* and *Horites*, is mere conjecture. *Hul*: *Delitzsch* associates this with *Cheli* (*Cheri*), the old Egyptian name for the Syrians, and the *Hylatae* who dwelt near the *Emesenes* (Plin. 5, 19). *Gether* he connects with the name given in the Arabian legends to the ancestor of the tribes *Themūd* and *Ghadis*. *Mash*: for which we find *Meshech* in 1Ch. 1:17, a tribe mentioned in Psa. 120: 5 along with *Kedar*, and since the time of *Bochart* generally associated with the *πορος Μάσιον* above *Nisibis*.

Gen. 10:25. Among the descendants of Arphaxad, Eber’s eldest son received the name of *Peleg*, because in his days the earth, i.e., the population of the earth, was divided, in consequence of the building of the tower of Babel (Gen. 11: 8). His brother *Joktan* is called *Kachtan* by the Arabians, and is regarded as the father of all the primitive tribes of Arabia. The names of his sons are given in vv. 26-29. There are thirteen of them, some of which are still retained in places and districts of Arabia, whilst others are not yet discovered, or are entirely extinct. Nothing certain has been ascertained about *Almodad*, *Jerah*, *Diklah*, *Obal*, *Abimael*, and *Jobab*. Of the rest, *Sheleph* is identical with *Salif* or *Sulaf* (in Ptl. 6, 7, *Σαλαπηνοί*), an old Arabian tribe, also a district of *Yemen*. *Hazarmaveth* (i.e., forecourt of death) is the Arabian *Hadhramaut* in South-eastern Arabia on the Indian Ocean, whose name *Jauhari* is derived from the unhealthiness of the climate. *Hadoram*: the *Ἀδραμίται* of Ptol. 6, 7, *Atramitae* of Plin. 6, 28, on the southern coast of Arabia. *Uzal*: one of the most important towns of *Yemen*, south-west of *Mareb*. *Sheba*: the *Sabaeans*, with the capital *Saba* or *Mareb*, *Mariaba regia* (Plin.), whose connection with the Cushite (v. 7) and *Abrahamite* *Sabaeans* (Gen. 25: 3) is quite in obscurity. *Ophir* has not yet been discovered in Arabia; it is probably to be sought on the Persian Gulf, even if the *Ophir* of Solomon was not situated there. *Havilah* appears to answer to *Chaulaw* of *Edrisi*, a district between *Sanaa* and *Mecca*. But this district, which lies in the heart of *Yemen*, does not fit the account in 1Sa. 15: 7, nor the statement in Gen. 25:18, that *Havilah* formed the boundary of the territory of the *Ishmaelites*. These two passages point rather to *ἄυλοσάιοι*, a place on the border of *Arabia Petraea* towards *Yemen*, between the *Nabataeans* and *Hagrites*, which *Strabo* describes as habitable.

Gen. 10:30. The settlements of these Joktanides lay *from Mesha towards Sephar the mountain of the East,*” *Mesha* is still unknown: according to *Gesenius*, it is *Mesene* on the Persian Gulf, and in *Knobel’s* opinion, it is the valley of *Bisha* or *Beishe* in the north of Yemen; but both are very improbable. *Sepher* is supposed by *Mesnel* to be the ancient Himyaritish capital, *Shafār*, on the Indian Ocean; and the *mountain of the East*, the mountain of incense, which is situated still farther to the east. — The genealogy of the Shemites closes with v. 31, and the entire genealogy of the nations with v. 32. According to the Jewish Midrash, there are seventy tribes, with as many different languages; but this number can only be arrived at by reckoning Nimrod among the Hamites, and not only placing Peleg among the Shemites, but taking his ancestors Salah and Eber to be names of separate tribes. By this we obtain for Japhet 14, for Ham 31, and for Shem 25, — in all 70 names. The Rabbins, on the other hand, reckon 14 Japhetic, 30 Hamitic, and 26 Semitic nations; whilst the fathers make 72 in all. But as these calculations are perfectly arbitrary, and the number 70 is nowhere given or hinted at, we can neither regard it as intended, nor discover in it “the number of the divinely appointed varieties of the human race,” or “of the cosmical development,” even if the seventy disciples (Luk. 10: 1) were meant to answer to the seventy nations whom the Jews supposed to exist upon the earth.

Gen. 10:32. The words, “*And by these were the nations of the earth divided in the earth after the flood,*” prepare the way for the description of that event which led to the division of the one race into many nations with different languages.

THE CONFUSION OF TONGUES. — GEN. 11: 1-9

Gen. 11: 1. “*And the whole earth* (i.e., the population of the earth, vid., Gen. 2:19) *was one lip and one kind of words:*” *unius labii eorundemque verborum*. The unity of language of the whole human race follows from the unity of its descent from one human pair (vid., Gen. 2:22). But as the origin and formation of the races of mankind are beyond the limits of empirical research, so no philology will ever be able to prove or deduce the original unity of human speech from the languages which have been historically preserved, however far comparative grammar may proceed in establishing the genealogical relation of the languages of different nations.

Gen. 11: 2 ff. As men multiplied they moved from the land of Ararat “*eastward,*” or more strictly to the *south-east*, and settled in a plain. בִּקְעָה does not denote a valley between mountain ranges, but a broad plain, πεδίον μέγα, as *Herodotus* calls the neighbourhood of Babylon. There they resolved to build an immense tower; and for this purpose they made bricks and burned

them thoroughly (לְשַׂרְפָּה “to burning” serves to intensify the verb like the *inf. absol.*), so that they became stone; whereas in the East ordinary buildings are constructed of bricks of clay, simply dried in the sun. For mortar they used asphalt, in which the neighbourhood of Babylon abounds. From this material, which may still be seen in the ruins of Babylon, they intended to build a city and a tower, whose top should be in heaven, i.e., reach to the sky, to make to themselves a name, that they might not be scattered over the whole earth. שָׂם עֲשָׂה לוֹ denotes, here and everywhere else, to establish a name, or reputation, to set up a memorial (Isa. 63:12, 14; Jer. 32:20, etc.). The real motive therefore was the desire for renown, and the object was to establish a noted central point, which might serve to maintain their unity. The one was just as ungodly as the other. For, according to the divine purpose, men were to fill the earth, i.e., to spread over the whole earth, not indeed to separate, but to maintain their inward unity notwithstanding their dispersion. But the fact that they were afraid of dispersion is a proof that the inward spiritual bond of unity and fellowship, not only “the oneness of their God and their worship,” but also the unity of brotherly love, was already broken by sin. Consequently the undertaking, dictated by pride, to preserve and consolidate by outward means the unity which was inwardly lost, could not be successful, but could only bring down the judgment of dispersion.

Gen. 11: 5 ff. “*Jehovah came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men had built*” (the perfect בָּנּוּ refers to the building as one finished up to a certain point). Jehovah’s “coming down” is not the same here as in Exo. 19:20; 34: 5, Num. 11:25; 12: 5, viz., the descent from heaven of some visible symbol of His presence, but is an anthropomorphic description of God’s interposition in the actions of men, primarily a “judicial cognizance of the actual fact,” and then, v. 7, a judicial infliction of punishment. The reason for the judgment is given in the word, i.e., the sentence, which Jehovah pronounces upon the undertaking (v. 6): “*Behold one people (עַם lit., union, connected whole, from עָמַם to bind) and one language have they all, and this (the building of this city and tower) is (only) the beginning of their deeds; and now (sc., when they have finished this) nothing will be impossible to them (לֹא יִבְצֵר מֵהֶם lit., cut off from them, prevented) which they purpose to do*” (זָמּוּ for זָמּוּ from זָמַם, see Gen. 9:19). By the firm establishment of an ungodly unity, the wickedness and audacity of men would have led to fearful enterprises. But God determined, by confusing their language, to prevent the heightening of sin through ungodly association, and to frustrate their design. “Up” (הָבָה “go to,” an ironical imitation of the same expression in vv. 3 and 4), “*We will go down, and there confound their language* (on the plural, see Gen. 1:26; נִבְלָה for נִבְלָה, Kal from בָּלַל, like זָמּוּ in v. 6), *that they may not*

understand one another's speech.” The execution of this divine purpose is given in v. 8, in a description of its consequences: “*Jehovah scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth, and they left off building the city.*” We must not conclude from this, however, that the differences in language were simply the result of the separation of the various tribes, and that the latter arose from discord and strife; in which case the confusion of tongues would be nothing more than “*dissensio animorum, per quam factum sit, ut qui turrem struebant distracti sint in contraria studia et consilia*” (*Bitringa*). Such a view not only does violence to the words “*that one may not discern (understand) the lip (language) of the other,*” but is also at variance with the object of the narrative. When it is stated, first of all, that God resolved to destroy the unity of lips and words by a confusion of the lips, and then that He scattered the men abroad, this act of divine judgment cannot be understood in any other way, than that God deprived them of the ability to comprehend one another, and thus effected their dispersion. The event itself cannot have consisted merely in a change of the organs of speech, produced by the omnipotence of God, whereby speakers were turned into stammerers who were unintelligible to one another. This opinion, which is held by *Bitringa* and *Hofmann*, is neither reconcilable with the text, nor tenable as a matter of fact. The differences, to which this event gave rise, consisted not merely in variations of sound, such as might be attributed to differences in the formation in the organs of speech (the lip or tongue), but had a much deeper foundation in the human mind. If language is the audible expression of emotions, conceptions, and thoughts of the mind, the cause of the confusion or division of the one human language into different national dialects must be sought in an effect produced upon the human mind, by which the original unity of emotion, conception, thought, and will was broken up. This inward unity had no doubt been already disturbed by sin, but the disturbance had not yet amounted to a perfect breach. This happened first of all in the event recorded here, through a direct manifestation of divine power, which caused the disturbance produced by sin in the unity of emotion, thought, and will to issue in a diversity of language, and thus by a miraculous suspension of mutual understanding frustrated the enterprise by which men hoped to render dispersion and estrangement impossible. More we cannot say in explanation of this miracle, which lies before us in the great multiplicity and variety of tongues, since even those languages which are genealogically related — for example, the Semitic and Indo-Germanic — were no longer intelligible to the same people even in the dim primeval age, whilst others are so fundamentally different from one another, that hardly a trace remains of their original unity. With the disappearance of unity the one original language was also lost, so that neither in the Hebrew nor in any other language of history has enough been preserved to enable us to form the least conception of its character.^{f34}

The primitive language is extinct, buried in the materials of the languages of the nations, to rise again one day to eternal life in the glorified form of the **καιναὶ γλῶσσαι** intelligible to all the redeemed, when sin with its consequences is overcome and extinguished by the power of grace. A type of pledge of this hope was given in the gift of tongues on the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the Church on the first Christian day of Pentecost, when the apostles, filled with the Holy Ghost, spoke with other or new tongues of “the wonderful works of God,” so that the people of every nation under heaven understood in their own language (Act. 2: 1-11).

From the confusion of tongues the city received the name *Babel* (**בְּבֶל** i.e., confusion, contracted from **בְּלַבֵּל** from **בָּלַל** to confuse), according to divine direction, though without any such intention on the part of those who first gave the name, as a standing memorial of the judgment of God which follows all the ungodly enterprises of the power of the world. ^{f35}

Of this city considerable ruins still remain, including the remains of an enormous tower, *Birs Nimrud*, which is regarded by the Arabs as the tower of Babel that was destroyed by fire from heaven. Whether these ruins have any historical connection with the tower of the confusion of tongues, must remain, at least for the present, a matter of uncertainty. With regard to the date of the event, we find from v. 10 that the division of the human race occurred in the days of Peleg, who was born 100 years after the flood. In 150 or 180 years, with a rapid succession of births, the descendants of the three sons of Noah, who were already 100 years old and married at the time of the flood, might have become quite numerous enough to proceed to the erection of such a building. If we reckon, for example, only four male and four female births as the average number to each marriage, since it is evident from Gen. 11:12 ff. that children were born as early as the 30th or 35th year of their parent's age, the sixth generation would be born by 150 years after the flood, and the human race would number 12,288 males and as many females. Consequently there would be at least about 30,000 people in the world at this time.

V. History of Shem

GEN. 11:10-26

Gen. 11:10-26. After describing the division of the one family which sprang from the three sons of Noah, into many nations scattered over the earth and speaking different languages, the narrative returns to Shem, and traces his descendants in a direct line to Terah the father of Abraham. The first five members of this pedigree have already been given in the genealogy of the Shemites; and in that case the object was to point out the connection in which

all the descendants of Eber stood to one another. They are repeated here to show the direct descent of the Terahites through Peleg from Shem, but more especially to follow the chronological thread of the family line, which could not be given in the genealogical tree without disturbing the uniformity of its plan. By the statement in v. 10, that “*Shem, a hundred years old, begat Arphaxad two years after the flood,*” the chronological *date* already given of Noah’s age at the birth of his sons (Gen. 5:32) and at the commencement of the flood (Gen. 7:11) are made still more definite. As the expression “after the flood” refers to the commencement of the flood (Gen. 9:28), and according to Gen. 7:11 the flood began in the second month, or near the beginning of the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, though the year 600 is given in Gen. 7: 6 in round numbers, it is not *necessary* to assume, as some do, in order to reconcile the difference between our verse and Gen. 5:32, that the number 500 in Gen. 5:32 stands as a round number for 502. On the other hand, there can be no objection to such an assumption. The different statements may be easily reconciled by placing the birth of Shem at the end of the five hundredth year of Noah’s life, and the birth of Arphaxad at the end of the hundredth year of that of Shem; in which case Shem would be just 99 years old when the flood began, and would be fully 100 years old “two years after the flood,” that is to say, in the second year from the commencement of the flood, when he begat Arphaxad. In this case the “two years after the flood” are not to be added to the sum-total of the chronological *data*, but are included in it. The table given here forms in a chronological and material respect the direct continuation of the one in Genesis ch. 5, and differs from it only in form, viz., by giving merely the length of life of the different fathers before and after the birth of their sons, without also summing up the whole number of their years as is the case there, since this is superfluous for chronological purposes. But on comparing the chronological *data* of the two tables, we find this very important difference in the duration of life before and after the flood, that the patriarchs after the flood lived upon an average only half the number of years of those before it, and that with Peleg the average duration of life was again reduced by one half. Whilst Noah with his 950 years belonged entirely to the old world, and Shem, who was born before the flood, reached the age of 600, Arphaxad lived only 438 years, Salah 433, and Eber 464; and again, with Peleg the duration of life fell to 239 years, Reu also lived only 239 years, Serug 230, and Nahor not more than 148. Here, then, we see that the two catastrophes, the flood and the separation of the human race into nations, exerted a powerful influence in shortening the duration of life; the former by altering the climate of the earth, the latter by changing the habits of men. But while the length of life diminished, the children were born proportionally earlier. Shem begat his first-born in his hundredth year, Arphaxad in the thirty-fifth, Salah in the thirtieth, and so on to Terah, who had no children till his seventieth year; consequently

the human race, notwithstanding the shortening of life, increased with sufficient rapidity to people the earth very soon after their dispersion. There is nothing astonishing, therefore, in the circumstance, that wherever Abraham went he found tribes, towns, and kingdoms, though only 365 years had elapsed since the flood, when we consider that eleven generations would have followed one another in that time, and that, supposing every marriage to have been blessed with eight children on an average (four male and four female), the eleventh generation would contain 12,582,912 couples, or 25,165,824 individuals. And is we reckon ten children as the average number, the eleventh generation would contain 146,484,375 pairs, or 292,968,750 individuals. In neither of these cases have we included such of the earlier generations as would be still living, although their number would be by no means inconsiderable, since nearly all the patriarchs from Shem to Terah were alive at the time of Abram's migration. In v. 26 the genealogy closes, like that in Gen. 5:32, with the names of three sons of Terah, all of whom sustained an important relation to the subsequent history, viz., *Abram* as the father of the chosen family, *Nahor* as the ancestor of Rebekah (cf. v. 29 with Gen. 22:20-23), and *Haran* as the father of Lot (v. 27).

VI. History of Terah

GEN. 11:27-25:11

FAMILY OF TERAH. — GEN. 11:27-32

Gen. 11:27-25:11. The genealogical *data* in vv. 27-32 prepare the way for the history of the patriarchs. The heading, "*These are the generations of Terah,*" belongs not merely to vv. 27-32, but to the whole of the following account of Abram, since it corresponds to "the generations" of Ishmael and of Isaac in Gen. 25:12 and 19. Of the three sons of Terah, who are mentioned again in v. 27 to complete the plan of the different *Toledoth*, such genealogical notices are given as are of importance to the history of Abram and his family. According to the regular plan of Genesis, the fact that Haran the youngest son of Terah begat Lot, is mentioned first of all, because the latter went with Abram to Canaan; and then the fact that he died before his father Terah, because the link which would have connected Lot with his native land was broken in consequence. "*Before his father,*" עַל פְּנֵי lit., upon the face of his father, so that he saw and survived his death. *Ur of the Chaldees* is to be sought either in the "*Ur nomine persicum castellum*" of *Ammian* (25, 8), between Hatra and Nisibis, near Arrapachitis, or in *Orhoi*, Armenian *Urrhai*, the old name for *Edessa*, the modern *Urfa*. — v. 29. Abram and Nahor took wives from their kindred. Abram married Sarai, his half-sister (Gen. 20:12), of

whom it is already related, in anticipation of what follows, that she was barren. Nahor married Milcah, the daughter of his brother Haran, who bore to him Bethuel, the father of Rebekah (Gen. 22:22, 23). The reason why Ischah is mentioned is doubtful. For the rabbinical notion, that Ischah is another name for Sarai, is irreconcilable with Gen. 20:12, where Abram calls Sarai his sister, daughter of his father, though not of his mother; on the other hand, the circumstance that Sarai is introduced in v. 31 merely as the daughter-in-law of Terah, may be explained on the ground that she left Ur, not as his daughter, but as the wife of his son Abram. A better hypothesis is that of *Ewald*, that Ischah is mentioned because she was the wife of Lot; but this is pure conjecture. According to v. 31, Terah already prepared to leave Ur of the Chaldees with Abram and Lot, and to remove to Canaan. In the phrase “*they went forth with them*,” the subject cannot be the unmentioned members of the family, such as Nahor and his children; though Nahor must also have gone to Haran, since it is called in Gen. 24:10 the city of Nahor. For if he accompanied them at this time, there is no perceptible reason why he should not have been mentioned along with the rest. The nominative to the verb must be Lot and Sarai, who went with Terah and Abram; so that although Terah is placed at the head, Abram must have taken an active part in the removal, or the resolution to remove. This does not, however, necessitate the conclusion, that he had already been called by God in Ur. Nor does Gen. 15: 7 require any such assumption. For it is not stated there that God called Abram in Ur, but only that He *brought him out*. But the simple fact of removing from Ur might also be called a leading out, as a work of divine superintendence and guidance, without a special call from God. It was in Haran that Abram first received the divine call to go to Canaan (Gen. 12: 1-4), when he left not only his country and kindred, but also his father’s house. Terah did not carry out his intention to proceed to Canaan, but remained in Haran, in his native country Mesopotamia, probably because he found there what he was going to look for in the land of Canaan. Haran, more properly *Charan*, Ⲱⲓⲛⲁ, is a place in north-western Mesopotamia, the ruins of which may still be seen, a full day’s journey to the south of Edessa (Gr. Κάρραι, Lat. *Carrae*), where Crassus fell when defeated by the Parthians. It was a leading settlement of the Ssabians, who had a temple there dedicated to the moon, which they traced back to Abraham. There Terah died at the age of 205, or sixty years after the departure of Abram for Canaan; for, according to v. 26, Terah was seventy years old when Abram was born, and Abram was seventy-five years old when he arrived in Canaan. When Stephen, therefore, placed the removal of Abram from Haran to Canaan after the death of his father, he merely inferred this from the fact, that the call of Abram (Genesis 12) was not mentioned till after the death of Terah had been noticed, taking the order of the narrative as the order of events; whereas, according to the plan of Genesis, the death of Terah is introduced here,

because Abram never met with his father again after leaving Haran, and there was consequently nothing more to be related concerning him.

CHARACTER OF THE PATRIARCHAL HISTORY

The dispersion of the descendants of the sons of Noah, who had now grown into numerous families, was necessarily followed on the one hand by the rise of a variety of nations, differing in language, manners, and customs, and more and more estranged from one another; and on the other by the expansion of the germs of idolatry, contained in the different attitudes of these nations towards God, into the polytheistic religions of heathenism, in which the glory of the immortal God was changed into an image made like to mortal man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things (Rom. 1:23 cf. Wisdom 13-15). If God therefore would fulfil His promise, no more to smite the earth with the curse of the destruction of every living thing because of the sin of man (Gen. 8:21, 22), and yet would prevent the moral corruption which worketh death from sweeping all before it; it was necessary that by the side of these self-formed nations He should form a nation for Himself, to be the recipient and preserver of His salvation, and that in opposition to the rising kingdoms of the world He should establish a kingdom for the living, saving fellowship of man with Himself. The foundation for this was laid by God in the call and separation of Abram from his people and his country, to make him, by special guidance, the father of a nation from which the salvation of the world should come. With the choice of Abram and revelation of God to man assumed a select character, inasmuch as God manifested Himself henceforth to Abram and his posterity alone as the author of salvation and the guide to true life; whilst other nations were left to follow their own course according to the powers conferred upon them, in order that they might learn that in their way, and without fellowship with the living God, it was impossible to find peace to the soul, and the true blessedness of life (cf. Act. 17:27). But this exclusiveness contained from the very first the germ of universalism. Abram was called, that through him all the families of the earth might be blessed (Gen. 12: 1-3). Hence the new form which the divine guidance of the human race assumed in the call of Abram was connected with the general development of the world, — in the one hand, by the fact that Abram belonged to the family of Shem, which Jehovah had blessed, and on the other, by his not being called alone, but as a married man with his wife. But whilst, regarded in this light, the continuity of the divine revelation was guaranteed, as well as the plan of human development established in the creation itself, the call of Abram introduced so far the commencement of a new period, that to carry out the designs of God their very foundations required to be renewed. Although, for example, the knowledge and worship of the true God had been preserved in the families of Shem in a purer form than among the remaining descendants of

Noah, even in the house of Terah and worship of God was corrupted by idolatry (Jos. 24: 2, 3); and although Abram was to become the father of the nation which God was about to form, yet his wife was barren, and therefore, in the way of nature, a new family could not be expected to spring from him.

As a perfectly new beginning, therefore, the patriarchal history assumed the form of a family history, in which the grace of God prepared the ground for the coming Israel. For the nation was to grow out of the family, and in the lives of the patriarchs its character was to be determined and its development foreshadowed. The early history consists of three stages, which are indicated by the three patriarchs, peculiarly so called, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and in the sons of Jacob the unity of the chosen family was expanded into the twelve immediate fathers of the nation. In the triple number of the patriarchs, the divine election of the nation on the one hand, and the entire formation of the character and guidance of the life of Israel on the other, were to attain to their fullest typical manifestation. These two were the pivots, upon which all the divine revelations made to the patriarchs, and all the guidance they received, were made to turn. The revelations consisted almost exclusively of promises; and so far as these promises were fulfilled in the lives of the patriarchs, the fulfilments themselves were predictions and pledges of the ultimate and complete fulfilment, reserved for a distant, or for the most remote futurity. And the guidance vouchsafed had for its object the calling forth of faith in response to the promise, which should maintain itself amidst all the changes of this earthly life.

“A faith, which laid hold of the word of promise, and on the strength of that word gave up the visible and present for the invisible and future, was the fundamental characteristic of the patriarchs” (*Delitzsch*).

This faith Abram manifested and sustained by great sacrifices, by enduring patience, and by self-denying by great sacrifices, by enduring patience, and by self-denying obedience of such a kind, that he thereby became the father of believers (πατὴρ πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων, Rom. 4:11). Isaac also was strong in patience and hope; and Jacob wrestled in faith amidst painful circumstances of various kinds, until he had secured the blessing of the promise.

“Abraham was a man of faith that works; Isaac, of faith that endures; Jacob, of faith that wrestles” (*Baumgarten*).

— Thus, walking in faith, the patriarchs were types of faith for all the families that should spring from them, and be blessed through them, and ancestors of a nation which God had resolved to form according to the election of His grace. For the election of God was not restricted to the separation of Abram from the family of Shem, to be the father of the nation which was destined to be the

vehicle of salvation; it was also manifest in the exclusion of Ishmael, whom Abram had begotten by the will of man, through Hagar the handmaid of his wife, for the purpose of securing the promised seed, and in the new life imparted to the womb of the barren Sarai, and her consequent conception and birth of Isaac, the son of promise. And lastly, it appeared still more manifestly in the twin sons born by Rebekah to Isaac, of whom the first-born, Esau, was rejected, and the younger, Jacob, chosen to be the heir of the promise; and this choice, which was announced before their birth, was maintained in spite of Isaac's plans, or that Jacob, and not Esau, received the blessing of the promise. — All this occurred as a type for the future, that Israel might know and lay to heart the fact, that bodily descent from Abraham did not make a man a child of God, but that they alone were children of God who laid hold of the divine promise in faith, and walked in the steps of their forefather's faith (cf. Rom. 9: 6-13).

If we fix our eyes upon the method of the divine revelation, we find a new beginning in this respect, that as soon as Abram is called, we read of the *appearing* of God. It is true that from the very beginning God had manifested Himself visibly to men; but in the olden time we read nothing of appearances, because before the flood God had not withdrawn His presence from the earth. Even to Noah He revealed Himself before the flood as one who was present on the earth. But when He had established a covenant with him after the flood, and thereby had assured the continuance of the earth and of the human race, the direct manifestations ceased, for God withdrew His visible presence from the world; so that it was from heaven that the judgment fell upon the tower of Babel, and even the call to Abram in his home in Haran was issued through His word, that is to say, no doubt, through an inward monition. But as soon as Abram had gone to Canaan, in obedience to the call of God, Jehovah *appeared* to him there (Gen. 12: 7). These appearances, which were constantly repeated from that time forward, must have taken place from heaven; for we read that Jehovah, after speaking with Abram and the other patriarchs, "went away" (Gen. 18:33), or "went up" (Gen. 17:22; 35:13); and the patriarchs saw them, sometimes while in a waking condition, in a form discernible to the bodily senses, sometimes in visions, in a state of mental ecstasy, and at other times in the form of a dream (Gen. 28:12 ff.). On the form in which God appeared, in most instances, nothing is related. But in Gen. 18: 1 ff. it is stated that three men came to Abram, one of whom is introduced as Jehovah, whilst the other two are called angels (Gen. 19: 1). Beside this, we frequently read of appearances of the "angel of Jehovah" (Gen. 16: 7; 22:11, etc.), or of "Elohim," and the "angel of Elohim" (Gen. 21:17; 31:11, etc.), which were repeated throughout the whole of the Old Testament, and even occurred, though only in vision, in the case of the prophet Zechariah. The appearances of the angel of Jehovah (or Elohim) cannot have been essentially different from

those of Jehovah (or Elohim) Himself; for Jacob describes the appearances of Jehovah at Bethel (Gen. 28:13 ff.) as an appearance of “the angel of Elohim,” and of “the God of Bethel” (Gen. 31:11, 13); and in his blessing on the sons of Joseph (Gen. 48:15, 16), “The God (*Elohim*) before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God (*Elohim*) which fed me all my life long unto this day, the *angel* which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads,” he places the angel of God on a perfect equality with God, not only regarding Him as the Being to whom he has been indebted for protection all his life long, but entreating from Him a blessing upon his descendants.

The question arises, therefore, whether the *angel of Jehovah*, or of *God*, was God Himself in one particular phase of His self-manifestation, or a created angel of whom God made use as the organ of His self-revelation. ^{f36}

The former appears to us to be the only scriptural view. For the essential unity of the Angel of Jehovah with Jehovah Himself follows indisputably from the following facts. In the first place, the Angel of God identifies Himself with Jehovah and Elohim, by attributing to Himself divine attributes and performing divine works: e.g., Gen. 22:12, “Now *I* know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from *me*” (i.e., hast been willing to offer him up as a burnt sacrifice to God); again (to Hagar) Gen. 16:10, “*I* will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude;” Genesis 21, “*I* will make him a great nation,” — the very words used by Elohim in Gen. 17:20 with reference to Ishmael, and by Jehovah in Gen. 13:16; 15: 4, 5, with regard to Isaac; also Exo. 3: 6 ff., “*I* am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: *I* have surely seen the affliction of *My* people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry, and *I* am come down to deliver them” (cf. Jud. 2: 1). In addition to this, He performs miracles, consuming with fire the offering placed before Him by Gideon, and the sacrifice prepared by Manoah, and ascending to haven in the flame of the burnt-offering (Jud. 6:21; 13:19, 20).

Secondly, the Angel of God was recognised as God by those to whom He appeared, on the one hand by their addressing Him as *Adonai* (i.e., the Lord God; Jud. 6:15), declaring that they had seen God, and fearing that they should die (Gen. 16:13; Exo. 3: 6; Jud. 6:22, 23; 13:22), and on the other hand by their paying Him divine honour, offering sacrifices which He accepted, and worshipping Him (Jud. 6:20; 13:19, 20, cf. 2: 5). The force of these facts has been met by the assertion, that the ambassador perfectly represents the person of the sender; and evidence of this is adduced not only from Grecian literature, but from the Old Testament also, where the addresses of the prophets often glide imperceptibly into the words of Jehovah, whose instrument they are. But even if the address in Gen. 22:16, where the oath of the Angel of Jehovah is accompanied by the words, “saith the Lord,” and the words and deeds of the

Angel of God in certain other cases, might be explained in this way, a created angel sent by God could never say, “I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” or by the acceptance of sacrifices and adoration, encourage the presentation of divine honours to himself. How utterly irreconcilable this fact is with the opinion that the Angel of Jehovah was a created angel, is conclusively proved by Rev. 22: 9, which is generally regarded as perfectly corresponding to the account of the “Angel of Jehovah” of the Old Testament. The angel of God, who shows the sacred seer the heavenly Jerusalem, and who is supposed to say, “Behold, I come quickly” (v. 7), and “I am Alpha and Omega” (v. 13), refuses in the most decided way the worship which John is about to present, and exclaims, “See I am thy fellow-servant: worship God.”

Thirdly, the Angel of Jehovah is also identified with Jehovah by the sacred writers themselves, who call the Angel Jehovah without the least reserve (cf. Exo. 3: 2 and 4, Jud. 6:12 and 14-16, but especially Exo. 14:19, where the Angel of Jehovah goes before the host of the Israelites, just as Jehovah is said to do in Exo. 13:21). — On the other hand, the objection is raised, that ἄγγελος κυρίου in the New Testament, which is confessedly the Greek rendering of מלאך יהוה, is always a created angel, and for that reason cannot be the uncreated Logos or Son of God, since the latter could not possibly have announced His own birth to the shepherds at Bethlehem. But this important difference has been overlooked, that according to Greek usage, ἄγγελος κυρίου denotes an (any) angel of the Lord, whereas according to the rules of the Hebrew language מלאך יהוה means *the* angel of the Lord; that in the New Testament the angel who appears is always described as ἄγγελος κυρίου without the article, and the definite article is only introduced in the further course of the narrative to denote the angel whose appearance has been already mentioned, whereas in the Old Testament it is always “*the* Angel of Jehovah” who appears, and whenever the appearance of a created angel is referred to, he is introduced first of all as “an angel” (vid., 1Ki. 19: 5 and 7).¹³⁷

At the same time, it does not follow from this use of the expression *Maleach Jehovah*, that the (particular) angel of Jehovah was essentially one with God, or that *Maleach Jehovah* always has the same signification; for in Mal. 2: 7 the priest is called *Maleach Jehovah*, i.e., the messenger of the Lord. Who the messenger or angel of Jehovah was, must be determined in each particular instance from the connection of the passage; and where the context furnishes no criterion, it must remain undecided. Consequently such passages as Psa. 34: 7; 35: 5, 6, etc., where the angel of Jehovah is not more particularly described, or Num. 20:16, where the general term *angel* is intentionally employed, or Acts 7:30, Gal. 3:19, and Heb. 2: 2, where the words are general and indefinite, furnish no evidence that *the* Angel of Jehovah, who proclaimed Himself in His appearances as one with God, was not in reality equal with

God, unless we are to adopt as the rule for interpreting Scripture the inverted principle, that clear and definite statements are to be explained by those that are indefinite and obscure.

In attempting now to determine the connection between the appearance of the Angel of Jehovah (or Elohim) and the appearance of Jehovah or Elohim Himself, and to fix the precise meaning of the expression *Maleach Jehovah*, we cannot make use, as recent opponents of the old Church view have done, of the manifestation of God in Genesis 18 and 19, and the allusion to the great prince *Michael* in Dan. 10:13, 21; 12: 1; just because neither the appearance of Jehovah in the former instance, nor that of the archangel Michael in the latter, is represented as an appearance of the Angel of Jehovah. We must confine ourselves to the passages in which “the Angel of Jehovah” is actually referred to. We will examine these, first of all, for the purpose of obtaining a clear conception of the form in which the Angel of Jehovah appeared. Gen. 16, where He is mentioned for the first time, contains no distinct statement as to His shape, but produces on the whole the impression that He appeared to Hagar in a human form, or one resembling that of man; since it was not till after His departure that she drew the inference from His words, that Jehovah had spoken with her. He came in the same form to Gideon, and sat under the terebinth at Ophrah with a staff in His hand (Jud. 6:11 and 21); also to Manoah’s wife, for she took Him to be a man of God, i.e., a prophet, whose appearance was like that of the Angel of Jehovah (Jud. 13: 6); and lastly, to Manoah himself, who did not recognise Him at first, but discovered afterwards, from the miracle which He wrought before his eyes, and from His miraculous ascent in the flame of the altar, that He was the Angel of Jehovah (vv. 9-20). In other cases He revealed Himself merely by calling and speaking from heaven, without those who heard His voice perceiving any form at all; e.g., to Hagar, in Gen. 21:17 ff., and to Abraham, Gen. 22:11 ff. On the other hand, He appeared to Moses (Exo. 3: 2) in a flame of fire, speaking to him from the burning bush, and to the people of Israel in a pillar of cloud and fire (Exo. 14:19, cf. 13:21 f.), without any angelic form being visible in either case. Balaam He met in a human or angelic form, with a drawn sword in His hand (Num. 22:22, 23). David saw Him by the threshing-floor of Araunah, standing between heaven and earth, with the sword drawn in His hand and stretched out over Jerusalem (1Ch. 21:16); and He appeared to Zechariah in a vision as a rider upon a red horse (Zec. 1: 9 ff.). — From these varying forms of appearance it is evident that the opinion that the Angel of the Lord was a real angel, a divine manifestation, “not in the disguise of angel, but through the actual appearance of an angel,” is not in harmony with all the statements of the Bible. The form of the Angel of Jehovah, which was discernible by the senses, varied according to the purpose of the appearance; and, apart from Gen. 21:17 and Gen. 22:11, we have a sufficient proof that it was not a real angelic

appearance, or the appearance of a created angel, in the fact that in two instances it was not really an angel at all, but a flame of fire and a shining cloud which formed the earthly substratum of the revelation of God in the Angel of Jehovah (Exo. 3: 2; 14:19), unless indeed we are to regard natural phenomena as angels, without any scriptural warrant for doing so. ^{f38}

These earthly *substrata* of the manifestation of the “Angel of Jehovah” perfectly suffice to establish the conclusion, that the Angel of Jehovah was only a peculiar form in which Jehovah Himself appeared, and which differed from the manifestations of God described as appearances of Jehovah simply in this, that in “the Angel of Jehovah,” God or Jehovah revealed Himself in a mode which was more easily discernible by human senses, and exhibited in a guise of symbolical significance the design of each particular manifestation. In the appearances of Jehovah no reference is made to any form visible to the bodily eye, unless they were through the medium of a vision or a dream, excepting in one instance (Genesis 18), where Jehovah and two angels come to Abraham in the form of three men, and are entertained by him, — a form of appearance perfectly resembling the appearances of the Angel of Jehovah, but which is not so described by the author, because in this case Jehovah does not appear alone, but in the company of two angels, that “the Angel of Jehovah” might not be regarded as a created angel.

But although there was no essential difference, but only a formal one, between the appearing of Jehovah and the appearing of the Angel of Jehovah, the distinction between Jehovah and the Angel of Jehovah points to a distinction in the divine nature, to which even the Old Testament contains several obvious allusions. The very name indicates such a difference. מְלַאֲכֵי יְהוָה (from לָאֵךְ to work, from which come מְלֶאכֶה the work, *opus*, and מְלַאֲךְ, lit., he through whom a work is executed, but in ordinary usage restricted to the idea of a messenger) denotes the person through whom God works and appears. Beside these passages which represent “the Angel of Jehovah” as one with Jehovah, there are others in which the Angel distinguishes Himself from Jehovah; e.g., when He gives emphasis to the oath by Himself as an oath by Jehovah, by adding “said Jehovah” (Gen. 22:16); when He greets Gideon with the words, “Jehovah with thee, thou brave hero” (Jud. 6:12); when He says to Manoah, “Though thou constrainedst me, I would not eat of thy food; but if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering to Jehovah, thou mayest offer it” (Jud. 13:16); for when He prays, in Zec. 1:12, “Jehovah Sabaoth, how long wilt Thou not have mercy on Jerusalem?” (Compare also Gen. 19:24, where Jehovah is distinguished from Jehovah.) Just as in these passages the Angel of Jehovah distinguishes Himself personally from Jehovah, there are others in which a distinction is drawn between a self-revealing side of the divine nature, visible to men, and a hidden side, invisible to men, i.e., between the self-revealing and the hidden

God. Thus, for example, not only does Jehovah say of the Angel, whom He sends before Israel in the pillar of cloud and fire, “My name is in Him,” i.e., he reveals My nature (Exo. 23:21), but He also calls Him פָּנַי, “My face” (Gen. 33:14); and in reply to Moses’ request to see His glory, He says “Thou canst not see My face, for there shall no man see Me and live,” and then causes His glory to pass by Moses in such a way that he only sees His back, but not His face (Gen. 33:18-23). On the strength of these expressions, He in whom Jehovah manifested Himself to His people as a Saviour is called in Isa. 63: 9, “the Angel of His face,” and all the guidance and protection of Israel are ascribed to Him. In accordance with this, Malachi, the last prophet of the Old Testament, proclaims to the people waiting for the manifestation of Jehovah, that is to say, for the appearance of the Messiah predicted by former prophets, that the Lord (יְהוָה, i.e., God), the Angel of the covenant, will come to His temple (Gen. 3: 1). This “Angel of the covenant,” or “Angel of the face,” has appeared in Christ. The Angel of Jehovah, therefore, was no other than the Logos, which not only “was with God,” but “was God,” and in Jesus Christ “was made flesh” and “came unto His own” (John 1: 1, 2, 11); the only-begotten Son of God, who was *sent* by the Father into the world, who, though one with the Father, prayed to the Father (John 17), and who is even called “the Apostle,” ὁ ἀπόστολος, in Heb. 3: 1. From all this it is sufficiently obvious, that neither the title Angel or Messenger of Jehovah, nor the fact that the Angel of Jehovah prayed to Jehovah Sabaoth, furnishes any evidence against His essential unity with Jehovah. That which is unfolded in perfect clearness in the New Testament through the incarnation of the Son of God, was still veiled in the Old Testament according to the wisdom apparent in the divine training. The difference between Jehovah and the Angel of Jehovah is generally hidden behind the unity of the two, and for the most part Jehovah is referred to as He who chose Israel as His nation and kingdom, and who would reveal Himself at some future time to His people in all His glory; so that in the New Testament nearly all the manifestations of Jehovah under the Old Covenant are referred to Christ, and regarded as fulfilled through Him. ^{f39}

CALL OF ABRAM. HIS REMOVAL TO CANAAN, AND JOURNEY INTO EGYPT. — GENESIS 12

Genesis 12. The life of Abraham, from his call to his death, consists of four stages, the commencement of each of which is marked by a divine revelation of sufficient importance to constitute a distinct epoch. The first stage (Genesis 12-14) commences with his call and removal to Canaan; the second (Genesis 15-16), with the promise of a lineal heir and the conclusion of a covenant; the third (Genesis 17-21), with the establishment of the covenant, accompanied by a change in his name, and the appointment of the covenant

sign of circumcision; the fourth (Gen. 22-25:11), with the temptation of Abraham to attest and perfect his life of faith. All the revelations made to him proceed from Jehovah; and the name Jehovah is employed throughout the whole life of the father of the faithful, Elohim being used only where Jehovah, from its meaning, would be either entirely inapplicable, or at any rate less appropriate. ^{f40}

Gen. 12: 1-3. THE CALL. — The word of Jehovah, by which Abram was called, contained a command and a promise. Abram was to leave all — his country, his kindred (see Gen. 43: 7), and his father's house — and to follow the Lord into the land which He would show him. Thus he was to trust entirely to the guidance of God, and to follow wherever He might lead him. But as he went in consequence of this divine summons into the land of Canaan (v. 5), we must assume that God gave him at the very first a distinct intimation, if not of the land itself, at least of the direction he was to take. That Canaan was to be his destination, was no doubt made known as a matter of certainty in the revelation which he received after his arrival there (v. 7). — For thus renouncing and denying all natural ties, the Lord gave him the inconceivably great promise, “*I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing.*” The four members of this promise are not to be divided into two parallel members, in which case the *athnach* would stand in the wrong place; but are to be regarded as an ascending climax, expressing four elements of the salvation promised to Abram, the last of which is still further expanded in v. 3. By placing the *athnach* under שְׂמַח the fourth member is marked as a new and independent feature added to the other three. The four distinct elements are —

1. increase into a numerous people;
2. a blessing, that is to say, material and spiritual prosperity;
3. the exaltation of his name, i.e., the elevation of Abram to honour and glory;
4. his appointment to be the possessor and dispenser of the blessing.

Abram was not only to *receive* blessing, but to *be* a blessing; not only to be blessed by God, but to become a blessing, or the medium of blessing, to others. The blessing, as the more minute definition of the expression “*be a blessing*” in v. 3 clearly shows, was henceforth to keep pace as it were with Abram himself, so that (1) the blessing and cursing of men were to depend entirely upon their attitude towards him, and (2) all the families of the earth were to be blessed in him. קַלַּל, lit., to treat as light or little, to despise, denotes “blasphemous cursing on the part of a man;” אָרַר “judicial cursing on the part of God.” It appears significant, however, “that the plural is used in relation to the blessing, and the singular only in relation to the cursing; grace expects that

there will be many to bless, and that only an individual here and there will render not blessing for blessing, but curse for curse.” — In v. 3 *b*, Abram, the one, is made a blessing for all. In the word בְּ the primary meaning of ב, *in*, is not to be given up, though the instrumental sense, *through*, is not to be excluded. Abram was not merely to become a mediator, but the source of blessing for all. The expression “*all the families of the ground*” points to the division of the one family into many (Gen. 10: 5, 20, 31), and the word אָרְצָה to the curse pronounced upon the ground (Gen. 3:17). The blessing of Abraham was once more to unite the divided families, and change the curse, pronounced upon the ground on account of sin, into a blessing for the whole human race. This concluding word comprehends all nations and times, and condenses, as *Baumgarten* has said, the whole fulness of the divine counsel for the salvation of men into the call of Abram. All further promises, therefore, not only to the patriarchs, but also to Israel, were merely expansions and closer definitions of the salvation held out to the whole human race in the first promise. Even the assurance, which Abram received after his entrance into Canaan (v. 6), was implicitly contained in this first promise; since a great nation could not be conceived of, without a country of its own.

This promise was renewed to Abram on several occasions: first after his separation from Lot (Gen. 13:14-16), on which occasion, however, the “blessing” was not mentioned, because not required by the connection, and the two elements only, viz., the numerous increase of his seed, and the possession of the land of Canaan, were assured to him and to his seed, and that “for ever;” secondly, in Gen. 18:18 somewhat more casually, as a reason for the confidential manner in which Jehovah explained to him the secret of His government; and lastly, at the two principal turning points of his life, where the whole promise was confirmed with the greatest solemnity, viz., in Genesis 17 at the commencement of the establishment of the covenant made with him, where “I will make of thee a great nation” was heightened into “I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee,” and his being a blessing was more fully defined as the establishment of a covenant, inasmuch as Jehovah would be God to him and to his posterity (vv. 3 ff.), and in Genesis 22 after the attestation of his faith and obedience, even to the sacrifice of his only son, where the innumerable increase of his seed and the blessing to pass from him to all nations were guaranteed by an oath. The same promise was afterwards renewed to Isaac, with a distinct allusion to the oath (Gen. 26: 3, 4), and again to Jacob, both on his flight from Canaan for fear of Esau (Gen. 28:13, 14), and on his return thither (Gen. 35:11, 12). In the case of these renewals, it is only in Gen. 28:14 that the last expression, “all the families of the Adamah,” is repeated *verbatim*, though with the additional clause “and in thy seed;” in the other passages “all the nations of the earth” are mentioned, the family

connection being left out of sight, and the national character of the blessing being brought into especial prominence. In two instances also, instead of the *Niphal* **נִבְרַךְ** we find the *Hithpael* **הִתְבְּרַךְ**. This change of conjugation by no means proves that the *Niphal* is to be taken in its original reflective sense. The *Hithpael* has no doubt the meaning “to wish one’s self blessed” (Deu. 29:19), with **כּ** of the person from whom the blessing is sought (Isa. 65:16; Jer. 4: 2), or whose blessing is desired (Gen. 48:20). But the *Niphal* **נִבְרַךְ** has only the passive signification “to be blessed.” And the promise not only meant that all families of the earth would wish for the blessing which Abram possessed, but that they would really receive this blessing in Abram and his seed. By the explanation “wish themselves blessed” the point of the promise is broken off; and not only is its connection with the prophecy of Noah respecting Japhet’s dwelling in the tents of Shem overlooked, and the parallel between the blessing on all the families of the earth, and the curse pronounced upon the earth after the flood, destroyed, but the actual participation of all the nations of the earth in this blessing is rendered doubtful, and the application of this promise by Peter (Acts 3:25) and Paul (Gal. 3: 8) to all nations, is left without any firm scriptural basis. At the same time, we must not attribute a passive signification on that account to the *Hithpael* in Gen. 22:18 and 24: 4. In these passages prominence is given to the subjective attitude of the nations towards the blessing of Abraham, — in other words, to the fact that the nations would desire the blessing promised to them in Abraham and his seed.

Gen. 12: 4-9. REMOVAL TO CANAAN. — Abram cheerfully followed the call of the Lord, and “departed as the Lord had spoken to him.” He was then 75 years old. His age is given, because a new period in the history of mankind commenced with his exodus. After this brief notice there follows a more circumstantial account, in v. 5, of the fact that he left Haran with his wife, with Lot, and with all that they possessed of servants and cattle, whereas Terah remained in Haran (cf. Gen. 11:31). **הַנְּפֹשׁ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ** are not the souls which they had begotten, but the male and female slaves that Abram and Lot had acquired.

Gen. 12: 6. On his arrival in Canaan, “Abram passed through the land to the place of Sichem.” i.e., the place where Sichem, the present Nablus, afterwards stood, between Ebal and Gerizim, in the heart of the land. “To the terebinth (or, according to Deu. 11:30, the terebinths) of Moreh:” **אֵיל אֶלֹן** (Gen. 14: 6) and **אֵילָה** are the terebinth, **אֶלֹן** and **אֵילָה** the oak; though in many MSS and editions **אֶלֹן** and **אֵילָה** are interchanged in Jos. 19:33 and Jud. 4:11, either because the pointing in one of these passages is inaccurate, or because the

word itself was uncertain, as the ever-green oaks and terebinths resemble one another in the colour of their foliage and their fissured bark of sombre grey. — The notice that “*the Canaanites were then in the land*” does not point to a post-Mosaic date, when the Canaanites were extinct. For it does not mean that the Canaanites were then still in the land, but refers to the promise which follows, that God would give this land to the seed of Abram (v. 7), and merely states that the land into which Abram had come was not uninhabited and without a possessor; so that Abram could not regard it at once as his own and proceed to take possession of it, but could only wander in it in faith as in a foreign land (Heb. 11: 9).

Gen. 12: 7. Here in Sichem Jehovah appeared to him, and assured him of the possession of the land of Canaan for his descendants. The assurance was made by means of an appearance of Jehovah, as a sign that this land was henceforth to be the scene of the manifestation of Jehovah. Abram understood this, “*and there builded he an altar to Jehovah, who appeared to him,*” to make the soil which was hallowed by the appearance of God a place for the worship of the God who appeared to him.

Gen. 12: 8. He did this also in the mountains, to which he probably removed to secure the necessary pasture for his flocks, after he had pitched his tent there. “*Bethel westwards and Ai eastwards,*” i.e., in a spot with Ai to the east and Bethel to the west. The name *Bethel* occurs here proleptically: at the time referred to, it was still called *Luz* (Gen. 28:19); its present name is *Beitin* (*Robinson’s Palestine*). At a distance of about five miles to the east was *Ai*, ruins of which are still to be seen, bearing the name of *Medinet Gai* (*Ritter’s Erdkunde*). On the words “*called upon the name of the Lord,*” see Gen. 4:26. From this point Abram proceeded slowly to the *Negeb*, i.e., to the southern district of Canaan towards the Arabian desert (vid., Gen. 20: 1).

Gen. 12:10-20. ABRAM IN EGYPT. — Abram had scarcely passed through the land promised to his seed, when a famine compelled him to leave it, and take refuge in Egypt, which abounded in corn; just as the Bedouins in the neighbourhood are accustomed to do now. Whilst the famine in Canaan was to teach Abram, that even in the promised land food and clothing come from the Lord and His blessing, he was to discover in Egypt that earthly craft is soon put to shame when dealing with the possessor of the power of this world, and that help and deliverance are to be found with the Lord alone, who can so smite the mightiest kings, that they cannot touch His chosen or do them harm (Psa. 105:14, 15). — When trembling for his life in Egypt on account of the beauty of Sarai his wife, he arranged with her, as he approached that land, that she should give herself out as his sister, since she really was his half-sister (Gen. 11:29). He had already made an arrangement with her, that she should

do this in certain possible contingencies, when they first removed to Canaan (Gen. 20:13). The conduct of the Sodomites (Genesis 19) was a proof that he had reason for his anxiety; and it was not without cause even so far as Egypt was concerned. But his precaution did not spring from faith. He might possibly hope, that by means of the plan concerted, he should escape the danger of being put to death on account of his wife, if any one should wish to take her; but how he expected to save the honour and retain possession of his wife, we cannot understand, though we must assume, that he thought he should be able to protect and keep her as his sister more easily, than if he acknowledged her as his wife. But the very thing he feared and hoped to avoid actually occurred.

Gen. 12:15 ff. The princes of Pharaoh finding her very beautiful, extolled her beauty to the king, and she was taken to Pharaoh's house. As Sarah was then 65 years old (cf. Gen. 17:17 and 12: 4), her beauty at such an age has been made a difficulty by some. But as she lived to the age of 127 (Gen. 23: 1), she was then middle-aged; and as her vigour and bloom had not been tried by bearing children, she might easily appear very beautiful in the eyes of the Egyptians, whose wives, according to both ancient and modern testimony, were generally ugly, and faded early. *Pharaoh* (the Egyptian *ouro*, king, with the article *Pi*) is the Hebrew name for all the Egyptian kings in the Old Testament; their proper names being only occasionally mentioned, as, for example, Necho in 2Ki. 23:29, or Hophra in Jer. 44:30. For Sarai's sake Pharaoh treated Abram well, presenting him with cattle and slaves, possessions which constitute the wealth of nomads. These presents Abram could not refuse, though by accepting them he increased his sin. God then interfered (v. 17), and smote Pharaoh and his house with great plagues. What the nature of these plagues was, cannot be determined; they were certainly of such a kind, however, that whilst Sarah was preserved by them from dishonour, Pharaoh saw at once that they were sent as punishment by the Deity on account of his relation to Sarai; he may also have learned, on inquiry from Sarai herself, that she was Abram's wife. He gave her back to him, therefore, with a reproof for his untruthfulness, and told him to depart, appointing men to conduct him out of the land together with his wife and all his possessions. שָׁלַח, to dismiss, to give an escort (Gen. 18:16; 31:27), does not necessarily denote an involuntary dismissal here. For as Pharaoh had discovered in the plague the wrath of the God of Abraham, he did not venture to treat him harshly, but rather sought to mitigate the anger of his God, by the safe-conduct which he granted him on his departure. But Abram was not justified by this result, as was very apparent from the fact, that he was mute under Pharaoh's reproofs, and did not venture to utter a single word in vindication of his conduct, as he did in the similar circumstances described in Gen. 10:11, 12. The saving mercy of God had so

humbled him, that he silently acknowledged his guilt in concealing his relation to Sarah from the Egyptian king.

ABRAM'S SEPARATION FROM LOT. — GENESIS 13

Gen. 13: 1-4. Abram, having returned from Egypt to the south of Canaan with his wife and property uninjured, through the gracious protection of God, proceeded with Lot **לְמַסְעָיו** “according to his journeys” (lit., with the repeated breaking up of his camp, required by a nomad life; on **נָסַע** to break up a tent, to remove, see Exo. 12:37) into the neighbourhood of Bethel and Ai, where he had previously encamped and built an altar (Gen. 12: 8), that he might there call upon the name of the Lord again. That **וַיִּקְרָא** (v. 4) is not a continuation of the relative clause, but a resumption of the main sentence, and therefore corresponds with **וַיֵּלֶךְ** (v. 3), “he went...and called upon the name of the Lord there,” has been correctly concluded by *Delitzsch* from the repetition of the subject *Abram*.

Gen. 13: 5-7. But as Abram was very rich (**בְּבָרָה**, lit., *weighty*) in possessions (**מִקְנֵהוּ**, *cattle and slaves*), and Lot also had flocks, and herds, and tents (**אֹהֲלֵים** for **אֹהֲלִים**, *Gen. § 93, 6, 3*) for his men, of whom there must have been many therefore, the land *did not bear them when dwelling together* (**נָשָׂא**, *masculine* at the commencement of the sentence, as is often the case when the verb precedes the subject, vid., *Gen. § 147*), i.e., the land did not furnish space enough for the numerous herd to graze. Consequently disputes arose between the two parties of herdsmen. The difficulty was increased by the fact that the Canaanites and Perizzites were then dwelling in the land, so that the space was very contracted. The *Perizzites*, who are mentioned here and in Gen. 34:30, Jud. 1: 4, along with the Canaanites, and who are placed in the other lists of the inhabitants of Canaan among the different Canaanitish tribes (Gen. 15:20; Exo. 3: 8, 17, etc.), are not mentioned among the descendants of Canaan (Gen. 10:15-17), and may therefore, like the Kenites, Kenizzites, Kadmonites, and Rephaim (Gen. 15:19-21), not have been descendants of Ham at all. The common explanation of the name Perizzite as equivalent to **פְּרִזְוֹת** **יֹשֵׁב אֶרֶץ** “inhabitant of the level ground” (Eze. 38:11), is at variance not only with the form of the word, the inhabitant of the level ground being called **הַפְּרִזְוִי** (Deu. 3: 5), but with the fact of their combination sometimes with the Canaanites, sometimes with the other tribes of Canaan, whose names were derived from their founders. Moreover, to explain the term “Canaanite,” as denoting “the civilised inhabitants of towns,” or “the trading Phoenicians,” is just as arbitrary as if we were to regard the Kenites, Kenizzites, and the other tribes mentioned Gen. 15:19 ff. along with the Canaanites, as all alike traders

or inhabitants of towns. The origin of the name Perizzite is involved in obscurity, like that of the Kenites and other tribes settled in Canaan that were not descended from Ham. But we may infer from the frequency with which they are mentioned in connection with the Hamitic inhabitants of Canaan, that they were widely dispersed among the latter. Vid., Gen. 15:19-21.

Gen. 13: 8, 9. To put an end to the strife between their herdsmen, Abram proposed to Lot that they should separate, as strife was unseemly between **אֲנָשִׁים אֲחֵים**, men who stood in the relation of brethren, and left him to choose his ground. “*If thou to the left, I will turn to the right; and if thou to the right, I will turn to the left.*” Although Abram was the older, and the leader of the company, he was magnanimous enough to leave the choice to his nephew, who was the younger, in the confident assurance that the Lord would so direct the decision, that His promise would be fulfilled.

Gen. 13:10-13. Lot chose what was apparently the best portion of the land, the whole district of the Jordan, or the valley on both sides of the Jordan from the Lake of Gennesareth to what was then the vale of Siddim. For previous to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, this whole country was well watered, “*as the garden of Jehovah,*” the garden planted by Jehovah in paradise, and “*as Egypt,*” the land rendered so fertile by the overflowing of the Nile, “*in the direction of Zoar.*” Abram therefore remained in the land of Canaan, whilst Lot settled in the cities of the plain of the Jordan, and tented (pitched his tents) as far as Sodom. In anticipation of the succeeding history (Gen. 19), it is mentioned here (v. 13), that the inhabitants of Sodom were very wicked, and sinful before Jehovah.

Gen. 13:14-18. After Lot’s departure, Jehovah repeated to Abram (by a mental, inward assurance, as we may infer from the fact that **אָמַר** “said” is not accompanied by **וַיֵּרָא** “he appeared”) His promise that He would give the land to him and to his seed in its whole extent, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward, and would make his seed innumerable like the dust of the earth. From this we may see that the separation of Lot was in accordance with the will of God, as Lot had no share in the promise of God; though God afterwards saved him from destruction for Abram’s sake. The possession of the land is promised **עַד עוֹלָם** “*for ever.*” The promise of God is unchangeable. As the seed of Abraham was to exist before God for ever, so Canaan was to be its everlasting possession. But this applied not to the lineal posterity of Abram, to his seed according to the flesh, but to the true spiritual seed, which embraced the promise in faith, and held it in a pure believing heart. The promise, therefore, neither precluded the expulsion of the unbelieving seed from the land of Canaan, nor guarantees to existing Jews a return to the earthly

Palestine after their conversion to Christ. For as *Calvin* justly says, “*quam terra in saeculum promittitur, non simpliciter notatur perpetuitas; sed quae finem accepit in Christo.*” Through Christ the promise has been exalted from its temporal form to its true essence; through Him the whole earth becomes Canaan (vid., Gen. 17: 8). That Abram might appropriate this renewed and now more fully expanded promise, Jehovah directed him to walk through the land in the length of it and the breadth of it. In doing this he came in his “*tenting,*” i.e., his wandering through the land, to Hebron, where he settled by the terebinth of the Amorite Mamre (Gen. 14:13), and built an altar to Jehovah. The term **נָסַח** (set himself, settled down, sat, dwelt) denotes that Abram made this place the central point of his subsequent stay in Canaan (cf. Gen. 14:13; 18: 1, and Genesis 23). On Hebron, see Gen. 23: 2.

ABRAM’S MILITARY EXPEDITION; AND HIS SUBSEQUENT MEETING WITH MELCHIZEDEK. — GENESIS 14

Gen. 14: 1-12. The war, which furnished Abram with an opportunity, while in the promised land of which as yet he could not really call a single rood his own, to prove himself a valiant warrior, and not only to smite the existing chiefs of the imperial power of Asia, but to bring back to the kings of Canaan the booty that had been carried off, is circumstantially described, not so much in the interests of secular history as on account of its significance in relation to the kingdom of God. It is of importance, however, as a simple historical fact, to see that in the statement in v. 1, the king of Shinar occupies the first place, although the king of Edom, Chedorlaomer, not only took the lead in the expedition, and had allied himself for that purpose with the other kings, but had previously subjugated the cities of the valley of Siddim, and therefore had extended his dominion very widely over hither Asia. If, notwithstanding this, the time of the war related here is connected with “*the days of Amraphel, king of Shinar,*” this is done, no doubt, with reference to the fact that the first worldly kingdom was founded in Shinar by Nimrod (Gen. 10:10), a kingdom which still existed under Amraphel, though it was now confined to Shinar itself, whilst Elam possessed the supremacy in inner Asia. There is no ground whatever for regarding the four kings mentioned in v. 1 as four Assyrian generally or viceroys, as Josephus has done in direct contradiction to the biblical text; for, according to the more careful historical researches, the commencement of the Assyrian kingdom belongs to a later period; and *Berosus* speaks of an earlier Median rule in Babylon, which reaches as far back as the age of the patriarchs (cf. *M. v. Niebuhr, Gesch. Assurs*, p. 271). It appears significant also, that the imperial power of Asia had already extended as far as Canaan, and had subdued the valley of the Jordan, no doubt with the intention of holding the Jordan valley as the high-road to Egypt. We have here

a prelude of the future assault of the worldly power upon the kingdom of God established in Canaan; and the importance of this event to sacred history consists in the fact, that the kings of the valley of the Jordan and the surrounding country submitted to the worldly power, whilst Abram, on the contrary, with his home-born servants, smote the conquerors and rescued their booty, — a prophetic sign that in the conflict with the power of the world the seed of Abram would not only not be subdued, but would be able to rescue from destruction those who appealed to it for aid.

Gen. 14: 1-3. In vv. 1-3 the account is introduced by a list of the parties engaged in war. The kings named here are not mentioned again. On *Shinar*, see Gen. 10:10; and on *Elam*, Gen. 10:22. It cannot be determined with certainty where *Ellasar* was. *Knobel* supposes it to be *Artemita*, which was also called *ἁλάσαρ*, in southern Assyria, to the north of Babylon. *Goyim* is not used here for nations generally, but is the name of one particular nation or country. In *Delitzsch's* opinion it is an older name for Galilee, though probably with different boundaries (cf. Jos. 12:23; Jud. 4: 2; and Isa. 9: 1). — The verb עָשָׂה (made), in v. 2, is governed by the kings mentioned in v. 1. To *Bela*, whose king is not mentioned by name, the later name *Zoar* (vid., 19:22) is added as being better known.

Gen. 14: 3. “All these (five kings) allied themselves together, (and came with their forces) into the vale of *Siddim* (שֵׁדִים, prob. fields of plains), which is the Salt Sea;” that is to say, which was changed into the Salt Sea on the destruction of its cities (Gen. 19:24, 25). That there should be five kings in the five cities (πεντάπολις, Wisdom 10: 6) of this valley, was quite in harmony with the condition of Canaan, where even at a later period every city had its king.

Gen. 14: 4 ff. The occasion of the war was the revolt of the kings of the vale of *Siddim* from *Chedorlaomer*. They had been subject to him for twelve years, “and the thirteenth year they rebelled.” In the fourteenth year *Chedorlaomer* came with his allies to punish them for their rebellion, and attacked on his way several other cities to the east of the *Arabah*, as far as the *Elanitic Gulf*, no doubt because they also had withdrawn from his dominion. The army moved along the great military road from inner Asia, past *Damascus*, through *Peraea*, where they smote the *Rephaims*, *Zuzims*, *Emims*, and *Horites*. “*The Rephaim in Asheroth Karnaim*.” all that is known with certainty of the *Rephaim* is, that they were a tribe of gigantic stature, and in the time of *Abram* had spread over the whole of *Peraea*, and held not only *Bashan*, but the country afterwards possessed by the *Moabites*; from which possessions they were subsequently expelled by the descendants of *Lot* and the *Amorites*, and so nearly exterminated, that *Og*, king of *Bashan*, is described as the remnant of the

Rephaim (Deu. 2:20; 3:11, 13; Jos. 12: 4; 13:12). Beside this, there were Rephaim on this side of the Jordan among the Canaanitish tribes (Gen. 15:20), some to the west of Jerusalem, in the valley which was called after them the valley of the Rephaim (Jos. 15: 8; 18:16; 2Sa. 5:18, etc.), others on the mountains of Ephraim (Jos. 17:15); while the last remains of them were also to be found among the Philistines (2Sa. 21:16 ff.; 1Ch. 20: 4 ff.). The current explanation of the name, viz., “the long-stretched,” or giants (*Ewald*), does not prevent our regarding רִפְיָאִים as the personal name of their forefather, though no intimation is given of their origin. That they were not Canaanites may be inferred from the fact, that on the eastern side of the Jordan they were subjugated and exterminated by the Canaanitish branch of the Amorites. Notwithstanding this, they may have been descendants of Ham, though the fact that the Canaanites spoke a Semitic tongue rather favours the conclusion that the oldest population of Canaan, and therefore the Rephaim, were of Semitic descent. At any rate, the opinion of *J. G. Müller*, that they belonged to the aborigines, who were not related to Shem, Ham, and Japhet, is perfectly arbitrary. — *Ashteroth Karnaim*, or briefly *Ashtaroth*, the capital afterwards of Og of Bashan, was situated in Hauran; and ruins of it are said to be still seen in *Tell Ashtereh*, two hours and a half from *Nowah*, and one and three-quarters from the ancient *Edrei*, somewhere between *Nowah* and *Mezareib* (see *Ritter, Erdkunde*).^{f41}

“*The Zuzims in Ham*” were probably the people whom the Ammonites called *Zam zummim*, and who were also reckoned among the Rephaim (Deu. 2:20). *Ham* was possibly the ancient name of *Rabba* of the Ammonites (Deu. 3:11), the remains being still preserved in the ruins of *Ammân*. — “*The Emim in the plain of Kiryathaim*:” the אִמִּים or אִמִּים (i.e., fearful, terrible), were the earlier inhabitants of the country of the Moabites, who gave them the name; and, like the Anakim, they were also reckoned among the Rephaim (Deu. 2:11). *Kiryathaim* is certainly not to be found where *Eusebius* and *Jerome* supposed, viz., in *Καριάδα, Coraiatha*, the modern *Koerriath* or *Kereyat*, ten miles to the west of *Medabah*; for this is not situated in the plain, and corresponds to *Kerioth* (Jer. 48:24), with which *Eusebius* and *Jerome* have confounded *Kiryathaim*. It is probably still to be seen in the ruins of *el Teym* or *et Tueme*, about a mile to the west of *Medabah*. “*The Horites* (from חֹרִי, dwellers in caves), *in the mountains of Seir*,” were the earlier inhabitants of the land between the Dead Sea and the Elanitic Gulf, who were conquered and exterminated by the Edomites (Gen. 36:20 ff.). — “*To El-Paran, which is by the wilderness*:” i.e., on the eastern side of the desert of *Paran* (see Gen. 21:21), probably the same as *Elath* (Deu. 2: 8) or *Eloth* (1Ki. 9:26), the important harbour of *Aila* on the northern extremity of the so-called Elanitic Gulf, near the modern fortress of *Akaba*, where extensive heaps of rubbish

show the site of the former town, which received its name *El* or *Elath* (*terebinth*, or rather *wood*) probably from the palm-groves in the vicinity.

Gen. 14: 7. From *Aila* the conquerors turned round, and marched (not through the Arabah, but on the desert plateau which they ascended from *Aila*) to *En-mishpat* (*well of judgment*), the older name of *Kadesh*, the situation of which, indeed, cannot be proved with certainty, but which is most probably to be sought for in the neighbourhood of the spring *Ain Kades*, discovered by *Rowland*, to the south of *Bir Seba* and *Khalasa* (*Elusa*), twelve miles E.S.E. of *Moyle*, the halting-place for caravans, near *Hagar's well* (Gen. 16:14), on the heights of *Jebel Halal* (see *Ritter, Erdkunde*, and Num. 13). “*And they smote all the country of the Amalekites,*” i.e., the country afterwards possessed by the Amalekites (vid., Gen. 26:12),^{f42} to the west of Edomitis on the southern border of the mountains of Judah (Num. 13:29), “*and also the Amorites, who dwelt in Hazazon-Thamar,*” i.e., *Engedi*, on the western side of the Dead Sea (2Ch. 20: 2).

Gen. 14: 8 ff. After conquering all these tribes to the east and west of the Arabah, they gave battle to the kings of the Pentapolis in the vale of *Siddim*, and put them to flight. The kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fell there, the valley being full of asphalt-pits, and the ground therefore unfavourable for flight; but the others escaped to the mountains (הַרְרָה for הַרְרָה), that is, to the Moabish highlands with their numerous defiles. The conquerors thereupon plundered the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, and carried off *Lot*, who dwelt in Sodom, and all his possessions, along with the rest of the captives, probably taking the route through the valley of the Jordan up to *Damascus*.

Gen. 14:13-16. A fugitive (lit., *the fugitive*; the article denotes the genus, Ewald, § 277) brought intelligence of this to *Abram* the *Hebrew* (הֵעֵבֵר, an immigrant from beyond the Euphrates). *Abram* is so called in distinction from *Mamre* and his two brothers, who were Amorites, and had made a defensive treaty with him. To rescue *Lot*, *Abram ordered his trained slaves* (הַנִּיבִי, i.e., practised in arms) *born in the house* (cf. Gen. 17:12), *318 men, to turn out* (lit., to pour themselves out); and with these, and (as the supplementary remark in v. 24 shows) with his allies, he pursued the enemy as far as *Dan*, where “*he divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night,*” — i.e., he divided his men into companies, who fell upon the enemy by night from different sides, — “*smote them, and pursued them to Hobah, to the left (or north) of Damascus.*” *Hobah* has probably been preserved in the village of *Noba*, mentioned by *Troilo*, a quarter of a mile to the north of *Damascus*. So far as the situation of *Dan* is concerned, this passage proves that it cannot have been identical with *Leshem* or *Laish* in the valley of Beth Rehob, which the Danites

conquered and named Dan (Jud. 18:28, 29; Jos. 19:47); for this Laish-Dan was on the central source of the Jordan, *el Leddan* in *Tell el Kady*, which does not lie in either of the two roads, leading from the vale of Siddim or of the Jordan to Damascus. ^{f43}

This Dan belonged to Gilead (Deu. 34: 1), and is no doubt the same as the *Dan-Jaan* mentioned in 2Sa. 24: 6 in connection with Gilead, and to be sought for in northern Peraea to the south-west of Damascus.

Gen. 14:17-24. — As Abram returned with the booty which he had taken from the enemy, the king of Sodom (of course, the successor to the one who fell in the battle) and Melchizedek, king of Salem, came to meet him to congratulate him on his victory; the former probably also with the intention of asking for the prisoners who had been rescued. They met him in “*the valley of Shaveh, which is* (what was afterwards called) *the King’s dale.*” This valley, in which Absalom erected a monument for himself (2Sa. 18:18), was, according to *Josephus*, two *stadia* from Jerusalem, probably by the brook Kidron therefore, although Absalom’s pillar, which tradition places there, was of the Grecian style rather than the early Hebrew. The name *King’s dale* was given to it undoubtedly with reference to the event referred to here, which points to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. For the *Salem* of Melchizedek cannot have been the Salem near to which John baptized (John 3:23), or Aenon, which was eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis, as a march of about forty hours for the purpose of meeting Abraham, if not romantic, would, at least be at variance with the text of Scripture, where the kings are said to have gone out to Abram after his return. It must be Jerusalem, therefore, which is called by the old name *Salem* in Psa. 76: 2, out of which the name Jerusalem (founding of peace, or possession of peace) was formed by the addition of the prefix יָרוּ = יָרוּ “founding,” or יְרוּשָׁה “possession.” Melchizedek brings bread and wine from Salem

“to supply the exhausted warriors with food and drink, but more especially as a mark of gratitude to Abram, who had conquered for them peace, freedom, and prosperity” (*Delitzsch*).

This gratitude he expresses, as a priest of the supreme God, in the words,

“*Blessed be Abram of the Most High God, the founder of heaven and earth; and blessed be God, the Most High, who hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand.*”

\The form of the blessing is poetical, two parallel members with words peculiar to poetry, אֱלֹהֵינוּ for אֱלֹהֵיךָ, and מִן — אֵל עֲלִיּוֹן without the article is a proper name for the supreme God, the God over all (cf. Exo. 18:11), who

is pointed out as the only true God by the additional clause, “founder of the heaven and the earth.” On the construction of בְּרוּךְ with לְ, vid., Gen. 31:15, Exo. 12:16, and Ges. § 143, 2. קָנָה, founder and possessor: קָנָה combines the meanings of κτίρειν and κτᾶσθαι. This priestly reception Abram reciprocated by giving him the tenth of all, i.e., of the whole of the booty taken from the enemy. Giving the tenth was a practical acknowledgment of the divine priesthood of Melchizedek; for the tenth was, according to the general custom, the offering presented to the Deity. Abram also acknowledged the God of Melchizedek as the true God; for when the king of Sodom asked for his people only, and would have left the rest of the booty to Abram, he lifted up his hand as a solemn oath “to Jehovah, the Most High God, the founder of heaven and earth,” — acknowledging himself as the servant of this God by calling Him by the name Jehovah, — and swore that he would not take “from a thread to a shoe-string,” i.e., the smallest or most worthless thing belonging to the king of Sodom, that he might not be able to say, he had made Abram rich. ׀, as the sign of an oath, is negative, and in an earnest address is repeated before the verb. “Except (בְּלִעְדִּי, lit., not to me, nothing for me) *only what the young men (Abram’s men) have eaten, and the portion of my allies...let them take their portion:*” i.e., his followers should receive what had been consumed as their share, and the allies should have the remainder of the booty.

Of the property belonging to the king of Sodom, which he had taken from the enemy, Abram would not keep the smallest part, because he would not have anything in common with Sodom. On the other hand, he accepted from Salem’s priest and king, Melchizedek, not only bread and wine for the invigoration of the exhausted warriors, but a priestly blessing also, and gave him in return the tenth of all his booty, as a sign that he acknowledged this king as a priest of the living God, and submitted to his royal priesthood. In this self-subordination of Abram to Melchizedek there was the practical prediction of a royal priesthood which is higher than the priesthood entrusted to Abram’s descendants, the sons of Levi, and foreshadowed in the noble form of Melchizedek, who blessed as king and priest the patriarch whom God had called to be a blessing to all the families of the earth. The name of this royal priest is full of meaning: *Melchizedek*, i.e., King of Righteousness. Even though, judging from Jos. 10: 1, 3, where a much later king is called *Adonizedek*, i.e., Lord of Righteousness, this name may have been a standing title of the ancient kings of Salem, it no doubt originated with a king who ruled his people in righteousness, and was perfectly appropriate in the case of the Melchizedek mentioned here. There is no less significance in the name of the seat of his government, *Salem*, the peaceful or peace, since it shows that the capital of its kings was a citadel of peace, not only as a natural stronghold, but through the righteousness of its sovereign; for which reason David chose it as

the seat of royalty in Israel; and Moriah, which formed part of it, was pointed out to Abraham by Jehovah as the place of sacrifice for the kingdom of God which was afterwards to be established. And, lastly, there was something very significant in the appearance in the midst of the degenerate tribes of Canaan of this king of righteousness, and priest of the true God of heaven and earth, without any account of his descent, or of the beginning and end of his life; so that he stands forth in the Scriptures, “without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life.” Although it by no means follows from this, however, that Melchizedek was a celestial being (the Logos, or an angel), or one of the primeval patriarchs (Enoch or Shem), as Church fathers, Rabbins, and others have conjectured, and we can see in him nothing more than one, perhaps the last, of the witnesses and confessors of the early revelation of God, coming out into the light of history from the dark night of heathenism; yet this appearance does point to a priesthood of universal significance, and to a higher order of things, which existed at the commencement of the world, and is one day to be restored again. In all these respects, the noble form of this king of Salem and priest of the Most High God was a type of the God-King and eternal High Priest Jesus Christ; a thought which is expanded in Hebrews 7 on the basis of this account, and of the divine utterance revealed to David in the Spirit, that the King of Zion sitting at the right hand of Jehovah should be a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (Psa. 110: 4).

THE COVENANT. — GENESIS 15

Genesis 15. With the formula “*after these things*” there is introduced a new revelation of the Lord to Abram, which differs from the previous ones in form and substance, and constitutes a new turning point in his life. The “*word of Jehovah*” came to him “*in a vision;*” i.e., neither by a direct internal address, nor by such a manifestation of Himself as fell upon the outward senses, nor in a dream of the night, but in a state of ecstasy by an inward spiritual intuition, and that not in a nocturnal vision, as in Gen. 46: 2, but in the day-time. The expression “in a vision” applies to the whole chapter. There is no pause anywhere, nor any sign that the vision ceased, or that the action was transferred to the sphere of the senses and of external reality. Consequently the whole process is to be regarded as an internal one. The vision embraces not only vv. 1-4 and 8, but the entire chapter, with this difference merely, that from v. 12 onwards the ecstasy assumed the form of a prophetic sleep produced by God. It is true that the bringing Abram out, his seeing the stars (v. 5), and still more especially his taking the sacrificial animals and dividing them (vv. 9, 10), have been supposed by some to belong to the sphere of external reality, on the ground that these purely external acts would not necessarily presuppose a cessation of ecstasy, since the vision was no catalepsy, and did not preclude

the full (?) use of the outward senses. But however true this may be, not only is every mark wanting, which would warrant us in assuming a transition from the purely inward and spiritual sphere, to the outward sphere of the senses, but the entire revelation culminates in a prophetic sleep, which also bears the character of a vision. As it was in a deep sleep that Abram saw the passing of the divine appearance through the carefully arranged portions of the sacrifice, and no reference is made either to the burning of them, as in Jud. 6:21, or to any other removal, the arrangement of the sacrificial animals must also have been a purely internal process. To regard this as an outward act, we must break up the continuity of the narrative in a most arbitrary way, and not only transfer the commencement of the vision into the night, and suppose it to have lasted from twelve to eighteen hours, but we must interpolate the burning of the sacrifices, etc., in a still more arbitrary manner, merely for the sake of supporting the erroneous assumption, that visionary procedures had no objective reality, or, at all events, less evidence of reality than outward acts, and things perceived by the senses. A vision wrought by God was not a mere fancy, or a subjective play of the thoughts, but a spiritual fact, which was not only in all respects as real as things discernible by the senses, but which surpassed in its lasting significance the acts and events that strike the eye. The covenant which Jehovah made with Abram was not intended to give force to a mere agreement respecting mutual rights and obligations, — a thing which could have been accomplished by an external sacrificial transaction, and by God passing through the divided animals in an assumed human form, — but it was designed to establish the purely spiritual relation of a living fellowship between God and Abram, of the deep inward meaning of which, nothing but a spiritual intuition and experience could give to Abram an effective and permanent hold.

Gen. 15: 1-6. The words of Jehovah run thus: “*Fear not, Abram: I am a shield to thee, thy reward very much.*” אֲרִיבָהּ an *inf. absol.*, generally used adverbially, but here as an adjective, equivalent to “*thy very great reward.*” The divine promise to be a *shield* to him, that is to say, a protection against all enemies, and a *reward*, i.e., richly to reward his confidence, his ready obedience, stands here, as the opening words “after these things” indicate, in close connection with the previous guidance of Abram. Whilst the protection of his wife in Egypt was a practical pledge of the possibility of his having a posterity, and the separation of Lot, followed by the conquest of the kings of the East, was also a pledge of the possibility of his one day possessing the promised land, there was as yet no prospect whatever of the promise being realized, that he should become a great nation, and possess an innumerable posterity. In these circumstances, anxiety about the future might naturally arise in his mind. To meet this, the word of the Lord came to him with the comforting assurance, “Fear not, I am thy shield.” But when the Lord added,

“and thy very great reward,” Abram could only reply, as he thought of his childless condition: “*Lord Jehovah, what wilt Thou give me, seeing I go childless?*” Of what avail are all my possessions, wealth, and power, since I have no child, and the heir of my house is Eliezer the Damascene? מֶשֶׁק, synonymous with מִמְשָׁק (Zep. 2: 9), possession, or the seizure of possession, is chosen on account of its assonance with בֶּן־מֶשֶׁק. דְּמֶשֶׁק, son of the seizing of possession = seizer of possession, or heir. *Eliezer of Damascus* (lit., Damascus viz., Eliezer): Eliezer is an explanatory apposition to Damascus, in the sense of the Damascene Eliezer; though דְּמֶשֶׁק, on account of its position before אֱלִיעֶזֶר, cannot be taken grammatically as equivalent to דְּמֶשֶׁקִי.^{f44}

— To give still more distinct utterance to his grief, Abram adds (v. 3): “*Behold, to me Thou hast given no seed; and lo, an inmate of my house (בֶּן־בַּיִת in distinction from יְלִיד־בַּיִת, home-born, Gen. 14:14) will be my heir.*” The word of the Lord then came to him: “*Not he, but one who shall come forth from thy body, he will be thine heir.*” God then took him into the open air, told him to look up to heaven, and promised him a posterity as numerous as the innumerable host of stars (cf. Gen. 22:17; 24: 4; Exo. 32:13, etc.). Whether Abram at this time was “in the body or out of the body,” is a matter of no moment. The reality of the occurrence is the same in either case. This is evident from the remark made by Moses (the historian) as to the conduct of Abram in relation to the promise of God: “*And he believed in Jehovah, and He counted it to him for righteousness.*” In the strictly objective character of the account in Genesis, in accordance with which the simple facts are related throughout without any introduction of subjective opinions, this remark appears so striking, that the question naturally arises, What led Moses to introduce it? In what way did Abram make known his faith in Jehovah? And in what way did Jehovah count it to him as righteousness? The reply to both questions must not be sought in the New Testament, but must be given or indicated in the context. What reply did Abram make on receiving the promise, or what did he do in consequence? When God, to confirm the promise, declared Himself to be Jehovah, who brought him out of Ur of the Chaldees to give him that land as a possession, Abram replied, “Lord, whereby shall I know that I shall possess it?” God then directed him to “fetch a heifer of three years old,” etc.; and Abram fetched the animals required, and arranged them (as we may certainly suppose, though it is not expressly stated) as God had commanded him. By this readiness to perform what God commanded him, Abram gave a practical proof that he believed Jehovah; and what God did with the animals so arranged was a practical declaration on the part of Jehovah, that He reckoned this faith to Abram as righteousness.

The significance of the divine act is, finally, summed up in v. 18, in the words, “*On that day Jehovah made a covenant with Abram.*” Consequently Jehovah reckoned Abram’s faith to him as righteousness, by making a covenant with him, by taking Abram into covenant fellowship with Himself. אָמַן, from אָמַן to continue and the preserve, to be firm and to confirm, in *Hiphil* to trust, believe (πιστεύειν), expresses “that state of mind which is sure of its object, and relies firmly upon it;” and as denoting conduct towards God, as “a firm, inward, personal, self-surrendering reliance upon a personal being, especially upon the source of all being,” it is construed sometimes with ל (e.g., Deu. 9:23), but more frequently with אָ (Num. 14:11; 20:12; Deu. 1:32), “to believe the Lord,” and “to believe on the Lord,” to trust in Him, — πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, as the apostle has more correctly rendered the ἐπίστευσεν τῷ Θεῷ of the LXX (vid., Rom. 4: 5). Faith therefore is not merely *assensus*, but *fiducia* also, unconditional trust in the Lord and His word, even where the natural course of events furnishes no ground for hope or expectation. This faith Abram manifested, as the apostle has shown in Rom. 4; and this faith God reckoned to him as righteousness by the actual conclusion of a covenant with him. צַדִּיקָה, righteousness, as a human characteristic, is correspondence to the will of God both in character and conduct, or a state answering to the divine purpose of a man’s being. This was the state in which man was first created in the image of God; but it was lost by sin, through which he placed himself in opposition to the will of God and to his own divinely appointed destiny, and could only be restored by God. When the human race had universally corrupted its way, Noah alone was found righteous before God (Gen. 7: 1), because he was blameless and walked with God (Gen. 6: 9). This righteousness Abram acquired through his unconditional trust in the Lord, his undoubting faith in His promise, and his ready obedience to His word. This state of mind, which is expressed in the words אָמַן בַּיהוָה, was reckoned to him as righteousness, so that God treated him as a righteous man, and formed such a relationship with him, that he was placed in living fellowship with God. The foundation of this relationship was laid in the manner described in vv. 7-11.

Gen. 15: 7-11. Abram’s question, “*Whereby shall I know that I shall take possession of it (the land)?*” was not an expression of doubt, but of desire for the confirmation or sealing of a promise, which transcended human thought and conception. To gratify this desire, God commanded him to make preparation for the conclusion of a covenant.

“Take Me, He said, a heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon;”

one of every species of the animals suitable for sacrifice. Abram took these, and “divided them in the midst,” i.e., in half, “and placed one half of each opposite to the other (אִישׁ בְּתָרוֹ), every one its half, cf. Gen. 42:25; Num. 17:17); only the birds divided he not,” just as in sacrifice the doves were not divided into pieces, but placed upon the fire whole (Lev. 1:17). The animals chosen, as well as the fact that the doves were left whole, corresponded exactly to the ritual of sacrifice. Yet the transaction itself was not a real sacrifice, since there was neither sprinkling of blood nor offering upon an altar (*oblatio*), and no mention is made of the pieces being burned. The proceeding corresponded rather to the custom, prevalent in many ancient nations, of slaughtering animals when concluding a covenant, and after dividing them into pieces, of laying the pieces opposite to one another, that the persons making the covenant might pass between them. Thus *Ephraem Syrus* (1, 161) observes, that God condescended to follow the custom of the Chaldeans, that He might in the most solemn manner confirm His oath to Abram the Chaldean. The wide extension of this custom is evident from the expression used to denote the conclusion of a covenant, פָּרַת בְּרִית, to hew, or cut a covenant, *Aram.* גָּרַז קָרָם, Greek ὄρκια τέμνειν, *faedus ferire*, i.e., *ferienda hostia facere faedus*; cf. *Bochart (Hiero.* 1, 332); whilst it is evident from Jer. 34:18, that this was still customary among the Israelites of later times. The choice of sacrificial animals for a transaction which was not strictly a sacrifice, was founded upon the symbolical significance of the sacrificial animals, i.e., upon the fact that they represented and took the place of those who offered them. In the case before us, they were meant to typify the promised seed of Abram. This would not hold good, indeed, if the cutting of the animals had been merely intended to signify, that any who broke the covenant would be treated like the animals that were there cut in pieces. But there is no sure ground in Jer. 34:18 ff. for thus interpreting the ancient custom. The meaning which the prophet there assigns to the symbolical usage, may be simply a different application of it, which does not preclude an earlier and different intention in the symbol. The division of the animals probably denoted originally the two parties to the covenant, and the passing of the latter through the pieces laid opposite to one another, their formation into one: a signification to which the other might easily have been attached as a further consequence and explanation. And if in such a case the sacrificial animals represented the parties to the covenant, so also even in the present instance the sacrificial animals were fitted for that purpose, since, although originally representing only the owner or offerer of the sacrifice, by their consecration as sacrifices they were also brought into connection with Jehovah. But in the case before us the animals represented Abram and his seed, not in the fact of their being slaughtered, as significant of the slaying of that seed, but only in what happened to and in connection with the slaughtered animals: birds of prey

attempted to eat them, and when extreme darkness came on, the glory of God passed through them. As all the seed of Abram was concerned, one of every kind of animal suitable for sacrifice was taken, *ut ex toto populo et singulis partibus sacrificium unum fieret* (Calvin). The age of the animals, three years old, was supposed by *Theodoret* to refer to the three generations of Israel which were to remain in Egypt, or the three centuries of captivity in a foreign land; and this is rendered very probable by the fact, that in Jud. 6:25 the bullock of seven years old undoubtedly refers to the seven years of Midianitish oppression. On the other hand, we cannot find in the six halves of the three animals and the undivided birds, either 7 things or the sacred number 7, for two undivided birds cannot represent one whole, but two; nor can we attribute to the eight pieces any symbolical meaning, for these numbers necessarily followed from the choice of one specimen of every kind of animal that was fit for sacrifice, and from the division of the larger animals into two.

Gen. 15:11. “Then birds of prey (הַעֵיִטִּים with the article, as Gen. 14:13) came down upon the carcasses, and Abram frightened them away.” The birds of prey represented the foes of Israel, who would seek to eat up, i.e., exterminate it. And the fact that Abram frightened them away was a sign, that Abram’s faith and his relation to the Lord would preserve the whole of his posterity from destruction, that Israel would be saved for Abram’s sake (Psa. 105:42).

Gen. 15:12-17. “And when the sun was just about to go down (on the construction, see Ges. § 132), and deep sleep (תַּרְדֵּמָה, as in Gen. 2:21, a deep sleep produced by God) had fallen upon Abram, behold there fell upon him terror, great darkness.” The vision here passes into a prophetic sleep produced by God. In this sleep there fell upon Abram dread and darkness; this is shown by the interchange of the perfect נִפְלָה and the participle נֹפֵלֶת. The reference to the time is intended to show “the supernatural character of the darkness and sleep, and the distinction between the vision and a dream” (*O. v. Gerlach*). It also possesses a symbolical meaning. The setting of the sun prefigured to Abram the departure of the sun of grace, which shone upon Israel, and the commencement of a dark and dreadful period of suffering for his posterity, the very anticipation of which involved Abram in darkness. For the words which he heard in the darkness were these (vv. 13 ff.): “Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them (the lords of the strange land), and they (the foreigners) shall oppress them 400 years.” That these words had reference to the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt, is placed beyond all doubt by the fulfilment. The 400 years were, according to prophetic language, a round number for the 430 years that Israel spent in Egypt (Exo. 12:40). “Also that nation whom they shall serve will I judge (see the fulfilment, Exo. 6:11); and afterward shall they come out with

great substance (the actual fact according to Exo. 12:31-36). *And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age* (cf. Gen. 25: 7, 8); *and in the fourth generation they shall come hither again.*” The calculations are made here on the basis of a hundred years to a generation: not too much for those times, when the average duration of life was above 150 years, and Isaac was born in the hundredth year of Abraham’s life. “*For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.*” *Amorite*, the name of the most powerful tribe of the Canaanites, is used here as the common name of all the inhabitants of Canaan, just as in Jos. 24:15 (cf. Gen. 10: 5), Jud. 6:10, etc.).

By this revelation Abram had the future history of his seed pointed out to him in general outlines, and was informed at the same time why neither he nor his descendants could obtain immediate possession of the promised land, viz., because the Canaanites were not yet ripe for the sentence of extermination.

Gen. 15:17. When the sun had gone down, and thick darkness had come on (אֵשׁ impersonal), “*behold a smoking furnace, and (with) a fiery torch, which passed between those pieces,*” — a description of what Abram saw in his deep prophetic sleep, corresponding to the mysterious character of the whole proceeding. אֵשׁ, a stove, is a cylindrical fire-pot, such as is used in the dwelling-houses of the East. The phenomenon, which passed through the pieces as they lay opposite to one another, resembled such a smoking stove, from which a fiery torch, i.e., a brilliant flame, was streaming forth. In this symbol Jehovah manifested Himself to Abram, just as He afterwards did to the people of Israel in the pillar of cloud and fire. Passing through the pieces, He ratified the covenant which He made with Abram. His glory was enveloped in fire and smoke, the produce of the consuming fire, — both symbols of the wrath of God (cf. Psa. 18: 9, and *Hengstenberg in loc.*), whose fiery zeal consumes whatever opposes it (vid., Exo. 3: 2). — To establish and give reality to the covenant to be concluded with Abram, Jehovah would have to pass through the seed of Abram when oppressed by the Egyptians and threatened with destruction, and to execute judgment upon their oppressors (Exo. 7: 4; 12:12). In this symbol, the passing of the Lord between the pieces meant something altogether different from the oath of the Lord by Himself in Gen. 22:16, or by His life in Deu. 32:40, or by His soul in Amo. 6: 8 and Jer. 51:14. It set before Abram the condescension of the Lord to his seed, in the fearful glory of His majesty as the judge of their foes. Hence the pieces were not consumed by the fire; for the transaction had reference not to a sacrifice, which God accepted, and in which the soul of the offerer was to ascend in the smoke to God, but to a covenant in which God came down to man. From the nature of this covenant, it followed, however, that God alone went through the pieces in a symbolical representation of Himself, and not Abram also. For although a covenant always establishes a reciprocal relation

between two individuals, yet in that covenant which God concluded with a man, the man did not stand on an equality with God, but God established the relation of fellowship by His promise and His gracious condescension to the man, who was at first purely a recipient, and was only qualified and bound to fulfil the obligations consequent upon the covenant by the reception of gifts of grace.

Gen. 15:18-21. In vv. 18-21 this divine revelation is described as the making of a covenant (בְּרִיתָהּ, from בָּרַחַהּ to cut, lit., the bond concluded by cutting up the sacrificial animals), and the substance of this covenant is embraced in the promise, that God would give that land to the seed of Abram, from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates. The river (נְהָר) of Egypt is the Nile, and not the brook (נְהַל) of Egypt (Num. 34: 5), i.e., the boundary stream *Rhinocorura*, *Wady el Arish*. According to the oratorical character of the promise, the two large rivers, the Nile and the Euphrates, are mentioned as the boundaries within which the seed of Abram would possess the promised land, the exact limits of which are more minutely described in the list of the tribes who were then in possession. Ten tribes are mentioned between the southern border of the land and the extreme north,

“to convey the impression of universality without exception, of unqualified completeness, the symbol of which is the number ten”
(*Delitzsch*).

In other passages we find sometimes seven tribes mentioned (Deu. 7: 1; Jos. 3:10), at other times six (Exo. 3: 8, 17; 23:23; Deu. 20:17), at others five (Exo. 13: 5), at others again only two (Gen. 13: 7); whilst occasionally they are all included in the common name of Canaanites (Gen. 12: 6). The absence of the Hivites is striking here, since they are not omitted from any other list where as many as five or seven tribes are mentioned. Out of the eleven descendants of Canaan (Gen. 10:15-18) the names of four only are given here; the others are included in the common name of the Canaanites. On the other hand, four tribes are given, whose descent from Canaan is very improbable. The origin of the *Kenites* cannot be determined. According to Jud. 1:16; 4:11, Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses, was a Kenite. His being called Midianite (Num. 10:29) does not prove that he was descended from Midian (Gen. 25: 2), but is to be accounted for from the fact that he dwelt in the land of Midian, or among the Midianites (Exo. 2:15). This branch of the Kenites went with the Israelites to Canaan, into the wilderness of Judah (Jud. 1:16), and dwelt even in Saul's time among the Amalekites on the southern border of Judah (1Sa. 15: 6), and in the same towns with members of the tribe of Judah (1Sa. 30:29). There is nothing either in this passage, or in Num. 24:21, 22, to compel us to distinguish these Midianitish Kenites from those of Canaan. The

Philistines also were not Canaanites, and yet their territory was assigned to the Israelites. And just as the Philistines had forced their way into the land, so the Kenites may have taken possession of certain tracts of the country. All that can be inferred from the two passages is, that there were Kenites outside Midian, who were to be exterminated by the Israelites. On the *Kenizzites*, all that can be affirmed with certainty is, that the name is neither to be traced to the Edomitish *Kenaz* (Gen. 36:15, 42), nor to be identified with the Kenezite Jephunneh, the father of Caleb of Judah (Num. 32:12; Jos. 14: 6: see my Comm. on Joshua, p. 356, Eng. tr.). — The *Kadmonites* are never mentioned again, and their origin cannot be determined. On the *Perizzites* see Gen. 13: 7; on the *Rephaims*, Gen. 14: 5; and on the other names, Gen. 10:15, 16.

BIRTH OF ISHMAEL. — GENESIS 16

Gen. 16: 1-6. As the promise of a lineal heir (Gen. 15: 4) did not seem likely to be fulfilled, even after the covenant had been made, Sarai resolved, ten years after their entrance into Canaan, to give her Egyptian maid Hagar to her husband, that if possible she might “*be built up by her,*” i.e., obtain children, who might found a house or family (Gen. 30: 3). The resolution seemed a judicious one, and according to the customs of the East, there would be nothing wrong in carrying it out. Hence Abraham consented without opposition, because, as Malachi (Mal. 2:15) says, he sought the seed promised by God. But they were both of them soon to learn, that their thoughts were the thoughts of man and not of God, and that their wishes and actions were not in accordance with the divine promise. Sarai, the originator of the plan, was the first to experience its evil consequences. When the maid was with child by Abram, “*her mistress became little in her eyes.*” When Sarai complained to Abram of the contempt she received from her maid (saying, “*My wrong,*” the wrong done to me, “*come upon thee,*” cf. Jer. 51:35; Gen. 27:13), and called upon Jehovah to judge between her and her husband, ^{f45} Abram gave her full power to act as mistress towards her maid, without raising the slave who was made a concubine above her position. But as soon as Sarai made her feel her power, Hagar fled. Thus, instead of securing the fulfilment of their wishes, Sarai and Abram had reaped nothing but grief and vexation, and apparently had lost the maid through their self-concerted scheme. But the faithful covenant God turned the whole into a blessing.

Gen. 16: 7-14. Hagar no doubt intended to escape to Egypt by a road used from time immemorial, that ran from Hebron past Beersheba, “*by the way of Shur.*” — *Shur*, the present *Jifar*, is the name given to the north-western portion of the desert of Arabia (cf. Exo. 15:22). There the angel of the Lord found her by a well, and directed her to return to her mistress, and submit to her; at the same time he promised her the birth of a son, and an innumerable

multiplication of her descendants. As the fruit of her womb was the seed of Abram, she was to return to his house and there bear him a son, who, though not the seed promised by God, would be honoured for Abram's sake with the blessing of an innumerable posterity. For this reason also Jehovah appeared to her in the form of the Angel of Jehovah (cf. p. 82). הָרָה is *adj. verb.* as in Gen. 28:24, etc.: “*thou art with child and wilt bear;*” יֵלֶדֶת for יָלְדָה (Gen. 17:19) is found again in Jud. 13: 5, 7. This son she was to call *Ishmael* (“*God hears*”), “*for Jehovah hath hearkened to thy distress.*” עָנִי *afflictionem sine dubio vocat, quam Hagar afflictionem sentiebat esse, nempe conditionem servitem et quod castigata esset a Sara (Luther).* It was *Jehovah*, not *Elohim*, who had heard, although the latter name was most naturally suggested as the explanation of *Ishmael*, because the hearing, i.e., the multiplication of *Ishmael's* descendants, was the result of the covenant grace of *Jehovah*. Moreover, in contrast with the oppression which has had endured and still would endure, she received the promise that her son would endure no such oppression. “*He will be a wild ass of a man.*” The figure of a פָּרָא, *onager*, that wild and untameable animal, roaming at its will in the desert, of which so highly poetic a description is given in Job. 39: 5-8, depicts most aptly “the Bedouin's boundless love of freedom as he rides about in the desert, spear in hand, upon his camel or his horse, hardy, frugal, revelling in the varied beauty of nature, and despising town life in every form;” and the words, “*his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him,*” describe most truly the incessant state of feud, in which the *Ishmaelites* live with one another or with their neighbours. “*He will dwell before the face of all his brethren.*” פָּנֵי עַל denotes, it is true, to the east of (cf. Gen. 25:18), and this meaning is to be retained here; but the geographical notice of the dwelling-place of the *Ishmaelites* hardly exhausts the force of the expression, which also indicated that *Ishmael* would maintain an independent standing before (in the presence of) all the descendants of *Abraham*. History has confirmed this promise. The *Ishmaelites* have continued to this day in free and undiminished possession of the extensive peninsula between the *Euphrates*, the *Straits of Suez*, and the *Red Sea*, from which they have overspread both *Northern Africa* and *Southern Asia*.

Gen. 16:13. In the angel, *Hagar* recognised *God* manifesting Himself to her, the presence of *Jehovah*, and called Him, “*Thou art a God of seeing; for she said, Have I also seen here after seeing?*” Believing that a man must die if he saw *God* (Exo. 20:19; 33:20), *Hagar* was astonished that she had seen *God* and remained alive, and called *Jehovah*, who had spoken to her, “*God of seeing,*” i.e., who allows Himself to be seen, because here, on the spot where this sight was granted her, after seeing she still saw, i.e., remained alive. From this

occurrence the well received the name of “*well of the seeing alive*,” i.e., at which a man saw God and remained alive. *Beer-lahai-roi*: according to *Ewald*, רֵאִי רְאִי is to be regarded as a composite noun, and לְ as a sign of the genitive; but this explanation, in which רֵאִי is treated as a pausal form of רְאִי, does not suit the form רֵאִי with the accent upon the last syllable, which points rather to the participle רֵאִה with the first pers. suffix. On this ground *Delitzsch* and others have decided in favour of the interpretation given in the Chaldee version, “Thou art a God of seeing, i.e., the all-seeing, from whose all-seeing eye the helpless and forsaken is not hidden even in the farthest corner of the desert.” “*Have I not even here (in the barren land of solitude) looked after Him, who saw me?*” and *Beer-lahai-roi*, “the well of the Living One who sees me, i.e., of the omnipresent Providence.” But still greater difficulties lie in the way of this view. It not only overthrows the close connection between this and the similar passages Gen. 32:31, Exo. 33:20, Jud. 13:22, where the sight of God excites a fear of death, but it renders the name, which the well received from this appearance of God, an inexplicable riddle. If Hagar called the God who appeared to her אֱלֹהֵי רְאִי because she looked after Him whom she saw, i.e., as we must necessarily understand the word, saw not His face, but only His back; how could it ever occur to her or to any one else, to call the well *Beer-lahai-roi*, “well of the Living One, who sees me,” instead of *Beer-el-roi*? Moreover, what completely overthrows this explanation, is the fact that neither in Genesis nor anywhere in the Pentateuch is God called “the Living One;” and throughout the Old Testament it is only in contrast with the dead gods of idols of the heathen, a contrast never thought of here, that the expressions אֱלֹהִים רְאִי and אֱלֹהֵי רְאִי occur, whilst רְאִי is never used in the Old Testament as a name of God. For these reasons we must abide by the first explanation, and change the reading רֵאִי into רְאִי. ^{f46}

With regard to the well, it is still further added that it was between *Kadesh* (Gen. 14: 7) and *Bered*. Though *Bered* has not been discovered, *Rowland* believes, with good reason, that he has found the well of Hagar, which is mentioned again in Gen. 24:62; 25:11, in the spring *Ain Kades*, to the south of *Beersheba*, at the leading place of encampment of the caravans passing from Syria to Sinai, viz., *Moyle*, or *Moilahi*, or *Muweilih* (Robinson, Pal. i. p. 280), which the Arabs call *Moilahi Hagar*, and in the neighbourhood of which they point out a rock *Beit Hagar*. *Bered* must lie to the west of this.

Gen. 16:15-16. Having returned to Abram’s house, Hagar bare him a son in his 86th year. He gave it the name *Ishmael*, and regarded it probably as the promised seed, until, thirteen years afterwards, the counsel of God was more clearly unfolded to him.

SEALING OF THE COVENANT BY THE GIVING OF NEW NAMES AND BY THE RITE OF CIRCUMCISION. — GENESIS 17

Gen. 17: 1-14. The covenant had been made with Abram for at least fourteen years, and yet Abram remained without any visible sign of its accomplishment, and was merely pointed in faith to the inviolable character of the promise of God. Jehovah now appeared to Him again, when he was ninety-nine years old, twenty-four years after his migration, and thirteen after the birth of Ishmael, to give effect to the covenant and prepare for its execution. Having come down to Abram in a visible form (v. 22), He said to him, “*I am El Shaddai (almighty God): walk before Me and be blameless.*” At the establishment of the covenant, God had manifested Himself to him as Jehovah (Gen. 15: 7); here Jehovah describes Himself as El Shaddai, God the Mighty One. שַׁדַּי: from שָׁדַד to be strong, with the substantive termination *ai*, like חַיִּי the festal, שִׁישׁ the old man, סִינִי the thorn-grown, etc. This name is not to be regarded as identical with *Elohim*, that is to say, with God as Creator and Preserver of the world, although in simple narrative *Elohim* is used for *El Shaddai*, which is only employed in the more elevated and solemn style of writing. It belonged to the sphere of salvation, forming one element in the manifestation of Jehovah, and describing Jehovah, the covenant God, as possessing the power to realize His promises, even when the order of nature presented no prospect of their fulfilment, and the powers of nature were insufficient to secure it. The name which Jehovah thus gave to Himself was to be a pledge, that in spite of “his own body now dead,” and “the deadness of Sarah’s womb” (Rom. 4:19), God could and would give him the promised innumerable posterity. On the other hand, God required this of Abram, “*Walk before Me* (cf. Gen. 5:22) *and be blameless*” (Gen. 6: 9). “Just as righteousness received in faith was necessary for the establishment of the covenant, so a blameless walk before God was required for the maintenance and confirmation of the covenant.” This introduction is followed by a more definite account of the new revelation; first of the promise involved in the new name of God (vv. 2-8), and then of the obligation imposed upon Abram (vv. 9-14). “*I will give My covenant,*” says the Almighty, “*between Me and thee, and multiply thee exceedingly.*” נָתַן בְּרִיתִי signifies, not to make a covenant, but to give, to put, i.e., to realize, to set in operation the things promised in the covenant — equivalent to setting up the covenant (cf. v. 7 and Gen. 9:12 with Gen. 9: 9). This promise Abram appropriated to himself by falling upon his face in worship, upon which God still further expounded the nature of the covenant about to be executed.

Gen. 17: 4. On the part of God (אֲנִי placed at the beginning absolutely: so far as I am concerned, for my part) it was to consist of this:

(1) that God would make Abram the father (אב instead of אבי chosen with reference to the name Abram) of a multitude of nations, the ancestor of nations and kings;

(2) that He would be God, show Himself to be God, in an eternal covenant relation, to him and to his posterity, according to their families, according to all their successive generations; and

(3) that He would give them the land in which he had wandered as a foreigner, viz., all Canaan, for an everlasting possession. As a pledge of this promise God changed his name אבִרָם, i.e., high father, into אבִרְהָם, i.e., father of the multitude, from אב and רָהֵם, Arab. *ruhâm* = multitude. In this name God gave him a tangible pledge of the fulfilment of His covenant, inasmuch as a name which God gives cannot be a mere empty sound, but must be the expression of something real, or eventually acquire reality.

Gen. 17: 9 ff. On the part of Abraham (וְאַתָּה thou, the antithesis to אֲנִי, as for me, v. 4) God required that he and his descendants in all generations should keep the covenant, and that as a sign he should circumcise himself and every male in his house. הַמּוֹל Niph. of מוֹל, and נִמְלְתָם perf. Niph. for נִמְלָתָם, from מָלַל = מוֹל. As the sign of the covenant, circumcision is called in v. 13, “the covenant in the flesh,” so far as the nature of the covenant was manifested in the flesh. It was to be extended not only to the seed, the lineal descendants of Abraham, but to all the males in his house, even to every foreign slave not belonging to the seed of Abram, whether born in the house or acquired (i.e., bought) with money, and to the “son of eight days,” i.e., the male child eight days old; with the threat that the uncircumcised should be exterminated from his people, because by neglecting circumcision he had broken the covenant with God. The form of speech נִבְרָתָהּ הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַדְּרִיָּא, by which many of the laws are enforced (cf. Exo. 12:15, 19; Lev. 7:20, 21, 25, etc.), denotes not rejection from the nation, or banishment, but death, whether by a direct judgment from God, an untimely death at the hand of God, or by the punishment of death inflicted by the congregation or the magistrates, and that whether מוֹת יוֹמָת is added, as in Exo. 31:14, etc., or not. This is very evident from Lev. 17: 9, 10, where the extermination to be effected by the authorities is distinguished from that to be executed by God Himself (see my *biblische Archäologie* ii. § 153, 1). In this sense we sometimes find, in the place of the earlier expression “from his people,” i.e., his nation, such expressions as “from among his people” (Lev. 17: 4, 10; Num. 15:30), “from Israel” (Exo. 12:15; Num. 19:13), “from the congregation of Israel” (Exo. 12:19); and instead of “that soul,” in Lev. 17: 4, 9 (cf. Exo. 30:33, 38), we find “that man.”

Gen. 17:15-21. The appointment of the sign of the covenant was followed by this further revelation as to the promised seed, that Abram would receive it through his wife Sarai. In confirmation of this her exalted destiny, she was no longer to be called *Sarai* (שַׂרַי, probably from שָׂרַר with the termination *ai*, the princely), but שָׂרָה, the princess; for she was to become nations, the mother of kings of nations. Abraham then fell upon his face and laughed, saying in himself (i.e., thinking), “*Shall a child be born to him that is a hundred years old, or shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?*”

“The promise was so immensely great, that he sank in adoration to the ground, and so immensely paradoxical, that he could not help laughing” (Del.).

“Not that he either ridiculed the promise of God, or treated it as a fable, or rejected it altogether; but, as often happens when things occur which are least expected, partly lifted up with joy, partly carried out of himself with wonder, he burst out into laughter” (Calvin).

In this joyous amazement he said to God (v. 18), “O that Ishmael might live before Thee!” To regard these words, with Calvin and others, as intimating that he should be satisfied with the prosperity of Ishmael, as though he durst not hope for anything higher, is hardly sufficient. The prayer implies anxiety, lest Ishmael should have no part in the blessings of the covenant. God answers, “Yes (לֵאמֹר), Sarah thy wife bears thee a son, and thou wilt call his name Isaac (according to the Greek form *Ἰσαάκ*, for the Hebrew *יִצְחָק*, i.e., laughter, with reference to Abraham’s laughing; v. 17, cf. Gen. 21: 6), and I will establish My covenant with him,” i.e., make him the recipient of the covenant grace. And the prayer for Ishmael God would also grant: He would make him very fruitful, so that he should beget twelve princes and become a great nation. But the covenant, God repeated (v. 21), should be established with Isaac, whom Sarah was to bear to him at that very time in the following year. — Since Ishmael therefore was excluded from participating in the covenant grace, which was ensured to Isaac alone; and yet Abraham was to become a multitude of nations, and that through Sarah, who was to become “nations” through the son she was to bear (v. 16); the “multitude of nations” could not include either the Ishmaelites or the tribes descended from the sons of Keturah (Gen. 25: 2 ff.), but the descendants of Isaac alone; and as one of Isaac’s two sons received no part of the covenant promise, the descendants of Jacob alone. But the whole of the twelve sons of Jacob founded only the one nation of Israel, with which Jehovah established the covenant made with Abraham (Exodus 6 and 20-24), so that Abraham became through Israel the lineal father of one nation only. From this it necessarily follows, that the posterity of Abraham, which was to expand into a multitude of nations, extends beyond

this one lineal posterity, and embraces the spiritual posterity also, i.e., all nations who are grafted ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ into the seed of Abraham (Rom. 4:11, 12, and 16, 17). Moreover, the fact that the seed of Abraham was not to be restricted to his lineal descendants, is evident from the fact, that circumcision as the covenant sign was not confined to them, but extended to all the inmates of his house, so that these strangers were received into the fellowship of the covenant, and reckoned as part of the promised seed. Now, if the whole land of Canaan was promised to this posterity, which was to increase into a multitude of nations (v. 8), it is perfectly evident, from what has just been said, that the sum and substance of the promise was not exhausted by the gift of the land, whose boundaries are described in Gen. 15:18-21, as a possession to the nation of Israel, but that the extension of the idea of the lineal posterity, "Israel after the flesh," to the spiritual posterity, "Israel after the spirit," requires the expansion of the idea and extent of the earthly Canaan to the full extent of the spiritual Canaan, whose boundaries reach as widely as the multitude of nations having Abraham as father; and, therefore, that in reality Abraham received the promise "that he should be the heir of the world" (Rom. 4:13).^{f47}

And what is true of the seed of Abraham and the land of Canaan must also hold good of the covenant and the covenant sign. Eternal duration was promised only to the covenant established by God with the seed of Abraham, which was to grow into a multitude of nations, but not to the covenant institution which God established in connection with the lineal posterity of Abraham, the twelve tribes of Israel. Everything in this institution which was of a local and limited character, and only befitted the physical Israel and the earthly Canaan, existed only so long as was necessary for the seed of Abraham to expand into a multitude of nations. So again it was only in its essence that circumcision could be a sign of the eternal covenant. Circumcision, whether it passed from Abraham to other nations, or sprang up among other nations independently of Abraham and his descendants (see my Archäologie, § 63, 1), was based upon the religious view, that the sin and moral impurity which the fall of Adam had introduced into the nature of man had concentrated itself in the sexual organs, because it is in sexual life that it generally manifests itself with peculiar force; and, consequently, that for the sanctification of life, a purification or sanctification of the organ of generation, by which life is propagated, is especially required. In this way circumcision in the flesh became a symbol of the circumcision, i.e., the purification, of the heart (Deu. 10:16; 30: 6, cf. Lev. 26:41, Jer. 4: 4; 9:25, Eze. 44: 7), and a covenant sign to those who received it, inasmuch as they were received into the fellowship of the holy nation (Exo. 19: 6), and required to sanctify their lives, in other words, to fulfil all that the covenant demanded. It was to be performed on every boy on the eighth day after its birth, not because the child, like its

mother, remains so long in a state of impurity, but because, as the analogous rule with regard to the fitness of young animals for sacrifice would lead us to conclude, this was regarded as the first day of independent existence (Lev. 22:27; Exo. 22:29; see my *Archäologie*, § 63).

Gen. 17:22-27. When God had finished His address and ascended again, Abraham immediately fulfilled the covenant duty enjoined upon him, by circumcision himself on that very day, along with all the male members of his house. Because Ishmael was 13 years old when he was circumcised, the Arabs even now defer circumcision to a much later period than the Jews, generally till between the ages of 5 and 13, and frequently even till the 13th year.

VISIT OF JEHOVAH, WITH TWO ANGELS, TO ABRAHAM'S TENT. — GENESIS 18

Having been received into the covenant with God through the rite of circumcision, Abraham was shortly afterwards honoured by being allowed to receive and entertain the Lord and two angels in his tent. This fresh manifestation of God had a double purpose, viz., to establish Sarah's faith in the promise that she should bear a son in her old age (vv. 1-15), and to announce the judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah (vv. 16-33).

Gen. 18: 1-15. When sitting, about mid-day, in the grove of Mamre, in front of his tent, Abraham looked up and unexpectedly saw three men standing at some distance from him (עָלָיו above him, looking down upon him as he sat), viz., *Jehovah* (v. 13) and *two angels* (Gen. 19: 1); all three in human form. Perceiving at once that one of them was the Lord (אֲדֹנָי, i.e., God), he prostrated himself reverentially before them, and entreated them not to pass him by, but to suffer him to entertain them as his guests: “*Let a little water be fetched, and wash your feet, and recline yourselves* (הִשְׁעֵן to recline, leaning upon the arm) *under the tree.*” — “*Comfort your hearts:*” lit., “strengthen the heart,” i.e., refresh yourselves by eating and drinking (Jud. 19: 5; 1Ki. 21: 7). “*For therefore* (sc., to give me an opportunity to entertain you hospitably) *have ye come over to your servant:*” עַל בְּנֵי כִי does not stand for כִּי עַל בְּנֵי (Ges. thes. p. 682), but means “because for this purpose” (vid., *Ewald*, § 353).

Gen. 18: 6 ff. When the three men had accepted the hospitable invitation, Abraham, just like a Bedouin sheikh of the present day, directed his wife to take three seahs (374 cubic inches each) of fine meal, and back cakes of it as quickly as possible (עֲגוֹת round unleavened cakes baked upon hot stones); he also had a tender calf killed, and sent for milk and butter, or curdled milk, and thus prepared a bountiful and savoury meal, of which the guests partook. The eating of material food on the part of these heavenly beings was not in

appearance only, but was really eating; an act which may be attributed to the corporeality assumed, and is to be regarded as analogous to the eating on the part of the risen and glorified Christ (Luk. 24:41 ff.), although the miracle still remains physiologically incomprehensible.

Gen. 18: 9-15. During the meal, at which Abraham stood, and waited upon them as the host, they asked for Sarah, for whom the visit was chiefly intended. On being told that she was in the tent, where she could hear, therefore, all that passed under the tree in front of the tent, the one whom Abraham addressed as *Adonai* (my Lord), and who is called Jehovah in v. 13, said, “*I will return to thee (פֶּעַת חַיָּה) at this time, when it lives again*” (חַיָּה, *reviviscens*, without the article, *Ges.* § 111, 2*b*), i.e., at this time next year; “*and, behold, Sarah, thy wife, will (then) have a son.*” Sarah heard this at the door of the tent; “*and it was behind Him*” (Jehovah), so that she could not be seen by Him as she stood at the door. But as the fulfilment of this promise seemed impossible to her, on account of Abraham’s extreme age, and the fact that her own womb had lost the power of conception, she laughed within herself, thinking that she was not observed. But that she might know that the promise was made by the omniscient and omnipotent God, He reproved her for laughing, saying, “*Is anything too wonderful (i.e., impossible) for Jehovah? at the time appointed I will return unto thee,*” etc.; and when her perplexity led her to deny it, He convicted her of falsehood. Abraham also had laughed at this promise (Gen. 17:17), and without receiving any reproof. For his laughing was the joyous outburst of astonishment; Sarah’s, on the contrary, the result of doubt and unbelief, which had to be broken down by reproof, and, as the result showed, really was broken down, inasmuch as she conceived and bore a son, whom she could only have conceived in faith (Heb. 11:11).

Gen. 18:16-33. After this conversation with Sarah, the heavenly guests rose up and turned their faces towards the plain of Sodom (עַל פְּנֵי, as in Gen. 19:28; Num. 21:20; 23:28). Abraham accompanied them some distance on the road; according to tradition, he went as far as the site of the later *Caphar barucha*, from which you can see the Dead Sea through a ravine, — *solitudinem ac terras Sodomae*. And Jehovah said, “*Shall I hide from Abraham what I propose to do? Abraham is destined to be a great nation and a blessing to all nations (Gen. 12: 2, 3); for I have known, i.e., acknowledged him (chosen him in anticipative love, יָדַע as in Amo. 3: 2; Hos. 13: 4), that he may command his whole posterity to keep the way of Jehovah, to practise justice and righteousness, that all the promises may be fulfilled in them.*” God then disclosed to Abraham what he was about to do to Sodom and Gomorrah, not, as *Kurtz* supposes, because Abraham had been constituted the hereditary possessor of the land, and Jehovah, being mindful of His covenant, would not

do anything to it without his knowledge and assent (a thought quite foreign to the context), but because Jehovah had chosen him to be the father of the people of God, in order that, by instructing his descendants in the fear of God, he might lead them in the paths of righteousness, so that they might become partakers of the promised salvation, and not be overtaken by judgment. The destruction of Sodom and the surrounding cities was to be a permanent memorial of the punitive righteousness of God, and to keep the fate of the ungodly constantly before the mind of Israel. To this end Jehovah explained to Abraham the cause of their destruction in the clearest manner possible, that he might not only be convinced of the justice of the divine government, but might learn that when the measure of iniquity was full, no intercession could avert the judgment, — a lesson and a warning to his descendants also.

Gen. 18:20. “*The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah, yea it is great; and their sin, yea it is very grievous.*” The cry is the appeal for vengeance or punishment, which ascends to heaven (Gen. 4:10). The כִּי serves to give emphasis to the assertion, and is placed in the middle of the sentence to give the greater prominence to the leading thought (cf. *Ewald*, § 330).

Gen. 18:21. God was about to go down, and convince Himself whether they had done entirely according to the cry which had reached Him, or not. כְּלָה עֲשֶׂה, lit., to make completeness, here referring to the extremity of iniquity, generally to the extremity of punishment (Nah. 1: 8, 9; Jer. 4:27; 5:10): כְּלָה is a noun, as Isa. 10:23 shows, not an adverb, as in Exo. 11: 1. After this explanation, the men (according to Gen. 19: 1, the two angels) turned from thence to go to Sodom (v. 22); but Abraham continued standing before Jehovah, who had been talking with him, and approached Him with earnestness and boldness of faith to intercede for Sodom. He was urged to this, not by any special interest in Lot, for in that case he would have prayed for his deliverance; nor by the circumstance that, as he had just before felt himself called upon to become the protector, avenger, and deliverer of the land from its foes, so he now thought himself called upon to act as mediator, and to appeal from Jehovah’s judicial wrath to Jehovah’s covenant grace (*Kurtz*), for he had not delivered the land from the foe, but merely rescued his nephew Lot and all the booty that remained after the enemy had withdrawn; nor did he appeal to the covenant grace of Jehovah, but to His justice alone; and on the principle that the Judge of all the earth could not possibly destroy the righteous with the wicked, he founded his entreaty that God would forgive the city if there were but fifty righteous in it, or even if there were only ten. He was led to intercede in this way, not by “*communis erga quinque populos misericordia*” (*Calvin*), but by the love which springs from the consciousness that one’s own preservation and rescue are due to compassionate grace alone; love, too, which

cannot conceive of the guilt of others as too great for salvation to be possible. This sympathetic love, springing from the faith which was counted for righteousness, impelled him to the intercession which *Luther* thus describes:

“sexies petiit, et cum tanto ardore ac affectu sic urgente, ut prae nimia angustia, qua cupit consultum miseris civitatibus, videatur quasi stulte loqui.”

There may be apparent folly in the words, “*Wilt Thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?*” but they were only “*violenta oratio et impetuosa, quasi cogens Deum ad ignoscendum.*” For Abraham added,

“peradventure there be fifty righteous within the city; wilt Thou also destroy and not forgive (שְׁוֹׁאָ, to take away and bear the guilt, i.e., forgive) the place for the fifty righteous that are therein?”

and described the slaying of the righteous with the wicked as irreconcilable with the justice of God. He knew that he was speaking to the Judge of all the earth, and that before Him he was “*but dust and ashes*” — “dust in his origin, and ashes in the end;” and yet he made bold to appeal still further, and even as low as ten righteous, to pray that for their sake He would spare the city. — אֲדָהּפַעַם (v. 32) signifies “*only this (one) time more,*” as in Exo. 10:17. This “seemingly commercial kind of entreaty is,” as Delitzsch observes, “the essence of true prayer. It is the holy ἀναίδεια, of which our Lord speaks in Luk. 11: 8, the shamelessness of faith, which bridges over the infinite distance of the creature from the Creator, appeals with importunity to the heart of God, and ceases not till its point is gained. This would indeed be neither permissible nor possible, had not God, by virtue of the mysterious interlacing of necessity and freedom in His nature and operations, granted a power to the prayer of faith, to which He consents to yield; had He not, by virtue of His absoluteness, which is anything but blind necessity, placed Himself in such a relation to men, that He not merely works upon them by means of His grace, but allows them to work upon Him by means of their faith; had He not interwoven the life of the free creature into His own absolute life, and accorded to a created personality the right to assert itself in faith, in distinction from His own.” With the promise, that even for the sake of ten righteous He would not destroy the city, Jehovah “went His way,” that is to say, vanished; and Abraham returned to his place, viz., to the grove of Mamre. The judgment which fell upon the wicked cities immediately afterwards, proves that there were not ten “*righteous persons*” in Sodom; by which we understand, not merely ten sinless or holy men, but ten who through the fear of God and conscientiousness had kept themselves free from the prevailing sin and iniquity of these cities.

INIQUITY AND DESTRUCTION OF SODOM. ESCAPE OF LOT, AND HIS SUBSEQUENT HISTORY. — GENESIS 19

Gen. 19: 1-11. The messengers (angels) sent by Jehovah to Sodom, arrived there in the evening, when Lot, who was sitting at the gate, pressed them to pass the night in his house. The gate, generally an arched entrance with deep recesses and seats on either side, was a place of meeting in the ancient towns of the East, where the inhabitants assembled either for social intercourse or to transact public business (vid., Gen. 34:20; Deu. 21:19; 22:15, etc.). The two travellers, however (for such Lot supposed them to be, and only recognised them as angels when they had smitten the Sodomites miraculously with blindness), said that they would spend the night in the street — בְּרֵחוֹב the broad open space within the gate — as they had been sent to inquire into the state of the town. But they yielded to Lot's entreaty to enter his house; for the deliverance of Lot, after having ascertained his state of mind, formed part of their commission, and entering into his house might only serve to manifest the sin of Sodom in all its heinousness. While Lot was entertaining his guests with the greatest hospitality, the people of Sodom gathered round his house, "*both old and young, all people from every quarter*" (of the town, as in Jer. 51:31), and demanded, with the basest violation of the sacred rite of hospitality and the most shameless proclamation of their sin (Isa. 3: 9), that the strangers should be brought out, that they might know them. יָדַע is applied, as in Jud. 19:22, to the carnal sin of *paederastia*, a crime very prevalent among the Canaanites (Lev. 18:22 ff., 20:23), and according to Rom. 1:27, a curse of heathenism generally.

Gen. 19: 6 ff. Lot went out to them, shut the door behind him to protect his guests, and offered to give his virgin daughters up to them. "*Only to these men* (הָאֵלִים, an archaism for הָאֱנָשִׁים, occurs also in v. 25, Gen. 26: 3, 4, Lev. 18:27, and Deu. 4:42; 7:22; 19:11; and אֵל for אֱלֹהִים in 1Ch. 20: 8) *do nothing, for therefore* (viz., to be protected from injury) *have they come under the shadow of my roof.*" In his anxiety, Lot was willing to sacrifice to the sanctity of hospitality his duty as a father, which ought to have been still more sacred, "and committed the sin of seeking to avert sin by sin." Even if he expected that his daughters would suffer no harm, as they were betrothed to Sodomites (v. 14), the offer was a grievous violation of his paternal duty. But this offer only heightened the brutality of the mob. "*Stand back*" (make way, Isa. 49:20), they said; "*the man, who came as a foreigner, is always wanting to play the judge*" (probably because Lot had frequently reproved them for their licentious conduct, 2Pe. 2: 7, 8): "*not will we deal worse with thee than with them.*" With these words they pressed upon him, and approached the door to break it in. The men inside, that is to say, the angels, then pulled Lot into the house, shut

the door, and by miraculous power smote the people without with blindness (סְנוּרִים here and 2Ki. 6:18 for mental blindness, in which the eye sees, but does not see the right object), as a punishment for their utter moral blindness, and an omen of the coming judgment.

Gen. 19:12-22. The sin of Sodom had now become manifest. The men, Lot's guests, made themselves known to him as the messengers of judgment sent by Jehovah, and ordered him to remove any one that belonged to him out of the city.

“Son-in-law (the singular without the article, because it is only assumed as a possible circumstance that he may have sons-in-law), and thy sons, and thy daughters, and all that belongs to thee”

(sc., of persons, not of things). *Sons* Lot does not appear to have had, as we read nothing more about them, but only “*sons-in-law (לְקַחֵי בְנָתָיו)* who were about to take his daughters,” as *Josephus, the Vulgate, Ewald, and many others* correctly render it. The LXX, *Targums, Knobel, and Delitzsch* adopt the rendering “who had taken his daughters,” in proof of which the last two adduce הַנְּמָצְאוֹת in v. 15 as decisive. But without reason; for this refers not to the daughters who were still in the father's house, as distinguished from those who were married, but to his wife and two daughters who were to be found with him in the house, in distinction from the bridegrooms, who also belonged to him, but were not yet living with him, and who had received his summons in scorn, because in their carnal security they did not believe in any judgment of God (Luk. 17:28, 29). If Lot had had married daughters, he would undoubtedly have called upon them to escape along with their husbands, his sons-in-law.

Gen. 19:15. As soon as it was dawn, the angels urged Lot to hasten away with his family; and when he still delayed, his heart evidently clinging to the earthly home and possessions which he was obliged to leave, they laid hold of him, with his wife and his two daughters, בְּחַמְלַת יְהוָה עָלָיו, “*by virtue of the sparing mercy of Jehovah (which operated) upon him,*” and led him out of the city.

Gen. 19:17. When they left him here (הִנִּיחַ, to let loose, and leave, to leave to one's self), the Lord commanded him, for the sake of his life, not to look behind him, and not to stand still in all the plain (בְּכָפַר, Gen. 13:10), but to flee to the mountains (afterwards called the mountains of Moab). In v. 17 we are struck by the change from the plural to the singular: “when *they* brought them forth, *he* said.” To think of one of the two angels — the one, for example, who led the conversation — seems out of place, not only because Lot addressed him by the name of God, “*Adonai*” (v. 18), but also because the speaker

attributed to himself the judgment upon the cities (vv. 21, 22), which is described in v. 24 as executed by Jehovah. Yet there is nothing to indicate that Jehovah suddenly joined the angels. The only supposition that remains, therefore, is that Lot recognised in the two angels a manifestation of God, and so addressed *them* (v. 18) as *Adonai* (my Lord), and that the angel who spoke addressed him as the messenger of Jehovah in the name of God, without its following from this, that Jehovah was present in the two angels. Lot, instead of cheerfully obeying the commandment of the Lord, appealed to the great mercy shown to him in the preservation of his life, and to the impossibility of his escaping to the mountains, without the evil overtaking him, and entreated therefore that he might be allowed to take refuge in the small and neighbouring city, i.e., in *Bela*, which received the name of *Zoar* (Gen. 14: 2) on account of Lot's calling it little. *Zoar*, the Σηγώρ of the LXX, and *Segor* of the crusaders, is hardly to be sought for on the peninsula which projects a long way into the southern half of the Dead Sea, in the Ghor of *el Mezraa*, as *Irby* and *Robinson* (Pal. iii. p. 481) suppose; it is much more probably to be found on the south-eastern point of the Dead Sea, in the Ghor of *el Szaphia*, at the opening of the Wady *el Ahsa* (vid., v. *Raumer*, Pal. p. 273, Anm. 14).

Gen. 19:23-28.

“When the sun had risen and Lot had come towards Zoar (i.e., was on the way thither, but had not yet arrived), Jehovah caused it to rain brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of heaven, and overthrew those cities, and the whole plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and the produce of the earth.”

In the words “Jehovah caused it to rain from Jehovah” there is no distinction implied between the hidden and the manifested God, between the Jehovah present upon earth in His angels who called down the judgment, and the Jehovah enthroned in heaven who sent it down; but the expression “from Jehovah” is

emphatica repetitio, quod non usitato naturae ordine tunc Deus pluerit, sed tanquam exerta manu palam fulminaverit praeter solitum morem: ut satis constaret nullis causis naturalibus conflata fuisse pluviam illam ex igne et sulphure (Calvin).

The rain of fire and brimstone was not a mere storm with lightning, which set on fire the soil already overcharged with naphtha and sulphur. The two passages, Psa. 11: 6 and Eze. 38:22, cannot be adduced as proofs that lightning is ever called fire and brimstone in the Scriptures, for in both passages there is an allusion to the event recorded here. The words are to be understood quite literally, as meaning that brimstone and fire, i.e., burning brimstone, fell from

the sky, even though the examples of burning bituminous matter falling upon the earth which are given in *Oedmann's vermischte Sammlungen* (iii. 120) may be called in question by historical criticism. By this rain of fire and brimstone not only were the cities and their inhabitants consumed, but even the soil, which abounded in asphalt, was set on fire, so that the entire valley was burned out and sank, or was overthrown (תִּבְרַת) i.e., utterly destroyed, and the Dead Sea took its place. ^{f48}

In addition to Sodom, which was probably the chief city of the valley of Siddim, Gomorrah and the whole valley (i.e., the valley of Siddim, Gen. 14: 3) are mentioned; and along with these the cities of Admah and Zeboim, which were situated in the valley (Deu. 29:23, cf. Hos. 11: 8), also perished, Zoar alone, which is at the south-eastern end of the valley, being spared for Lot's sake. Even to the present day the Dead Sea, with the sulphureous vapour which hangs about it, the great blocks of saltpetre and sulphur which lie on every hand, and the utter absence of the slightest trace of animal and vegetable life in its waters, are a striking testimony to this catastrophe, which is held up in both the Old and New Testaments as a fearfully solemn judgment of God for the warning of self-secure and presumptuous sinners.

Gen. 19:26. On the way, Lot's wife, notwithstanding the divine command, looked "*behind him away,*" — i.e., went behind her husband and looked backwards, probably from a longing for the house and the earthly possessions she had left with reluctance (cf. Luk. 17:31, 32), — and "*became a pillar of salt.*" We are not to suppose that she was actually turned into one, but having been killed by the fiery and sulphureous vapour with which the air was filled, and afterwards encrusted with salt, she resembled an actual statue of salt; just as even now, from the saline exhalation of the Dead Sea, objects near it are quickly covered with a crust of salt, so that the fact, to which Christ refers in Luk. 17:32, may be understood without supposing a miracle. ^{f49} — In v. 27, 28, the account closes with a remark which points back to Gen. 18:17 ff., viz., that Abraham went in the morning to the place where he had stood the day before, interceding with the Lord for Sodom, and saw how the judgment had fallen upon the entire plain, since the smoke of the country went up like the smoke of a furnace. Yet his intercession had not been in vain.

Gen. 19:29-38. For on the destruction of these cities, God had thought of Abraham, and rescued Lot. This rescue is attributed to Elohim, as being the work of the Judge of the whole earth (Gen. 18:25), and not to Jehovah the covenant God, because Lot was severed from His guidance and care on his separation from Abraham. The fact, however, is repeated here, for the purpose of connecting with it an event in the life of Lot of great significance to the future history of Abraham's seed.

Gen. 19:30 ff. From Zoar Lot removed with his two daughters to the (Moabitish) mountains, for fear that Zoar might after all be destroyed, and dwelt in one of the caves (מְעָרָה with the generic article), in which the limestone rocks abound (vid., *Lynch*), and so became a dweller in a cave. While there, his daughters resolved to procure children through their father; and to that end on two successive evenings they made him intoxicated with wine, and then lay with him in the night, one after the other, that they might conceive seed. To this accursed crime they were impelled by the desire to preserve their family, because they thought there was no man on the earth to come in unto them, i.e., to marry them, “after the manner of all the earth.” Not that they imagined the whole human race to have perished in the destruction of the valley of Siddim, but because they were afraid that no man would link himself with them, the only survivors of a country smitten by the curse of God. If it was not lust, therefore, which impelled them to this shameful deed, their conduct was worthy of Sodom, and shows quite as much as their previous betrothal to men of Sodom, that they were deeply imbued with the sinful character of that city. The words of vv. 33 and 35, “And he knew not of her lying down and of her rising up,” do not affirm that he was in an unconscious state, as the Rabbins are said by *Jerome* to have indicated by the point over בְּקוֹמָה: “*quasi incredibile et quod natura rerum non capiat, coire quempiam nescientem.*” They merely mean, that in his intoxicated state, though not entirely unconscious, yet he lay with his daughters without clearly knowing what he was doing.

Gen. 19:36 ff. But Lot’s daughters had so little feeling of shame in connection with their conduct, that they gave names to the sons they bore, which have immortalized their paternity. *Moab*, another form of מֹאָב “from the father,” as is indicated in the clause appended in the LXX: λέγουσα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου, and also rendered probable by the reiteration of the words “of our father” and “by their father” (vv. 32, 34, and 36), as well as by the analogy of the name *Ben-Ammi* = *Ammon*, Ἀμμάν λέγουσά’ ἰδὸς γένους μου (LXX). For עֲמֹן, the sprout of the nation, bears the same relation to עַם, as אֲנָן, the rush or sprout of the marsh, to אֲנָן (*Delitzsch*). — This account was neither the invention of national hatred to the Moabites and Ammonites, nor was it placed here as a brand upon those tribes. These discoveries of a criticism imbued with hostility to the Bible are overthrown by the fact, that, according to Deu. 2: 9, 19, Israel was ordered not to touch the territory of either of these tribes because of their descent from Lot; and it was their unbrotherly conduct towards Israel alone which first prevented their reception into the congregation of the Lord, Deu. 23: 4, 5. — Lot is never mentioned again. Separated both outwardly and inwardly from Abraham, he was of no further importance in

relation to the history of salvation, so that even his death is not referred to. His descendants, however, frequently came into contact with the Israelites; and the history of their descent is given here to facilitate a correct appreciation of their conduct towards Israel.

ABRAHAM'S SOJOURN AT GERAR. — GENESIS 20.

Gen. 20: 1-7. After the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Abraham removed from the grove of Mamre at Hebron to the south country, hardly from the same fear as that which led Lot from Zoar, but probably to seek for better pasture. Here he dwelt between Kadesh (Gen. 14: 7) and Shur (Gen. 16: 7), and remained for some time in *Gerar*, a place the name of which has been preserved in the deep and broad Wady *Jurf el Gerâr* (i.e., torrent of Gerar) about eight miles S.S.E. of Gaza, near to which Rowland discovered the ruins of an ancient town bearing the name of *Khirbet el Gerâr*. Here Abimelech, the Philistine king of Gerar, like Pharaoh in Egypt, took Sarah, whom Abraham had again announced to be his sister, into his harem, — not indeed because he was charmed with the beauty of the woman of 90, which was either renovated, or had not yet faded (*Kurtz*), but in all probability “to ally himself with Abraham, the rich nomad prince” (*Delitzsch*). From this danger, into which the untruthful statement of both her husband and herself had brought her, she was once more rescued by the faithfulness of the covenant God. In a dream by night God appeared to Abimelech, and threatened him with death (עֲנִי מָוֶת *en te moriturum*) on account of the woman, whom he had taken, because she was married to a husband.

Gen. 20: 4 ff. Abimelech, who had not yet come near her, because God had hindered him by illness (vv. 6 and 17), excused himself on the ground that he had done no wrong, since he had supposed Sarah to be Abraham's sister, according to both her husband's statement and her own. This plea was admitted by God, who told him that He had kept him from sinning through touching Sarah, and commanded him to restore the woman immediately to her husband, who was a prophet, that he might pray for him and save his life, and threatened him with certain death to himself and all belonging to him in case he should refuse. That Abimelech, when taking the supposed sister of Abraham into his harem, should have thought that he was acting “in innocence of heart and purity of hands,” i.e., in perfect innocence, is to be fully accounted for, from his undeveloped moral and religious standpoint, by considering the customs of that day. But that God should have admitted that he had acted “in innocence of heart,” and yet should have proceeded at once to tell him that he could only remain alive through the intercession of Abraham, that is to say, through his obtaining forgiveness of a sin that was deserving of death, is a proof that God treated him as capable of deeper moral discernment and piety.

The history itself indicates this in the very characteristic variation in the names of God. First of all (v. 3), *Elohim* (without the article, i.e., Deity generally) appears to him in a dream; but Abimelech recognises the Lord, *Adonai*, i.e., God (v. 4); whereupon the historian represents **האלהים** (*Elohim* with the article), the personal and true God, as speaking to him. The address of God, too, also shows his susceptibility of divine truth. Without further pointing out to him the wrong which he had done in simplicity of heart, in taking the sister of the stranger who had come into his land, for the purpose of increasing his own harem, since he must have been conscious of this himself, God described Abraham as a prophet, whose intercession alone could remove his guilt, to show him the way of salvation. *A prophet*: lit., the God-addressed or inspired, since the “inward speaking” (*Ein-sprache*) or inspiration of God constitutes the essence of prophecy. Abraham was **προφήτης** as the recipient of divine revelation, and was thereby placed in so confidential a relation to God, that he could intercede for sinners, and atone for sins of infirmity through his intercession.

Gen. 20: 8-15. Abimelech carried out the divine instructions. The next morning he collected his servants together and related what had occurred, at which the men were greatly alarmed. He then sent for Abraham, and complained most bitterly of his conduct, by which he had brought a great sin upon him and his kingdom.

Gen. 20:10. “*What sawest thou,*” i.e., what hadst thou in thine eye, with thine act (thy false statement)? Abimelech did this publicly in the presence of his servants, partly for his own justification in the sight of his dependents, and partly to put Abraham to shame. The latter had but two weak excuses: (1) that he supposed there was no fear of God at all in the land, and trembled for his life because of his wife; and (2) that when he left his father’s house, he had arranged with his wife that in every foreign place she was to call herself his sister, as she really was his half-sister. On the subject of his emigration, he expressed himself indefinitely and with reserve, accommodating himself to the polytheistic standpoint of the Philistine king: “*when God* (or the gods, *Elohim*) *caused me to wander,*” i.e., led me to commence an unsettled life in a foreign land; and saying nothing about Jehovah, and the object of his wandering as revealed by Him.

Gen. 20:14 ff. Abimelech then gave him back his wife with a liberal present of cattle and slaves, and gave him leave to dwell wherever he pleased in his land. To Sarah he said,

“Behold, I have given a thousand shekele of silver to thy brother; behold, it is to thee a covering of the eyes (i.e., an expiatory gift) with

regard to all that are with thee (“because in a mistress the whole family is disgraced,” *Del.*), and with all — so art thou justified.”

The thousand shekels (about £131) were not a special present made to Sarah, but indicate the value of the present made to Abraham, the amount of which may be estimated by this standard, that at a later date (Exo. 21:32) a slave was reckoned at 30 shekels. By the “covering of the eyes” we are not to understand a veil, which Sarah was to procure for 1000 shekels; but it is a figurative expression for an atoning gift, and is to be explained by the analogy of the phrase **כָּפַר פְּנֵי פִּי** “to cover any one’s face,” so that he may forget a wrong done (cf. Gen. 32:21; and Job. 9:24, “he covereth the faces of the judges,” i.e., he bribes them). **וְנוֹכַחְתָּ** can only be the 2 pers. fem. sing. perf. Niphal, although the *Dagesh lene* is wanting in the **ח**; for the rules of syntax will hardly allow us to regard this form as a participle, unless we imagine the extremely harsh ellipsis of **נוֹכַחְתָּ אֵת** for **נוֹכַחְתָּ אֵת**. The literal meaning is “so thou art judged,” i.e., justice has been done thee.

Gen. 20:17, 18. After this reparation, God healed Abimelech at Abraham’s intercession; also his wife and maids, so that they could bear again, for Jehovah had closed up every womb in Abimelech’s house on Sarah’s account. **אִמָּהוֹת**, maids whom the king kept as concubines, are to be distinguished from **שִׁפְחוֹת** female slaves (v. 14). That there was a material difference between them, is proved by 1Sa. 25:41. **עָצַר כָּל-רַחֵם** does not mean, as is frequently supposed, to prevent actual childbirth, but to prevent conception, i.e., to produce barrenness (1Sa. 1: 5, 6). This is evident from the expression “He hath restrained me from bearing” in Gen. 16: 2 (cf. Isa. 66: 9, and 1Sa. 21: 6), and from the opposite phrase, “open the womb,” so as to facilitate conception (Gen. 29:31, and Gen. 30:22). The plague brought upon Abimelech’s house, therefore, consisted of some disease which rendered the begetting of children (the *coitus*) impossible. This might have occurred as soon as Sarah was taken into the royal harem, and therefore need not presuppose any lengthened stay there. There is no necessity, therefore, to restrict **וַיֵּלְדוּ** to the women and regard it as equivalent to **וַתֵּלְדֵנָה**, which would be grammatically inadmissible; for it may refer to Abimelech also, since **יָלַד** signifies to beget as well as to bear. We may adopt *Knobel’s* explanation, therefore, though without approving of the inference that v. 18 was an appendix of the Jehovist, and arose from a misunderstanding of the word **וַיֵּלְדוּ** in v. 17. A later addition v. 18 cannot be; for the simple reason, that without the explanation give there, the previous verse would be unintelligible, so that it cannot have been wanting in any of the accounts. The name Jehovah, in contrast with *Elohim* and *Ha-Elohim* in v. 17, is obviously significant. The cure of Abimelech and his wives

belonged to the Deity (*Elohim*). Abraham directed his intercession not to *Elohim*, an indefinite and unknown God, but to **האלהים**; for the God, whose prophet he was, was the personal and true God. It was He too who had brought the disease upon Abimelech and his house, not as *Elohim* or *Ha-Elohim*, but as *Jehovah*, the God of salvation; for His design therein was to prevent the disturbance of frustration of His saving design, and the birth of the promised son from Sarah.

But if the divine names *Elohim* and *Ha-Elohim* indicate the true relation of God to Abimelech, and here also it was Jehovah who interposed for Abraham and preserved the mother of the promised seed, our narrative cannot be merely an Elohist side-piece appended to the Jehovistic account in Gen. 12:14 ff., and founded upon a fictitious legend. The thoroughly distinctive character of this event is a decisive proof of the fallacy of any such critical conjecture. Apart from the one point of agreement — the taking of Abraham's wife into the royal harem, because he said she was his sister in the hope of thereby saving his own life (an event, the repetition of which in the space of 24 years is by no means startling, when we consider the customs of the age) — all the more minute details are entirely different in the two cases. In king Abimelech we meet with a totally different character from that of Pharaoh. We see in him a heathen imbued with a moral consciousness of right, and open to receive divine revelation, of which there is not the slightest trace in the king of Egypt. And Abraham, in spite of his natural weakness, and the consequent confusion which he manifested in the presence of the pious heathen, was exalted by the compassionate grace of God to the position of His own friend, so that even the heathen king, who seems to have been in the right in this instance, was compelled to bend before him and to seek the removal of the divine punishment, which had fallen upon him and his house, through the medium of his intercession. In this way God proved to the Philistine king, on the one hand, that He suffers no harm to befall His prophets (Psa. 105:15), and to Abraham, on the other, that He can maintain His covenant and secure the realization of His promise against all opposition from the sinful desires of earthly potentates. It was in this respect that the event possessed a typical significance in relation to the future attitude of Israel towards surrounding nations.

BIRTH OF ISAAC. EXPULSION OF ISHMAEL. ABIMELECH'S TREATY WITH ABRAHAM. — GENESIS 21

Gen. 21: 1-7. BIRTH OF ISAAC. — Jehovah did for Sarah what God had promised in Gen. 17: 6 (cf. Gen. 18:14): she conceived, and at the time appointed bore a son to Abraham, when he was 100 years old. Abraham gave it the name of *Jizchak* (or Isaac), and circumcised it on the eighth day. The name

for the promised son had been selected by God, in connection with Abraham's laughing (Gen. 17:17 and 19), to indicate the nature of his birth and existence. For as his laughing sprang from the contrast between the idea and the reality; so through a miracle of grace the birth of Isaac gave effect to this contrast between the promise of God and the pledge of its fulfilment on the one hand, and the incapacity of Abraham for begetting children, and of Sarah for bearing them, on the other; and through this name, Isaac was designated as the fruit of omnipotent grace working against and above the forces of nature. Sarah also, who had previously laughed with unbelief at the divine promise (Gen. 18:12), found a reason in the now accomplished birth of the promised son for laughing with joyous amazement; so that she exclaimed, with evident allusion to his name, "*A laughing hath God prepared for me; every one who hears it will laugh to me*" (i.e., will rejoice with me, in amazement at the blessing of God which has come upon me even in my old age), and gave a fitting expression to the joy of her heart, in this inspired *tristich* (v. 7): "*Who would have said unto Abraham: Sarah is giving suck; for I have born a son to his old age.*" מַלֵּל is the poetic word for דִּבֶּר, and מַ before the perfect has the sense of — whoever has said, which we should express as a subjunctive; cf. 2Ki. 20: 9; Psa. 11: 3, etc.

Gen. 21: 8-21. EXPULSION OF ISHMAEL. — The weaning of the child, which was celebrated with a feast, furnished the outward occasion for this. Sarah saw Ishmael mocking, making ridicule on the occasion.

"Isaac, the object of holy laughter, was made the butt of unholy wit or profane sport. He did not laugh (צַחֵק), but he made fun (מִצַּחֵק). The little helpless Isaac a father of nations! Unbelief, envy, pride of carnal superiority, were the causes of his conduct. Because he did not understand the sentiment, 'Is anything too wonderful for the Lord?' it seemed to him absurd to link so great a thing to one so small" (*Hengstenberg*).

Paul calls this the persecution of him that was after the Spirit by him that was begotten after the flesh (Gal. 4:29), and discerns in this a prediction of the persecution, which the Church of those who are born after the spirit of faith endures from those who are in bondage to the righteousness of the law.

Gen. 21: 9. Sarah therefore asked that the maid and her son might be sent away, saying, the latter "shall not be heir with Isaac." The demand, which apparently proceeded from maternal jealousy, displeased Abraham greatly "*because of his son,*" — partly because in Ishmael he loved his own flesh and blood, and partly on account of the promise received for him (Gen. 17:18 and 20). But God (*Elohim*, since there is no appearance mentioned, but the divine

will was made known to him inwardly) commanded him to comply with Sarah's demand: "for in Isaac shall seed (posterity) be called to thee." This expression cannot mean "thy descendants will call themselves after Isaac," for in that case, at all events, **וְרָעָה** would be used; for "in (through) Isaac shall seed be called into existence to thee," for **קרא** does not mean to call into existence; but, "in the person of Isaac shall there be posterity to thee, which shall pass as such," for **נִקְרָא** includes existence and the recognition of existence. Though the noun is not defined by any article, the seed intended must be that to which all the promises of God referred, and with which God would establish His covenant (Gen. 17:21, cf. Rom. 9: 7, 8; Heb. 11:18). To make the dismissal of Ishmael easier to the paternal heart, God repeated to Abraham (v. 13) the promise already given him with regard to this son (Gen. 17:20).

Gen. 21:14 ff. The next morning Abraham sent Hagar away with Ishmael. The words, "he took bread and a bottle of water and gave it to Hagar, putting it (**שָׂם** participle, not perfect) upon her shoulder, and the boy, and sent her away," do not state the Abraham gave her Ishmael also to carry. For **וְאֶת־הַיֶּלֶד** does not depend upon **שָׂם** and **וַיִּתֵּן** because of the copula **ו**, but upon **וַיִּקַּח**, the leading verb of the sentence, although it is separated from it by the parenthesis "putting it upon her shoulder." It does not follow from these words, therefore, that Ishmael is represented as a little child. Nor is this implied in the statement which follows, that Hagar, when wandering about in the desert, "cast the boy under one of the shrubs," because the water in the bottle was gone. For **יָלַד** like **נָעַר** does not mean an infant, but a boy, and also a young man (Gen. 4:23); — Ishmael must have been 15 or 16 years old, as he was 14 before Isaac was born (cf. v. 5, and 16:16); — and **הִשְׁלִיךְ**, "to throw," signifies that she suddenly left hold of the boy, when he fell exhausted from thirst, just as in Mat. 15:30 **ῥίπτειν** is used for laying hastily down. Though despairing of his life, the mother took care that at least he should breathe out his life in the shade, and she sat over against him weeping, "in the distance as archers," i.e., according to a concise simile very common in Hebrew, as far off as archers are accustomed to place the target. Her maternal love could not bear to see him die, and yet she would not lose sight of him.

Gen. 21:17 ff. Then God heard the voice (the weeping and crying) of the boy, and the angel of God called to Hagar from heaven, "What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not, for God hath heard the voice of the boy, where he is" (**בְּמָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶשֶׁר** for **בְּאֶשֶׁר**, 2Sa. 15:21), i.e., in his helpless condition: "arise, lift up the lad," etc. It was Elohim, not Jehovah, who heard the voice of the boy, and appeared as the angel of Elohim, not of Jehovah (as in Gen. 16: 7),

because, when Ishmael and Hagar had been dismissed from Abraham's house, they were removed from the superintendence and care of the covenant God to the guidance and providence of God the ruler of all nations. God then opened her eyes, and she saw what she had not seen before, a well of water, from which she filled the bottle and gave her son to drink.

Gen. 21:20. Having been miraculously saved from perishing by the angel of God, Ishmael grew up under the protection of God, settled in the wilderness of Paran, and “*became as he grew up an archer.*” Although preceded by **יָנִידָל**, the **רִבֵּה** is not tautological; and there is no reason for attributing to it the meaning of “archer,” in which sense **רִבֵּה** alone occurs in the one passage Gen. 49:23.

The desert of *Paran* is the present large desert of *et-Tih*, which stretches along the southern border of Canaan, from the western fringe of the Arabah, towards the east to the desert of Shur (*Jifar*), on the frontier of Egypt, and extends southwards to the promontories of the mountains of Horeb (vid., Num. 10:12). On the northern edge of this desert was *Beersheba* (proleptically so called in v. 14), to which Abraham had removed from Gerar; so that in all probability Hagar and Ishmael were sent away from his abode there, and wandered about in the surrounding desert, till Hagar was afraid that they should perish with thirst. Lastly, in preparation for Gen. 25:12-18, it is mentioned in v. 21 that Ishmael married a wife out of Egypt.

Gen. 21:22-34. ABIMELECH'S TREATY WITH ABRAHAM. — Through the divine blessing which visibly attended Abraham, the Philistine king *Abimelech* was induced to secure for himself and his descendants the friendship of a man so blessed; and for that purpose he went to Beersheba, with his captain *Phicol*, to conclude a treaty with him. Abraham was perfectly ready to agree to this; but first of all he complained to him about a well which Abimelech's men had stolen, i.e., had unjustly appropriated to themselves. Abimelech replied that this act of violence had never been made known to him till that day, and as a matter of course commanded the well to be returned. After the settlement of this dispute the treaty was concluded, and Abraham presented the king with sheep and oxen, as a material pledge that he would reciprocate the kindness shown, and live in friendship with the king and his descendants. Out of this present he selected seven lambs and set them by themselves; and when Abimelech inquired what they were, he told him to take them from his hand, that they might be to him (Abraham) for a witness that he had digged the well. It was not to redeem the well, but to secure the well as his property against any fresh claims on the part of the Philistines, that the present was given; and by the acceptance of it, Abraham's right of possession was practically and solemnly acknowledged.

Gen. 21:31. From this circumstance, the place where it occurred received the name **בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע**, i.e., seven-well, “because there they swore both of them.” It does not follow from this note, that the writer interpreted the name “oath-well,” and took **שֶׁבַע** in the sense of **שְׁבַעָה**. The idea is rather the following: the place received its name from the seven lambs, by which Abraham secured to himself possession of the well, because the treaty was sworn to on the basis of the agreement confirmed by the seven lambs. There is no mention of sacrifice, however, in connection with the treaty (see Gen. 26:33). **נִשְׁבַע** to swear, lit., to seven one’s self, not because in the oath the divine number 3 is combined with the world-number 4, but because, from the sacredness of the number 7, the real origin and ground of which are to be sought in the number 7 of the work of creation, seven things were generally chosen to give validity to an oath, as was the case, according to *Herodotus* (3, 8), with the Arabians among others. *Beersheba* was in the *Wady es-Seba*, the broad channel of a winter-torrent, 12 hours’ journey to the south of Hebron on the road to Egypt and the Dead Sea, where there are still stones to be found, the relics of an ancient town, and two deep wells with excellent water, called *Bir es Seba*, i.e., seven-well (not lion-well, as the Bedouins erroneously interpret it): cf. *Robinson’s Pal.* i. pp. 300 ff.

Gen. 21:33. Here Abraham planted a tamarisk and called upon the name of the Lord (vid., Gen. 4:26), the everlasting God. Jehovah is called the everlasting God, as the eternally true, with respect to the eternal covenant, which He established with Abraham (Gen. 17: 7). The planting of this long-lived tree, with its hard wood, and its long, narrow, thickly clustered, evergreen leaves, was to be a type of the ever-enduring grace of the faithful covenant God.

Gen. 21:34. Abraham sojourned a long time there in the Philistines’ land. There Isaac was probably born, and grew up to be a young man (Gen. 22: 6), capable of carrying the wood for a sacrifice; cf. Gen. 22:19. The expression “in the land of the Philistines” appears to be at variance with v. 32, where Abimelech and Phicol are said to have returned to the land of the Philistines. But the discrepancy is easily reconciled, on the supposition that at that time the land of the Philistines had no fixed boundary, at all events, towards the desert. Beersheba did not belong to Gerar, the kingdom of Abimelech in the stricter sense; but the Philistines extended their wanderings so far, and claimed the district as their own, as is evident from the fact that Abimelech’s people had taken the well from Abraham. On the other hand, Abraham with his numerous flocks would not confine himself to the *Wady es Seba*, but must have sought for pasture-ground in the whole surrounding country; and as Abimelech had given him full permission to dwell in his land (Gen. 20:15), he would still, as

heretofore, frequently come as far as Gerar, so that his dwelling at Beersheba (Gen. 22:19) might be correctly described as sojourning (nomadizing) in the land of the Philistines.

OFFERING UP OF ISAAC UPON MORIAH. FAMILY OF NAHOR. — GENESIS. 22

Gen. 22: 1-19. OFFERING UP OF ISAAC. — For many years had Abraham waited to be fulfilled. At length the Lord had given him the desired heir of his body by his wife Sarah, and directed him to send away the son of the maid. And now that this son had grown into a young man, the word of God came to Abraham to offer up this very son, who had been given to him as the heir of the promise, for a burnt-offering, upon one of the mountains which should be shown him. This word did not come from his own heart, — was not a thought suggested by the sight of the human sacrifices of the Canaanites, that he would offer a similar sacrifice to his God; nor did it originate with the tempter to evil. The word came from *Ha-Elohim*, the personal, true God, who tried him (יִסָּדָה), i.e., demanded the sacrifice of the only, beloved son, as a proof and attestation of his faith. The issue shows, that God did not desire the sacrifice of Isaac by slaying and burning him upon the altar, but his complete surrender, and a willingness to offer him up to God even by death. Nevertheless the divine command was given in such a form, that Abraham could not understand it in any other way than as requiring an outward burnt-offering, because there was no other way in which Abraham could accomplish the complete surrender of Isaac, than by an actual preparation for really offering the desired sacrifice. This constituted the trial, which necessarily produced a severe internal conflict in his mind.

Ratio humana simpliciter concluderet aut mentiri promissionem aut mandatum non esse Dei sed Diaboli; est enim contradictio manifesta. Si enim debet occidi Isaac, irrita est promissio; sin rata est promissio, impossibile est hoc esse Dei mandatum (Luther).

But Abraham brought his reason into captivity to the obedience of faith. He did not question the truth of the word of God, which had been addressed to him in a mode that was to his mind perfectly infallible (not in a vision of the night, however, of which there is not a syllable in the text), but he stood firm in his faith, “accounting that god was able to raise him up, even from the dead” (Heb. 11:19). Without taking counsel with flesh and blood, Abraham started early in the morning (vv. 3, 4), with his son Isaac and two servants, to obey the divine command; and on the third day (for the distance from Beersheba to Jerusalem is about 20 1/2 hours; Rob. Pal. iii. App. 66, 67) he saw in the distance the place mentioned by God, the land of Moriah, i.e., the mountainous

country round about Jerusalem. The name **מִרְיָה**, composed of the Hophal partic. of **רָאָה** and the divine name **יה**, an abbreviation of **יְהוָה** (lit., “the shown of Jehovah,” equivalent to the manifestation of Jehovah), is no doubt used proleptically in v. 2, and given to the mountain upon which the sacrifice was to be made, with direct reference to this event and the appearance of Jehovah to Abraham there. This is confirmed by v. 14, where the name is connected with the event, and explained in the fuller expression *Jehovah-jireh*. On the ground of this passage the mountain upon which Solomon built the temple is called **הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** with reference to the appearance of the angel of the Lord to David on that mountain at the threshing-floor of Araunah (2Sa. 24:16, 17), the old name being revived by this appearance.

Gen. 22: 5. When in sight of the distant mountain, Abraham left the servants behind with the ass, that he might perform the last and hardest part of the journey alone with Isaac, and, as he said to the servants, “*worship yonder and then return.*” The servants were not to see what would take place there; for they could not understand this “worship,” and the issue even to him, notwithstanding his saying “we will come again to you,” was still involved in the deepest obscurity. This last part of the journey is circumstantially described in vv. 6-8, to show how strong a conflict every step produced in the paternal heart of the patriarch. They go both together, he with the fire and the knife in his hand, and his son with the wood for the sacrifice upon his shoulder. Isaac asks his father, where is the lamb for the burnt-offering; and the father replies, not “Thou wilt be it, my son,” but “God (Elohim without the article — God as the all-pervading supreme power) will provide it;” for he will not and cannot yet communicate the divine command to his son. *Non vult filium macerare longa cruce et tentatione* (Luther).

Gen. 22: 9, 10. Having arrived at the appointed place, Abraham built an altar, arranged the wood upon it, bound his son and laid him upon the wood of the altar, and then stretched out his hand and took the knife to slay his son.

Gen. 22:11 ff. In this eventful moment, when Isaac lay bound like a lamb upon the altar, about to receive the fatal stroke, the angel of the Lord called down from heaven to Abraham to stop, and do his son no harm. For the Lord now knew that Abraham was **יִרְאֵ אֱלֹהִים** God-fearing, and that his obedience of faith did extend even to the sacrifice of his own beloved son. The sacrifice was already accomplished in his heart, and he had fully satisfied the requirements of God. He was not to slay his son: therefore God prevented the outward fulfilment of the sacrifice by an immediate interposition, and showed him a ram, which he saw, probably being led to look round through a rustling behind him, with its horns fast in a thicket (**אָחַר** *adv.* behind, in the

background); and as an offering provided by God Himself, he sacrificed it instead of his son.

Gen. 22:14. From this interposition of God, Abraham called the place *Jehovah-jireh*, “Jehovah sees,” i.e., according to v. 8, provides, *providet*; so that (אֲשֶׁר, as in Gen. 13:16, is equivalent to עַל כֵּן, 10: 9) men are still accustomed to say, “*On the mountain where Jehovah appears*” (הַר אֲשֶׁר), from which the name *Moriah* arose. The rendering “on the mount of Jehovah it is provided” is not allowable, for the Niphal of the verb does not mean *provideri*, but “appear.” Moreover, in this case the medium of God’s seeing or interposition was His appearing.

Gen. 22:15-19. After Abraham had offered the ram, the angel of the Lord called to him a second time from heaven, and with a solemn oath renewed the former promises, as a reward for this proof of his obedience of faith (cf. Gen. 12: 2, 3). To confirm their unchangeableness, Jehovah swore by Himself (cf. Heb. 6:13 ff.), a thing which never occurs again in His intercourse with the patriarchs; so that subsequently not only do we find repeated references to this oath (Gen. 24: 7; 26: 3; 50:24; Exo. 13: 5, 11; 33: 1, etc.), but, as *Luther* observes, all that is said in Psa. 89:36; 132:11; 110: 4 respecting the oath given to David, is founded upon this. *Sicut enim promissio seminis Abrahae derivata est in semen Davidis, ita Scriptura S. jusjurandum Abrahae datum in personam Davidis transfert.* For in the promise upon which these psalms are based nothing is said about an oath (cf. 2Sa. 7; 1Ch. 17). The declaration on oath is still further confirmed by the addition of נִאֲמַר יְהוָה “*edict (Ausspruch) of Jehovah,*” which, frequently as it occurs in the prophets, is met with in the Pentateuch only in Num. 14:28, and (without Jehovah) in the oracles of Balaam, Num. 24: 3, 15, 16. As the promise was intensified in form, so was it also in substance. To express the innumerable multiplication of the seed in the strongest possible way, a comparison with the sand of the sea-shore is added to the previous simile of the stars. And this seed is also promised the possession of the gate of its enemies, i.e., the conquest of the enemy and the capture of his cities (cf. Gen. 24:60).

This glorious result of the test so victoriously stood by Abraham, not only sustains the historical character of the event itself, but shows in the clearest manner that the trial was necessary to the patriarch’s life of faith, and of fundamental importance to his position in relation to the history of salvation. The question, whether the true God could demand a human sacrifice, was settled by the fact that God Himself prevented the completion of the sacrifice; and the difficulty, that at any rate God contradicted Himself, if He first of all demanded a sacrifice and then prevented it from being offered, is met by the significant interchange of the names of God, since God, who commanded

Abraham to offer up Isaac, is called *Ha-Elohim*, whilst the actual completion of the sacrifice is prevented by “the angel of Jehovah,” who is identical with *Jehovah* Himself. The sacrifice of the heir, who had been both promised and bestowed, was demanded neither by *Jehovah*, the God of salvation or covenant God, who had given Abraham this only son as the heir of the promise, nor by *Elohim*, God as creator, who has the power to give life and take it away, but by *He-Elohim*, the true God, whom Abraham had acknowledged and adored as his personal God, and with whom he had entered into a personal relation. Coming from the true God whom Abraham served, the demand could have no other object than to purify and sanctify the feelings of the patriarch’s heart towards his son and towards his God, in accordance with the great purpose of his call. It was designed to purify his love to the son of his body from all the dross of carnal self-love and natural selfishness which might still adhere to it, and so to transform it into love to God, from whom he had received him, that he should no longer love the beloved son as his flesh and blood, but simply and solely as a gift of grace, as belonging to his God, — a trust committed to him, which he should be ready at any moment to give back to God. As he had left his country, kindred, and father’s house at the call of God (Gen. 12: 1), so was he in his walk with God cheerfully to offer up even his only son, the object of all his longing, the hope of his life, the joy of his old age. And still more than this, not only did he possess and love in Isaac the heir of his possessions (Gen. 15: 2), but it was upon him that all the promises of God rested: in Isaac should his seed be called (Gen. 21:12). By the demand that he should sacrifice to God this only son of his wife Sarah, in whom his seed was to grow into a multitude of nations (Gen. 17: 4, 6, 16), the divine promise itself seemed to be cancelled, and the fulfilment not only of the desires of his heart, but also of the repeated promises of his God, to be frustrated. And by this demand his faith was to be perfected into unconditional trust in God, into the firm assurance that God could even raise him up from the dead. — But this trial was not only one of significance to Abraham, by perfecting him, through the conquest of flesh and blood, to be the father of the faithful, the progenitor of the Church of God; Isaac also was to be prepared and sanctified by it for his vocation in connection with the history of salvation. In permitting himself to be bound and laid upon the altar without resistance, he gave up his natural life to death, to rise to a new life through the grace of God. On the altar he was sanctified to God, dedicated as the first beginning of the holy Church of God, and thus “the dedication of the first-born, which was afterwards enjoined in the law, was perfectly fulfilled in him.” If therefore the divine command exhibits in the most impressive way the earnestness of the demand of God upon His people to sacrifice all to Him, not excepting the dearest of their possessions (cf. Mat. 10:37, and Luk. 14:26); the issue of the trial teaches that the true God does not demand a literal human sacrifice from His worshippers, but the

spiritual sacrifice of an unconditional denial of the natural life, even to submission to death itself. By the sacrifice of a ram as a burnt-offering in the place of his son, under divine direction, not only was animal sacrifice substituted for human, and sanctioned as an acceptable symbol of spiritual self-sacrifice, but the offering of human sacrifices by the heathen was condemned and rejected as an ungodly *ἑθελοθησκεία*. And this was done by Jehovah, the God of salvation, who prevented the outward completion of the sacrifice. By this the event acquires prophetic importance for the Church of the Lord, to which the place of sacrifice points with peculiar clearness, viz., Mount Moriah, upon which under the legal economy all the typical sacrifices were offered to Jehovah; upon which also, in the fulness of time, God the Father gave up His only-begotten Son as an atoning sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, that by this one true sacrifice the shadows of the typical sacrifices might be rendered both real and true. If therefore the appointment of Moriah as the scene of the sacrifice of Isaac, and the offering of a ram in his stead, were primarily only typical in relation to the significance and intent of the Old Testament institution of sacrifice; this type already pointed to the antitype to appear in the future, when the eternal love of the heavenly Father would perform what it had demanded of Abraham; that is to say, when God would not spare His only Son, but give Him up to the real death, which Isaac suffered only in spirit, that we also might die with Christ spiritually, and rise with Him to everlasting life (Rom. 8:32; 6: 5, etc.).

Gen. 22:20-24. DESCENDANTS OF NAHOR. — With the sacrifice of Isaac the test of Abraham's faith was now complete, and the purpose of his divine calling answered: the history of his life, therefore, now hastens to its termination. But first of all there is introduced quite appropriately an account of the family of his brother Nahor, which is so far in place immediately after the story of the sacrifice of Isaac, that it prepares the way for the history of the marriage of the heir of the promise. The connection is pointed out in v. 20, as compared with Gen. 11:29, in the expression, "*she also*." Nahor, like Ishmael and Jacob, had twelve sons, eight by his wife Milcah and four by his concubine; whereas Jacob had his by two wives and two maids, and Ishmael apparently all by one wife. This difference with regard to the mothers proves that the agreement as to the number twelve rests upon a good historical tradition, and is no product of a later myth, which traced to Nahor the same number of tribes as to Ishmael and Jacob. For it is a perfectly groundless assertion or assumption, that Nahor's twelve sons were the fathers of as many tribes. There are only a few names, of which it is probable that their bearers were the founders of tribes of the same name. On *Uz*, see Gen. 10:23. *Buz* is mentioned in Jer. 25:23 along with Dedan and Tema as an Arabian tribe; and *Elihu* was a Buzite of the family of *Ram* (Job. 32: 2). *Kemuel*, the father of

Aram, was not the founder of the Aramaeans, but the forefather of the family of *Ram*, to which the Buzite Elihu belonged, — *Aram* being written for *Ram*, like *Arammim* in 2Ki. 8:29 for *Rammim* in 2Ch. 22: 5. *Chesed* again was not the father of the Chasdim (Chaldeans), for they were older than *Chesed*; at the most he was only the founder of one branch of the *Chasdim*, possibly those who stole Job's camels (*Knobel*; vid., Job. 1:17). Of the remaining names, *Bethuel* was not the founder of a tribe, but the father of Laban and Rebekah (Gen. 25:20). The others are never met with again, with the exception of *Maachach*, from whom probably the Maachites (Deu. 3:14; Jos. 12: 5) in the land of Maacah, a small Arabian kingdom in the time of David (2Sa. 10: 6, 8; 1Ch. 19: 6), derived their origin and name; though *Maachah* frequently occurs as the name of a person (1Ki. 2:39; 1Ch. 11:43; 27:16).

DEATH OF SARAH; AND PURCHASE OF THE CAVE AT MACHPELAH. — GENESIS 23

Gen. 23: 1, 2. Sarah is the only woman whose age is mentioned in the Scriptures, because as the mother of the promised seed she became the mother of all believers (1Pe. 3: 6). She died at the age of 127, thirty-seven years after the birth of Isaac, at Hebron, or rather in the grove of Mamre near that city (Gen. 13:18), whither Abraham had once more returned after a lengthened stay at Beersheba (Gen. 22:19). The name Kirjath Arba, i.e., the city of Arba, which Hebron bears here and also in Gen. 35:27, and other passages, and which it still bore at the time of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites (Jos. 14:15), was not the original name of the city, but was first given to it by Arba the Anakite and his family, who had not yet arrived there in the time of the patriarchs. It was probably given by them when they took possession of the city, and remained until the Israelites captured it and restored the original name. The place still exists, as a small town on the road from Jerusalem to Beersheba, in a valley surrounded by several mountains, and is called by the Arabs, with allusion to Abraham's stay there, *el Khalil*, i.e., the friend (of God), which is the title given to Abraham by the Mohammedans. The clause "*in the land of Canaan*" denotes, that not only did Sarah die in the land of promise, but Abraham as a foreigner acquired a burial-place by purchase there. "*And Abraham came*" (not from Beersheba, but from the field where he may have been with the flocks), "*to mourn for Sarah and to weep for her,*" i.e., to arrange for the customary mourning ceremony.

Gen. 23: 3-16. He then went to the Hittites, the lords and possessors of the city and its vicinity at that time, to procure from them "a possession of a burying-place." The negotiations were carried on in the most formal style, in a public assembly "of the people of the land," i.e., of natives (v. 7), in the gate of the city (v. 10). As a foreigner and sojourner, Abraham presented his request in

the most courteous manner to all the citizens (“all that went in at the gate,” vv. 10, 18; a phrase interchangeable with “all that went out at the gate,” Gen. 34:24, and those who “go out and in,” Jer. 17:19). The citizens with the greatest readiness and respect offered “the prince of God,” i.e., the man exalted by God to the rank of a prince, “the choice” (מִבְּחָרָה, i.e., the most select) of their graves for his use (v. 6). But Abraham asked them to request Ephron, who, to judge from the expression “his city” in v. 10, was then ruler of the city, to give him for a possession the cave of *Machpelah*, at the end of his field, of which he was the owner, “for full silver,” i.e., for its full worth. Ephron thereupon offered to make him a present of both field and cave. This was a turn in the affair which is still customary in the East; the design, so far as it is seriously meant at all, being either to obtain a present in return which will abundantly compensate for the value of the gift, or, what is still more frequently the case, to preclude any abatement in the price to be asked. The same design is evident in the peculiar form in which Ephron stated the price, in reply to Abraham’s repeated declaration that he was determined to buy the piece of land: “a piece of land of 400 shekels of silver, what is that between me and thee” (v. 15)? Abraham understood it so (שָׁמַע v. 16), and weighed him the price demanded. The shekel of silver “current with the merchant,” i.e., the shekel which passed in trade as of standard weight, was 274 Parisian grains, so that the price of the piece of land was £52, 10s.; a very considerable amount for that time.

Gen. 23:17-20. “*Thus arose (אָרָא) the field...to Abraham for a possession;*” i.e., it was conveyed to him in all due legal form. The expression “the field of Ephron which is at Machpelah” may be explained, according to v. 9, from the fact that the cave of Machpelah was at the end of the field, the field, therefore, belonged to it. In v. 19 the shorter form, “cave of Machpelah,” occurs; and in v. 20 the field is distinguished from the cave. The name *Machpelah* is translated by the LXX as a common noun, τὸ σπήλαιον τὸ διπλοῦν, from מַכְפֵּלָה doubling; but it had evidently grown into a proper name, since it is used not only of the cave, but of the adjoining field also (Gen. 49:30; 50:13), though it undoubtedly originated in the form of the cave. The cave was before, i.e., probably to the east of, the grove of Mamre, which was in the district of Hebron. This description cannot be reconciled with the tradition, which identifies Mamre and the cave with *Ramet el Khalil*, where the strong foundation-walls of an ancient heathen temple (according to Rosenmüller’s conjecture, an Idumaeen one) are still pointed out as Abraham’s house, and where a very old terebinth stood in the early Christian times; for this is an hour’s journey to the north of modern Hebron, and even the ancient Hebron cannot have stretched so far over the mountains which separate the modern city from *Rameh*, but must also, according to Gen. 37:14, have been

situated in the valley (see Robinson's later Biblical Researches, pp. 365 ff.). There is far greater probability in the Mohammedan tradition, that the Harem, built of colossal blocks with grooved edges, which stands on the western slope of the *Beabireh* mountain, in the north-western portion of the present town, contains hidden within it the cave of Machpelah with the tomb of the patriarchs (cf. *Robinson*, Pal. ii. 435 ff.); and *Rosen.* is induced to look for Mamre on the eastern slope of the *Rumeidi* hill, near to the remarkable well *Ain el Jedid*.

Gen. 23:20. The repetition of the statement, that the field with the cave in it was conveyed to Abraham by the Hittites for a burial-place, which gives the result of the negotiation that has been described with, so to speak, legal accuracy, shows the great importance of the event to the patriarch. The fact that Abraham purchased a burying-place in strictly legal form as an hereditary possession in the promised land, was a proof of his strong faith in the promises of God and their eventual fulfilment. In this grave Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, were buried; there Jacob buried Leah; and there Jacob himself requested that he might be buried, thus declaring his faith in the promises, even in the hour of his death.

ISAAC'S MARRIAGE. — GENESIS 24

Gen. 24: 1-9. After the death of Sarah, Abraham had still to arrange for the marriage of Isaac. He was induced to provide for this in a mode in harmony with the promise of God, quite as much by his increasing age as by the blessing of God in everything, which necessarily instilled the wish to transmit that blessing to a distant posterity. He entrusted this commission to his servant, "the eldest of his house," — i.e., his upper servant, who had the management of all his house (according to general opinion, to Eliezer, whom he had previously thought of as the heir of his property, but who would now, like Abraham, be extremely old, as more than sixty years had passed since the occurrence related in Gen. 15: 2), — and made him swear that he would not take a wife for his son from the daughters of the Canaanites, but would fetch one from his (Abraham's) native country, and his kindred. Abraham made the servant take an oath in order that his wishes might be inviolably fulfilled, even if he himself should die in the interim. In swearing, the servant put his hand under Abraham's hip. This custom, which is only mentioned here and in Gen. 47:29, the so-called bodily oath, was no doubt connected with the significance of the hip as the part from which the posterity issued (Gen. 46:26), and the seat of vital power; but the early Jewish commentators supposed it to be especially connected with the rite of circumcision. The oath was by "*Jehovah*, God of heaven and earth," as the God who rules in heaven and on earth, not by *Elohim*; for it had respect not to an ordinary oath, but to a

question of great importance in relation to the kingdom of God. "Isaac was not regarded as a merely pious candidate for matrimony, but as the heir of the promise, who must therefore be kept from any alliance with the race whose possessions were to come to his descendants, and which was ripening for the judgment to be executed by those descendants" (*Hengstenberg*, Dissertations i. 350). For this reason the rest of the negotiation was all conducted in the name of Jehovah.

Gen. 24: 5 ff. Before taking the oath, the servant asks whether, in case no woman of their kindred would follow him to Canaan, Isaac was to be conducted to the land of his fathers. But Abraham rejected the proposal, because Jehovah took him from his father's house, and had promised him the land of Canaan for a possession. He also discharged the servant, if that should be the case, from the oath which he had taken, in the assurance that the Lord through His angel would bring a wife to his son from thence.

Gen. 24:10-28. The servant then went, with ten camels and things of every description belonging to his master, into Mesopotamia to the city of Nahor, i.e., Haran, where Nahor dwelt (*Gen. 11:31, and 12: 4*). On his arrival there, he made the camels kneel down, or rest, without the city by the well, "*at the time of evening, the time at which the women come out to draw water,*" and at which, now as then, women and girls are in the habit of fetching the water required for the house (vid., *Robinson's Palestine* ii. 368 ff.). He then prayed to Jehovah, the God of Abraham, "*Let there come to meet me to-day,*" sc., the person desired, the object of my mission. He then fixed upon a sign connected with the custom of the country, by the occurrence of which he might decide upon the maiden (הַנְּעִרָה *puella*, used in the Pentateuch for both sexes, except in *Deu. 22:19*, where נְעִרָה occurs) whom Jehovah had indicated as the wife appointed for His servant Isaac. הוֹכִיחַ (v. 14) to set right, then to point out as right; not merely to appoint. He had scarcely ended his prayer when his request was granted. Rebekah did just what he had fixed upon as a token, not only giving him to drink, but offering to water his camels, and with youthful vivacity carrying out her promise. *Niebuhr* met with similar kindness in those regions (see also *Robinson*, *Pal.* ii. 351, etc.). The servant did not give himself blindly up to first impressions, however, but tested the circumstances.

Gen. 24:21. "The man, wondering at her, stood silent, to know whether Jehovah had made his journey prosperous or not." מִשְׁתַּשָּׂא, from שָׂא to be desert, inwardly laid waste, i.e., confused. Others derive it from שָׂא = שָׂעָה to see; but in the *Hithpael* this verb signifies to look restlessly about, which is not applicable here.

Gen. 24:22 ff. After the watering of the camels was over, the man took a golden nose-ring of the weight of a beka, i.e., half a shekel (Exo. 38:26), and two golden armlets of 10 shekels weight, and (as we find from vv. 30 and 47) placed these ornaments upon her, not as a bridal gift, but in return for her kindness. He then asked her about her family, and whether there was room in her father's house for him and his attendants to pass the night there; and it was not till after Rebekah had told him that she was the daughter of Bethuel, the nephew of Abraham, and had given a most cheerful assent to his second question, that he felt sure that this was the wife appointed by Jehovah for Isaac. He then fell down and thanked Jehovah for His grace and truth, whilst Rebekah in the meantime had hastened home to relate all that had occurred to "*her mother's house*," i.e., to the female portion of her family. דִּקְדָּה the condescending love, אֱמֶת the truth which God had displayed in the fulfilment of His promise, and here especially manifested to him in bringing him to the home of his master's relations.

Gen. 24:29-54. As soon as Laban her brother had seen the splendid presents and heard her account, he hurried out to the stranger at the well, to bring him to the house with his attendants and animals, and to show to him the customary hospitality of the East. The fact that Laban addressed him as the blessed of Jehovah (v. 31), may be explained from the words of the servant, who had called his master's God Jehovah. The servant discharged his commission before he partook of the food set before him (the Kethibh אֲשֶׁר in v. 33 is the imperf. Kal of אָשֶׁר = אֲשֶׁר); and commencing with his master's possessions and family affairs, he described with the greatest minuteness his search for a wife, and the success which he had thus far met with, and then (in v. 49) pressed his suit thus: "*And now, if he will show kindness and truth to my lord, tell me; and if not, tell me; that I may turn to the right hand or to the left*," sc., to seek in other families a wife for Isaac.

Gen. 24:50. Laban and Bethuel recognised in this the guidance of God, and said, "*From Jehovah (the God of Abraham) the thing proceedeth; we cannot speak unto thee bad or good*," i.e., cannot add a word, cannot alter anything (Num. 24:13; 2Sa. 13:22). That Rebekah's brother Laban should have taken part with her father in deciding, was in accordance with the usual custom (cf. 34: 5, 11, 25, Jud. 21:22, 2Sa. 13:22), which may have arisen from the prevalence of polygamy, and the readiness of the father to neglect the children (daughters) of the wife he cared for least.

Gen. 24:52. After receiving their assent, the servant first of all offered thanks to Jehovah with the deepest reverence; he then gave the remaining presents to

the bride, and to her relations (brother and mother); and after everything was finished, partook of the food provided.

Gen. 24:54-60. The next morning he desired at once to set off on the journey home; but her brother and mother wished to keep her with them עָשׂוֹר יָמִים אֹ, “some days, or rather ten;” but when she was consulted, she decided to so, sc., without delay. “Then they sent away Rebekah their sister (Laban being chiefly considered, as the leading person in the affair) and her nurse” (Deborah; Gen. 35: 8), with the parting wish that she might become the mother of an exceedingly numerous and victorious posterity. “Become thousands of myriads” is a hyperbolic expression for an innumerable host of children. The second portion of the blessing (v. 60b) is almost *verbatim* the same as Gen. 22:17, but is hardly borrowed thence, as the thought does not contain anything specifically connected with the history of salvation.

Gen. 24:61-67. When the caravan arrived in Canaan with Rebekah and her maidens, Isaac had just come from going to the well Lahai-Roi (Gen. 16:14), as he was then living in the south country; and he went towards evening עָרַב לַפְּנוֹת, at the turning, coming on, of the evening, Deu. 23:12) to the field “to meditate.” It is impossible to determine whether Isaac had been to the well of Hagar which called to mind the omnipresence of God, and there, in accordance with his contemplative character, had laid the question of his marriage before the Lord (*Delitzsch*), or whether he had merely travelled thither to look after his flocks and herds (*Knobel*). But the object of his going to the field to meditate, was undoubtedly to lay the question of his marriage before God in solitude. שָׁוָה, *meditari*, is rendered “to pray” in the *Chaldee*, and by *Luther* and others, with substantial correctness. The caravan arrived at the time; and Rebekah, as soon as she saw the man in the field coming to meet them, sprang נָפְלָה signifying a hasty descent, 2Ki. 5:21) from the camel to receive him, according to Oriental custom, in the most respectful manner. She then inquired the name of the man; and as soon as she heard that it was Isaac, she enveloped herself in her veil, as became a bride when meeting the bridegroom. צִעִיר, θέριον, the cloak-like veil of Arabia (see my *Archäologie*, § 103, 5). The servant then related to Isaac the result of his journey; and Isaac conducted the maiden, who had been brought to him by God, into the tent of Sarah his mother, and she became his wife, and he loved her, and was consoled after his mother, i.e., for his mother’s death. הָאֵלֶּה, with ה local, in the construct state, as in Gen. 20: 1; 28: 2, etc.; and in addition to that, with the article prefixed (cf. *Ges. Gram.* § 110, 2bc).

ABRAHAM'S MARRIAGE TO KETURAH — HIS DEATH AND BURIAL. — GENESIS 25

Gen. 25: 1-4. Abraham's Marriage to Keturah is generally supposed to have taken place after Sarah's death, and his power to beget six sons at so advanced an age is attributed to the fact, that the Almighty had endowed him with new vital and reproductive energy for begetting the son of the promise. But there is no firm ground for this assumption; as it is not stated anywhere, that Abraham did not take Keturah as his wife till after Sarah's death. It is merely an inference drawn from the fact, that it is not mentioned till afterwards; and it is taken for granted that the history is written in strictly chronological order. But this supposition is precarious, and is not in harmony with the statement, that Abraham sent away the sons of the concubines with gifts during his own lifetime; for in the case supposed, the youngest of Keturah's sons would not have been more than twenty-five or thirty years old at Abraham's death; and in those days, when marriages were not generally contracted before the fortieth year, this seems too young for them to have been sent away from their father's house. This difficulty, however, is not decisive. Nor does the fact that Keturah is called a concubine in v. 6, and 1Ch. 1:32, necessarily show that she was contemporary with Sarah, but may be explained on the ground that Abraham did not place her on the same footing as Sarah, his sole wife, the mother of the promised seed. Of the sons and grandsons of Keturah, who are mentioned in 1Ch. 1:32 as well as here, a few of the names may still be found among the Arabian tribes, but in most instances the attempt to trace them is very questionable. This remark applies to the identification of *Zimran* with *Ζαβράμ* (Ptol. vi. 7, 5), the royal city of the *Κιναιδοκολπιται* to the west of Mecca, on the Red Sea; of *Jokshan* with the *Κασσανιται*, on the Red Sea (Ptol. vi. 7, 6), or with the Himyaritish tribe of *Jakish* in Southern Arabia; of *Ishbak* with the name *Shobek*, a place in the Edomitish country first mentioned by *Abulfeda*; of *Shuah* with the tribe *Syayhe* to the east of Aila, or with *Szyhhan* in Northern Edom (*Burckhardt*, Syr. 692, 693, and 945), although the epithet the Shuhite, applied to Bildad, points to a place in Northern Idumaea. There is more plausibility in the comparison of *Medan* and *Midian* with *Μοδιάνα* on the eastern coast of the Elanitic Gulf, and *Μαδιάνα*, a tract to the north of this (Ptol. vi. 7, 2, 27; called by Arabian geographers *Madyan*, a city five days' journey to the south of Aila). The relationship of these two tribes will explain the fact, that the *Midianim*, Gen. 37:28, are called *Medanim* in v. 36.

Gen. 25: 3. Of the sons of Jokshan, *Sheba* was probably connected with the Sabaeans, who are associated in Job. 6:19 with *Tema*, are mentioned in Job. 1:15 as having stolen Job's oxen and asses, and, according to *Strabo* (xvi. 779), were neighbours of the Nabataeans in the vicinity of Syria. *Dedan* was probably the trading people mentioned in Jer. 25:23 along with *Tema* and *Bus*

(Isa. 21:13; Jer. 49: 8), in the neighbourhood of Edom (Eze. 24:15), with whom the tribe of *Banu Dudan*, in Hejas, has been compared. On their relation to the Cushites of the same name, vid., Gen. 10: 7 and 28, — Of the sons of Dedan, the *Asshurim* have been associated with the warlike tribe of the *Asir* to the south of Hejas, the *Letushim* with the *Banu Leits* in Hejas, and the *Leummim* with the tribe of the *Banu Lâm*, which extended even to Babylon and Mesopotamia. Of the descendants of Midian, *Ephah* is mentioned in Isa. 60: 6, in connection with Midian, as a people trading in gold and incense. *Epher* has been compared with the *Banu Gifar* in Hejas; *Hanoch*, with the place called *Hanakeye*, three days' journey to the north of Medinah; *Abidah* and *El-daah*, with the tribes of *Abide* and *Vadaa* in the neighbourhood of Asir. But all this is very uncertain.

Gen. 25: 5-11. Before his death, Abraham made a final disposition of his property. Isaac, the only son of his marriage with Sarah, received all his possessions. The sons of the concubines (Hagar and Keturah) were sent away with presents from their father's house into the east country, i.e., Arabia in the widest sense, to the east and south-east of Palestine.

Gen. 25: 7, 8. Abraham died at the good old age of 175, and was “gathered to his people.” This expression, which is synonymous with “going to his fathers” (Gen. 15:15), or “being gathered to his fathers” (Jud. 2:10), but is constantly distinguished from departing this life and being buried, denotes the reunion in Sheol with friends who have gone before, and therefore presupposes faith in the personal continuance of a man after death, as a presentiment which the promises of God had exalted in the case of the patriarchs into a firm assurance of faith (Heb. 11:13).

Gen. 25: 9, 10. The burial of the patriarch in the cave of Machpelah was attended to by Isaac and Ishmael; since the latter, although excluded from the blessings of the covenant, was acknowledged by God as the son of Abraham by a distinct blessing (Gen. 17:20), and was thus elevated above the sons of Keturah.

Gen. 25:11. After Abraham's death the blessing was transferred to Isaac, who took up his abode by Hagar's well, because he had already been there, and had dwelt in the south country (Gen. 24:62). The blessing of Isaac is traced to *Elohim*, not to Jehovah; because it referred neither exclusively nor pre-eminently to the gifts of grace connected with the promises of salvation, but quite generally to the inheritance of earthly possessions, which Isaac had received from his father.

VII. History of Ishmael

GEN. 25:12-18

(COMPARE 1CH. 1:28-31)

Gen. 25:12-18. To show that the promises of God, which had been made to Ishmael (Gen. 16:10 ff. and 17:20), were fulfilled, a short account is given of his descendants; and according to the settled plan of Genesis, this account precedes the history of Isaac. This is evidently the intention of the list which follows of the twelve sons of Ishmael, who are given as princes of the tribes which sprang from them. *Nebajoth* and *Kedar* are mentioned in Isa. 60: 7 as rich possessors of flocks, and, according to the current opinion which *Wetzstein* disputes, are the *Nabataei et Cedrei* of *Pliny* (h. n. 5, 12). The *Nabataeans* held possession of *Arabia Petraea*, with *Petra* as their capital, and subsequently extended toward the south and north-east, probably as far as Babylon; so that the name was afterwards transferred to all the tribes to the east of the Jordan, and in the Nabataean writings became a common name for Chaldeans (ancient Babylonians), Syrians, Canaanites, and others. The *Kedarenes* are mentioned in Isa. 21:17 as good bowmen. They dwelt in the desert between Arabia Petraea and Babylon (Isa. 42:11; Psa. 120: 5). According to *Wetzstein*, they are to be found in the nomad tribes of Arabia Petraea up to *Harra*. The name *Dumah*, Δούμηθα Δουμαίθα (Ptol. v. 19, 7, *Steph. Byz.*), *Domata* (Plin. 6, 32), has been retained in the modern *Dumat el Jendel* in Nejd, the Arabian highland, four days' journey to the north of Taima. — *Tema*: a trading people (Job. 6:19; Isa. 21:14; mentioned in Jer. 24:23, between Dedan and Bus) in the land of *Taima*, on the border of Nejd and the Syrian desert. According to *Wetzstein*, *Dûma* and *Têma* are still two important places in Eastern Hauran, three-quarters of an hour apart. *Jetur* and *Naphish* were neighbours of the tribes of Israel to the east of the Jordan (1Ch. 5:19), who made war upon them along with the Hagrites, the Ἀγρᾶῖοι of Ptol. and Strabo. From *Jetur* sprang the *Ituraeans*, who lived, according to *Strabo*, near the Trachonians in an almost inaccessible, mountainous, and cavernous country; according to *Wetzstein*, in the mountains of the Druses in the centre of the Hauran, possibly the forefathers of the modern Druses. The other names are not yet satisfactorily determined. For *Adbeel*, *Mibsam*, and *Kedma*, the Arabian legends give no corresponding names. *Mishma* is associated by *Knobel* with the Μαῖσαιμανεῖς of Ptol. vi. 7, 21, to the N.E. of Medina; *Massa* with the Μασσανοί on the N.E. of Duma; *Hadad* (the proper reading for *Hadar*, according to 1Ch. 1:30, the LXX, Sam., Masor., and most MSS) with the Arabian coast land, *Chathth*, between Oman and Bahrein, a district renowned for its lancers (Ἀττηνία, *Polyb.*; *Attene*, *Plin.*). — V. 16. These are the Ishmaelites “in their villages and encampments, twelve princes according to

their tribes.” חָצֵר: premises hedged round, then a village without a wall in contrast with a walled town (Lev. 25:31). מַחֲנֶה: a circular encampment of tents, the tent village of the *Duâr* of the Bedouins. אֲמֹת, here and Num. 25:15, is not used of nations, but of the tribe-divisions or single tribes of the Ishmaelites and Midianites, for which the word had apparently become a technical term among them. — Vv. 17, 18. Ishmael died at the age of 137, and his descendants dwelt in Havilah — i.e., according to Gen. 10:29, the country of the *Chaulotaeans*, on the borders of Arabia Petraea and Felix — as far as *Shur* (the desert of *Jifar*, 16: 7) to the east of Egypt, “in the direction of Assyria.” Havilah and Shur therefore formed the south-eastern and south-western boundaries of the territories of the Ishmaelites, from which they extended their nomadic excursions towards the N.E. as far as the districts under Assyrian rule, i.e., to the lands of the Euphrates, traversing the whole of the desert of Arabia, or (as *Josephus* says, *Ant.* i. 12, 4) dwelling from the Euphrates to the Red Sea. Thus, according to the announcement of the angel, Ishmael “encamped in the presence of all his brethren.” נָפַל, to throw one’s self, to settle down, with the subordinate idea of keeping by force the place you have taken (Jud. 7:12). *Luther* wavers between *corruit*, *vel cecidit*, *vel fixit tabernaculum*.

VIII. History of Isaac

GEN. 25:19-35:29

ISAAC’S TWIN SONS. — GEN. 25:19-34

Gen. 25:19-34. According to the plan of Genesis, the history (*tholedoth*) of Isaac commences with the birth of his sons. But to give it the character of completeness in itself, Isaac’s birth and marriage are mentioned again in vv. 19, 20, as well as his age at the time of his marriage. The name given to the country of Rebekah (v. 20) and the abode of Laban in Gen. 28: 2, 6, 7; 31:18; 33:18; 35: 9, 26; 46:15, viz., *Padan-Aram*, or more concisely *Padan* (Gen. 48: 7), “the flat, or flat land of Aram,” for which Hosea uses “the field of Aram” (Hos. 12:12), is not a peculiar expression employed by the Elohist, or in the so-called foundation-work, for *Aram Naharaim*, Mesopotamia (Gen. 24:10), but a more exact description of one particular district of Mesopotamia, viz., of the large plain, surrounded by mountains, in which the town of *Haran* was situated. The name was apparently transferred to the town itself afterwards. The history of Isaac consists of two stages:

(1) the period of his active life, from his marriage and the birth of his sons till the departure of Jacob for Mesopotamia (Gen. 25:20-28: 9); and

(2) the time of his suffering endurance in the growing infirmity of age, when the events of Jacob's life form the leading feature of the still further expanded history of salvation (Gen. 28:10-35:29). This suffering condition, which lasted more than 40 years, reflected in a certain way the historical position which Isaac held in the patriarchal triad, as a passive rather than active link between Abraham and Jacob; and even in the active period of his life many of the events of Abraham's history were repeated in a modified form.

The name *Jehovah* prevails in the historical development of the *tholedoth* of Isaac, in the same manner as in that of Terah; although, on closer examination of the two, we find, *first*, that in this portion of Genesis the references to God are less frequent than in the earlier one; and *secondly*, that instead of the name *Jehovah* occurring more frequently than *Elohim*, the name *Elohim* predominates in this second stage of the history. The first difference arises from the fact, that the historical matter furnishes less occasion for the introduction of the name of God, just because the revelations of God are more rare, since the appearances of Jehovah to Isaac and Jacob together are not so numerous as those to Abraham alone. The second may be explained partly from the fact, that Isaac and Jacob did not perpetually stand in such close and living faith in Jehovah as Abraham, and partly also from the fact, that the previous revelations of God gave rise to other titles for the covenant God, such as "God of Abraham," "God of my father," etc., which could be used in the place of the name *Jehovah* (cf. Gen. 26:24; 31: 5, 42; 35: 1, 3, and the remarks on Gen. 35: 9).

Gen. 25:21-26. Isaac's marriage, like Abraham's, was for a long time unfruitful; not to extreme old age, however, but only for 20 years. The seed of the promise was to be prayed for from the Lord, that it might not be regarded merely as a fruit of nature, but be received and recognised as a gift of grace. At the same time Isaac was to be exercised in the patience of faith in the promise of God. After this lengthened test, Jehovah heard his prayer in relation to his wife. לַנְּכַחָהּ, v. 21 and Gen. 30:38, lit., opposite to, so that the object is before the eyes, has been well explained by *Luther* thus: *quod toto pectore et intentus in calamitatem uxoris oraverit. Sicut quando oro pro aliquo, propono illum mihi in conspectum cordis mei, et nihil aliud video aut cogito; in eum solum animo intueor.*

Gen. 25:22, 23. When Rebekah conceived, the children struggled together in her womb. In this she saw an evil omen, that the pregnancy so long desired and entreated of Jehovah would bring misfortune, and that the fruit of her womb might not after all secure the blessing of the divine promise; so that in intense excitement she cried out, "If it be so, wherefore am I?" i.e., why am I alive? cf. Gen. 27:46. But she sought counsel from God: she went to inquire of Jehovah.

Where and how she looked for a divine revelation in the matter, is not recorded, and therefore cannot be determined with certainty. Some suppose that it was by prayer and sacrifice at a place dedicated to Jehovah. Others imagine that she applied to a prophet — to Abraham, Melchizedek, or Shem (*Luther*); a frequent custom in Israel afterwards (1Sa. 9: 9), but not probable in the patriarchal age. The divine answer, couched in the form of a prophetic oracle, assured her that she carried two nations in her womb, one stronger than the other; and that the greater (elder or first-born) should serve the less (younger). מִמֵּעֵד הַפֶּרֶד: “*proceeding from thy womb, are separated.*”

Gen. 25:24 ff. When she was delivered, there were twins; the first-born was reddish, i.e., of a reddish-brown colour (1Sa. 16:12; 17:42), and “all over like a hairy cloak,” i.e., his whole body as if covered with a fur, with an unusual quantity of hair (*hypertrichosis*), which is sometimes the case with new-born infants, but was a sign in this instance of excessive sensual vigour and wildness. The second had laid hold of the heel of the first, i.e., he came into the world with his hand projected and holding the heel of the first-born, a sign of his future attitude towards his brother. From these accidental circumstances the children received their names. The elder they called *Esau*, the hairy one; the younger *Jacob*, heel-holder: יַעֲקֹב from עָקַב (*denom.* of עָקַב heel, Hos. 12: 3), to hold the heel, then to outwit (Gen. 27:36), just as in wrestling an attempt may be made to throw the opponent by grasping the heel.

Gen. 25:27-34. Esau became “*a cunning hunter, a man of the field,*” i.e., a man wandering about in the fields. He was his father’s favourite, for “*venison was in his mouth,*” i.e., he was fond of it. But Jacob was אִישׁ תָּם, “a pious man” (*Luther*); תָּם, *integer*, denotes here a disposition that finds pleasure in the quiet life of home. יָשַׁב אֹהֲלִים, not dwelling in tents, but sitting in the tents, in contrast with the wild hunter’s life led by his brother; hence he was his mother’s favourite.

Gen. 25:29 ff. The difference in the characters of the two brothers was soon shown in a singular circumstance, which was the turning-point in their lives. Esau returned home one day from the field quite exhausted, and seeing Jacob with a dish of lentils, still a favourite dish in Syria and Egypt, he asked with passionate eagerness for some to eat: “*Let me swallow some of that red, that red there;*” אֶדָם, the brown-red lentil pottage. From this he received the name *Edom*, just as among the ancient Arabians persons received names from quite accidental circumstances, which entirely obscured their proper names. Jacob made use of his brother’s hunger to get him to sell his birthright. The birthright consisted afterwards in a double portion of the father’s inheritance (Deu. 21:17); but with the patriarchs it embraced the chieftainship, the rule

over the brethren and the entire family (Gen. 27:29), and the title to the blessing of the promise (Gen. 27: 4, 27-29), which included the future possession of Canaan and of covenant fellowship with Jehovah (Gen. 28: 4). Jacob knew this, and it led him to anticipate the purposes of God. Esau also knew it, but attached no value to it. There is proof enough that he knew he was giving away, along with the birthright, blessings which, because they were not of a material but of a spiritual nature, had no particular value in his estimation, in the words he made use of: "*Behold I am going to die (to meet death), and what is the birthright to me?*" The only thing of value to him was the sensual enjoyment of the present; the spiritual blessings of the future his carnal mind was unable to estimate. In this he showed himself to be βέβηλος (Heb. 12:16), a profane man, who cared for nothing but the momentary gratification of sensual desires, who "*did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way, and so despised his birthright*" (v. 34). With these words the Scriptures judge and condemn the conduct of Esau. Just as Ishmael was excluded from the promised blessing because he was begotten "according to the flesh," so Esau lost it because his disposition was according to the flesh. The frivolity with which he sold his birthright to his brother for a dish of lentils, rendered him unfit to be the heir and possessor of the promised grace. But this did not justify Jacob's conduct in the matter. Though not condemned here, yet in the further course of the history it is shown to have been wrong, by the simple fact that he did not venture to make this transaction the basis of a claim.

ISAAC'S JOYS AND SORROWS. — GENESIS 26

Genesis 26. The incidents of Isaac's life which are collected together in this chapter, from the time of his sojourn in the south country, resemble in many respects certain events in the life of Abraham; but the distinctive peculiarities are such as to form a true picture of the dealings of God, which were in perfect accordance with the character of the patriarch.

Gen. 26: 1-5. RENEWAL OF THE PROMISE. — A famine "*in the land*" (i.e., Canaan, to which he had therefore returned from Hagar's well; Gen. 25:11), compelled Isaac to leave Canaan, as it had done Abraham before. Abraham went to Egypt, where his wife was exposed to danger, from which she could only be rescued by the direct interposition of God. Isaac also intended to go there, but on the way, viz., in Gerar, he received instruction through a divine manifestation that he was to remain there. As he was the seed to whom the land of Canaan was promised, he was directed not to leave it. To this end Jehovah assured him of the fulfilment of all the promises made to Abraham on oath, with express reference to His oath (Gen. 22:16) to him and to his posterity, and on account of Abraham's obedience of faith. The only peculiarity in the words is the plural, "*all these lands.*" This plural refers to all

the lands or territories of the different Canaanitish tribes, mentioned in Gen. 15:19-21, like the different divisions of the kingdom of Israel or Judah in 1Ch. 13: 2, 2Ch. 11:23. **הַיֵּאֵל**; an antique form of **הַאֱלֹהִים** occurring only in the Pentateuch. The piety of Abraham is described in words that indicate a perfect obedience to all the commands of God, and therefore frequently recur among the legal expressions of a later date. **שָׁמַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת יְהוָה** “to take care of Jehovah’s care,” i.e., to observe Jehovah, His persons, and His will, *Mishmereth*, reverence, observance, care, is more closely defined by “*commandments, statutes, laws*,” to denote constant obedience to all the revelations and instructions of God.

Gen. 26: 6-11. PROTECTION OF REBEKAH AT GERAR. — As Abraham had declared his wife to be his sister both in Egypt and at Gerar, so did Isaac also in the latter place. But the manner in which God protected Rebekah was very different from that in which Sarah was preserved in both instances. Before any one had touched Rebekah, the Philistine king discovered the untruthfulness of Isaac’s statement, having seen Isaac “sporting with Rebekah,” sc., in a manner to show that she was his wife; whereupon he reprov’d Isaac for what he had said, and forbade any of his people to touch Rebekah on pain of death. Whether this was the same Abimelech as the one mentioned in Genesis 20 cannot be decided with certainty. The name proves nothing, for it was the standing official name of the kings of Gerar (cf. 1Sa. 21:11 and Psalm 34), as Pharaoh was of the kings of Egypt. The identity is favoured by the pious conduct of Abimelech in both instances; and no difficulty is caused either by the circumstance that 80 years had elapsed between the two events (for Abraham had only been dead five years, and the age of 150 was no rarity then), or by the fact, that whereas the first Abimelech had Sarah taken into his harem, the second not only had no intention of doing this, but was anxious to protect her from his people, inasmuch as it would be all the easier to conceive of this in the case of the same king, on the ground of his advanced age.

Gen. 26:12-17. ISAAC’S INCREASING WEALTH. — As Isaac had experienced the promised protection (“I will be with thee,” v. 3) in the safety of his wife, so did he received while in Gerar the promised blessing. He sowed and received in that year “*a hundred measures*,” i.e., a hundred-fold return. This was an unusual blessing, as the yield even in very fertile regions is not generally greater than from twenty-five to fifty-fold (*Niebuhr* and *Burckhardt*), and it is only in the *Ruhbe*, that small and most fruitful plain of Syria, that wheat yields on an average eighty, and barley a hundred-fold. Agriculture is still practised by the Bedouins, as well as grazing (*Robinson*, Pal. i. 77, and *Seetzen*); so that Isaac’s sowing was no proof that he had been stimulated by the promise of Jehovah to take up a settled abode in the promised land.

Gen. 26:13 ff. Being thus blessed of Jehovah, Isaac became increasingly (יָלַן, vid., Gen. 8: 3) greater (i.e., stronger), until he was very powerful and his wealth very great; so that the Philistines envied him, and endeavoured to do him injury by stopping up and filling with rubbish all the wells that had been dug in his father's time; and even Abimelech requested him to depart, because he was afraid of his power. Isaac then encamped in the valley of Gerar, i.e., in the "undulating land of Gerar," through which the torrent (*Jurf*) from Gerar flows from the south-east (*Ritter*, *Erdk.* 14, pp. 1084-5).

Gen. 26:18-22. REOPENING AND DISCOVERY OF WELLS. — In this valley Isaac dug open the old wells which had existed from Abraham's time, and gave them the old names. His people also dug three new wells. But Abimelech's people raised a contest about two of these; and for this reason Isaac called them *Esek* and *Sitnah*, strife and opposition. The third there was no dispute about; and it received in consequence the name *Rehoboth*, "breadths," for Isaac said, "Yea now (כִּי־עָתָה) as in Gen. 29:32, etc.) *Jehovah has provided for us a broad space, that we may be fruitful (multiply) in the land.*" This well was probably not in the land of Gerar, as Isaac had removed thence, but in the Wady *Ruhaibeh*, the name of which is suggestive of Rehoboth, which stands at the point where the two roads from Gaza and Hebron meet, about 3 hours to the south of *Elusa*, 8 1/3 to the south of Beersheba, and where there are extensive ruins of the city of the same name upon the heights, also the remains of wells (*Robinson*, *Pal.* i. 289 ff.; *Strauss*, *Sinai and Golgotha*); where too the name *Sitnah* seems to have been retained in the Wady *Shutein*, with ruins on the northern hills between *Ruhaibeh* and *Khulasa* (*Elusa*).

Gen. 26:23-25. ISAAC'S JOURNEY TO BEERSHEBA. — Here, where Abraham had spent a long time (Gen. 21:33 ff.), Jehovah appeared to him during the night and renewed the promises already given; upon which, Isaac built an altar and performed a solemn service. Here his servants also dug a well near to the tents.

Gen. 26:26-33. ABIMELECH'S TREATY WITH ISAAC. — The conclusion of this alliance was substantially only a repetition of renewal of the alliance entered into with Abraham; but the renewal itself arose so completely out of the circumstances, that there is no ground whatever for denying that it occurred, or for the hypothesis that our account is merely another form of the earlier alliance; to say nothing of the fact, that besides the agreement in the leading event itself, the attendant circumstances are altogether peculiar, and correspond to the events which preceded. Abimelech not only brought his chief captain *Phicol* (supposed to be the same as in Gen. 21:22, if *Phicol* is not

also an official name), but his **מֵרֵעַ** “friend,” i.e., his privy councillor, *Ahuzzath*. Isaac referred to the hostility they had shown; to which Abimelech replied, that they (he and his people) did not smite him (**נָנַעַ**), i.e., drive him away by force, but let him depart in peace, and expressed a wish that there might be an oath between them. **שָׁלַח** the oath, as an act of self-imprecation, was to form the basis of the covenant to be made. From this **שָׁלַח** came also to be used for a covenant sanctioned by an oath (Deu. 29:11, 13). **אַם תַּעֲשֶׂה** “that thou do not:” **אַם** a particle of negation used in an oath (Gen. 14:23, etc.). (On the verb with *zere*, see Ges. § 75, Anm. 17; Ewald, § 224.) — The same day Isaac’s servants informed him of the well which they had dug; and Isaac gave it the name *Shebah* (**שֶׁבַעַה**, oath), in commemoration of the treaty made on oath. “Therefore the city was called Beersheba.” This derivation of the name does not shut the other (Gen. 21:31) out, but seems to confirm it. As the treaty made on oath between Abimelech and Isaac was only a renewal of his covenant concluded before with Abraham, so the name *Beersheba* was also renewed by the well *Shebah*. The reality of the occurrence is supported by the fact that the two wells are in existence still (vid., Gen. 21:31).

Gen. 26:34, 35. ESAU’S MARRIAGE. — To the various troubles which the Philistines prepared for Isaac, but which, through the blessing of God, only contributed to the increase of his wealth and importance, a domestic cross was added, which caused him great and lasting sorrow. Esau married two wives in the 40th year of his age, the 100th of Isaac’s life (Gen. 25:26); and that not from his own relations in Mesopotamia, but from among the Canaanites whom God had cast off. On their names, see Gen. 34: 2, 3. They became “*bitterness of spirit*,” the cause of deep trouble, to his parents, viz., on account of their Canaanitish character, which was so opposed to the vocation of the patriarchs; whilst Esau by these marriages furnished another proof, how thoroughly his heart was set upon earthly things.

ISAAC’S BLESSING. — GENESIS 27

Gen. 27: 1-4. When Isaac had grown old, and his eyes were dim, so that he could no longer see (**מֵרָאָה** from seeing, with the neg. **אֵין** as in Gen. 16: 2, etc.), he wished, in the consciousness of approaching death, to give his blessing to his elder son. Isaac was then in his 137th year, at which age his half-brother Ishmael had died fourteen years before; ¹⁵⁰ and this, with the increasing infirmities of age, may have suggested the thought of death, though he did not die till forty-three years afterwards (Gen. 35:28). Without regard to the words which were spoken by God with reference to the children before their birth, and without taking any notice of Esau’s frivolous barter of his

birthright and his ungodly connection with Canaanites, Isaac maintained his preference for Esau, and directed him therefore to take his things (בָּלִים, hunting gear), his quiver and bow, to hunt game and prepare a savoury dish, that he might eat, and his soul might bless him. As his preference for Esau was fostered and strengthened by, if it did not spring from, his liking for game (Gen. 25:28), so now he wished to raise his spirits for imparting the blessing by a dish of venison prepared to his taste. In this the infirmity of his flesh is evident. At the same time, it was not merely because of his partiality for Esau, but unquestionably on account of the natural rights of the first-born, that he wished to impart the blessing to him, just as the desire to do this before his death arose from the consciousness of his patriarchal call.

Gen. 27: 5-17. Rebekah, who heard what he said, sought to frustrate this intention, and to secure the blessing for her (favourite) son Jacob. Whilst Esau was away hunting, she told Jacob to take his father a dish, which she would prepare from two kids according to his taste; and, having introduced himself as Esau, to ask for the blessing “*before Jehovah.*” Jacob’s objection, that the father would know him by his smooth skin, and so, instead of blessing him, might pronounce a curse upon him as a mocker, i.e., one who was trifling with his blind father, she silenced by saying, that she would take the curse upon herself. She evidently relied upon the word of promise, and thought that she ought to do her part to secure its fulfilment by directing the father’s blessing to Jacob; and to this end she thought any means allowable. Consequently she was so assured of the success of her stratagem as to have no fear of the possibility of a curse. Jacob then acceded to her plan, and fetched the goats. Rebekah prepared them according to her husband’s taste; and having told Jacob to put on Esau’s best clothes which were with her in the dwelling (the tent, not the house), she covered his hands and the smooth (i.e., the smoother parts) of his neck with the skins of the kids of the goats,^{f51} and sent him with the savoury dish to his father.

Gen. 27:18-29. But Jacob had no easy task to perform before his father. As soon as he had spoken on entering, his father asked him, “*Who art thou, my son?*” On his replying, “*I am Esau, thy first-born,*” the father expressed his surprise at the rapid success of his hunting; and when he was satisfied with the reply, “*Jehovah thy God sent it (the thing desired) to meet me,*” he became suspicious about the voice, and bade him come nearer, that he might feel him. But as his hands appeared hairy like Esau’s, he did not recognise him; and “*so he blessed him.*” In this remark (v. 23) the writer gives the result of Jacob’s attempt; so that the blessing is merely mentioned proleptically here, and refers to the formal blessing described afterwards, and not to the first greeting and salutation.

Gen. 27:24 ff. After his father, in order to get rid of his suspicion about the voice, had asked him once more, “*Art thou really my son Esau?*” and Jacob had replied, “*I am*” (אֵן = yes), he told him to hand him the savoury dish that he might eat. After eating, he kissed his son as a sign of his paternal affection, and in doing so he smelt the odour of his clothes, i.e., the clothes of Esau, which were thoroughly scented with the odour of the fields, and then imparted his blessing (vv. 27-29). The blessing itself is thrown, as the sign of an elevated state of mind, into the poetic style of parallel clauses, and contains the peculiar forms of poetry, such as רִאֵה for הִנֵּה, הִנֵּה for הִנֵּה, etc. The smell of the clothes with the scent of the field suggested to the patriarch’s mind the image of his son’s future prosperity, so that he saw him in possession of the promised land and the full enjoyment of its valuable blessings, having the smell of the field which Jehovah blessed, i.e., the garden of paradise, and broke out into the wish, “*God (Ha-Elohim, the personal God, not Jehovah, the covenant God) give thee from the dew of heaven, and the fat fields of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine,*” i.e., a land blessed with the dew of heaven and a fruitful soil. In Eastern countries, where there is so little rain, the dew is the most important prerequisite for the growth of the fruits of the earth, and is often mentioned therefore as a source of blessing (Deu. 33:13, 28; Hos. 14: 6; Zec. 8:12). In מִשְׁמַנֵּי, notwithstanding the absence of the Dagesh from the ש, the מ is the prep. מִן, as the parallel מִמֶּלֶךְ proves; and שְׂמֵנִים both here and in v. 39 are the fat (fertile) districts of a country. The rest of the blessing had reference to the future pre-eminence of his son. He was to be lord not only over his brethren (i.e., over kindred tribes), but over (foreign) peoples and nations also. The blessing rises here to the idea of universal dominion, which was to be realized in the fact that, according to the attitude assumed by the people towards him as their lord, it would secure to them either a blessing or a curse. If we compare this blessing with the promises which Abraham received, there are two elements of the latter which are very apparent; viz., the possession of the land, in the promise of the rich enjoyment of its produce, and the numerous increase of posterity, in the promised dominion over the nations. The third element, however, the blessing of the nations in and through the seed of Abraham, is so generalized in the expression, which is moulded according to Gen. 12: 3, “*Cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee,*” that the person blessed is not thereby declared to be the medium of salvation to the nations. Since the intention to give the blessing to Esau the first-born did not spring from proper feelings towards Jehovah and His promises, the blessing itself, as the use of the word *Elohim* instead of *Jehovah* or *El Shaddai* (cf. 28: 3) clearly shows, could not rise to the full height of the divine blessings of salvation, but referred chiefly to the relation in which the two brothers and their descendants would stand to one another, the theme with

which Isaac's soul was entirely filled. It was only the painful discovery that, in blessing against his will, he had been compelled to follow the saving counsel of God, which awakened in him the consciousness of his patriarchal vocation, and gave him the spiritual power to impart the "blessing of Abraham" to the son whom he had kept back, but whom Jehovah had chosen, when he was about to send him away to Haran (Gen. 28: 3, 4).

Gen. 27:30-40. Jacob had hardly left his father, after receiving the blessing (בִּרְכָתוֹ, was only gone out), when Esau returned and came to Isaac, with the game prepared, to receive the blessing. The shock was inconceivable which Isaac received, when he found that he had blessed another, and not Esau — that, in fact, he had blessed Jacob. At the same time he neither could nor would, either curse him on account of the deception which he had practised, or withdraw the blessing imparted. For he could not help confessing to himself that he had sinned and brought the deception upon himself by his carnal preference for Esau. Moreover, the blessing was not a matter of subjective human affection, but a right entrusted by the grace of God to paternal supremacy and authority, in the exercise of which the person blessing, being impelled and guided by a higher authority, imparted to the person to be blest spiritual possessions and powers, which the will of man could not capriciously withdraw. Regarding this as the meaning of the blessing, Isaac necessarily saw in what had taken place the will of God, which had directed to Jacob the blessing that he had intended for Esau. He therefore said, "*I have blessed him; yea, he will be (remain) blessed*" (cf. Heb. 12:17). Even the great and bitter lamentation into which Esau broke out could not change his father's mind. To his entreaty in v. 34, "*Bless me, even me also, O my father!*" he replied, "*Thy brother came with subtilty, and hath taken away thy blessing.*" Esau answered, "*Is it that (הֲבֵנָה) they have named him Jacob (overreacher), and he has overreached me twice?*" i.e., has he received the name Jacob from the fact that he has twice outwitted me? הֲבֵנָה is used "when the cause is not rightly known" (cf. Gen. 29:15). To his further entreaty, "*Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me?*" (אֲצַל, lit., to lay aside), Isaac repeated the substance of the blessing given to Jacob, and added, "*and to thee (לְכֵהָ for לְךָ as in Gen. 3: 9), now, what can I do, my son?*" When Esau again repeated, with tears, the entreaty that Isaac would bless him also, the father gave him a blessing (vv. 39, 40), but one which, when compared with the blessing of Jacob, was to be regarded rather as "a modified curse," and which is not even described as a blessing, but "introduced a disturbing element into Jacob's blessing, a retribution for the impure means by which he had obtained it." "*Behold,*" it states, "*from the fat fields of the earth will thy dwelling be, and from the dew of heaven from above.*" By a play upon the words Isaac uses the same expression as in v. 28, "from the fat fields of the earth, and from the dew," but in the opposite sense,

מן being partitive there, and privative here, “from = away from.” The context requires that the words should be taken thus, and not in the sense of “thy dwelling shall partake of the fat of the earth and the dew of heaven” (*Vulg., Luth., etc.*).^{f52}

Since Isaac said (v. 37) he had given Jacob the blessing of the superabundance of corn and wine, he could not possibly promise Esau also fat fields and the dew of heaven. Nor would this agree with the words which follows, “*By thy sword wilt thou live.*” Moreover, the privative sense of מן is thoroughly poetical (cf. 2Sa. 1:22; Job. 11:15, etc.). The idea expressed in the words, therefore, was that the dwelling-place of Esau would be the very opposite of the land of Canaan, viz., an unfruitful land. This is generally the condition of the mountainous country of Edom, which, although not without its fertile slopes and valleys, especially in the eastern portion (cf. Robinson, Pal. ii. p. 552), is thoroughly waste and barren in the western; so that *Seetzen* says it consists of “the most desolate and barren mountains probably in the world.”

The mode of life and occupation of the inhabitants were adapted to the country. “*By (lit., on) thy sword thou wilt live,*” i.e., thy maintenance will depend on the sword (על as in Deu. 8: 3 cf. Isa. 28:16), “live by war, rapine, and freebooting” (*Knobel*). “*And thy brother thou wilt serve; yet it will come to pass, as (פֶּאֶשֶׁר, lit., in proportion as, cf. Num. 27:14) thou shakest (tossest), thou wilt break his yoke from thy neck.*” רוד, “to rove about” (Jer. 2:31; Hos. 12: 1), *Hiphil* “to cause (the thoughts) to rove about” (Psa. 55: 3); but *Hengstenberg’s* rendering is the best here, viz., “to shake, sc., the yoke.” In the wild, sport-loving Esau there was aptly prefigured the character of his posterity. *Josephus* describes the Idumaeen people as

“a tumultuous and disorderly nation, always on the watch on every motion, delighting in mutations” (*Whiston’s tr.: de bell Jud. 4, 4, 1*).

The mental eye of the patriarch discerned in the son his whole future family in its attitude to its brother-nation, and he promised Edom, not freedom from the dominion of Israel (for Esau was to serve his brother, as Jehovah had predicted before their birth), but only a repeated and not unsuccessful struggle for freedom. And so it was; the historical relation of Edom to Israel assumed the form of a constant reiteration of servitude, revolt, and reconquest. After a long period of independence at the first, the Edomites were defeated by Saul (1Sa. 14:47) and subjugated by David (2Sa. 8:14); and, in spite of an attempt at revolt under Solomon (1Ki. 11:14 ff.), they remained subject to the kingdom of Judah until the time of Joram, when they rebelled. They were subdued again by Amaziah (2Ki. 14: 7; 2Ch. 25:11 ff.), and remained in subjection under Uzziah and Jotham (2Ki. 14:22; 2 Chron 26: 2). It was not till the reign of

Ahaz that they shook the yoke of Judah entirely off (2Ki. 16: 6; 2Ch. 28:17), without Judah being ever able to reduce them again. At length, however, they were completely conquered by John Hyrcanus about B.C. 129, compelled to submit to circumcision, and incorporated in the Jewish state (*Josephus*, Ant. xiii. 9, 1, xv. 7, 9). At a still later period, through Antipater and Herod, they established an Idumaeen dynasty over Judea, which lasted till the complete dissolution of the Jewish state.

Thus the words of Isaac to his two sons were fulfilled, — words which are justly said to have been spoken “in faith concerning things to come” (Heb. 11:20). For the blessing was a prophecy, and that not merely in the case of Esau, but in that of Jacob also; although Isaac was deceived with regard to the person of the latter. Jacob remained blessed, therefore, because, according to the predetermination of God, the elder was to serve the younger; but the deceit by which his mother prompted him to secure the blessing was never approved. On the contrary, the sin was followed by immediate punishment. Rebekah was obliged to send her pet son into a foreign land, away from his father’s house, and in an utterly destitute condition. She did not see him for twenty years, even if she lived till his return, and possibly never saw again. Jacob had to atone for his sin against both brother and father by a long and painful exile, in the midst of privation, anxiety, fraud, and want. Isaac was punished for retaining his preference for Esau, in opposition to the revealed will of Jehovah, by the success of Jacob’s stratagem; and Esau for his contempt of the birthright, by the loss of the blessing of the first-born. In this way a higher hand prevailed above the acts of sinful men, bringing the counsel and will of Jehovah to eventual triumph, in opposition to human thought and will.

Gen. 27:41-46. Esau’s complaining and weeping were now changed into mortal hatred of his brother. “*The days of mourning,*” he said to himself, “*for my father are at hand, and I will kill my brother Jacob.*” אָבִל אָבִי: *genit. obj.* as in Amo. 8:10; Jer. 6:26. He would put off his intended fratricide that he might not hurt his father’s mind.

Gen. 27:42. When Rebekah was informed by some one of Esau’s intention, she advised Jacob to protect himself from his revenge (הִתְנַחֵם to procure comfort by retaliation, equivalent to “avenge himself,” הִתְנַקֵּם, Isa. 1:24 ^{f53}), by fleeing to her brother Laban in Haran, and remaining there “*some days,*” as she mildly puts it, until his brother’s wrath was subdued. “*For why should I lose you both in one day?*” viz., Jacob through Esau’s vengeance, and Esau as a murderer by the avenger of blood (Gen. 9: 6, cf. 2Sa. 14: 6, 7). In order to obtain Isaac’s consent to this plan, without hurting his feelings by telling him of Esau’s murderous intentions, she spoke to him of her troubles on account of

the Hittite wives of Esau, and the weariness of life that she should feel if Jacob also were to marry one of the daughters of the land, and so introduced the idea of sending Jacob to her relations in Mesopotamia, with a view to his marriage there.

JACOB'S FLIGHT TO HARAN AND DREAM IN BETHEL. — GENESIS 28

Gen. 28: 1-9. JACOB'S DEPARTURE FROM HIS PARENTS' HOUSE. — Rebekah's complaint reminded Isaac of his own call, and his consequent duty to provide for Jacob's marriage in a manner corresponding to the divine counsels of salvation.

Gen. 28: 1-5. He called Jacob, therefore, and sent him to Padan-Aram to his mother's relations, with instructions to seek a wife there, and not among the daughters of Canaan, giving him at the same time the "*blessing of Abraham,*" i.e., the blessing of promise, which Abraham had repeatedly received from the Lord, but which is more especially recorded in Gen. 17: 2 ff., and Gen. 22:16-18.

Gen. 28: 6-9. When Esau heard of this blessing and the sending away of Jacob, and saw therein the displeasure of his parents at his Hittite wives, he went to Ishmael — i.e., to the family of Ishmael, for Ishmael himself had been dead fourteen years (p. 175) — and took as a third wife Mahalath, a daughter of Ishmael (called Bashemath in Gen. 36: 3, a descendant of Abraham therefore), a step by which he might no doubt ensure the approval of his parents, but in which he failed to consider that Ishmael had been separated from the house of Abraham and family of promise by the appointment of God; so that it only furnished another proof that he had no thought of the religious interests of the chosen family, and was unfit to be the recipient of divine revelation.

Gen. 28:10-22. JACOB'S DREAM AT BETHEL. — As he was travelling from Beersheba, where Isaac was then staying (Gen. 26:25), to Haran, Jacob came to a place where he was obliged to stop all night, because the sun had set. The words "*he hit (lighted) upon the place,*" indicate the apparently accidental, yet really divinely appointed choice of this place for his night-quarters; and the definite article points it out as having become well known through the revelation of God that ensued. After making a pillow with the stones (מְרִאשׁוֹת, head-place, pillow), he fell asleep and had a dream, in which he saw a ladder resting upon the earth, with the top reaching to heaven; and upon it angels of God going up and down, and Jehovah Himself standing above it. The ladder was a visible symbol of the real and uninterrupted fellowship

between God in heaven and His people upon earth. The angels upon it carry up the wants of men to God, and bring down the assistance and protection of God to men. The ladder stood there upon the earth, just where Jacob was lying in solitude, poor, helpless, and forsaken by men. Above in heaven stood Jehovah, and explained in words the symbol which he saw. Proclaiming Himself to Jacob as the God of his fathers, He not only confirmed to him all the promises of the fathers in their fullest extent, but promised him protection on his journey and a safe return to his home (vv. 13-15). But as the fulfilment of this promise to Jacob was still far off, God added the firm assurance, “*I will not leave thee till I have done (carried out) what I have told thee.*”

Gen. 28:16 ff. Jacob gave utterance to the impression made by this vision as soon as he awoke from sleep, in the words, “*Surely Jehovah is in this place, and I knew it not.*” Not that the omnipresence of God was unknown to him; but that Jehovah in His condescending mercy should be near to him even here, far away from his father’s house and from the places consecrated to His worship, — it was this which he did not know or imagine. The revelation was intended not only to stamp the blessing, with which Isaac had dismissed him from his home, with the seal of divine approval, but also to impress upon Jacob’s mind the fact, that although Jehovah would be near to protect and guide him even in a foreign land, the land of promise was the holy ground on which the God of his fathers would set up the covenant of His grace. On his departure from that land, he was to carry with him a sacred awe of the gracious presence of Jehovah there. To that end the Lord proved to him that He was near, in such a way that the place appeared “*dreadful,*” inasmuch as the nearness of the holy God makes an alarming impression upon unholy man, and the consciousness of sin grows into the fear of death. But in spite of this alarm, the place was none other than “*the house of God and the gate of heaven,*” i.e., a place where God dwelt, and a way that opened to Him in heaven.

Gen. 28:18. In the morning Jacob set up the stone at his head, as a monument (מַצְבֵּה) to commemorate the revelation he had received from God; and poured oil upon the top, to consecrate it as a memorial of the mercy that had been shown him there (*visionis insigne μνημόστυνον*, Calvin), not as an idol or an object of divine worship (vid., Exo. 30:26 ff.). — He then gave the place the name of *Bethel*, i.e., House of God, whereas (בֵּית־לֵזְרַיִם) the town had been called *Luz* before. This antithesis shows that Jacob gave the name, not to the place where the pillar was set up, but to the town, in the neighbourhood of which he had received the divine revelation. He renewed it on his return from Mesopotamia (Gen. 35:15). This is confirmed by Gen. 48: 3, where Jacob, like the historian in Gen. 35: 6, 7, speaks of *Luz* as the place of this revelation. There is nothing at variance with this in Jos. 16: 2; 18:13; for it is not Bethel as

a city, but the mountains of Bethel, that are there distinguished from Luz (see my Commentary on Jos. 16: 2). ^{f54}

Gen. 28:20. Lastly, Jacob made a vow: that if God would give him the promised protection on his journey, and bring him back in safety to his father's house, Jehovah should be his God (אֱלֹהֵי in v. 21 commences the apodosis), the stone which he had set up should be a house of God, and Jehovah should receive a tenth of all that He gave to him. It is to be noticed here, that *Elohim* is used in the protasis instead of *Jehovah*, as constituting the essence of the vow: if Jehovah, who had appeared to him, proved Himself to be God by fulfilling His promise, then he would acknowledge and worship Him as his God, by making the stone thus set up into a house of God, i.e., a place of sacrifice, and by tithing all his possessions. With regard to the fulfilment of this vow, we learn from Gen. 35: 7 that Jacob built an altar, and probably also dedicated the tenth to God, i.e., offered it to Jehovah; or, as some have supposed, applied it partly to the erection and preservation of the altar, and partly to burnt and thank-offerings combined with sacrificial meals, according to the analogy of Deu. 14:28, 29 (cf. Gen. 31:54; 46: 1).

JACOB'S STAY IN HARAN. HIS DOUBLE MARRIAGE AND CHILDREN. — GENESIS 29 AND 30

Gen. 29: 1-14. ARRIVAL IN HARAN, AND RECEPTION BY LABAN. — Being strengthened in spirit by the nocturnal vision, Jacob proceeded on his journey into "the land of the sons of the East," by which we are to understand, not so much the Arabian desert, that reaches to the Euphrates, as Mesopotamia, which lies on the other side of that river. For there he saw the well in the field (v. 2), by which three flocks were lying, waiting for the arrival of the other flocks of the place, before they could be watered. The remark in v. 2, that the stone upon the well's mouth was large (גְּדֹלָה without the article is a predicate), does not mean that the united strength of all the shepherds was required to roll it away, whereas Jacob rolled it away alone (v. 10); but only that it was not in the power of every shepherd, much less of a shepherdess like Rachel, to roll it away. Hence in all probability the agreement that had been formed among them, that they would water the flocks together. The scene is so thoroughly in harmony with the customs of the East, both ancient and modern, that the similarity to the one described in Gen. 24:11 ff. is by no means strange (vid., Rob. Pal. i. 301, 304, ii. 351, 357, 371). Moreover the well was very differently constructed from that at which Abraham's servant met with Rebekah. There the water was drawn at once from the (open) well and poured into troughs placed ready for the cattle, as is the case now at most of the wells in the East; whereas here the well was closed up with a stone, and there is no

mention of pitchers and troughs. The well, therefore, was probably a cistern dug in the ground, which was covered up or closed with a large stone, and probably so constructed, that after the stone had been rolled away the flocks could be driven to the edge to drink. ^{f55}

Gen. 29: 5, 6. Jacob asked the shepherds where they lived; from which it is probable that the well was not situated, like that in Gen. 24:11, in the immediate neighbourhood of the town of Haran; and when they said they were from Haran, he inquired after Laban, the son, i.e., the descendant, of Nahor, and how he was (הַשְּׁלוֹם לוֹ: is he well?; and received the reply, “Well; and behold Rachel, his daughter, is just coming (בָּאָהָּ particip.) with the flock.” When Jacob thereupon told the shepherds to water the flocks and feed them again, for the day was still “great,” — i.e., it wanted a long while to the evening, and was not yet time to drive them in (to the folds to rest for the night), — he certainly only wanted to get the shepherds away from the well, that he might meet with his cousin alone. But as Rachel came up in the meantime, he was so carried away by the feelings of relationship, possibly by a certain love at first sight, that he rolled the stone away from the well, watered her flock, and after kissing her, introduced himself with tears of joyous emotion as her cousin (אָחִי אֲבִיָּהּ, brother, i.e., relation of her father) and Rebekah’s son. What the other shepherds thought of all this, is passed over as indifferent to the purpose of the narrative, and the friendly reception of Jacob by Laban is related immediately afterwards. When Jacob had told Laban “*all these things*,” — i.e., hardly “the cause of his journey, and the things which had happened to him in relation to the birthright” (*Rosenmüller*), but simply the things mentioned in vv. 2-12, — Laban acknowledged him as his relative: “*Yes, thou art my bone and my flesh*” (cf. 2:23 and Jud. 9: 2); and thereby *eo ipso* ensured him an abode in his house.

Gen. 29:15-30. JACOB’S DOUBLE MARRIAGE. — After a full month (“a month of days,” Gen. 41: 4; Num. 11:20, etc.), during which time Laban had discovered that he was a good and useful shepherd, he said to him, “*Shouldst thou, because thou art my relative, serve me for nothing? fix me thy wages.*” Laban’s selfishness comes out here under the appearance of justice and kindness. To preclude all claim on the part of his sister’s son to gratitude or affection in return for his services, he proposes to pay him like an ordinary servant. Jacob offered to serve him seven years for *Rachel*, the younger of his two daughters, whom he loved because of her beauty; i.e., just as many years as the week has days, that he might bind himself to a complete and sufficient number of years of service. For the elder daughter, *Leah*, had weak eyes, and consequently was not so good-looking; since bright eyes, with fire in them, are

regarded as the height of beauty in Oriental women. Laban agreed. He would rather give his daughter to him than to a stranger. ¹⁵⁶

Jacob's proposal may be explained, partly on the ground that he was not then in a condition to give the customary dowry, or the usual presents to relations, and partly also from the fact that his situation with regard to Esau compelled him to remain some time with Laban. The assent on the part of Laban cannot be accounted for from the custom of selling daughters to husbands, for it cannot be shown that the purchase of wives was a general custom at that time; but is to be explained solely on the ground of Laban's selfishness and avarice, which came out still more plainly afterwards. To Jacob, however, the seven years seemed but "*a few days, because he loved Rachel.*" This is to be understood, as *C. a Lapide* observes, "*not affective, but appetitive,*" i.e., in comparison with the reward to be obtained for his service.

Gen. 29:21 ff. But when Jacob asked for his reward at the expiration of this period, and according to the usual custom a great marriage feast had been prepared, instead of Rachel, Laban took his elder daughter Leah into the bride-chamber, and Jacob went in unto her, without discovering in the dark the deception that had been practised. Thus the overreacher of Esau was overreached himself, and sin was punished by sin.

Gen. 29:25 ff. But when Jacob complained to Laban the next morning of his deception, he pleaded the custom of the country: **לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה בֵּן**, "*it is not accustomed to be so in our place, to give the younger before the first-born.*" A perfectly worthless excuse; for if this had really been the custom in Haran as in ancient India and elsewhere, he ought to have told Jacob of it before. But to satisfy Jacob, he promised him that in a week he would give him the younger also, if he would serve him seven years longer for her.

Gen. 29:27. "*Fulfil her week;*" i.e., let Leah's marriage-week pass over. The wedding feast generally lasted a week (cf. Jud. 14:12; Job. 11:19). After this week had passed, he received Rachel also: two wives in eight days. To each of these Laban gave one maid-servant to wait upon her; less, therefore, than Bethuel gave to his daughter (Gen. 24:61). — This bigamy of Jacob must not be judged directly by the Mosaic law, which prohibits marriage with two sisters at the same time (Lev. 18:18), or set down as incest (*Calvin*, etc.), since there was no positive law on the point in existence then. At the same time, it is not to be justified on the ground, that the blessing of God made it the means of the fulfilment of His promise, viz., the multiplication of the seed of Abraham into a great nation. Just as it had arisen from Laban's deception and Jacob's love, which regarded outward beauty alone, and therefore from sinful infirmities, so did it become in its results a true school of affliction to Jacob, in

which God showed to him, by many a humiliation, that such conduct as his was quite unfitted to accomplish the divine counsels, and thus condemned the ungodliness of such a marriage, and prepared the way for the subsequent prohibition in the law.

Gen. 29:31-35. LEAH'S FIRST SONS. — Jacob's sinful weakness showed itself even after his marriage, in the fact that he loved Rachel more than Leah; and the chastisement of God, in the fact that the hated wife was blessed with children, whilst Rachel for a long time remained unfruitful. By this it was made apparent once more, that the origin of Israel was to be a work not of nature, but of grace. Leah had four sons in rapid succession, and gave them names which indicated her state of mind:

- (1) *Reuben*, "see, a son!" because she regarded his birth as a pledge that Jehovah had graciously looked upon her misery, for now her husband would love her;
- (2) *Simeon*, i.e., "hearing," for Jehovah had heard, i.e., observed that she was hated;
- (3) *Levi*, i.e., attachment, for she hoped that this time, at least, after she had born three sons, her husband would become attached to her, i.e., show her some affection;
- (4) *Judah* (יהודה, verbal, of the fut. hoph. of היה), i.e., praise, not merely the praised one, but the one for whom Jehovah is praised.

After this fourth birth there was a pause (v. 31), that she might not be unduly lifted up by her good fortune, or attribute to the fruitfulness of her own womb what the faithfulness of Jehovah, the covenant God had bestowed upon her.

Gen. 30: 1-8. BILHAH'S SONS. — When Rachel thought of her own barrenness, she became more and more envious of her sister, who was blessed with sons. But instead of praying, either directly or through her husband, as Rebekah had done, to Jehovah, who had promised His favour to Jacob (Gen. 28:13 ff.), she said to Jacob, in passionate displeasure, "*Get me children, or I shall die;*" to which he angrily replied, "*Am I in God's stead* (i.e., equal to God, or God), *who hath withheld from thee the fruit of the womb?*" i.e., Can I, a powerless man, give thee what the Almighty God has withheld? Almighty like God Jacob certainly was not; but he also wanted the power which he might have possessed, the power of prayer, in firm reliance upon the promise of the Lord. Hence he could neither help nor advise his beloved wife, but only assent to her proposal, that he should beget children for her through her maid Bilhah (cf. Gen. 16: 2), through whom two sons were born to her. The first she named *Dan*, i.e., judge, because God had judged her, i.e., procured her justice, hearkened to her voice (prayer), and removed the reproach of childlessness;

the second *Naphtali*, i.e., my conflict, or my fought one, for “*fightings of God, she said, have I fought with my sister, and also prevailed.*” נִפְתָּלִי אֱלֹהִים are neither *luctationes quam maximae*, nor “a conflict in the cause of God, because Rachel did not wish to leave the founding of the nation of God to Leah alone” (*Knobel*), but “fightings for God and His mercy” (*Hengstenberg*), or, what comes to the same thing,

“wrestlings of prayer she had wrestled with Leah; in reality, however, with God Himself, who seemed to have restricted His mercy to Leah alone” (*Delitzsch*).

It is to be noticed, that Rachel speaks of *Elohim* only, whereas Leah regarded her first four sons as the gift of Jehovah. In this variation of the names, the attitude of the two women, not only to one another, but also to the cause they served, is made apparent. It makes no difference whether the historian has given us the very words of the women on the birth of their children, or, what appears more probable, since the name of God is not introduced into the names of the children, merely his own view of the matter as related by him (Gen. 29:31; 30:17, 22). Leah, who had been forced upon Jacob against his inclination, and was put by him in the background, was not only proved by the four sons, whom she bore to him in the first years of her marriage, to be the wife provided for Jacob by *Elohim*, the ruler of human destiny; but by the fact that these four sons formed the real stem of the promised numerous seed, she was proved still more to be the wife selected by Jehovah, in realization of His promise, to be the tribe-mother of the greater part of the covenant nation. But this required that Leah herself should be fitted for it in heart and mind, that she should feel herself to be the handmaid of Jehovah, and give glory to the covenant God for the blessing of children, or see in her children actual proofs that Jehovah had accepted her and would bring to her the affection of her husband. It was different with Rachel, the favourite and therefore high-minded wife. Jacob should give her, what God alone could give. The faithfulness and blessing of the covenant God were still hidden from her. Hence she resorted to such earthly means as procuring children through her maid, and regarded the desired result as the answer of God, and a victory in her contest with her sister. For such a state of mind the term *Elohim*, God the sovereign ruler, was the only fitting expression.

Gen. 30: 9-13. ZILPAH’S SONS. — But Leah also was not content with the divine blessing bestowed upon her by Jehovah. The means employed by Rachel to retain the favour of her husband made her jealous; and jealousy drove her to the employment of the same means. Jacob begat two sons by Zilpah her maid. The one Leah named *Gad*, i.e., “good fortune,” saying, בְּגֵד, “with good fortune,” according to the *Chethib*, for which the Masoretic reading

is **בְּאֵן**, “good fortune has come,” — not, however, from any ancient tradition, for the *Sept.* reads **ἐν τύχῃ**, but simply from a subjective and really unnecessary conjecture, since **בְּאֵן**= “to my good fortune,” sc., a son is born, gives a very suitable meaning. The second she named *Asher*, i.e., the happy one, or bringer of happiness; for she said, **בְּאַשְׁרֵי**, “to my happiness, for daughters call me happy,” i.e., as a mother with children. The *perfect* **אַשְׁרֵינִי** relates to “what she had now certainly reached” (*Del.*). Leah did not think of God in connection with these two births. They were nothing more than the successful and welcome result of the means she had employed.

Gen. 30:14-21. THE OTHER CHILDREN OF LEAH. — How thoroughly henceforth the two wives were carried away by constant jealousy of the love and attachment of their husband, is evident from the affair of the love-apples, which Leah’s son Reuben, who was then four years old, found in the field and brought to his mother. **מִן הַדְּרָקִים**, **μῆλα μανδραγορῶν** (LXX), the yellow apples of the *alraun* (*Mandragora vernalis*), a mandrake very common in Palestine. They are about the size of a nutmeg, with a strong and agreeable odour, and were used by the ancients, as they still are by the Arabs, as a means of promoting child-bearing. To Rachel’s request that she would give her some, Leah replied (v. 15): “*Is it too little, that thou hast taken* (drawn away from me) *my husband, to take also*” (**לְקַחְתְּ לִּי** *infin.*), i.e., that thou wouldst also take, “*my son’s mandrakes?*” At length she parted with them, on condition that Rachel would let Jacob sleep with her the next night. After relating how Leah conceived again, and Rachel continued barren in spite of the mandrakes, the writer justly observes (v. 17), “*Elohim hearkened unto Leah,*” to show that it was not from such natural means as love-apples, but from God the author of life, that she had received such fruitfulness. Leah saw in the birth of her fifth son a divine reward for having given her maid to her husband — a recompense, that is, for her self-denial; and she named him on that account *Issaschar*, **יִשָּׁשכָר**, a strange form, to be understood either according to the Chethib **יֵשׁ שָׁכָר** “there is reward,” or according to the *Keri* **יֵשָׁא שָׁכָר** “he bears (brings) reward.” At length she bore her sixth son, and named him *Zebulun*, i.e., “dwelling;” for she hoped that now, after God had endowed her with a good portion, her husband, to whom she had born six sons, would dwell with her, i.e., become more warmly attached to her. The name is from **זָבַל** to dwell, with *acc. constr.* “to inhabit,” formed with a play upon the alliteration in the word **זָבַר** to present — two **ἄπαξ λεγόμενα**. In connection with these two births, Leah mentions Elohim alone, the supernatural giver, and not Jehovah, the covenant God, whose grace had been forced out of her heart by jealousy. She afterwards bore a daughter, *Dinah*, who is mentioned simply because of

the account in Gen. 34; for, according to Gen. 37:35 and 46: 7, Jacob had several daughters, though they were nowhere mentioned by name.

Gen. 30:22-24. BIRTH OF JOSEPH. — At length God gave Rachel also a son, whom she named *Joseph*, יוֹסֵף, i.e., taking away (= יָסַף, cf. 1Sa. 15: 6; 2Sa. 6: 1; Psa. 104:29) and adding (from יָסַף), because his birth not only furnished an actual proof that God had *removed* the reproach of her childlessness, but also excited the wish, that Jehovah might *add* another son. The fulfilment of this wish is recorded in Gen. 35:16 ff. The double derivation of the name, and the exchange of *Elohim* for *Jehovah*, may be explained, without the hypothesis of a double source, on the simple ground, that Rachel first of all looked back at the past, and, thinking of the earthly means that had been applied in vain for the purpose of obtaining a child, regarded the son as a gift of God. At the same time, the good fortune which had now come to her banished from her heart her envy of her sister (v. 1), and aroused belief in that God, who, as she had no doubt heard from her husband, had given Jacob such great promises; so that in giving the name, probably at the circumcision, she remembered Jehovah and prayed for another son from His covenant faithfulness.

After the birth of Joseph, Jacob asked Laban to send him away, with the wives and children for whom he had served him (v. 25). According to this, Joseph was born at the end of the 14 years of service that had been agreed upon, *or* seven years after Jacob had taken Leah and (a week later) Rachel as his wives (Gen. 29:21-28). Now if all the children, whose births are given in Gen. 29:32-30:24, had been born one after another during the period mentioned, not only would Leah have had seven children in 7, or literally 6 1/4 years, but there would have been a considerable interval also, during which Rachel's maid and her own gave birth to children. But this would have been impossible; and the text does not really state it. When we bear in mind that the *imperf. c. 1 consec.* expresses not only the order of time, but the order of thought as well, it becomes apparent that in the history of the births, the intention to arrange them according to the mothers prevails over the chronological order, so that it by no means follows, that because the passage, "when Rachel saw that she bare Jacob no children," occurs after Leah is said to have had four sons, therefore it was not till after the birth of Leah's fourth child that Rachel became aware of her own barrenness. There is nothing on the part of the grammar to prevent our arranging the course of events thus. Leah's first four births followed as rapidly as possible one after the other, so that four sons were born in the first four years of the second period of Jacob's service. In the meantime, not necessarily after the birth of Leah's fourth child, Rachel, having discovered her own barrenness, had given her maid to Jacob; so that not only may Dan have been

born *before* Judah, but Naphtali also not long after him. The rapidity and regularity with which Leah had born her first four sons, would make her notice all the more quickly the cessation that took place; and jealousy of Rachel, as well as the success of the means she had adopted, would impel her to attempt in the same way to increase the number of her children. Moreover, Leah herself may have conceived again before the birth of her maid's second son, and may have given birth to her last two sons in the sixth and seventh years of their marriage. And contemporaneously with the birth of Leah's last son, or immediately afterwards, Rachel may have given birth to Joseph. In this way Jacob may easily have had eleven sons within seven years of his marriage. But with regard to the birth of Dinah, the expression "afterwards" (v. 21) seems to indicate, that she was not born during Jacob's years of service, but during the remaining six years of his stay with Laban.

Gen. 30:25-43. NEW CONTRACT OF SERVICE BETWEEN JACOB AND LABAN. — As the second period of seven years terminated about the time of Joseph's birth, Jacob requested Laban to let him return to his own place and country, i.e., to Canaan. Laban, however, entreated him to remain, for he had perceived that Jehovah, Jacob's God, had blessed him for his sake; and told him to fix his wages for further service. The words, "*if I have found favour in thine eyes*" (v. 27), contain an *aposiopesis*, sc., then remain. נְחֻשְׁתִּי "a heathen expression, like *augurando cognovi*" (*Delitzsch*). שְׂכָרְךָ עָלַי *thy wages*, which it will be binding *upon me* to give. Jacob reminded him, on the other hand, what service he had rendered him, how Jehovah's blessing had followed "*at his foot*," and asked when he should begin to provide for his own house. But when Laban repeated the question, what should he give him, Jacob offered to feed and keep his flock still, upon one condition, which was founded upon the fact, that in the East the goats, as a rule, are black or dark-brown, rarely white or spotted with white, and that the sheep for the most part are white, very seldom black or speckled. Jacob required as wages, namely, all the speckled, spotted, and black among the sheep, and all the speckled, spotted, and white among the goats; and offered "*even to-day*" to commence separating them, so that "*to-morrow*" Laban might convince himself of the uprightness of his proceedings. הָסַר (v. 32) cannot be *imperative*, because of the preceding אֶעֱבֹר, but must be infinitive: "I will go through the whole flock to-day to remove from thence all...;" and הָנָה שְׂכָרִי signifies "what is removed shall be my wages," but not everything of an abnormal colour that shall hereafter be found in the flock. This was no doubt intended by Jacob, as the further course of the narrative shows, but it is not involved in the words of v. 32. Either the writer has restricted himself to the main fact, and omitted to mention that it was also agreed at the same time that the separation should be repeated at certain regular periods, and that all the sheep of an abnormal colour in Laban's flock

should also be set aside as part of Jacob's wages; or this point was probably not mentioned at first, but taken for granted by both parties, since Jacob took measures with that idea to his own advantage, and even Laban, notwithstanding the frequent alteration of the contract with which Jacob charged him (Gen. 31: 7, 8, and 41), does not appear to have disputed this right.

Gen. 30:34 ff. Laban cheerfully accepted the proposal, but did not leave Jacob to make the selection. He undertook that himself, probably to make more sure, and then gave those which were set apart as Jacob's wages to his own sons to tend, since it was Jacob's duty to take care of Laban's flock, and "*set three days' journey betwixt himself and Jacob,*" i.e., between the flock to be tended by himself through his sons, and that to be tended by Jacob, for the purpose of preventing any copulation between the animals of the two flocks. Nevertheless he was overreached by Jacob, who adopted a double method of increasing the wages agreed upon. In the first place (vv. 37-39), he took fresh rods of storax, maple, and walnut-trees, all of which have a dazzling white wood under their dark outside, and peeled white stripes upon them, הַלְבֵן מְחֹשֶׁף (the verbal noun instead of the inf. abs. חֹשֶׁף), "*peeling the white naked in the rods.*" These partially peeled, and therefore mottled rods, he placed in the drinking-troughs (רְהַטִּים lit., gutters, from רָהַט = רוץ to run, is explained by שְׁקֵתוֹת הַמַּיִם water-troughs), to which the flock came to drink, in front of the animals, in order that, if copulation took place at the drinking time, it might occur near the mottled sticks, and the young be speckled and spotted in consequence. וַיַּחְמְנָה a rare, antiquated form for וַתַּחְמְנָה from חָמַם, and וַיַּחְמוּ for וַיַּחְמוּ imperf. Kal of יָחַם = חָמַם. This artifice was founded upon a fact frequently noticed, particularly in the case of sheep, that whatever fixes their attention in copulation is marked upon the young (see the proofs in *Bochart, Hieroz.* 1, 618, and *Friedreich zur Bibel* 1, 37 ff.). —*Secondly* (v. 40), Jacob separated the speckled animals thus obtained from those of a normal colour, and caused the latter to feed so that the others would be constantly in sight, in order that he might in this way obtain a constant accession of mottled sheep. As soon as these had multiplied sufficiently, he formed separate flocks (viz., of the speckled additions), "*and put them not unto Laban's cattle;*" i.e., he kept them apart in order that a still larger number of speckled ones might be procured, through Laban's one-coloured flock having this mottled group constantly in view.

Gen. 30:41, 42. He did not adopt the trick with the rods, however, on every occasion of copulation, for the sheep in those countries lamb twice a year, but only at the copulation of the strong sheep (הַמְקֻשְׁרוֹת the bound ones, i.e., firm

and compact), — *Luther*, “the spring flock;” לַיְחֲמָנָה *inf. Pi.* “to conceive it (the young);” — but not “in the weakening of the sheep,” i.e., when they were weak, and would produce weak lambs. The meaning is probably this: he only adopted this plan at the summer copulation, not the autumn; for, in the opinion of the ancients (*Pliny, Columella*), lambs that were conceived in the spring and born in the autumn were stronger than those born in the spring (cf. *Bochart l.c.* p. 582). Jacob did this, possibly, less to spare Laban, than to avoid exciting suspicion, and so leading to the discovery of his trick. — In v. 43 the account closes with the remark, that the man increased exceedingly, and became rich in cattle (צֹאן רַבּוֹת many head of sheep and goats) and slaves, without expressing approbation of Jacob’s conduct, or describing his increasing wealth as a blessing from God. The verdict is contained in what follows.

JACOB’S FLIGHT, AND FAREWELL OF LABAN.

— GENESIS 31

Gen. 31: 1-21. THE FLIGHT. — Through some angry remarks of Laban’s sons with reference to his growing wealth, and the evident change in the feelings of Laban himself towards him (vv. 1, 2), Jacob was inwardly prepared for the termination of his present connection with Laban; and at the same time he received instructions from Jehovah, to return to his home, together with a promise of divine protection. In consequence of this, he sent for Rachel and Leah to come to him in the field, and explained to them (vv. 4-13), how their father’s disposition had changed towards him, and how he had deceived him in spite of the service he had forced out of him, and had altered his wages ten times; but that the God of his father had stood by him, and had transferred to him their father’s cattle, and now at length had directed him to return to his home.

Gen. 31: 6. אֶתֶּן: the original form of the abbreviated אֶתֶּן, which is merely copied from the Pentateuch in Exo. 13:11, 20; 34:17.

Gen. 31: 9. אֶבְיָכָם: for אֶבְיָכָן as in Gen. 32:16, etc. — “*Ten times.*” i.e., as often as possible, the ten as a round number expressing the idea of completeness. From the statement that Laban had changed his wages ten times, it is evident that when Laban observed, that among his sheep and goats, of one colour only, a large number of mottled young were born, he made repeated attempts to limit the original stipulation by changing the rule as to the colour of the young, and so diminishing Jacob’s wages. But when Jacob passes over his own stratagem in silence, and represents all that he aimed at and secured by crafty means as the fruit of God’s blessing, this differs no doubt from the account in Genesis 30. It is not a contradiction, however, pointing to a

difference in the sources of the two chapters, but merely a difference founded upon actual fact, viz., the fact that Jacob did not tell the whole truth to his wives. Moreover self-help and divine help do not exclude one another. Hence his account of the dream, in which he saw that the rams that leaped upon the cattle were all of various colours, and heard the voice of the angel of God calling his attention to what had been seen, in the words, “*I have seen all that Laban hath done to thee,*” may contain actual truth; and the dream may be regarded as a divine revelation, which was either sent to explain to him now, at the end of the sixth year,

“that it was not his stratagem, but the providence of God which had prevented him from falling a victim to Laban’s avarice, and had brought him such wealth” (*Delitzsch*);

or, if the dream occurred at an earlier period, was meant to teach him, that

“the help of God, without any such self-help, could procure him justice and safety in spite of Laban’s selfish covetousness” (*Kurtz*).

It is very difficult to decide between these two interpretations. As Jehovah’s instructions to him to return were not given till the end of his period of service, and Jacob connects them so closely with the vision of the rams that they seem contemporaneous, *Delitzsch’s* view appears to deserve the preference. But the עֲשֵׂה in v. 12, “all that Laban *is doing* to thee,” does not exactly suit this meaning; and we should rather expect to find עָשָׂה used at the end of the time of service. The participle rather favours *Kurtz’s* view, that Jacob had the vision of the rams and the explanation from the angel at the beginning of the last six years of service, but that in his communication to his wives, in which there was no necessity to preserve a strict continuity or distinction of time, he connected it with the divine instructions to return to his home, which he received at the end of his time of service. But if we decide in favour of this view, we have no further guarantee for the objective reality of the vision of the rams, since nothing is said about it in the historical account, and it is nowhere stated that the wealth obtained by Jacob’s craftiness was the result of the divine blessing. The attempt so unmistakeably apparent in Jacob’s whole conversation with his wives, to place his dealing with Laban in the most favourable light for himself, excites the suspicion, that the vision of which he spoke was nothing more than a natural dream, the materials being supplied by the three thoughts that were most frequently in his mind, by night as well as by day, viz., (1) his own schemes and their success; (2) the promise received at Bethel; (3) the wish to justify his actions to his own conscience; and that these were wrought up by an excited imagination into a visionary dream, of the divine origin of which Jacob himself may not have had the slightest doubt. —

In v. 13 **הָאֵל** has the article in the construct state, contrary to the ordinary rule; cf. Ges. § 110, 2b; Ewald, § 290.

Gen. 31:14 ff. The two wives naturally agreed with their husband, and declared that they had no longer any part or inheritance in their father's house. For he had not treated them as daughters, but sold them like strangers, i.e., servants. "*And he has even constantly eaten our money,*" i.e., consumed the property brought to him by our service. The *inf. abs.* **אָכַל** after the finite verb expresses the continuation of the act, and is intensified by **גַּם** "yes, even." **כִּי** in v. 16 signifies "so that," as in Deu. 14:24, Job. 10: 6.

Gen. 31:17-19. Jacob then set out with his children and wives, and all the property that he had acquired in Padan-Aram, to return to his father in Canaan; whilst Laban had gone to the sheep-shearing, which kept him some time from his home on account of the size of his flock. Rachel took advantage of her father's absence to rob him of his *teraphim* (*penates*), probably small images of household gods in human form, which were worshipped as givers of earthly prosperity, and also consulted as oracles (see my *Archäologie*, § 90).

Gen. 31:20. "*Thus Jacob deceived Laban the Syrian, in that he told him not that he fled;*" — **לָבַב לֵב** to steal the heart (as the seat of the understanding), like **κλέπτειν νοῦν**, and **לָבַב** with the simple *accus. pers.*, v. 27, like **κλέπτειν τίνα**, signifies to take the knowledge of anything away from a person, to deceive him; — "*and passed over the river (Euphrates), and took the direction to the mountains of Gilead.*"

Gen. 31:22-54. LABAN'S PURSUIT, RECONCILIATION, AND COVENANT WITH JACOB. — As Laban was not told till the third day after the flight, though he pursued the fugitives with his brethren, i.e., his nearest relations, he did not overtake Jacob for seven days, by which time he had reached the mountains of Gilead (vv. 22-24). The night before he overtook them, he was warned by God in a dream, "*not to speak to Jacob from good to bad,*" i.e., not to say anything decisive and emphatic for the purpose of altering what had already occurred (vid., v. 29, and the note on 24:50). Hence he confined himself, when they met, "to bitter reproaches combining paternal feeling on the one hand with hypocrisy on the other;" in which he told them that he had the power to do them harm, if God had not forbidden him, and charged them with stealing his gods (the *teraphim*).

Gen. 31:26. "*Like sword-booty;*" i.e., like prisoners of war (2Ki. 6:22) carried away unwillingly and by force.

Gen. 31:27. “So I might have conducted thee with mirth and songs, with tabret and harp,” i.e., have sent thee away with a parting feast. V. 28. עָשׂוּ: an old form of the infinitive for עֲשׂוֹת as in Gen. 48:11; 50:20.

Gen. 31:29. יֵשׁ לִּי אֵל יְדִי: “there is to God my hand” (Mic. 2: 1; cf. Deu. 28:32; Neh. 5: 5), i.e., my hand serves me as God (Hab. 1:11; Job. 12: 6), a proverbial expression for “the power lies in my hand.”

Gen. 31:30. “And now thou art gone (for, if thou art gone), because thou longest after thy father’s house, why hast thou stolen my gods?” The meaning is this: even if thy secret departure can be explained, thy stealing of my gods cannot.

Gen. 31:31, 32. The first, Jacob met by pleading his fear lest Laban should take away his daughters (keep them back by force). “For I said:” equivalent to “for I thought.” But Jacob knew nothing of the theft; hence he declared, that with whomsoever he might find the gods he should be put to death, and told Laban to make the strictest search among all the things that he had with him. “Before our brethren,” i.e., the relations who had come with Laban, as being impartial witnesses (cf. v. 37); not, as *Knobel* thinks, before Jacob’s horde of male and female slaves, of women and of children.

Gen. 31:33 ff. Laban looked through all the tents, but did not find his teraphim; for Rachel had put them in the saddle of her camel and was sitting upon them, and excused herself to her lord (*Adonai*, v. 35), on the ground that the custom of women was upon her. “The camel’s furniture,” i.e., the saddle (not “the camel’s litter:” *Luther*), here the woman’s riding saddle, which had a comfortable seat formed of carpets on the top of the packsaddle. The fact that Laban passed over Rachel’s seat because of her pretended condition, does not presuppose the Levitical law in Lev. 15:19 ff., according to which, any one who touched the couch or seat of such a woman was rendered unclean. For, in the first place, the view which lies at the foundation of this law was much older than the laws of Moses, and is met with among many other nations (cf. *Bähr*, *Symbolik* ii. 466, etc.); consequently Laban might refrain from making further examination, less from fear of defilement, than because he regarded it as impossible that any one with the custom of women upon her should sit upon his gods.

Gen. 31:36 ff. As Laban found nothing, Jacob grew angry, and pointed out the injustice of his hot pursuit and his search among all his things, but more especially the harsh treatment he had received from him in return for the unselfish and self-denying services that he had rendered him for twenty years. Acute sensibility and elevated self-consciousness give to Jacob’s words a

rhythmical movement and a poetical form. Hence such expressions as אָחַרְךָ דָּלַק *“hotly pursued,”* which is only met with in 1Sa. 17:53; אָחַזְתָּהּ אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אָחַזְתָּהּ *“I had to atone for it,”* i.e., to bear the loss; *“the Fear of Isaac,”* used as a name for God, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, σέβας = σέβασμα, the object of Isaac’s fear or sacred awe.

Gen. 31:40. *“I have been; by day (i.e., I have been in this condition, that by day) heat has consumed (prostrated) me, and cold by night”* — for it is well known, that in the East the cold by night corresponds to the heat by day; the hotter the day the colder the night, as a rule.

Gen. 31:42. *“Except the God of my father...had been for me, surely thou wouldst now have sent me away empty. God has seen mine affliction and the labour of my hands, and last night He judged it.”* By the warning given to Laban, God pronounced sentence upon the matter between Jacob and Laban, condemning the course which Laban had pursued, and still intended to pursue, towards Jacob; but not on that account sanctioning all that Jacob had done to increase his own possessions, still less confirming Jacob’s assertion that the vision mentioned by Jacob (vv. 11, 12) was a revelation from God. But as Jacob had only met cunning with cunning, deceit with deceit, Laban had no right to punish him for what he had done. Some excuse may indeed be found for Jacob’s conduct in the heartless treatment he received from Laban, but the fact that God defended him from Laban’s revenge did not prove it to be right. He had not acted upon the rule laid down in Pro. 20:22 (cf. Rom. 12:17; 1Th. 5:15).

Gen. 31:43-54. These words of Jacob *“cut Laban to the heart with their truth, so that he turned round, offered his hand, and proposed a covenant.”* Jacob proceeded at once to give a practical proof of his assent to this proposal of his father-in-law, by erecting a stone as a memorial, and calling upon his relations also (*“his brethren,”* as in v. 23, by whom Laban and the relations who came with him are intended, as v. 54 shows) to gather stones into a heap, which formed a table, as is briefly observed in v. 46*b*, for the covenant meal (v. 54). This stone-heap was called *Jegar-Sahadutha* by Laban, and *Galeed* by Jacob (the former is the Chaldee, the latter the Hebrew; they have both the same meaning, viz., *“heaps of witness”*¹⁵⁷), because, as Laban, who spoke first, as being the elder, explained, the heap was to be a *“witness between him and Jacob.”* The historian then adds this explanation: *“therefore they called his name Gal’ed,”* and immediately afterwards introduces a second name, which the heap received from words that were spoken by Laban at the conclusion of the covenant (v. 49): *“And Mizpah,”* i.e., watch, watch-place (sc., he called it), *“for he (Laban) said, Jehovah watch between me and thee; for we are hidden*

from one another (from the face of one another), *if thou shalt oppress my daughters, and if thou shalt take wives to my daughters! No man is with us, behold God is witness between me and thee!*" (vv. 49, 50). After these words of Laban, which are introduced parenthetically, ^{f58} and in which he enjoined upon Jacob fidelity to his daughters, the formation of the covenant of reconciliation and peace between them is first described, according to which, neither of them (*sive ego sive tu*, as in Exo. 19:13) was to pass the stone-heap and memorial-stone with a hostile intention towards the other. Of this the memorial was to serve as a witness, and the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, the God of their father (Terah), would be umpire between them. To this covenant, in which Laban, according to his polytheistic views, placed the God of Abraham upon the same level with the God of Nahor and Terah, Jacob swore by "the Fear of Isaac" (v. 42), the God who was worshipped by his father with sacred awe. He then offered sacrifices upon the mountain, and invited his relations to eat, i.e., to partake of a sacrificial meal, and seal the covenant by a feast of love.

The geographical names *Gilead* and *Ramath-Mizpeh* (Jos. 13:26), also *Mizpeh-Gilead* (Jud. 2:29), sound so obviously like *Gal'ed* and *Mizpah*, that they are no doubt connected, and owe their origin to the monument erected by Jacob and Laban; so that it was by prolepsis that the scene of this occurrence was called "the mountains of Gilead" in vv. 21, 23, 25. By the *mount* or *mountains of Gilead* we are not to understand the mountain range to the south of the Jabbok (Zerka), the present *Jebel Jelaad*, or *Jebel es Salt*. The name *Gilead* has a much more comprehensive signification in the Old Testament; and the mountains to the south of the Jabbok are called in Deu. 3:12 the half of Mount Gilead; the mountains to the north of the Jabbok, the *Jebel-Ajlun*, forming the other half. In this chapter the name is used in the broader sense, and refers primarily to the northern half of the mountains (above the Jabbok); for Jacob did not cross the Jabbok till afterwards (Gen. 32:23, 24). There is nothing in the names *Ramath-Mizpeh*, which *Ramoth* in Gilead bears in Jos. 13:26, and *Mizpeh-Gilead*, which it bears in Jud. 11:29, to compel us to place Laban's meeting with Jacob in the southern portion of the mountains of Gilead. For even if this city is to be found in the modern *Salt*, and was called *Ramath-Mizpeh* from the even recorded here, all that can be inferred from that is, that the tradition of Laban's covenant with Jacob was associated in later ages with *Ramoth* in Gilead, without the correctness of the association being thereby established.

THE CAMP OF GOD AND JACOB'S WRESTLING.
— **GENESIS 32**

Gen. 32: 1-3. THE HOST OF GOD. — When Laban had taken his departure peaceably, Jacob pursued his journey to Canaan. He was then met by some angels of God, in whom he discerned an encampment of God; and he called the place where they appeared *Mahanaim*, i.e., double camp or double host, because the host of God joined his host as a safeguard. This appearance of angels necessarily reminded him of the vision of the ladder, on his flight from Canaan. Just as the angels ascending and descending had then represented to him the divine protection and assistance during his journey and sojourn in a foreign land, so now the angelic host was a signal of the help of God for the approaching conflict with Esau of which he was in fear, and a fresh pledge of the promise (Gen. 28:15), “I will bring thee back to the land,” etc. Jacob saw it during his journey; in a waking condition, therefore, not internally, but out of or above himself: but whether with the eyes of the body or of the mind (cf. 2Ki. 6:17), cannot be determined. *Mahanaim* was afterwards a distinguished city, which is frequently mentioned, situated to the north of the Jabbok; and the name and remains are still preserved in the place called *Mahneh* (*Robinson*, Pal. Appendix, p. 166), the site of which, however, has not yet been minutely examined (see my Comm. on Joshua, p. 259).

Gen. 32: 4-13. From this point Jacob sent messengers forward to his brother Esau, to make known his return in such a style of humility (“thy servant,” “my lord”) as was adapted to conciliate him. אָנֹכִי (v. 5) is the first pers. imperf. Kal for אָנֹכִי, from אָנֹךְ to delay, to pass a time; cf. Pro. 8:17, and Ges. § 68, 2. The statement that Esau was already in the land of Seir (v. 4), or, as it is afterwards called, the field of Edom, is not at variance with Gen. 36: 6, and may be very naturally explained on the supposition, that with the increase of his family and possessions, he severed himself more and more from his father's house, becoming increasingly convinced, as time went on, that he could hope for no change in the blessings pronounced by his father upon Jacob and himself, which excluded him from the inheritance of the promise, viz., the future possession of Canaan. Now, even if his malicious feelings towards Jacob had gradually softened down, he had probably never said anything to his parents on the subject, so that Rebekah had been unable to fulfil her promise (Gen. 27:45); and Jacob, being quite uncertain as to his brother's state of mind, was thrown into the greatest alarm and anxiety by the report of the messengers, that Esau was coming to meet him with 400 men. The simplest explanation of the fact that Esau should have had so many men about him as a standing army, is that given by *Delitzsch*; namely, that he had to subjugate the Horite population in Seir, for which purpose he might easily have formed such an

army, partly from the Canaanitish and Ishmaelitish relations of his wives, and partly from his own servants. His reason for going to meet Jacob with such a company may have been, either to show how mighty a prince he was, or with the intention of making his brother sensible of his superior power, and assuming a hostile attitude if the circumstances favoured it, even though the lapse of years had so far mitigated his anger, that he no longer seriously thought of executing the vengeance he had threatened twenty years before. For we are warranted in regarding Jacob's fear as no vain, subjective fancy, but as having an objective foundation, by the fact that God endowed him with courage and strength for his meeting with Esau, through the medium of the angelic host and the wrestling at the Jabbok; whilst, on the other hand, the brotherly affection and openness with which Esau met him, are to be attributed partly to Jacob's humble demeanour, and still more to the fact, that by the influence of God, the still remaining malice had been rooted out from his heart.

Gen. 32: 8 ff. Jacob, fearing the worst, divided his people and flocks into two camps, that if Esau smote the one, the other might escape. He then turned to the Great Helper in every time of need, and with an earnest prayer besought the God of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, who had directed him to return, that, on the ground of the abundant mercies and truth (cf. 24:27) He had shown him thus far, He would deliver him out of the hand of his brother, and from the threatening destruction, and so fulfil His promises.

Gen. 32:12. “For I am in fear of him, that (פֶּנֶּה) he come and smite me, mother with children.” אָם עַל בְּנֵיהֶם is a proverbial expression for unsparing cruelty, taken from the bird which covers its young to protect them (Deu. 22: 6, cf. Hos. 10:14). עַל super, una cum, as in Exo. 35:22.

Gen. 32:14-22. Although hoping for aid and safety from the Lord alone, Jacob neglected no means of doing what might help to appease his brother. Having taken up his quarters for the night in the place where he received the tidings of Esau's approach, he selected from his flocks (“of that which came to his hand,” i.e., which he had acquired) a very respectable present of 550 head of cattle, and sent them in different detachments to meet Esau, “as a present from his servant Jacob,” who was coming behind. The selection was in harmony with the general possessions of nomads (cf. Job. 1: 3; 43:12), and the proportion of male to female animals was arranged according to the agricultural rule of Varro (*de re rustica* 2, 3). The division of the present, “drove and drove separately,” i.e., into several separate droves which followed one another at certain intervals, was to serve the purpose of gradually mitigating the wrath of Esau. כִּפַּר פְּנֵים, v. 21, to appease the countenance; נִשָּׂא פְנֵים to raise any one's countenance, i.e., to receive him in a friendly

manner. This present he sent forward; and he himself remained the same night (mentioned in v. 14) in the camp.

Gen. 32:23-33. THE WRESTLING WITH GOD. — The same night, he conveyed his family with all his possessions across the ford of the Jabbok. *Jabbok* is the present Wady es Zerka (i.e., the blue), which flows from the east towards the Jordan, and with its deep rocky valley formed at that time the boundary between the kingdoms of Sihon at Heshbon and Og of Bashan. It now separates the countries of *Moerad* or *Ajlun* and *Belka*. The ford by which Jacob crossed was hardly the one which he took on his outward journey, upon the Syrian caravan-road by *Kalaat-Zerka*, but one much farther to the west, between *Jebel Ajlun* and *Jebel Jelaad*, through which *Buckingham*, *Burckhardt*, and *Seetzen* passed; and where there are still traces of walls and buildings to be seen, and other marks of cultivation.

Gen. 32:25. When Jacob was left alone on the northern side of the Jabbok, after sending all the rest across, “*there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day.*” נִאָבַק, an old word, which only occurs here (vv. 25, 26), signifying to wrestle, is either derived from אָבַק to wind, or related to הִבַּק to contract one’s self, to plant limb and limb firmly together. From this wrestling the river evidently received its name of *Jabbok* (יַבֹּק = יֵאָבַק).

Gen. 32:26. “*And when He (the unknown) saw that He did not overcome him, He touched his hip-socket; and his hip-socket was put out of joint* (תִּקַּע from יָקַע) *as He wrestled with him.*” Still Jacob would not let Him go until He blessed him. He then said to Jacob, “*They name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel* (יִשְׂרָאֵל, God’s fighter, from שָׂרָה to fight, and אֵל God); *for thou hast fought with God and with men, and hast prevailed.*” When Jacob asked Him His name, He declined giving any definite answer, and “*blessed him there.*” He did not tell him His name; not merely, as the angel stated to Manoah in reply to a similar question (Jud. 13:18), because it was פֶּלֶא wonder, i.e., incomprehensible to mortal man, but still more to fill Jacob’s soul with awe at the mysterious character of the whole event, and to lead him to take it to heart. What Jacob wanted to know, with regard to the person of the wonderful Wrestler, and the meaning and intention of the struggle, he must already have suspected, when he would not let Him go until He blessed him; and it was put before him still more plainly in the new name that was given to him with this explanation, “*Thou hast fought with Elohim and with men, and hast conquered.*” God had met him in the form of a man: God in the angel, according to Hos. 12: 4, 5, i.e., not in a created angel, but in the Angel of Jehovah, the visible manifestation of the invisible God. Our history does not

speak of Jehovah, or the Angel of Jehovah, but of *Elohim*, for the purpose of bringing out the contrast between God and the creature.

This remarkable occurrence is not to be regarded as a dream or an internal vision, but fell within the sphere of sensuous perception. At the same time, it was not a natural or corporeal wrestling, but a “real conflict of both mind and body, a work of the spirit with intense effort of the body” (*Delitzsch*), in which Jacob was lifted up into a highly elevated condition of body and mind resembling that of ecstasy, through the medium of the manifestation of God. In a merely outward conflict, it is impossible to conquer through prayers and tears. As the idea of a dream or vision has no point of contact in the history; so the notion, that the outward conflict of bodily wrestling, and the spiritual conflict with prayer and tears, are two features opposed to one another and spiritually distinct, is evidently at variance with the meaning of the narrative and the interpretation of the prophet Hosea. Since Jacob still continued his resistance, even after his hip had been put out of joint, and would not let Him go till He had blessed him, it cannot be said that it was not till all hope of maintaining the conflict by bodily strength was taken from him, that he had recourse to the weapon of prayer. And when Hosea (Hos. 12: 4, 5) points his contemporaries to their wrestling forefather as an example for their imitation, in these words, “He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and in his human strength he fought with God; and he fought with the Angel and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto Him,” the turn by which the explanatory periphrasis of Jacob’s words, “I will not let Thee go except Thou bless me,” is linked on to the previous clause by **וַיִּבְכֶּה** without a copula or *vav consec.*, is a proof that the prophet did not regard the weeping and supplication as occurring after the wrestling, or as only a second element, which was subsequently added to the corporeal struggle. Hosea evidently looked upon the weeping and supplication as the distinguishing feature in the conflict, without thereby excluding the corporeal wrestling. At the same time, by connecting this event with what took place at the birth of the twins (Gen. 25:26), the prophet teaches that Jacob merely completed, by his wrestling with God, what he had already been engaged in even from his mother’s womb, viz., his striving for the birthright; in other words, for the possession of the covenant promise and the covenant blessing. This meaning is also indicated by the circumstances under which the event took place. Jacob had wrested the blessing of the birthright from his brother Esau; but it was by cunning and deceit, and he had been obliged to flee from his wrath in consequence. And now that he desired to return to the land of promise and his father’s house, and to enter upon the inheritance promised him in his father’s blessing; Esau was coming to meet him with 400 men, which filled him with great alarm. As he felt too weak to enter upon a conflict with him, he prayed to the covenant God for deliverance

from the hand of his brother, and the fulfilment of the covenant promises. The answer of God to this prayer was the present wrestling with God, in which he was victorious indeed, but not without carrying the marks of it all his life long in the dislocation of his thigh. Jacob's great fear of Esau's wrath and vengeance, which he could not suppress notwithstanding the divine revelations at Bethel and Mahanaim, had its foundation in his evil conscience, in the consciousness of the sin connected with his wilful and treacherous appropriation of the blessing of the first-born. To save him from the hand of his brother, it was necessary that God should first meet him as an enemy, and show him that his real opponent was God Himself, and that he must first of all overcome Him before he could hope to overcome his brother. And Jacob overcame God; not with the power of the flesh however, with which he had hitherto wrestled for God against man (God convinced him of that by touching his hip, so that it was put out of joint), but by the power of faith and prayer, reaching by firm hold of God even to the point of being blessed, by which he proved himself to be a true wrestler of God, who fought with God and with men, i.e., who by his wrestling with God overcame men as well. And whilst by the dislocation of his hip the carnal nature of his previous wrestling was declared to be powerless and wrong, he received in the new name of *Israel* the prize of victory, and at the same time directions from God how he was henceforth to strive for the cause of the Lord. — By his wrestling with God, Jacob entered upon a new stage in his life. As a sign of this, he received a new name, which indicated, as the result of this conflict, the nature of his new relation to God. But whilst Abram and Sarai, from the time when God changed their names (Gen. 17: 5 and 15), are always called by their new names; in the history of Jacob we find the old name used interchangeably with the new. "For the first two names denoted a change into a new and permanent position, effected and intended by the will and promise of God; consequently the old names were entirely abolished. But the name *Israel* denoted a spiritual state determined by faith; and in Jacob's life the natural state, determined by flesh and blood, still continued to stand side by side with this. Jacob's new name was transmitted to his descendants, however, who were called *Israel* as the covenant nation. For as the blessing of their forefather's conflict came down to them as a spiritual inheritance, so did they also enter upon the duty of preserving this inheritance by continuing in a similar conflict.

Gen. 32:31. The remembrance of this wonderful conflict Jacob perpetuated in the name which he gave to the place where it had occurred, viz., *Pniel* or *Pnuel* (with the connecting wound פ or ף), because there he had seen Elohim face to face, and his soul had been delivered (from death, 16:13).

Gen. 32:32, 33. With the rising of the sun after the night of his conflict, the night of anguish and fear also passed away from Jacob's mind, so that he was

able to leave Pnuel in comfort, and go forward on his journey. The dislocation of the thigh alone remained. For this reason the children of Israel are accustomed to avoid eating the *nervus ischiadicus*, the principal nerve in the neighbourhood of the hip, which is easily injured by any violent strain in wrestling. “*Unto this day:*” the remark is applicable still.

JACOB’S RECONCILIATION WITH ESAU AND RETURN TO CANAAN. — CH. 33

Gen. 33: 1-17. MEETING WITH ESAU. — Vv. 1 ff. As Jacob went forward, he saw Esau coming to meet him with his 400 men. He then arranged his wives and children in such a manner, that the maids with their children went first, Leah with hers in the middle, and Rachel with Joseph behind, thus forming a long procession. But he himself went in front, and met Esau with sevenfold obeisance. **שָׁתַחוּ אֲרָצָה** does not denote complete prostration, like **אִפְסִים אֲרָצָה** in Gen. 19: 1, but a deep Oriental bow, in which the head approaches the ground, but does not touch it. By this manifestation of deep reverence, Jacob hoped to win his brother’s heart. He humbled himself before him as the elder, with the feeling that he had formerly sinned against him. Esau, on the other hand, “had a comparatively better, but not so tender a conscience.” At the sight of Jacob he was carried away by the natural feelings of brotherly affection, and running up to him, embraced him, fell on his neck, and kissed him; and they both wept. The *puncta extraordinaria* above **יִשְׁקָהוּ** are probably intended to mark the word as suspicious. They “are like a note of interrogation, questioning the genuineness of this kiss; but without any reason” (*Del.*). Even if there was still some malice in Esau’s heart, it was overcome by the humility with which his brother met him, so that he allowed free course to the generous emotions of his heart; all the more, because the “roving life” which suited his nature had procured him such wealth and power, that he was quite equal to his brother in earthly possessions.

Gen. 33: 5-7. When his eyes fell upon the women and children, he inquired respecting them, “*Whom hast thou here?*” And Jacob replied, “*The children with whom Elohim hath favoured me.*” Upon this, the mothers and their children approached in order, making reverential obeisance. **הִנְּנִי** with double acc. “graciously to present.” *Elohim*: “to avoid reminding Esau of the blessing of *Jehovah*, which had occasioned his absence” (*Del.*).

Gen. 33: 8-11. Esau then inquired about the *camp* that had met him, i.e., the presents of cattle that were sent to meet him, and refused to accept them, until Jacob’s urgent persuasion eventually induced him to do so.

Gen. 33:10. “For therefore,” sc., to be able to offer thee this present, “have I come to see thy face, as man seeth the face of God, and thou hast received me favourably.” The thought is this: In thy countenance I have been met with divine (heavenly) friendliness (cf. 1Sa. 29: 9, 2Sa. 14:17). Jacob might say this without cringing, since he “must have discerned the work of God in the unexpected change in his brother’s disposition towards him, and in his brother’s friendliness a reflection of this divine.”

Gen. 33:11. Blessing: i.e., the present, expressive of his desire to bless, as in 1Sa. 25:27; 30:26. הַבְּרָכָה: for הַבְּרָכָה, as in Deu. 31:29, Isa. 7:14, etc.; sometimes also in verbs ל"ה, Lev. 25:21; 26:34. יֶשְׁלִי כֹל: “I have all” (not all kinds of things); viz as the heir of the divine promise.

Gen. 33:12-15. Lastly, Esau proposed to accompany Jacob on his journey. But Jacob politely declined not only his own company, but also the escort, which Esau afterwards offered him, of a portion of his attendants; the latter as being unnecessary, the former as likely to be injurious to his flocks. This did not spring from any feeling of distrust; and the ground assigned was no mere pretext. He needed no military guard, “for he knew that he was defended by the hosts of God;” and the reason given was a very good one: “My lord knoweth that the children are tender, and the flocks and herds that are milking (עֲלוֹת from עוּל, giving milk or suckling) are upon me” (עָלַי): i.e., because they are giving milk they are an object of especial anxiety to me; “and if one should overdrive them a single day, all the sheep would die.” A caravan, with delicate children and cattle that required care, could not possibly keep pace with Esau and his horsemen, without taking harm. And Jacob could not expect his brother to accommodate himself to the rate at which he was travelling. For this reason he wished Esau to go on first; and he would drive gently behind, “according to the foot of the cattle (מְלֶאכְבָּה possessions = cattle), and according to the foot of the children,” i.e., “according to the pace at which the cattle and the children could go” (Luther). “Till I come to my lord to Seir:” these words are not to be understood as meaning that he intended to go direct to Seir; consequently they were not a wilful deception for the purpose of getting rid of Esau. Jacob’s destination was Canaan, and in Canaan probably Hebron, where his father Isaac still lived. From thence he may have thought of paying a visit to Esau in Seir. Whether he carried out this intention or not, we cannot tell; for we have not a record of all that Jacob did, but only of the principal events of his life. We afterwards find them both meeting together as friends at their father’s funeral (Gen. 35:29). Again, the attitude of inferiority which Jacob assumed in his conversation with Esau, addressing him as lord, and speaking of himself as servant, was simply an act of courtesy suited to the circumstances, in which he paid to Esau the respect due to the head of a

powerful band; since he could not conscientiously have maintained the attitude of a brother, when inwardly and spiritually, in spite of Esau's friendly meeting, they were so completely separated the one from the other.

Gen. 33:16, 17. Esau set off the same day for Mount Seir, whilst Jacob proceeded to *Succoth*, where he built himself a house and made *succoth* for his flocks, i.e., probably not huts of branches and shrubs, but hurdles or folds made of twigs woven together. According to Jos. 13:27, *Succoth* was in the valley of the Jordan, and was allotted to the tribe of Gad, as part of the district of the Jordan, "on the other side Jordan eastward;" and this is confirmed by Jud. 8: 4, 5, and by *Jerome (quaest. ad h. l.): Sochoth usque hodie civitas trans Jordanem in parte Scythopoleos*. Consequently it cannot be identified with the *Sâcut* on the western side of the Jordan, to the south of Beisan, above the *Wady el Mâlih*. — How long Jacob remained in Succoth cannot be determined; but we may conclude that he stayed there some years from the circumstance, that by erecting a house and huts he prepared for a lengthened stay. The motives which induced him to remain there are also unknown to us. But when *Knobel* adduces the fact, that Jacob came to Canaan for the purpose of visiting Isaac (Gen. 31:18), as a reason why it is improbable that he continued long at Succoth, he forgets that Jacob could visit his father from Succoth just as well as from Shechem, and that, with the number of people and cattle that he had about him, it was impossible that he should join and subordinate himself to Isaac's household, after having attained through his past life and the promises of God a position of patriarchal independence.

Gen. 33:18-20. From Succoth, Jacob crossed a ford of the Jordan, and "came in safety to the city of Sichem in the land of Canaan." שָׁלֵם is not a proper name meaning "to Shalem," as it is rendered by *Luther* (and Eng. Vers., *Tr.*) after the LXX, Vulg., etc.; but an adjective, safe, peaceful, equivalent to בְּשָׁלוֹם, "in peace," in Gen. 28:21, to which there is an evident allusion. What Jacob had asked for in his vow at Bethel, before his departure from Canaan, was now fulfilled. He had returned in safety "to the land of Canaan;" Succoth, therefore, did not belong to the land of Canaan, but must have been on the eastern side of the Jordan. עִיר שֶׁכֶם, lit., city of Shechem; so called from Shechem the son of the Hivite prince Hamor ^{f59} (v. 19, 34: 2 ff.), who founded it and called it by the name of his son, since it was not in existence in Abraham's time (vid., 12: 6). Jacob pitched his tent before the town, and then bought the piece of ground upon which he encamped from the sons of Hamor for 100 *Kesita*. קֶשֶׁטָה is not a piece of silver of the value of a lamb (according to the ancient versions), but a quantity of silver weighed out, of considerable, though not exactly determinable value: cf. *Ges. thes. s. v.* This purchase showed that Jacob, in reliance upon the promise of God, regarded

Canaan as his own home and the home of his seed. This piece of field, which fell to the lot of the sons of Joseph, and where Joseph's bones were buried (Jos. 24:32), was, according to tradition, the plain which stretches out at the south-eastern opening of the valley of Shechem, where Jacob's well is still pointed out (John 4: 6), also Joseph's grave, a Mahometan wely (grave) two or three hundred paces to the north (Rob. Pal. iii. 95 ff.). Jacob also erected an altar, as Abraham had previously done after his entrance into Canaan (Gen. 12: 7), and called it *El-elohe-Israel*, "*God (the mighty) is the God of Israel,*" to set forth in this name the spiritual acquisition of his previous life, and according to his vow (Gen. 28:21) to give glory to the "God of Israel" (as he called Jehovah, with reference to the name given to him at Gen. 32:29), for having proved Himself to be El, a mighty God, during his long absence, and that it might serve as a memorial for his descendants.

VIOLATION OF DINAH; REVENGE OF SIMEON AND LEVI. — GENESIS 34

Gen. 34: 1-4. During their stay at Shechem, *Dinah*, Jacob's daughter by Leah, went out one day to see, i.e., to make the acquaintance of the daughters of the land; when Shechem the Hivite, the son of the prince, took her with him and seduced her. Dinah was probably between 13 and 15 at the time, and had attained perfect maturity; for this is often the case in the East at the age of 12, and sometimes earlier. There is no ground for supposing her to have been younger. Even if she was born after Joseph, and not till the end of Jacob's 14 years' service with Laban, and therefore was only five years old when they left Mesopotamia, eight or ten years may have passed since then, as Jacob may easily have spent from eight to eleven years in Succoth, where he had built a house, and Shechem, where he had bought "a parcel of a field." But she cannot have been older; for, according to Gen. 37: 2, Joseph was sold by his brethren when he was 17 years old, i.e., in the 11th year after Jacob's return from Mesopotamia, as he was born in the 14th year of Jacob's service with Laban ^{f60} (cf. Gen. 30:24). In the interim between Dinah's seduction and the sale of Joseph there occurred nothing but Jacob's journey from Shechem to Bethel and thence to Ephratah, in the neighbourhood of which Benjamin was born and Rachel died, and his arrival in Hebron (Genesis 35). This may all have taken place within a single year. Jacob was still at Hebron, when Joseph was sent to Shechem and sold by his brethren (Gen. 37:14); and Isaac's death did not happen for 12 years afterwards, although it is mentioned in connection with the account of Jacob's arrival at Hebron (Gen. 35:27 ff.).

Gen. 34: 3. Shechem "*loved the girl, and spoke to her heart;*" i.e., he sought to comfort her by the promise of a happy marriage, and asked his father to obtain her for him as a wife.

Gen. 34: 5-12. When Jacob heard of the seduction of his daughter, “*he was silent,*” i.e., he remained quiet, without taking any active proceedings (ex. 14:14; 2Sa. 19:11) until his sons came from the field. When they heard of it, they were grieved and burned with wrath at the disgrace. **נָטַם** to defile = to dishonour, disgrace, because it was an uncircumcised man who had seduced her. “*Because he had wrought folly in Israel, by lying with Jacob’s daughter.*” “To work folly” was a standing phrase for crimes against the honour and calling of Israel as the people of God, especially for shameful sins of the flesh (Deu. 22:21; Jud. 20:10; 2Sa. 13: 2, etc.); but it was also applied to other great sins (Jos. 7:15). As Jacob had become Israel, the seduction of his daughter was a crime against Israel, which is called folly, inasmuch as the relation of Israel to God was thereby ignored (Psa. 14: 1). “*And this ought not to be done:*” **יַעֲשֶׂה** *potentialis* as in Gen. 20: 9. — Hamor went to Jacob to ask for his daughter (v. 6); but Jacob’s sons reached home at the same time (v. 7), so that Hamor spoke to them (Jacob and his sons). To attain his object Hamor proposed a further intermarriage, unrestricted movement on their part in the land, and that they should dwell there, trade (**εμπορεύεσθαι**), and secure possessions (**יָסֻדוּ**) settle down securely, as in Gen. 47:27). Shechem also offered (vv. 11, 12) to give anything they might ask in the form of dowry (**מְהָרָה** not purchase-money, but the usual gift made to the bride, vid., Gen. 24:53) and presents (for the brothers and mother), if they would only give him the damsel.

Gen. 34:13-17. Attractive as these offers of the Hivite prince and his son were, they were declined by Jacob’s sons, who had the chief voice in the question of their sister’s marriage (vid., Gen. 24:50). And they were quite right; for, by accepting them, they would have violated the sacred call of Israel and his seed, and sacrificed the promises of Jehovah to Mammon. But they did it in a wrong way; for “*they answered with deceit and acted from behind*” (**בְּמַרְמָה וּבְדַבָּר**) is to be rendered *dolos struxit*; **דִּבַּר דְּבָרִים** would be the expression for “giving mere words,” Hos. 10: 4; vid., *Ges. thes.*), “*because he had defiled Dinah their sister.*” They told him that they could not give their sister to an uncircumcised man, because this would be a reproach to them; and the only condition upon which they would consent (**נִאֲוָה** *imperf. Niph.* of **אָוָה**) was, that the Shechemites should all be circumcised; otherwise they would take their sister and go.

Gen. 34:18-24. The condition seemed reasonable to the two suitors, and by way of setting a good example, “*the young man did not delay to do this word,*” i.e., to submit to circumcision, “*as he was honoured before all his father’s house.*” This is stated by anticipation in v. 19; but before submitting to the

operation, he went with his father to the gate, the place of public assembly, to lay the matter before the citizens of the town. They knew so well how to make the condition palatable, by a graphic description of the wealth of Jacob and his family, and by expatiating upon the advantages of being united with them, that the Shechemites consented to the proposal. שְׁלֵמִים: *integri*, people whose bearing is unexceptionable. “*And the land, behold broad on both sides it is before them,*” i.e., it offers space enough in every direction for them to wander about with their flocks. And then the gain: “*Their cattle, and their possessions, and their beasts of burden...shall they not be ours?*” מִקְנֶה is used here for flocks and herds, בְּהֵמָה for beasts of burden, viz., camels and asses (cf. Num. 32:26). But notwithstanding the advantages here pointed out, the readiness of all the citizens of Shechem (vid., Gen. 23:10) to consent to be circumcised, could only be satisfactorily explained from the fact that this religious rite was already customary in different nations (according to *Herod.* 2, 104, among the Egyptians and Colchians), as an act of religious or priestly consecration.

Gen. 34:25-31. But on the third day, when the Shechemites were thoroughly prostrated by the painful effects of the operation, Simeon and Levi (with their servants of course) fell upon the town בְּמַח (i.e., while the people were off their guard, as in Eze. 30: 9), slew all the males, including Hamor and Shechem, with the edge of the sword, i.e., without quarter (Num. 21:24; Jos. 10:28, etc.), and brought back their sister. The sons of Jacob then plundered the town, and carried off all the cattle in the town and in the fields, and all their possessions, including the women and the children in their houses. By the sons of Jacob (v. 27) we are not to understand the rest of his sons to the exclusion of Simeon, Levi, and even Reuben, as *Delitzsch* supposes, but all his sons. For the supposition, that Simeon and Levi were content with taking their murderous revenge, and had no share in the plunder, is neither probable in itself nor reconcilable with what Jacob said on his death-bed (Gen. 49: 5-7, observe עֲקְרוּ-שׁוּר) about this very crime; nor can it be inferred from וַיֵּצְאוּ in v. 26, for this relates merely to their going away from the house of the two princes, not to their leaving Shechem altogether. The abrupt way in which the plundering is linked on to the slaughter of all the males, without any copulative *Vav*, gives to the account the character of indignation at so revolting a crime; and this is also shown in the verbosity of the description. The absence of the copula is not to be accounted for by the hypothesis that vv. 27-29 are interpolated; for an interpolator might have supplied the missing link by a *vav*, just as well as the LXX and other ancient translators.

Gen. 34:30, 31. Jacob reproved the originators of this act most severely for their wickedness:

“Ye have brought me into trouble (conturbare), to make me stink (an abomination) among the inhabitants of the land;...and yet I (with my attendants) am a company that can be numbered (lit., people of number, easily numbered, a small band, Deu. 4:27, cf. Isa. 10:19); and if they gather together against me, they will slay me,” etc.

If Jacob laid stress simply upon the consequences which this crime was likely to bring upon himself and his house, the reason was, that this was the view most adapted to make an impression upon his sons. For his last words concerning Simeon and Levi (Gen. 49: 5-7) are a sufficient proof that the wickedness of their conduct was also an object of deep abhorrence. And his fear was not groundless. Only God in His mercy averted all the evil consequences from Jacob and his house (Gen. 35: 5, 6). But his sons answered, *“Are they to treat our sister like a harlot?”* עֵשָׂה as in Lev. 16:15, etc. Their indignation was justifiable enough; and their seeking revenge, as Absalom avenged the violation of his sister on Amnon (2Sa. 13:22 ff.), was in accordance with the habits of nomadic tribes. In this way, for example, seduction is still punished by death among the Arabs, and the punishment is generally inflicted by the brothers (cf. *Niebuhr*, Arab. p. 39; *Burckhardt*, Syr. p. 361, and *Beduinen*, p. 89, 224-5). In addition to this, Jacob’s sons looked upon the matter not merely as a violation of their sister’s chastity, but as a crime against the peculiar vocation of their tribe. But for all that, the deception they practised, the abuse of the covenant sign of circumcision as a means of gratifying their revenge, and the extension of that revenge to the whole town, together with the plundering of the slain, were crimes deserving of the strongest reprobation. The crafty character of Jacob degenerated into malicious cunning in Simeon and Levi; and jealousy for the exalted vocation of their family, into actual sin. This event “shows us in type all the errors into which the belief in the pre-eminence of Israel was sure to lead in the course of history, whenever that belief was rudely held by men of carnal minds” (*O. v. Gerlach*).

JACOB’S RETURN TO BETHEL AND HEBRON. DEATH OF ISAAC. — GENESIS 35

Gen. 35: 1-8. *JOURNEY TO BETHEL.* — Jacob had allowed ten years to pass since his return from Mesopotamia, without performing the vow which he made at Bethel when fleeing from Esau (Gen. 28:20 ff.), although he had recalled it to mind when resolving to return (Gen. 31:13), and had also erected an altar in Shechem to the “God of Israel” (Gen. 33:20). He was now directed by God (v. 1) to go to Bethel, and there build an altar to the God who had appeared to him on his flight from Esau. This command stirred him up to perform what had been neglected, viz., to put away from his house the strange

gods, which he had tolerated in weak consideration for his wives, and which had no doubt occasioned the long neglect, and to pay to God the vow that he had made in the day of his trouble. He therefore commanded his house (vv. 2, 3), i.e., his wives and children, and “*all that were with him,*” i.e., his men and maid-servants, to put away the strange gods, to purify themselves, and wash their clothes. He also buried “all the strange gods,” i.e., Rachel’s teraphim (Gen. 31:19), and whatever other idols there were, with the earrings which were worn as amulets and charms, “*under the terebinth at Shechem,*” probably the very tree under which Abraham once pitched his tent (Gen. 12: 6), and which was regarded as a sacred place in Joshua’s time (vid., Jos. 24:26, though the pointing is אֵלָם there). The burial of the idols was followed by purification through the washing of the body, as a sign of the purification of the heart from the defilement of idolatry, and by the putting on of clean and festal clothes, as a symbol of the sanctification and elevation of the heart to the Lord (Jos. 24:23). This decided turning to the Lord was immediately followed by the blessing of God. When they left Shechem a “*terror of God,*” i.e., a supernatural terror, “*came upon the cities round about,*” so that they did not venture to pursue the sons of Jacob on account of the cruelty of Simeon and Levi (v. 5). Having safely arrived in Bethel, Jacob built an altar, which he called *El Bethel* (God of Bethel) in remembrance of the manifestation of God on His flight from Esau.

Gen. 35: 8. There *Deborah*, Rebekah’s nurse, died, and was buried below Bethel under an oak, which was henceforth called the “oak of weeping,” a mourning oak, from the grief of Jacob’s house on account of her death. Deborah had either been sent by Rebekah to take care of her daughters-in-law and grandsons, or had gone of her own accord into Jacob’s household after the death of her mistress. The mourning at her death, and the perpetuation of her memory, are proofs that she must have been a faithful and highly esteemed servant in Jacob’s house.

Gen. 35: 9-15. THE FRESH REVELATION AT BETHEL. — After Jacob had performed his vow by erecting the altar at Bethel, God appeared to him again there (“*again,*” referring to Genesis 28), “*on his coming out of Padan-Aram,*” as He had appeared to him 30 years before on his journey thither, — though it was then in a dream, now by daylight in a visible form (cf. v. 13, “*God went up from him*”). The gloom of that day of fear had now brightened into the clear daylight of salvation. This appearance was the answer, which God gave to Jacob on his acknowledgement of Him; and its reality is thereby established, in opposition to the conjecture that it is merely a legendary repetition of the previous vision. ^{f61}

The former theophany had promised to Jacob divine protection in a foreign land and restoration to his home, on the ground of his call to be the bearer of the blessings of salvation. This promise God had fulfilled, and Jacob therefore performed his vow. On the strength of this, God now confirmed to him the name of Israel, which He had already given him in Gen. 32:28, and with it the promised of a numerous seed and the possession of Canaan, which, so far as the form and substance are concerned, points back rather to Gen. 17: 6 and 8 than to Gen. 28:13, 14, and for the fulfilment of which, commencing with the birth of his sons and his return to Canaan, and stretching forward to the most remote future, the name of *Israel* was to furnish him with a pledge. — Jacob alluded to this second manifestation of God at Bethel towards the close of his life (Gen. 48: 3, 4); and Hosea (Hos. 12: 4) represents it as the result of his wrestling with God. The remembrance of this appearance Jacob transmitted to his descendants by erecting a memorial stone, which he not only anointed with oil like the former one in Gen. 28:17, but consecrated by a drink-offering and by the renewal of the name Bethel.

Gen. 35:16-20. BIRTH OF BENJAMIN AND DEATH OF RACHEL. — Jacob's departure from Bethel was not in opposition to the divine command, "dwell there" (v. 1). For the word **יָשַׁב** does not enjoin a permanent abode; but, when taken in connection with what follows, "make there an altar," it merely directs him to stay there and perform his vow. As they were travelling forward, Rachel was taken in labour not far from Ephrath. **כְּבֵרֵת־הָאֲרָזִים** is a space, answering probably to the Persian parasang, though the real meaning of **כְּבֵרֵת** is unknown. The birth was a difficult one. **תִּקְשָׁ בְלִדְתָהּ**: she had difficulty in her labour (instead of *Piel* we find *Hiphil* in v. 17 with the same signification). The midwife comforted her by saying: "*Fear not, for this also is to thee a son,*" — a wish expressed by her when Joseph was born (Gen. 30:24). But she expired; and as she was dying, she called him *Been-oni*, "son of my pain." Jacob, however, called him *Ben-jamin*, probably son of good fortune, according to the meaning of the word *jamin* sustained by the Arabic, to indicate that his pain at the loss of his favourite wife was compensated by the birth of this son, who now completed the number twelve. Other explanations are less simple. He buried Rachel on the road to Ephrath, or Ephrath (probably the fertile, from **פְּרָתָהּ**), i.e., *Bethlehem* (bread-house), by which name it is better known, though the origin of it is obscure. He also erected a monument over her grave (**מִצְבֵּהּ**, **στήλη**), on which the historian observes, "*This is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day:*" a remark which does not necessarily point to a post-Mosaic period, but which could easily have been made even 10 or 20 years after its erection. For the fact that a grave-stone had been preserved upon the high road in a foreign land, the inhabitants of

which had no interest whatever in it, might appear worthy of notice even though only a single decennary had passed away. ¹⁶²

Gen. 35:21, 22a . REUBEN'S INCEST. — As they travelled onward, Jacob pitched his tent on the other side of *Migdal Eder*, where Reuben committed incest with Bilhah, his father's concubine. It is merely alluded to her in the passing remark that Israel heard it, by way of preparation for Gen. 49: 4. *Migdal Eder* (flock-tower) was a watch-tower built for the protection of flocks against robbers (cf. 2Ki. 18: 8; 2Ch. 26:10; 27: 4) on the other side of Bethlehem, but hardly within 1000 paces of the town, where it has been placed by tradition since the time of Jerome. The *piska* in the middle of v. 22 does not indicate a gap in the text, but the conclusion of a *parashah*, a division of the text of greater antiquity and greater correctness than the Masoretic division.

Gen. 35:22-29. JACOB'S RETURN TO HIS FATHER'S HOUSE, AND DEATH OF ISAAC. — Jacob had left his father's house with no other possession than a staff, and now he returned with 12 sons. Thus had he been blessed by the faithful covenant God. To show this, the account of his arrival in his father's tent at Hebron is preceded by a list of his 12 sons, arranged according to their respective mothers; and this list is closed with the remark, "*These are the sons of Jacob, which were born to him in Padan-Aram*" (יָלְדוּ for יָלְדָה; Ges. § 143, 1), although Benjamin, the twelfth, was not born *in* Padan-Aram, but on the journey back.

Gen. 35:27, 28. Jacob's arrival in "*Mamre Kirjath-Arbah*," i.e., in the terebinth-grove of Mamre (Gen. 13:18) by Kirjath-Arbah or Hebron (vid., 23: 2), constituted his entrance into his father's house, to remain there as Isaac's heir. He had probably visited his father during the ten years that had elapsed since his return from Mesopotamia, though no allusion is made to this, since such visits would have no importance, either in themselves or their consequences, in connection with the sacred history. This was not the case, however, with his return to enter upon the family inheritance. With this, therefore, the history of Isaac's life is brought to a close. Isaac died at the age of 180, and was buried by his two sons in the cave of Machpelah (Gen. 49:31), Abraham's family grave, Esau having come from Seir to Hebron to attend the funeral of his father. But Isaac's death did not actually take place for 12 years after Jacob's return to Hebron. For as Joseph was 17 years old when he was sold by his brethren (Gen. 37: 2), and Jacob was then living at Hebron (Gen. 37:14), it cannot have been more than 31 years after his flight from Esau when Jacob returned home (cf. Gen. 34: 1). Now since, according to our calculation at Gen. 27: 1, he was 77 years old when he fled, he must have been 108 when he returned home; and Isaac would only have reached his 168th year, as he was 60 years old when Jacob was born (Gen. 25:26). Consequently

Isaac lived to witness the grief of Jacob at the loss of Joseph, and died but a short time before his promotion in Egypt, which occurred 13 years after he was sold (Gen. 41:46), and only 10 years before Jacob's removal with his family to Egypt, as Jacob was 130 years old when he was presented to Pharaoh (Gen. 47: 9). But the historical significance of his life was at an end, when Jacob returned home with his twelve sons.

IX. History of Esau

GENESIS 36

“Esau and Jacob shook hands once more over the corpse of their father. Henceforth their paths diverged, to meet no more” (*Del.*). As Esau had also received a divine promise (Gen. 25:23), and the history of his tribe was already interwoven in the paternal blessing with that of Israel (Gen. 27:29 and 40), an account is given in the book of Genesis of his growth into a nation; and a separate section is devoted to this, which, according to the invariable plan of the book, precedes the *tholedoth* of Jacob. The account is subdivided into the following sections, which are distinctly indicated by their respective headings. (Compare with these the parallel list in 1Ch. 1:35-54.)

Gen. 36: 1-8. ESAU'S WIVES AND CHILDREN. HIS SETTLEMENT IN THE MOUNTAINS OF SEIR. — In the heading (v. 1) the surname *Edom* is added to the name Esau, which he received at his birth, because the former became the national designation of his descendants. — Vv. 2, 3. The names of Esau's three wives differ from those given in the previous accounts (Gen. 26:34 and 28: 9), and in one instance the father's name as well. The daughter of Elon the Hittite is called *Adah* (the ornament), and in Gen. 26:34 *Basmath* (the fragrant); the second is called *Aholibamah* (probably tent-height), the daughter of Anah, daughter, i.e., grand-daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, and in Gen. 26:34, *Jehudith* (the praised or praiseworthy), daughter of Beeri the Hittite; the third, the daughter of Ishmael, is called *Basmath* here and *Mahalath* in Gen. 28: 9. This difference arose from the fact, that Moses availed himself of genealogical documents for Esau's family and tribe, and inserted them without alteration. It presents no irreconcilable discrepancy, therefore, but may be explained from the ancient custom in the East, of giving surnames, as the Arabs frequently do still, founded upon some important or memorable event in a man's life, which gradually superseded the other name (e.g., the name Edom, as explained in Gen. 25:30); whilst as a rule the women received new names when they were married (cf. *Chardin, Hengstenberg, Dissertations*, vol. ii. p. 223-6). The different names given for the father of Aholibamah or Judith, *Hengstenberg* explains by referring to the statement in v. 24, that Anah, the son of Zibeon, while watching the asses of his father in the desert, discovered the warm

springs (of Calirrhoe), on which he founds the acute conjecture, that from this discovery Anah received the surname *Beeri*, i.e., spring-man, which so threw his original name into the shade, as to be the only name given in the genealogical table. There is no force in the objection, that according to v. 25 Aholibamah was not a daughter of the discoverer of the springs, but of his uncle of the same name. For where is it stated that the Aholibamah mentioned in v. 25 was Esau's wife? And is it a thing unheard of that aunt and niece should have the same name? If Zibeon gave his second son the name of his brother Anah (cf. vv. 24 and 20), why could not his son Anah have named his daughter after his cousin, the daughter of his father's brother? The reception of Aholibamah into the list of the Seirite princes is no proof that she was Esau's wife, but may be much more naturally supposed to have arisen from the same (unknown) circumstance as that which caused one of the seats of the Edomitish *Alluphim* to be called by her name (v. 41). — Lastly, the remaining diversity, viz., that Anah is called a Hivite in v. 2 and a Hittite in Gen. 26:34, is not to be explained by the conjecture, that for Hivite we should read Horite, according to v. 20, but by the simple assumption that Hittite is used in Gen. 26:34 *sensu latiori* for Canaanite, according to the analogy of Jos. 1: 4, 1Ki. 10:29, 2Ki. 7: 6; just as the two Hittite wives of Esau are called daughters of Canaan in Gen. 28: 8. For the historical account, the general name Hittite sufficed; but the genealogical list required the special name of the particular branch of the Canaanitish tribes, viz., the Hivites. In just as simple a manner may the introduction of the Hivite Zibeon among the Horites of Seir (vv. 20 and 24) be explained, viz., on the supposition that he removed to the mountains of Seir, and there became a Horite, i.e., a troglodyte, or dweller in a cave. — The names of Esau's sons occur again in 1Ch. 1:35. The statement in vv. 6, 7, that Esau went with his family and possessions, which he had acquired in Canaan, into the land of Seir, from before his brother Jacob, does not imply (in contradiction to Gen. 32: 4; 33:14-16) that he did not leave the land of Canaan till after Jacob's return. The words may be understood without difficulty as meaning, that after founding a house of his own, when his family and flocks increased, Esau sought a home in Seir, because he knew that Jacob, as the heir, would enter upon the family possessions, but without waiting till he returned and actually took possession. In the clause "*went into the country*" (v. 6), the name *Seir* or *Edom* (cf. v. 16) must have dropt out, as the words "*into the country*" convey no sense when standing by themselves.

Gen. 36: 9-14 (cf. 1Ch. 1:36, 37). ESAU'S SONS AND GRANDSONS AS FATHERS OF TRIBES. — Through them he became the *father of Edom*, i.e., the founder of the Edomitish nation on the mountains of Seir. *Mouth Seir* is the mountainous region between the Dead Sea and the Elanitic Gulf, the northern half of which is called *Jebâl* (Γεβαλήνη) by the Arabs, the southern half,

Sherah (Rob. Pal. ii. 552). — In the case of two of the wives of Esau, who bore only one son each, the tribes were founded not by the sons, but by the grandsons; but in that of Aholibamah the three sons were the founders. Among the sons of Eliphaz we find *Amalek*, whose mother was Timna, the concubine of Eliphaz. He was the ancestor of the Amalekites, who attacked the Israelites at Horeb as they came out of Egypt under Moses (Exo. 17: 8 ff.), and not merely of a mixed tribe of Amalekites and Edomites, belonging to the supposed aboriginal Amalekite nation. For the Arabic legend of *Amlik* as an aboriginal tribe of Arabia is far too recent, confused, and contradictory to counterbalance the clear testimony of the record before us. The allusion to the fields of the Amalekites in Gen. 14: 7 does not imply that the tribe was in existence in Abraham's time, nor does the expression "first of the nations," in the saying of Balaam (Num. 24:20), represent Amalek as the aboriginal or oldest tribe, but simply as the first heathen tribe by which Israel was attacked. The Old Testament says nothing of any fusion of Edomites or Horites with Amalekites, nor does it mention a double Amalek (cf. *Hengstenberg*, Dissertations 2, 247 ff., and *Kurtz*, History i. 122, 3, ii. 240 ff.). ^{f63}

If there had been an Amalek previous to Edom, with the important part which they took in opposition to Israel even in the time of Moses, the book of Genesis would not have omitted to give their pedigree in the list of the nations. At a very early period the Amalekites separated from the other tribes of Edom and formed an independent people, having their headquarters in the southern part of the mountains of Judah, as far as Kadesh (Gen. 14: 7; Num. 13:29; 14:43, 45), but, like the Bedouins, spreading themselves as a nomad tribe over the whole of the northern portion of Arabia Petraea, from Havilah to Shur on the border of Egypt (1Sa. 15: 3, 7; 27: 8); whilst one branch penetrated into the heart of Canaan, so that a range of hills, in what was afterwards the inheritance of Ephraim, bore the name of mountains of the Amalekites (Jud. 12:15, cf. 5:14). Those who settled in Arabia seem also to have separated in the course of time into several branches, so that Amalekite hordes invaded the land of Israel in connection sometimes with the Midianites and the sons of the East (the Arabs, Jud. 6: 3; 7:12), and at other times with the Ammonites (Jud. 3:13). After they had been defeated by Saul (1Sa. 14:48; 15: 2 ff.), and frequently chastised by David (1Sa. 27: 8; 30: 1 ff.; 2Sa. 8:12), the remnant of them was exterminated under Hezekiah by the Simeonites on the mountains of Seir (1Ch. 4:42, 43).

Gen. 36:15-19. THE TRIBE-PRINCES WHO DESCENDED FROM ESAU. —

אֱלֹפִים was the distinguishing title of the Edomite and Horite phylarchs; and it is only incidentally that it is applied to Jewish heads of tribes in Zec. 9: 7, and 12: 5. It is probably derived from **אֱלֹף** or **אֱלָפִים**, equivalent to **מִשְׁפָּחוֹת**, families (1Sa. 10:19; Mic. 5: 2), — the heads of the families, i.e., of the

principal divisions, of the tribe. The names of these *Alluphim* are not names of places, but of persons — of the three sons and ten grandsons of Esau mentioned in vv. 9-14; though *Knobel* would reverse the process and interpret the whole geographically. — In v. 16 *Korah* has probably been copied by mistake from v. 18, and should therefore be erased, as it really is in the *Samar.* Codex.

Gen. 36:20-30 (parallel, 1Ch. 1:38-42). Descendants of Seir the Horite; — the inhabitants of the land, or pre-Edomitish population of the country. — “*The Horite:*” ὁ ὄρωλοδύτης, the dweller in caves, which abound in the mountains of Edom (vid., Rob. Pal. ii. p. 424). The Horites, who had previously been an independent people (Gen. 14: 6), were partly exterminated and partly subjugated by the descendants of Esau (Deu. 2:12, 22). Seven sons of Seir are given as tribe-princes of the Horites, who are afterwards mentioned as *Alluphim* (vv. 29, 30), also their sons, as well as two daughters, *Timna* (v. 22) and *Aholibamah* (v. 25), who obtained notoriety from the fact that two of the headquarters of Edomitish tribe-princes bore their names (vv. 40 and 41). *Timna* was probably the same as the concubine of Eliphaz (v. 12); but *Aholibamah* was not the wife of Esau (cf. v. 2). — There are a few instances in which the names in this list differ from those in the Chronicles. But they are differences which either consist of variation in form, or have arisen from mistakes in copying. ^{f64}

Of *Anah*, the son of Zibeon, it is related (v. 24), that as he fed the asses of his father in the desert, he “found מַמְלֵי” — not “he invented mules,” as the Talmud, Luther, etc., render it, for mules are פְּרָדִים, and מַמְלֵי does not mean to invent; but he discovered *aquae calidae* (*Vulg.*), either the hot sulphur spring of *Calirrhoe* in the Wady *Zerka Maein* (vid., 10:19), or those in the Wady *el Ahsa* to the S.E. of the Dead Sea, or those in the Wady *Hamad* between Kerek and the Dead Sea. ^{f65}

Gen. 36:30. “*These are the princes of the Horites according to their princes,*” i.e., as their princes were individually named in the land of Seir. הַ in enumerations indicates the relation of the individual to the whole, and of the whole to the individual.

Gen. 36:31-39 (parallel, 1Ch. 1:43-50). The Kings in the Land of Edom: before the children of Israel had a king. It is to be observed in connection with the eight kings mentioned here, that whilst they follow one another, that is to say, one never comes to the throne till his predecessor is dead, yet the son never succeeds the father, but they all belong to different families and places, and in the case of the last the statement that “he died” is wanting. From this it is unquestionably obvious, that the sovereignty was elective; that the kings

were chosen by the phylarchs; and, as Isa. 34:12 also shows, that they lived or reigned contemporaneously with these. The contemporaneous existence of the *Alluphim* and the kings may also be inferred from Exo. 15:15 as compared with Num. 20:14 ff. Whilst it was with the king of Edom that Moses treated respecting the passage through the land, in the song of Moses it is the princes who tremble with fear on account of the miraculous passage through the Red Sea (cf. Eze. 32:29). Lastly, this is also supported by the fact, that the account of the seats of the phylarchs (vv. 40-43) follows the list of the kings. This arrangement would have been thoroughly unsuitable if the monarchy had been founded upon the ruins of the phylarchs (vid., *Hengstenberg, ut sup.* pp. 238 ff.). Of all the kings of Edom, not one is named elsewhere. It is true, the attempt has been made to identify the fourth, *Hadad* (v. 35), with the Edomite Hadad who rose up against Solomon (1Ki. 11:14); but without foundation. The contemporary of Solomon was of royal blood, but neither a king nor a pretender; our Hadad, on the contrary, was a king, but he was the son of an unknown Hadad of the town of *Avith*, and no relation to his predecessor *Husham* of the country of the Temanites. It is related of him that he smote Midian in the fields of Moab (v. 35); from which *Hengstenberg* (pp. 235-6) justly infers that this event cannot have been very remote from the Mosaic age, since we find the Midianites allied to the Moabites in Numbers 22; whereas afterwards, viz., in the time of Gideon, the Midianites vanished from history, and in Solomon's days the fields of Moab, being Israelitish territory, cannot have served as a field of battle for the Midianites and Moabites. — Of the tribe-cities of these kings only a few can be identified now. *Bozrah*, a noted city of the Edomites (Isa. 34: 6; 43: 1, etc.), is still to be traced in *el Buseireh*, a village with ruins in *Jebal* (Rob. Pal. ii. 571). — The land of the *Temanite* (v. 34) is a province in northern Idumaea, with a city, *Teman*, which has not yet been discovered; according to *Jerome, quinque millibus* from Petra. — *Rehoboth* of the river (v. 37) can neither be the Idumaeen *Robotha*, nor *er Ruheibeh* in the wady running towards *el Arish*, but must be sought for on the Euphrates, say in *Errachabi* or *Rachabeh*, near the mouth of the Chaboras. Consequently Saul, who sprang from Rehoboth, was a foreigner. — Of the last king, *Hadar* (v. 39; not Hadad, as it is written in 1Ch. 1:50), the wife, the mother-in-law, and the mother are mentioned: his death is not mentioned here, but is added by the later chronicler (1Ch. 1:51). This can be explained easily enough from the simple fact, that at the time when the table was first drawn up, Hadad was still alive and seated upon the throne. In all probability, therefore, Hadad was the king of Edom, to whom Moses applied for permission to pass through the land (Num. 20:14 ff.).¹⁶⁶

At any rate the list is evidently a record relating to the Edomitish kings of a pre-Mosaic age. But if this is the case, the heading, "*These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of*"

Israel,” does not refer to the time when the monarchy was introduced into Israel under Saul, but was written with the promise in mind, that kings should come out of the loins of Jacob (Gen. 35:11, cf. 17: 4 ff.), and merely expresses the thought, that Edom became a kingdom at an earlier period than Israel. Such a thought was by no means inappropriate to the Mosaic age. For the idea,

“that Israel was destined to grow into a kingdom with monarchs of his own family, was a hope handed down to the age of Moses, which the long residence in Egypt was well adapted to foster” (*Del.*).

Gen. 36:40-43 (parallel, 1Ch. 1:51-54). SEATS OF THE TRIBE-PRINCES OF ESAU ACCORDING TO THEIR FAMILIES. — That the names which follow are not a second list of Edomitish tribe-princes (viz., of those who continued the ancient constitution, with its hereditary aristocracy, after Hadar’s death), but merely relate to the capital cities of the old phylarchs, is evident from the expression in the heading, “*After their places, by their names,*” as compared with v. 43, “*According to their habitations in the land of their possession.*” This being the substance and intention of the list, there is nothing surprising in the fact, that out of the eleven names only two correspond to those given in vv. 15-19. This proves nothing more than that only two of the capitals received their names from the princes who captured or founded them, viz., *Timnah* and *Kenaz*. Neither of these has been discovered yet. The name *Aholibamah* is derived from the Horite princess (v. 25); its site is unknown. *Elah* is the port *Aila* (vid., 14: 6). *Pinon* is the same as *Phunon*, an encampment of the Israelites (Num. 33:42-43), celebrated for its mines, in which many Christians were condemned to labour under Diocletian, between Petra and Zoar, to the northeast of Wady Musa. *Teman* is the capital of the land of the Temanites (v. 34). *Mibzar* is supposed by *Knobel* to be Petra; but this is called *Selah* elsewhere (2Ki. 14: 7). *Magdiel* and *Iram* cannot be identified. The concluding sentence, “*This is Esau, the father (founder) of Edom*” (i.e., from his sprang the great nation of the Edomites, with its princes and kings, upon the mountains of Seir), not only terminates this section, but prepared the way for the history of Jacob, which commences with the following chapter.

X. History of Jacob

GENESIS 37-50 ITS SUBSTANCE AND CHARACTER

Genesis 37-50. The history (*tholedoth*) of Isaac commenced with the founding of his house by the birth of his sons (p. 171); but Jacob was abroad when his sons were born, and had not yet entered into undisputed possession of his inheritance. Hence his *tholedoth* only commence with his return to his

father's tent and his entrance upon the family possessions, and merely embrace the history of his life as patriarch of the house which he founded. In this period of his life, indeed, his sons, especially Joseph and Judah, stand in the foreground, so that "Joseph might be described as the moving principle of the following history." But for all that, Jacob remains the head of the house, and the centre around whom the whole revolves. This section is divided by the removal of Jacob to Egypt, into the period of his residence in Canaan (Genesis 37-45), and the close of his life in Goshen (Genesis 46-50). The first period is occupied with the events which prepared the way for, and eventually occasioned, his migration into Egypt. The way was prepared, directly by the sale of Joseph (Genesis 37), indirectly by the alliance of Judah with the Canaanites (Genesis 38), which endangered the divine call of Israel, inasmuch as this showed the necessity for a temporary removal of the sons of Israel from Canaan. The way was opened by the wonderful career of Joseph in Egypt, his elevation from slavery and imprisonment to be the ruler over the whole of Egypt (Genesis 39-41). And lastly, the migration was occasioned by the famine in Canaan, which rendered it necessary for Jacob's sons to travel into Egypt to buy corn, and, whilst it led to Jacob's recovery of the son he had mourned for as dead, furnished an opportunity for Joseph to welcome his family into Egypt (Genesis 42-45). The *second* period commences with the migration of Jacob into Egypt, and his settlement in the land of Goshen (Genesis 46-47:27). It embraces the patriarch's closing years, his last instructions respecting his burial in Canaan (Gen. 47:28-31), his adoption of Joseph's sons, and the blessing given to his twelve sons (Genesis 49), and extends to his burial and Joseph's death (Genesis 50).

Now if we compare this period of the patriarchal history with the previous ones, viz., those of Isaac and Abraham, it differs from them most in the absence of divine revelations — in the fact, that from the time of the patriarch's entrance upon the family inheritance to the day of his death, there was only one other occasion on which God appeared to him in a dream, viz., in Beersheba, on the border of the promised land, when he had prepared to go with his whole house into Egypt: the God of his father then promised him the increase of his seed in Egypt into a great nation, and their return to Canaan (Gen. 46: 2-4). This fact may be easily explained on the ground, that the end of the divine manifestations had been already attained; that in Jacob's house with his twelve sons the foundation was laid for the development of the promised nation; and that the time had come, in which the chosen family was to grow into a nation, — a process for which they needed, indeed, the blessing and protection of God, but no special revelations, so long at least as this growth into a nation took its natural course. That course was not interrupted, but rather facilitated by the removal into Egypt. But as Canaan had been assigned to the patriarchs as the land of their pilgrimage, and promised to their seed for a

possession after it had become a nation; when Jacob was compelled to leave this land, his faith in the promise of God might have been shaken, if God had not appeared to him as he departed, to promise him His protection in the foreign land, and assure him of the fulfilment of His promises. More than this the house of Israel did not need to know, as to the way by which God would lead them, especially as Abraham had already received a revelation from the Lord (Gen. 15:13-16).

In perfect harmony with the character of the time thus commencing for Jacob-Israel, is the use of the names of God in this last section of Genesis: viz., the fact, that whilst in Genesis 37 (the sale of Joseph) the name of God is not met with at all, in Genesis 38 and 39 we find the name of *Jehovah* nine times and *Elohim* only once (Gen. 39: 9), and that in circumstances in which *Jehovah* would have been inadmissible; and after Gen. 40: 1, the name *Jehovah* almost entirely disappears, occurring only once in Genesis 40-50 (Gen. 49:18, where Jacob uses it), whereas *Elohim* is used eighteen times and *Ha-Elohim* seven, not to mention such expressions as “your God” (Gen. 43:23), or “the God of his, or your father” (Gen. 46: 1, 3). So long as the attention is confined to this numerical proportion of *Jehovah*, and *Elohim* or *Ha-Elohim*, it must remain “a difficult enigma.” But when we look at the way in which these names are employed, we find the actual fact to be, that in Genesis 38 and 39 the writer mentions God nine times, and calls Him *Jehovah*, and that in Genesis 40-50 he only mentions God twice, and then calls Him *Elohim* (Gen. 46: 1, 2), although the God of salvation, i.e., *Jehovah*, is intended. In every other instance in which God is referred to in Genesis 40-50, it is always by the persons concerned: either Pharaoh (Gen. 41:38, 39), or Joseph and his brethren (Gen. 40: 8; 41:16, 51, 52, etc., *Elohim*; and Gen. 41:25, 28, 32, etc., *Ha-Elohim*), or by Jacob (Gen. 48:11, 20, 21, *Elohim*). Now the circumstance that the historian speaks of God nine times in Genesis 38-39 and only twice in Genesis 40-50 is explained by the substance of the history, which furnished no particular occasion for this in the last eleven chapters. But the reason why he does not name *Jehovah* in Genesis 40-50 as in Genesis 38-39, but speaks of the “God of his (Jacob’s) father Isaac,” in Gen. 41: 1, and directly afterwards of *Elohim* (v. 2), could hardly be that the periphrasis “the God of his father” seemed more appropriate than the simple name *Jehovah*, since Jacob offered sacrifice at Beersheba to the God who appeared to his father, and to whom Isaac built an altar there, and this God (*Elohim*) then appeared to him in a dream and renewed the promise of his fathers. As the historian uses a periphrasis of the name *Jehovah*, to point out the internal connection between what Jacob did and experienced at Beersheba and what his father experienced there; so Jacob also, both in the blessing with which he sends his sons the second time to Egypt (Gen. 43:14) and at the adoption of Joseph’s sons (Gen. 48: 3), uses the name *El Shaddai*, and in his blessings on Joseph’s sons

(Gen. 43:15) and on Joseph himself (Gen. 49:24, 25) employs rhetorical periphrases for the name *Jehovah*, because Jehovah had manifested Himself not only to him (Gen. 35:11, 12), but also to his fathers Abraham and Isaac (Gen. 17: 1 and 28: 3) as *El Shaddai*, and had proved Himself to be the Almighty, “the God who fed him,” “the Mighty One of Jacob,” “the Shepherd and Rock of Israel.” In these set discourses the titles of God here mentioned were unquestionably more significant and impressive than the simple name *Jehovah*. and when Jacob speaks of *Elohim* only, not of *Jehovah*, in Gen. 48:11, 20, 21, the *Elohim* in vv. 11 and 21 may be easily explained from the antithesis of Jacob to both man and God, and in v. 20 from the words themselves, which contain a common and, so to speak, a stereotyped saying. Wherever the thought required the name Jehovah as the only appropriate one, there Jacob used this name, as Gen. 49:18 will prove. But that name would have been quit unsuitable in the mouth of Pharaoh in Gen. 41:38, 39, in the address of Joseph to the prisoners (Gen. 40: 8) and to Pharaoh (Gen. 41:16, 25, 28, 32), and in his conversation with his brethren before he made himself known (Gen. 42:18; 43:29), and also in the appeal of Judah to Joseph as an unknown Egyptian officer of state (Gen. 44:16). In the meantime the brethren of Joseph also speak to one another of *Elohim* (Gen. 43:28); and Joseph not only sees in the birth of his sons merely a gift of *Elohim* (Gen. 41:51, 52; 48: 9), but in the solemn moment in which he makes himself known to his brethren (Gen. 45: 5-9) he speaks of *Elohim* alone: “*Elohim* did send me before you to preserve life” (v. 5); and even upon his death-bed he says, “I die, and *Elohim* will surely visit you and bring you out of this land” (Gen. 50:24, 25). But the reason of this is not difficult to discover, and is no other than the following: Joseph, like his brethren, did not clearly discern the ways of the Lord in the wonderful changes of his life; and his brethren, though they felt that the trouble into which they were brought before the unknown ruler of Egypt was a just punishment from God for their crime against Joseph, did not perceive that by the sale of their brother they had sinned not only against *Elohim* (God the Creator and Judge of men), but against Jehovah the covenant God of their father. They had not only sold their brother, but in their brother they had cast out a member of the seed promised and given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from the fellowship of the chosen family, and sinned against the God of salvation and His promises. But this aspect of their crime was still hidden from them, so that they could not speak of Jehovah. In the same way, Joseph regarded the wonderful course of his life as a divine arrangement for the preservation or rescue of his family, and he was so far acquainted with the promises of God, that he regarded it as a certainty, that Israel would be led out of Egypt, especially after the last wish expressed by Jacob. But this did not involve so full and clear an insight into the ways of Jehovah, as to lead Joseph

to recognise in his own career a special appointment of the covenant God, and to describe it as a gracious work of Jehovah. ¹⁶⁷

The disappearance of the name Jehovah, therefore, is to be explained, partly from the fact that previous revelations and acts of grace had given rise to other phrases expressive of the idea of Jehovah, which not only served as substitutes for this name of the covenant God, but in certain circumstances were much more appropriate; and partly from the fact that the sons of Jacob, including Joseph, did not so distinctly recognise in their course the saving guidance of the covenant God, as to be able to describe it as the work of *Jehovah*. This imperfect insight, however, is intimately connected with the fact that the direct revelations of God had ceased; and that Joseph, although chosen by God to be the preserver of the house of Israel and the instrument in accomplishing His plans of salvation, was separated at a very early period from the fellowship of his father's house, and formally naturalized in Egypt, and though endowed with the supernatural power to interpret dreams, was not favoured, as Daniel afterwards was in the Chaldaean court, with visions or revelations of God. Consequently we cannot place Joseph on a level with the three patriarchs, nor assent to the statement, that

“as the noblest blossom of the patriarchal life is seen in Joseph, as in him the whole meaning of the patriarchal life is summed up and fulfilled, so in Christ we see the perfect blossom and sole fulfilment of the whole of the Old Testament dispensation” (*Kurtz*, *Old Covenant* ii. 95),

as being either correct or scriptural, so far as the first portion is concerned. For Joseph was not a medium of salvation in the same way as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He was indeed a benefactor, not only to his brethren and the whole house of Israel, but also to the Egyptians; but salvation, i.e., spiritual help and culture, he neither brought to the Gentiles nor to the house of Israel. In Jacob's blessing he is endowed with the richest inheritance of the first-born in earthly things; but salvation is to reach the nations through Judah. We may therefore without hesitation look upon the history of Joseph as a

“type of the pathway of the Church, not of Jehovah only, but also of Christ, from lowliness to exaltation, from slavery to liberty, from suffering to glory” (*Delitzsch*);

we may also, so far as the history of Israel is a type of the history of Christ and His Church, regard the life of Joseph, as believing commentators of all centuries have done, as a type of the life of Christ, and use these typical traits as aids to progress in the knowledge of salvation; but that we may not be seduced into typological trifling, we must not overlook the fact, that neither

Joseph nor his career is represented, either by the prophets or by Christ and His apostles, as typical of Christ, — in anything like the same way, for example, as the guidance of Israel into and out of Egypt (Hos. 11: 1 cf. Mat. 2:15), and other events and persons in the history of Israel.

SALE OF JOSEPH INTO EGYPT. — GENESIS 37

Gen. 37: 1-4. The statement in v. 1, which introduces the *tholedoth* of Jacob, “*And Jacob dwelt in the land of his father’s pilgrimage, in the land of Canaan,*” implies that Jacob had now entered upon his father’s inheritance, and carries on the patriarchal pilgrim-life in Canaan, the further development of which was determined by the wonderful career of Joseph. This strange and eventful career of Joseph commenced when he was 17 years old. The notice of his age at the commencement of the narrative which follows, is introduced with reference to the principal topic in it, viz., the sale of Joseph, which was to prepare the way, according to the wonderful counsel of God, for the fulfilment of the divine revelation to Abraham respecting the future history of his seed (Gen. 15:13 ff.). While feeding the flock with his brethren, and, as he was young, with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, who were nearer his age than the sons of Leah, he brought an evil report of them to his father (רָעָה intentionally indefinite, connected with דָּבַרְתִּים without an article). The words וְהוּא נֶעַר, “*and he a lad,*” are subordinate to the main clause: they are not to be rendered, however, “*he was a lad with the sons,*” but, “*as he was young, he fed the flock with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah.*”

Gen. 37: 3. “*Israel (Jacob) loved Joseph more than all his (other) sons, because he was born in his old age,*” as the first-fruits of the beloved Rachel (Benjamin was hardly a year old at this time). *And he made him כִּתְנֵת פְּסִים*: a long coat with sleeves (χιτών ἄστραγάλειος, *Aqu.*, or ἄστραγαλωτός, LXX at 2Sa. 13:18, *tunica talaris*, *Vulg.* ad Sam.), i.e., an upper coat reaching to the wrists and ankles, such as noblemen and kings’ daughters wore, not “*a coat of many colours*” (“*bunter Rock,*” as *Luther* renders it, from the χιτώνα ποικίλον, *tunicam polymitam*, of the LXX and *Vulgate*). This partiality made Joseph hated by his brethren; so that they could not “*speak peaceably unto him,*” i.e., ask him how he was, offer him the usual salutation, “*Peace be with thee.*”

Gen. 37: 5-11. This hatred was increased when Joseph told them of two dreams that he had had: viz., that as they were binding sheaves in the field, his sheaf “*stood and remained standing,*” but their sheaves placed themselves round it and bowed down to it; and that the sun (his father), and the moon (his mother, “*not Leah, but Rachel, who was neither forgotten nor lost*”), and eleven stars (his eleven brethren) bowed down before him. These dreams

pointed in an unmistakable way to the supremacy of Joseph; the first to supremacy over his brethren, the second over the whole house of Israel. The repetition seemed to establish the thing as certain (cf. Gen. 41:32); so that not only did his brethren hate him still more “*on account of his dreams and words*” (v. 8), i.e., the substance of the dreams and the open interpretation of them, and become jealous and envious, but his father gave him a sharp reproof for the second, though he preserved the matter, i.e., retained it in his memory (שָׁמַר LXX διετήρησε, cf. συνετήρει, Luk. 2:19). The brothers with their ill-will could not see anything in the dreams but the suggestions of his own ambition and pride of heart; and even the father, notwithstanding his partiality, was grieved by the second dream. The dreams are not represented as divine revelations; yet they are not to be regarded as pure flights of fancy from an ambitious heart, but as the presentiments of deep inward feelings, which were not produced without some divine influence being exerted upon Joseph’s mind, and therefore were of prophetic significance, though they were not inspired directly by God, inasmuch as the purposes of God were still to remain hidden from the eyes of men for the saving good of all concerned.

Gen. 37:12-24. In a short time the hatred of Joseph’s brethren grew into a crime. On one occasion, when they were feeding their flock at a distance from Hebron, in the neighbourhood of Shechem (Nablus, in the plain of Mukhnah), and Joseph who was sent thither by Jacob to inquire as to the welfare (*shalom, valetudo*) of the brethren and their flocks, followed them to *Dothain* or *Dothan*, a place 12 Roman miles to the north of Samaria (*Sebaste*), towards the plain of Jezreel, they formed the malicious resolution to put him, “this dreamer,” to death, and throw him into one of the pits, i.e., cisterns, and then to tell (his father) that a wild beast had slain him, and so to bring his dreams to nought.

Gen. 37:21 ff. *Reuben*, who was the eldest son, and therefore specially responsible for his younger brother, opposed this murderous proposal. He dissuaded his brethren from killing Joseph (הִבְהֵא פִי נֶפֶשׁ), and advised them to throw him “*into this pit in the desert*,” i.e., into a dry pit that was near. As Joseph would inevitably perish even in that pit, their malice was satisfied; but Reuben intended to take Joseph out again, and restore him to his father. As soon, therefore, as Joseph arrived, they took off his coat with sleeves and threw him into the pit, which happened to be dry.

Gen. 37:25-36. Reuben had saved Joseph’s life indeed by his proposal; but his intention to send him back to his father was frustrated. For as soon as the brethren sat down to eat, after the deed was performed, they saw a company of Ishmaelites from Gilead coming along the road which leads from Beisan past Jenin (Rob. Pal. iii. 155) and through the plain of Dothan to the great caravan

road that runs from Damascus by Lejun (*Legio, Megiddo*), Ramleh, and Gaza to Egypt (Rob. iii. 27, 178). The caravan drew near, laden with spices: viz., נִכְאֵת, gum-tragacanth; צָרִי, balsam, for which Gilead was celebrated (Gen. 43:11; Jer. 8:22; 46:11); and לָטִי, *ladanum*, the fragrant resin of the cistus-rose. Judah seized the opportunity to propose to his brethren to sell Joseph to the Ishmaelites. “*What profit have we,*” he said, “*that we slay our brother and conceal his blood? Come, let us sell him to the Ishmaelites; and our hand, let it not lay hold of him* (sc., to slay him), *for he is our brother, our flesh.*” Reuben wished to deliver Joseph entirely from his brothers’ malice. Judah also wished to save his life, though not from brotherly love so much as from the feeling of horror, which was not quite extinct within him, at incurring the guilt of fratricide; but he would still like to get rid of him, that his dreams might not come true. Judah, like his brethren, was probably afraid that their father might confer upon Joseph the rights of the first-born, and so make him lord over them. His proposal was a welcome one. When the Arabs passed by, the brethren fetched Joseph out of the pit and sold him to the Ishmaelites, who took him into Egypt. The different names given to the traders — viz., *Ishmaelites* (vv. 25, 27, and 28*b*), *Midianites* (v. 28*a*), and *Medanites* (v. 36) — do not show that the account has been drawn from different legends, but that these tribes were often confounded, from the fact that they resembled one another so closely, not only in their common descent from Abraham (Gen. 16:15 and 25: 2), but also in the similarity of their mode of life and their constant change of abode, that strangers could hardly distinguish them, especially when they appeared not as tribes but as Arabian merchants, such as they are here described as being: “*Midianitish men, merchants.*” That descendants of Abraham should already be met with in this capacity is by no means strange, if we consider that 150 years had passed by since Ishmael’s dismissal from his father’s house, — a period amply sufficient for his descendants to have grown through marriage into a respectable tribe. The price, “*twenty* (sc., shekels) *of silver,*” was the price which Moses afterwards fixed as the value of a boy between 5 and 20 (Lev. 27: 5), the average price of a slave being 30 shekels (Exo. 21:32). But the Ishmaelites naturally wanted to make money by the transaction.

Gen. 37:29 ff. The business was settled in Reuben’s absence; probably because his brethren suspected that he intended to rescue Joseph. When he came to the pit and found Joseph gone, he rent his clothes (a sign of intense grief on the part of the natural man) and exclaimed: “*The boy is no more, and I, whither shall I go!*” — how shall I account to his father for his disappearance! But the brothers were at no loss; they dipped Joseph’s coat in the blood of a goat and sent it to his father, with the message, “*We have found this; see whether it is thy son’s coat or not.*” Jacob recognised the coat at once,

and mourned bitterly in mourning clothes (שֵׁק) for his son, whom he supposed to have been devoured and destroyed by a wild beast (מִרְרָה מִרְרָה inf. abs. of Kal before Pual, as an indication of undoubted certainty), and refused all comfort from his children, saying, “No (כֵּן immo, elliptical: Do not attempt to comfort me, for) *I will go down mourning into Sheol to my son.*” Sheol denotes the place where departed souls are gathered after death; it is an infinitive form from שָׁאֵל to demand, the demanding, applied to the place which inexorably summons all men into its shade (cf. Pro. 30:15, 16; Isa. 5:14; Hab. 2: 5). How should his sons comfort him, when they were obliged to cover their wickedness with the sin of lying and hypocrisy, and when even Reuben, although at first beside himself at the failure of his plan, had not courage enough to disclose his brothers’ crime?

Gen. 37:36. But Joseph, while his father was mourning, was sold by the Midianites to Potiphar, the chief of Pharaoh’s *trabantes*, to be first of all brought low, according to the wonderful counsel of God, and then to be exalted as ruler in Egypt, before whom his brethren would bow down, and as the saviour of the house of Israel. The name *Potiphar* is a contraction of *Poti Pherah* (Gen. 41:50); the LXX render both Πετεφρής or Πετεφρή (vid., 41:50). טָרִיס (eunuch) is used here, as in 1Sa. 8:15 and in most of the passages of the Old Testament, for courtier or chamberlain, without regard to the primary meaning, as Potiphar was married. “*Captain of the guard*” (lit., captain of the slaughterers, i.e., the executioners), commanding officer of the royal body-guard, who executed the capital sentences ordered by the king, as was also the case with the Chaldeans (2Ki. 25: 8; Jer. 39: 9; 52:12. See my Commentary on the Books of Kings, vol. i. pp. 35, 36, Eng. Tr.).

JUDAH’S MARRIAGE AND CHILDREN. HIS INCEST WITH THAMAR. — GENESIS 38

The following sketch from the life of Judah is intended to point out the origin of the three leading families of the future princely tribe in Israel, and at the same time to show in what danger the sons of Jacob would have been of forgetting the sacred vocation of their race, through marriages with Canaanitish women, and of perishing in the sin of Canaan, if the mercy of God had not interposed, and by leading Joseph into Egypt prepared the way for the removal of the whole house of Jacob into that land, and thus protected the family, just as it was expanding into a nation, from the corrupting influence of the manners and customs of Canaan. This being the intention of the narrative, it is no episode or interpolation, but an integral part of the early history of Israel, which is woven here into the history of Jacob, because the events occurred subsequently to the sale of Joseph.

Gen. 38: 1-11. About this time, i.e., after the sale of Joseph, while still feeding the flocks of Jacob along with his brethren (Gen. 37:26), ^{f68} Judah separated from them, and went down (from Hebron, Gen. 37:14, or the mountains) to Adullam, in the lowland (Jos. 15:35), into the neighbourhood of a man named Hirah. “*He pitched (his tent, Gen. 26:25) up to a man of Adullam,*” i.e., in his neighbourhood, so as to enter into friendly intercourse with him.

Gen. 38: 2 ff. There Judah married the daughter of Shuah, a Canaanite, and had three sons by her: Ger (גֵּר), Onan, and Shelah. The name of the place is mentioned when the last is born, viz., Chezib or Achzib (Jos. 15:44; Micah 1:14), in the southern portion of the lowland of Judah, that the descendants of Shelah might know the birth-place of their ancestor. This was unnecessary in the case of the others, who died childless.

Gen. 38: 6 ff. When Ger was grown up, according to ancient custom (cf. 21:21; 34: 4) his father gave him a wife, named Tamar, probably a Canaanite, of unknown parentage. But Ger was soon put to death by Jehovah on account of his wickedness. Judah then wished Onan, as the brother-in-law, to marry the childless widow of his deceased brother, and raise up seed, i.e., a family, for him. But as he knew that the first-born son would not be the founder of his own family, but would perpetuate the family of the deceased and receive his inheritance, he prevented conception when consummating the marriage by spilling the semen. שָׁחַת אֶרְצָה, “destroyed to the ground (i.e., let it fall upon the ground), so as not to give seed to his brother” (נָתַן for נָתַת only here and Num. 20:21). This act not only betrayed a want of affection to his brother, combined with a despicable covetousness for his possession and inheritance, but was also a sin against the divine institution of marriage and its object, and was therefore punished by Jehovah with sudden death. The custom of levirate marriage, which is first mentioned here, and is found in different forms among Indians, Persians, and other nations of Asia and Africa, was not founded upon a divine command, but upon an ancient tradition, originating probably in Chaldea. It was not abolished, however, by the Mosaic law (Deu. 25: 5 ff.), but only so far restricted as not to allow it to interfere with the sanctity of marriage; and with this limitation it was enjoined as a duty of affection to build up the brother’s house, and to preserve his family and name (see my *Bibl. Archäologie*, § 108).

Gen. 38:11. The sudden death of his two sons so soon after their marriage with Tamar made Judah hesitate to give her the third as a husband also, thinking, very likely, according to a superstition which we find in Tobit 3: 7 ff., that either she herself, or marriage with her, had been the cause of her

husbands' deaths. He therefore sent her away to her father's house, with the promise that he would give her his youngest son as soon as he had grown up; though he never intended it seriously, "for he thought lest (לִּפְנֵי אֲמֹרָתוֹ, i.e., he was afraid that) *he also might die like his brethren.*"

Gen. 38:12-30. But when Tamar, after waiting a long time, saw that Shelah had grown up and yet was not given to her as a husband, she determined to procure children from Judah himself, who had become a widower in the meantime; and his going to Timnath to the sheep-shearing afforded her a good opportunity. The time mentioned ("the days multiplied," i.e., a long time passed by) refers not to the statement which follows, that Judah's wife died, but rather to the leading thought of the verse, viz., Judah's going to the sheep-shearing. מִן־הַיָּמִים: *he comforted himself*, i.e., he ceased to mourn. *Timnath* is not the border town of Dan and Judah between Bethshemesh and Ekron in the plain (Jos. 15:10; 19:43), but *Timnah* on the mountains of Judah (Jos. 15:57, cf. Rob. Pal. ii. 343, note), as the expression "went up" shows. The sheep-shearing was a *fête* with shepherds, and was kept with great feasting. Judah therefore took his friend Hirah with him; a fact noticed in v. 12 in relation to what follows.

Gen. 38:13, 14. As soon as Tamar heard of Judah's going to this feast, she took off her widow's clothes, put on a veil, and sat down, disguised as a harlot, by the gate of Enayim, where Judah would be sure to pass on his return from Timnath. *Enayim* was no doubt the same as *Enam* in the lowland of Judah (Jos. 15:34).

Gen. 38:15 ff. When Judah saw her here and took her for a harlot, he made her an offer, and gave her his signet-ring, with the band (פְּתִיל) by which it was hung round his neck, and his staff, as a pledge of the young buck-goat which he offered her. They were both objects of value, and were regarded as ornaments in the East, as *Herodotus* (i. 195) has shown with regard to the Babylonians (see my *Bibl. Arch.* 2, 48). He then lay with her, and she became pregnant by him.

Gen. 38:19 ff. After this had occurred, Tamar laid aside her veil, put on her widow's dress again, and returned home. When Judah, therefore, sent the kid by his friend Hirah to the supposed harlot for the purpose of redeeming his pledges, he could not find her, and was told, on inquiring of the inhabitants of Enayim, that there was no קְדֻשָּׁה there. הַקְדֻשָּׁה: lit., "the consecrated," i.e., the *hierodule*, a woman sacred to Astarte, a goddess of the Canaanites, the deification of the generative and productive principle of nature; one who served this goddess by prostitution (vid., Deu. 23:18). This was no doubt regarded as the most respectable designation for public prostitutes in Canaan.

Gen. 38:22, 23. When his friend returned with the kid and reported his want of success, Judah resolved to leave his pledges with the girl, that he might not expose himself to the ridicule of the people by any further inquiries, since he had done his part towards keeping his promise. “*Let her take them (i.e., keep the signet-ring and staff) for herself, that we may not become a (an object of) ridicule.*” The pledges were unquestionably of more value than a young he-goat.

Gen. 38:24-26. About three months afterwards (משלש prob. for משלש with the prefix ה) Judah was informed that Tamar had played the harlot and was certainly (הנה) with child. He immediately ordered, by virtue of his authority as head of the tribe, that she should be brought out and burned. Tamar was regarded as the affianced bride of Shelah, and was to be punished as a bride convicted of a breach of chastity. But the Mosaic law enjoined stoning in the case of those who were affianced and broke their promise, or of newly married women who were found to have been dishonoured (Deu. 22:20, 21, 23, 24); and it was only in the case of the whoredom of a priest’s daughter, or of carnal intercourse with a mother or a daughter, that the punishment of burning was enjoined (Lev. 21: 9 and 20:14). Judah’s sentence, therefore, was more harsh than the subsequent law; whether according to patriarchal custom, or on other grounds, cannot be determined. When Tamar was brought out, she sent to Judah the things which she had kept as a pledge, with this message:

“By a man to whom these belong am I with child: look carefully therefore to whom this signet-ring, and band, and stick belong.”

Judah recognised the things as his own, and was obliged to confess, “*She is more in the right than I; for therefore (sc., that this might happen to me, or that it might turn out so; on בִּי-עֲלֵבֶן see Gen. 18: 5) have I not given her to my son Shelah.*” In passing sentence upon Tamar, Judah had condemned himself. His son, however, did not consist merely in his having given way to his lusts so afar as to lie with a supposed public prostitute of Canaan, but still more in the fact, that by breaking his promise to give her his son Shelah as her husband, he had caused his daughter-in-law to practise this deception upon him, just because in his heart he blamed her for the early and sudden deaths of his elder sons, whereas the real cause of the deaths which had so grieved his paternal heart was the wickedness of the sons themselves, the mainspring of which was to be found in his own marriage with a Canaanite in violation of the patriarchal call. And even if the sons of Jacob were not unconditionally prohibited from marrying the daughters of Canaanites, Judah’s marriage at any rate had borne such fruit in his sons Ger and Onan, as Jehovah the covenant God was compelled to reject. But if Judah, instead of recognising the hand of the Lord in the sudden death of his sons, traced the cause to Tamar, and

determined to keep her as a childless widow all her life long, not only in opposition to the traditional custom, but also in opposition to the will of God as expressed in His promises of a numerous increase of the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Tamar had by no means acted rightly in the stratagem by which she frustrated his plan, and sought to procure from Judah himself the seed of which he was unjustly depriving her, though her act might be less criminal than Judah's. For it is evident from the whole account, that she was not driven to her sin by lust, but by the innate desire for children (ὅτι δὲ παιδοποιίας χάριν καὶ οὐ φιληδονίας τοῦτο ὁ Θάμαρ ἐμηχανήσατο, — *Theodoret*); and for that reason she was more in the right than Judah. Judah himself, however, not only saw his guilt, but he confessed it also; and showed both by this confession, and also by the fact that he had no further conjugal intercourse with Tamar, an earnest endeavour to conquer the lusts of the flesh, and to guard against the sin into which he had fallen. And because he thus humbled himself, God gave him grace, and not only exalted him to be the chief of the house of Israel, but blessed the children that were begotten in sin.

Gen. 38:27-30. Tamar brought forth twins; and a circumstance occurred at the birth, which does occasionally happen when the children lie in an abnormal position, and always impedes the delivery, and which was regarded in this instance as so significant that the names of the children were founded upon the fact. At the birth יָדָאֵן “*there was a hand,*” i.e., a hand came out (יָדָאֵן as in Job. 37:10, Pro. 13:10), round which the midwife tied a scarlet thread, to mark this as the first-born.

Gen. 38:29. “*And it came to pass, when it (the child) drew back its hand* (בְּמָשִׁיב for בְּהִיּוֹת מָשִׁיב as in Gen. 40:10), *behold its brother came out. Then she (the midwife) said, What a breach hast thou made for thy part? Upon thee the breach;”* i.e., thou bearest the blame of the breach. פָּרַץ signifies not *rupturam perinoei*, but breaking through by pressing forward. From that he received the name of *Perez* (breach, breaker through). Then the other one with the scarlet thread came into the world, and was named *Zerah* (צֶרֶחַ exit, rising), because he sought to appear first, whereas in fact *Perez* was the first-born, and is even placed before *Zerah* in the lists in Gen. 46:12, Num. 26:20. *Perez* was the ancestor of the tribe-prince Nahshon (Num. 2: 3), and of king David also (Rut. 4:18 ff.; 1Ch. 2: 5 ff.). Through him, therefore, Tamar has a place as one of the female ancestors in the genealogy of Jesus Christ.

JOSEPH IN POTIPHAR'S HOUSE, AND IN PRISON. — GENESIS 39

Gen. 39: 1-18. IN POTIPHAR'S HOUSE. — Potiphar had bought him of the Ishmaelites, as is repeated in v. 1 for the purpose of resuming the thread of the narrative; and Jehovah was with him, so that he prospered in the house of his Egyptian master. **אִישׁ מְצַלִּיחַ**: a man who has prosperity, to whom God causes all that he undertakes and does to prosper. When Potiphar perceived this, Joseph found favour in his eyes, and became his servant, whom he placed over his house (made manager of his household affairs), and to whom he entrusted all his property (**כָּל-אֲשֶׁר יֵשׁ-לוֹ** v. 4 = **כָּל-יֵשׁ-לוֹ** vv. 5, 6). This confidence in Joseph increased, when he perceived how the blessing of Jehovah (Joseph's God) rested upon his property in the house and in the field; so that now "*he left to Joseph everything that he had, and did not trouble himself אֲתוֹ (with or near him) about anything but his own eating.*"

Gen. 39: 6b ff. Joseph was handsome in form and feature; and Potiphar's wife set her eyes upon the handsome young man, and tried to persuade him to lie with her. But Joseph resisted the adulterous proposal, referring to the unlimited confidence which his master had placed in him. He (Potiphar) was not greater in that house than he, and had given everything over to him except her, because she was his wife. "How could he so abuse this confidence, as to do this great wickedness and sin against God!"

Gen. 39:10 ff. But after she had repeated her enticements day after day without success, "*it came to pass at that time (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא for the more usual בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה (Gen. 50:20), lit., about this day, i.e., the day in the writer's mind, on which the thing to be narrated occurred) that Joseph came into his house to attend to his duties, and there were none of the house-servants within.*" And she laid hold of him by his garment and entreated him to lie with her; but he left his garment in her hand and fled from the house.

Gen. 39:13-18. When this daring assault upon Joseph's chastity had failed, on account of his faithfulness and fear of God, the adulterous woman reversed the whole affair, and charged him with an attack upon her modesty, in order that she might have her revenge upon him and avert suspicion from herself. She called her house-servants and said, "*See, he (her husband, whom she does not think worth naming) has brought us a Hebrew man ("no epitheton ornans to Egyptian ears: Gen. 43:32") to mock us (צַחֵק to show his wantonness; us, the wife and servants, especially the female portion): he came in unto me to lie with me; and I cried with a loud voice...and he left his garment by me.*" She said **אֲצִלִּי** "by my side," not "in my hand," as that would have shown the true

state of the case. She then left the garment lying by her side till the return of Joseph's master, to whom she repeated her tale.

Gen. 39:19-23. JOSEPH IN PRISON. — Potiphar was enraged at what he heard, and put Joseph into the prison where (אֲשֶׁר for שָׁם אֲשֶׁר, 40: 3 like 35:13) the king's prisoners (state-prisoners) were confined. בֵּית הַסֹּהַר: lit., the house of enclosure, from סָהַר, to surround or enclose (ὄγκρωμα, LXX); the state-prison surrounded by a wall. This was a very moderate punishment. For according to *Diod. Sic.* (i. 78) the laws of the Egyptians were *πικροὶ περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν νόμοι*. An attempt at adultery was to be punished with 1000 blows, and rape upon a free woman still more severely. It is possible that Potiphar was not fully convinced of his wife's chastity, and therefore did not place unlimited credence in what she said. ^{f69}

But even in that case it was the mercy of the faithful covenant God, which now as before (Gen. 37:20 ff.) rescued Joseph's life.

Gen. 39:21-23. In the prison itself Jehovah was with Joseph, procuring him favour in the eyes of the governor of the prison, so that he entrusted all the prisoners to his care, leaving everything that they had to do, to be done through him, and not troubling himself about anything that was in his hand, i.e., was committed to him, because Jehovah made all that he did to prosper. "The keeper" was the governor of the prison, or superintendent of the gaolers, and was under Potiphar, the captain of the *trabantes* and chief of the executioners (Gen. 37:36).

THE PRISONERS' DREAMS AND JOSEPH'S INTERPRETATION. — GENESIS 40

Gen. 40: 1-8. The head cup-bearer and head baker had committed crimes against the king of Egypt, and were imprisoned in "the prison of the house of the captain of the trabantes, the prison where Joseph himself was confined;" the state-prison, according to Eastern custom, forming part of the same building as the dwelling-house of the chief of the executioners. From a regard to the exalted position of these two prisoners, Potiphar ordered Joseph to wait upon them, not to keep watch over them; for פָּקֵד אֵת does not mean to appoint as guard, but to place by the side of a person.

Gen. 40: 5. After some time ("days," v. 4, as in 4: 3), and on the same night, these two prisoners had each a peculiar dream, "each one according to the interpretation of his dream;" i.e., each one had a dream corresponding to the interpretation which specially applied to him. On account of these dreams, which seemed to them to have some bearing upon their fate, and, as the issue

proved, were really true omens of it, Joseph found them the next morning looking anxious, and asked them the reason of the trouble which was depicted upon their countenances.

Gen. 40: 8. On their replying that they had dreamed, and there was no one to interpret the dream, Joseph reminded them first of all that “interpretations are God’s,” come from God, are His gift; at the same time he bade them tell him their dreams, from a consciousness, no doubt, that he was endowed with this divine gift.

Gen. 40: 9-15. The cup-bearer gave this account:

“In my dream, behold there was a vine before me, and on the vine three branches; and it was as though blossoming, it shot forth its blossom (נִצְּחָה) either from the hapax l. נִצְּחָה = נִצְּחָה, or from נִצְּחָה with the fem. termination resolved into the 3 pers. suff.: Ewald, § 257d), its clusters ripened into grapes. And Pharaoh’s cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes and pressed them into Pharaoh’s cup, and gave the cup into Pharaoh’s hand.”

In this dream the office and duty of the royal cup-bearer were represented in an unmistakable manner, though the particular details must not be so forced as to lead to the conclusion, that the kings of ancient Egypt drank only the fresh juice of the grape, and not fermented wine as well. The cultivation of the vine, and the making and drinking of wine, among the Egyptians, are established beyond question by ancient testimony and the earliest monuments, notwithstanding the statement of Herodotus (2, 77) to the contrary (see *Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses*, pp. 13 ff.).

Gen. 40:12 ff. Joseph then gave this interpretation: The three branches were three days, in which time Pharaoh would restore him to his post again (“lift up his head,” i.e., raise him from his degradation, send and fetch him from prison, 2Ki. 25:27). And he added this request (v. 14):

“Only think of me, as it goes well with thee, and show favour to me...for I was stolen (i.e., carried away secretly and by force; I did not abscond because of any crime) out of the land of the Hebrews (the land where the Ibrim live); and here also I have done nothing (committed no crime) for which they should put me into the hole.”

פֹּר: the cell, applied to a prison as a miserable hole, because often dry cess-pools were used as prisons.

Gen. 40:16-19. Encouraged by this favourable interpretation, the chief baker also told his dream:

“I too,...in my dream: behold, baskets of white bread upon my head, and in the top basket all kinds of food for Pharaoh, pastry; and the birds ate it out of the basket from my head.”

In this dream, the carrying of the baskets upon the head is thoroughly Egyptian; for, according to *Herod.* 2, 35, the men in Egypt carry burdens upon the head, the women upon the shoulders. And, according to the monuments, the variety of confectionary was very extensive (cf. *Hengst.* p. 27). In the opening words, “*I too,*” the baker points to the resemblance between his dream and the cup-bearer’s. The resemblance was not confined to the sameness of the numbers — three baskets of white bread, and three branches of the vine, — but was also seen in the fact that his official duty at the court was represented in the dream. But instead of Pharaoh taking the bread from his hand, the birds of heaven ate it out of the basket upon his head. And Joseph gave this interpretation:

“The three baskets signify three days: within that time Pharaoh will take away thy head from thee (“lift up thy head,” as in v. 13, but with מַעֲלִידָי “away from thee,” i.e., behead thee), and hang thee on the stake (thy body after execution; vid., Deu. 21:22, 23), and the birds will eat thy flesh from off thee.”

However simple and close this interpretation of the two dreams may appear, the exact accordance with the fulfilment was a miracle wrought by God, and showed that as the dreams originated in the instigation of God, the interpretation was His inspiration also.

Gen. 40:20-23. Joseph’s interpretations were fulfilled three days afterwards, on the king’s birth-day. יוֹם הֵלֵדָתוֹ: the day of being born; the *inf. Hoph.* is construed as a passive with the *accus. obj.*, as in Gen. 4:18, etc. Pharaoh gave his servants a feast, and lifted up the heads of both the prisoners, but in very different ways. The cup-bearer was pardoned, and reinstated in his office; the baker, on the other hand, was executed.

Gen. 40:23. But the former forgot Joseph in his prosperity, and did nothing to procure his liberation.

PHARAOH’S DREAMS AND JOSEPH’S EXALTATION. — GENESIS 41

Gen. 41: 1-36. PHARAOH’S DREAMS AND THEIR INTERPRETATION. — Two full years afterwards (יָמִים *accus.* “in days,” as in Gen. 29:14) Pharaoh had a dream. He was standing by the Nile, and saw seven fine fat cows ascend from the Nile and feed in the Nile-grass (אֵשֶׁתָּא an Egyptian word); and behind them

seven others, ugly (according to v. 19, unparalleled in their ugliness), lean (דַּקוֹת בָּשָׂר “thin in flesh,” for which we find in v. 19 דָּלוּת “fallen away,” and רַקוֹת בָּשָׂר withered in flesh, fleshless), which placed themselves beside those fat ones on the brink of the Nile and devoured them, without there being any effect to show that they had eaten them. He then awoke, but fell asleep again and had a second, similar dream: seven fat (v. 22, full) and fine ears grew upon one blade, and were swallowed up by seven thin (v. 23, “and hardened”) ones, which were blasted by the east wind (קָדִיִּם i.e., the S.E. wind, Chamsin, from the desert of Arabia).

Gen. 41: 7. “Then Pharaoh awoke, and behold it was a dream.” The dream was so like reality, that in was only when he woke that he perceived it was a dream.

Gen. 41: 8. Being troubled about this double dream, Pharaoh sent the next morning for all the scribes and wise men of Egypt, to have it interpreted. חֲרָטְמִים, from חָרַט a stylus (pencil), and the ἱερογραμματῆς, men of the priestly caste, who occupied themselves with the sacred arts and sciences of the Egyptians, the hieroglyphic writings, astrology, the interpretation of dreams, the foretelling of events, magic, and conjuring, and who were regarded as the possessors of secret arts (vid., Exo. 7:11) and the *wise men* of the nation. But not one of these could interpret it, although the clue to the interpretation was to be found in the religious symbols of Egypt. For the cow was the symbol of Isis, the goddess of the all-sustaining earth, and in the hieroglyphics it represented the earth, agriculture, and food; and the Nile, by its overflowing, was the source of the fertility of the land. But however simple the explanation of the fat and lean cows ascending out of the Nile appears to be, it is “the fate of the wisdom of this world, that where it suffices it is compelled to be silent. For it belongs to the government of God to close the lips of the eloquent, and take away the understanding of the aged (Job. 12:20).” *Baumgarten*.

Gen. 41: 9 ff. In this dilemma the head cup-bearer thought of Joseph; and calling to mind his offence against the king (Gen. 40: 1), and his ingratitude to Joseph (Gen. 40:23), he related to the king how Joseph had explained their dreams to him and the chief baker in the prison, and how entirely the interpretation had come true.

Gen. 41:14 ff. Pharaoh immediately sent for Joseph. As quickly as possible he was fetched from the prison; and after shaving the hair of his head and beard, and changing his clothes, as the customs of Egypt required (see Hengst. Egypt and the Books of Moses, p. 30), he went in to the king. On the king’s saying to him, “I have heard of thee (עָלִידָה de te), thou hearest a dream to

interpret it,” — i.e., thou only needest to hear a dream, and thou canst at once interpret it — Joseph replied, “*Not I (בְּלִעְדִּי)*, lit., “not so far as me,” this is not in my power, vid., 14:24), *God will answer Pharaoh’s good,*” i.e., what shall profit Pharaoh; just as in Gen. 40: 8 he had pointed the two prisoners away from himself to God. Pharaoh then related his double dream (vv. 17-24), and Joseph gave the interpretation (vv. 25-32): “*The dream of Pharaoh is one* (i.e., the two dreams have the same meaning); *God hath showed Pharaoh what He is about to do.*” The seven cows and seven ears of corn were seven years, the fat ones very fertile years of superabundance, the lean ones very barren years of famine; the latter would follow the former over the whole land of Egypt, so that the years of famine would leave no trace of the seven fruitful years; and, “*for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice*” (i.e., so far as this fact is concerned, it signifies) “*that the thing is firmly resolved by God, and God will quickly carry it out.*” In the confidence of this interpretation which looked forward over fourteen years, the divinely enlightened seer’s glance was clearly manifested, and could not fail to make an impression upon the king, when contrasted with the perplexity of the Egyptian augurs and wise men. Joseph followed up his interpretation by the advice (vv. 33-36), that Pharaoh should “*look out (נִרְאֶה) a man discreet and wise, and set him over the land of Egypt;*” and cause (יַעֲשֶׂה) that in the seven years of superabundance he should raise fifths (חֲמִשָּׁה), i.e., the fifth part of the harvest, through overseers, and have the corn, or the stores of food (אֶכְלָה), laid up in the cities “under the hand of the king,” i.e., by royal authority and direction, as food for the land for the seven years of famine, that it might not perish through famine.

Gen. 41:37-57. JOSEPH’S PROMOTION. — This counsel pleased Pharaoh and all his servants, so that he said to them, “*Shall we find a man like this one, in whom the Spirit of God is?*” “*The Spirit of Elohim,*” i.e., the spirit of supernatural insight and wisdom. He then placed Joseph over his house, and over all Egypt; in other words, he chose him as his grand vizier, saying to him, “*After God hath showed thee all this, there is none discreet and wise as thou.*” *עַל-פִּיךָ יֵשֶׁק*, “according to thy mouth (i.e., command, Gen. 45:21) shall my whole people arrange itself.” *נִשֶּׁק* does not mean to kiss (*Rabb., Ges., etc.*), for *נִשֶּׁק עַל* is not Hebrew, and kissing the mouth was not customary as an act of homage, but “to dispose, arrange one’s self” (*ordine disposuit*). “*Only in the throne will I be greater than thou.*”

Gen. 41:42 ff. As an installation in this post of honour, the king handed him his signet-ring, the seal which the grand vizier or prime minister wore, to give authority to the royal edicts (Est. 3:10), clothed him in a byssus dress (שֵׁשׁ, fine muslin or white cotton fabric),¹⁷⁰ and put upon his neck the golden chain,

which was usually worn in Egypt as a mark of distinction, as the Egyptian monuments show (Hgst. pp. 30, 31).

Gen. 41:43. He then had him driven in the second chariot, the chariot which followed immediately upon the king's state-carriage; that is to say, he directed a solemn procession to be made through the city, in which they (heralds) cried before him **יִכָּבֹד** (i.e., bow down), — an Egyptian word, which has been pointed by the Masorites according to the *Hiphil* or *Aphel* of **יִכָּבֹד**. In Coptic it is *abork, projicere*, with the signs of the imperative and the second person. Thus he placed him over all Egypt. **וְיָתֵן** *inf. absol.* as a continuation of the finite verb (*vid.*, Exo. 8:11; Lev. 25:14, etc.).

Gen. 41:44. “*I am Pharaoh,*” he said to him, “*and without thee shall no man lift his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt;*” i.e., I am the actual king, and thou, the next to me, shalt rule over all my people.

Gen. 41:45. But in order that Joseph might be perfectly naturalized, the king gave him an Egyptian name, *Zaphnath-Paaneah*, and married him to *Asenath*, the daughter of *Potipherah*, the priest at *On*. The name *Zaphnath-Paaneah* (a form adapted to the Hebrew, for **ὄνθομαφανήχ** [LXX]; according to a Greek scholium, **σωτήρ κόσμου**, “*salvator mundi*” [Jerome]), answers to the Coptic *P-sote-m-ph-eneh*, — *P* the article, *sote* salvation, *m* the sign of the genitive, *ph* the article, and *eneh* the world (lit., *aetas, seculum*); or perhaps more correctly, according to *Rosellini* and more recent Egyptologists, to the Coptic *P-sōnt-em-ph-anh*, i.e., *sustentator vitae*, support or sustainer of life, with reference to the call entrusted to him by God.^{f71}

Asenath, **Ἀσενέθ** (LXX), possibly connected with the name *Neith*, the Egyptian *Pallas*. *Poti-Phera*, **Πετεφρή** (LXX), a Coptic name signifying *ille qui solis est*, consecrated to the sun (**φρη** with the aspirated article signifies the sun in Memphitic). *On* was the popular name for *Heliopolis* (**Ἡλιούπολις**, LXX), and according to *Cyrril. Alex.* and Hos. 5: 8 signifies *the sun*; whilst the name upon the monuments is *ta-Râ* or *pa-Râ*, house of the sun (*Brugsch*, *Reisebericht*, p. 50). From a very early date there was a celebrated temple of the sun here, with a learned priesthood, which held the first place among the priests' colleges of Egypt (*Herod.* 2, 3; *Hengst.* pp. 32 ff.). This promotion of Joseph, from the position of a Hebrew slave pining in prison to the highest post of honour in the Egyptian kingdom, is perfectly conceivable, on the one hand, from the great importance attached in ancient times to the interpretation of dreams and to all occult science, especially among the Egyptians, and on the other hand, from the despotic form of government in the East; but the miraculous power of God is to be seen in the fact, that God endowed Joseph with the gift of infallible interpretation, and so ordered the circumstances that

this gift opened the way for him to occupy that position in which he became the preserver, not of Egypt alone, but of his own family also. And the same hand of God, by which he had been so highly exalted after deep degradation, preserved him in his lofty post of honour from sinking into the heathenism of Egypt; although, by his alliance with the daughter of a priest of the sun, the most distinguished caste in the land, he had fully entered into the national associations and customs of the land.

Gen. 41:46. Joseph was 30 years old when he stood before Pharaoh, and went out from him and passed through all the land of Egypt, i.e., when he took possession of his office; consequently he had been in Egypt for 13 years as a slave, and at least three years in prison.

Gen. 41:47 ff. For the seven years of superabundance the land bore **לְקַמְצִים**, in full hands or bundles; and Joseph gathered all the provisional store of these years (i.e., the fifth part of the produce, which was levied) into the cities. “The food of the field of the city, which was round about it, he brought into the midst of it;” i.e., he provided granaries in the towns, in which the corn of the whole surrounding country was stored. In this manner he collected as much corn “as the sand of the sea,” until he left off reckoning the quantity, or calculating the number of bushels, which the monuments prove to have been the usual mode adopted (vid., *Hengst.* p. 36).

Gen. 41:50-52. During the fruitful years two sons were born to Joseph. The first-born he named *Manasseh*, i.e., causing to forget; “*for, he said, God hath made me forget all my toil and all my father’s house* (**נִשְׁכַּח**, an Aram. Piel form, for **נִשְׁכַּח**, on account of the resemblance in sound to **מִנְשָׁח**).”

Haec pia est, ac sancta gratiarum actio, quod Deus oblivisci eum fecit pristinas omnes areumnas: sed nullus honor tanti esse debuit, ut desiderium et memoriam paternae domus ex animo deponeret (Calvin).

But the true answer to that question, whether it was a Christian boast for him to make, that he had forgotten father and mother, is given by *Luther*: “I see that God would take away the reliance which I placed upon my father; for God is a jealous God, and will not suffer the heart to have any other foundation to rely upon, but Him alone.” This also meets the objection raised by *Theodoret*, why Joseph did not inform his father of his life and promotion, but allowed so many years to pass away, until he was led to do so at last in consequence of the arrival of his brothers. The reason of this forgetfulness and silence can only be found in the fact, that through the wondrous alteration in his condition he had been led to see, that he was brought to Egypt according to the counsel of God, and was redeemed by God from slavery and prison, and had been exalted by

Him to be lord over Egypt; so that, knowing he was in the hand of God, the firmness of his faith led him to renounce all wilful interference with the purposes of God, which pointed to a still broader and more glorious goal (*Baumgarten, Delitzsch*).

Gen. 41:52. The second son he named *Ephraim*, i.e., double-fruitfulness; “*for God hath made me fruitful in the land of my affliction.*” Even after his elevation Egypt still continued the land of affliction, so that in this word we may see one trace of a longing for the promised land.

Gen. 41:53-57. When the years of scarcity commenced, at the close of the years of plenty, the famine spread over all (the neighbouring) lands; only in Egypt was there bread. As the famine increased in the land, and the people cried to Pharaoh for bread, he directed them to Joseph, who “opened all in which was” (bread), i.e., all the granaries, and sold corn (שֶׁבֶר, *denom.* from שָׁבַר, signifies to trade in corn, to buy and sell corn) to the Egyptians, and (as the writer adds, with a view to what follows) to all the world (בְּכָל-הָאָרֶץ, v. 57), that came thither to buy corn, because the famine was great on every hand. — Years of famine have frequently fallen, like this one, upon Egypt, and the neighbouring countries to the north. The cause of this is to be seen in the fact, that the overflowing of the Nile, to which Egypt is indebted for its fertility, is produced by torrents of rain falling in the alpine regions of Abyssinia, which proceed from clouds formed in the Mediterranean and carried thither by the wind; consequently it has a common origin with the rains of Palestine (see the proofs in *Hengst.* pp. 37 ff.).

FIRST JOURNEY MADE TO EGYPT BY JOSEPH’S BRETHREN, WITHOUT BENJAMIN. — GENESIS 42

Gen. 42: 1-6. With the words “*Why do ye look at one another!*” viz., in such a helpless and undecided manner. Jacob exhorted his sons to fetch corn from Egypt, to preserve his family from starvation. Joseph’s ten brothers went, as their aged father would not allow his youngest son Benjamin to go with them, for fear that some calamity might befall him (קָרָה = קָרָה, Gen. 44:29 as in v. 38 and Gen. 49: 1); and they came “*in the midst of the comers,*” i.e., among others who came from the same necessity, and bowed down before Joseph with their faces to the earth. For he was “the ruler over the land,” and had the supreme control of the sale of the corn, so that they were obliged to apply to him. הַשְּׁלִיט seems to have been the standing title which the Shemites gave to Joseph as ruler in Egypt; and from this the later legend of Σάλατις the first king of the Hyksos arose (*Josephus* c. Ap. i. 14). The only other passages in which the word occurs in the Old Testament are in writings of the captivity or

a still later date, and there it is taken from the Chaldee; it belongs, however, not merely to the Aramaean thesaurus, but to the Arabic also, from which it was introduced into the passage before us.

Gen. 42: 7-17. Joseph recognised his brothers at once; but they could not recognise a brother who had not been seen for 20 years, and who, moreover, had not only become thoroughly Egyptianized, but had risen to be a great lord. And he acted as a foreigner (אֲרַמִּי) towards them, speaking harshly, and asking them whence they had come. In v. 7, according to a truly Semitic style of narrative, we have a condensation of what is more circumstantially related in vv. 8-17.

Gen. 42: 9 ff. As the sight of his brethren bowing before him with the deepest reverence reminded Joseph of his early dreams of the sheaves and stars, which had so increased the hatred of his brethren towards him as to lead to a proposal to kill him, and an actual sale, he said to them, “*Ye are spies; to see the nakedness of the land* (i.e., the unfortified parts of the kingdom which would be easily accessible to a foe) *ye are come;*” and persisted in this charge notwithstanding their reply, “*nay, my lord, but (אֲנִי see Gen. § 155, 1b) to buy food are thy servants come. We are all one man’s sons* (אֲנִי אֲנִי for אֲנִי אֲנִי, only in Exo. 16: 7, 8; Num. 32:32; 2Sa. 17:12; Lam. 3:42): *honest* (יִשְׁרָאֵל) *are we; thy servants are no spies.*” *Cum exploratio sit delictum capitale, non est verisimile; quod pater tot filios uno tempore vitae periculo expositurus sit* (J. Gerhard). But as their assertion failed to make any impression upon the Egyptian lord, they told him still more particularly about their family (vv. 13 ff.): “*Twelve are thy servants, brothers are we, sons of a man in the land of Canaan; and behold the youngest is now with our father, and one is no more* (אֲנִי אֲנִי as in Gen. 5:24). Joseph then replied,

“*That is it (אֲנִי neut. like Gen. 20:16) that I spake unto you, saying ye are spies. By this shall ye be proved: By the life of Pharaoh! ye shall not* (אֲנִי, like Gen. 14:23) *go hence, unless your youngest brother come hither. Send one of you, and let him fetch your brother; but he shall be in bonds, and your words shall be proved, whether there be truth in you or not. By the life of Pharaoh! ye are truly spies!*”

He then had them put into custody for three days. By the coming of the youngest brother, Joseph wanted to test their assertion, not because he thought it possible that he might not be living with them, and they might have treated him as they did Joseph (*Kn.*), but because he wished to discover their feelings towards Benjamin, and see what affection they had for this son of Rachel, who had taken Joseph’s place as his father’s favourite. And with his harsh mode of

addressing them, Joseph had no intention whatever to administer to his brethren “a just punishment for their wickedness towards him,” for his heart could not have stooped to such mean revenge; but he wanted to probe thoroughly the feelings of their hearts, “whether they felt that they deserved the punishment of God for the sin they had committed,” and how they felt towards their aged father and their youngest brother. ^{f72}

Even in the fact that he did not send the one away directly to fetch Benjamin, and merely detain the rest, but put the whole ten in prison, and afterwards modified his threat (vv. 18 ff.), there was no indecision as to the manner in which he should behave towards them — no “waver- ing between thoughts of wrath and revenge on the one hand, and forgiving love and meekness on the other;” but he hoped by imprisoning them to make his brethren feel the earnestness of his words, and to give them time for reflection, as the curt “is no more” with which they had alluded to Joseph’s removal was a sufficient proof that they had not yet truly repented of the deed.

Gen. 42:18-25. On the third day Joseph modified his severity. “*This do and live,*” i.e., then ye shall live: “*I fear God.*” One shall remain in prison, but let the rest of you take home “corn for the famine of your families,” and fetch your youngest brother, that your words may be verified, and ye may not die, i.e., may not suffer the death that spies deserve. That he might not present the appearance of despotic caprice and tyranny by too great severity, and so render his brethren obdurate, Joseph stated as the reason for his new decision, that he feared God. From the fear of God, he, the lord of Egypt, would not punish or slay these strangers upon mere suspicion, but would judge them justly. How differently had they acted towards their brother! The ruler of all Egypt had compassion on their families who were in Canaan suffering from hunger; but they had intended to leave their brother in the pit to starve! These and similar thoughts could hardly fail to pass involuntarily through their minds at Joseph’s words, and to lead them to a penitential acknowledgement of their sin and unrighteousness. The notion that Joseph altered his first intention merely from regard to his much afflicted father, appears improbable, for the simple reason, that he can only have given utterance to the threat that he should keep them all in prison till one of them had gone and fetched Benjamin, for the purpose of giving the greater force to his accusation, that they were spies. But as he was not serious in making this charge, he could not for a moment have thought of actually carrying out the threat. “*And they did so:*” in these words the writer anticipates the result of the colloquy which ensued, and which is more fully narrated afterwards. Joseph’s intention was fulfilled. The brothers now saw in what had happened to them a divine retribution: “*Surely we atone because of our brother, whose anguish of soul we saw, when he entreated us and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us.*” And Reuben

reminded them how he had warned them to no purpose, not to sin against the boy — “*and even his blood...behold it is required*” (cf. Gen. 9: 5); i.e., not merely the sin of casting him into the pit and then selling him, but his death also, of which we have been guilty through that sale. Thus they accused themselves in Joseph’s presence, not knowing that he could understand; “*for the interpreter was between them.*” Joseph had conversed with them through an interpreter, as an Egyptian who was ignorant of their language. “*The interpreter,*” viz., the one appointed for that purpose; **בִּינּוּת** like Gen. 26:28. But Joseph understood their words, and “*turned away and wept*” (v. 24), with inward emotion at the wonderful leadings of divine grace, and at the change in his brothers’ feelings. He then turned to them again, and, continuing the conversation with them, had Simeon bound before their eyes, to be detained as a hostage (not Reuben, who had dissuaded them from killing Joseph, and had taken no part in the sale, but Simeon, the next in age). He then ordered his men to fill their sacks with corn, to give every one (**אִישׁ** as in Gen. 15:10) his money back in his sack, and to provide them with food for the journey.

Gen. 42:26-38. Thus they started with their asses laden with the corn. On the way, when they had reached their halting-place for the night, one of them opened his sack to feed the ass, and found his money in it. **מָלוֹן**, camping-place for the night, is merely a resting-place, not an inn, both here and in Exo. 4:24; for there can hardly have been caravanserais at that time, either in the desert or by the desert road. **אִמְתַּחַת**: an antiquated word for a corn-sack, occurring only in these chapters, and used even here interchangeably with **שֶׁק**.

Gen. 42:28. When this discovery was made known to the brethren, their hearts sank within them. They turned trembling to one another, and said, “*What is this that God hath done to us!*” Joseph had no doubt had the money returned, “merely because it was against his nature to trade with his father and brethren for bread;” just as he had caused them to be supplied with food for the journey, for no other reason than to give them a proof of his good-will. And even if he may have thought it possible that the brothers would be alarmed when they found the money, and thrown into a state of much greater anxiety from the fear of being still further accused by the stern lord of Egypt of cheating or of theft, there was no reason why he should spare them this anxiety, since it could only help to break their hard hearts still more. At any rate, this salutary effect was really produced, even if Joseph had no such intention. The brothers looked upon this incomprehensible affair as a punishment from God, and neglected in their alarm to examine the rest of the sacks.

Gen. 42:29-34. On their arrival at home, they told their father all that had occurred.

Gen. 42:35 ff. But when they emptied their sacks, and, to their own and their father's terror, found their bundles of money in their separate sacks, Jacob burst out with the complaint, "*Ye are making me childless! Joseph is gone, and Simeon is gone, and will ye take Benjamin! All this falls upon me*" (בָּלְנָה for בָּלָן as in Pro. 31:29).

Gen. 42:37, 38. Reuben then offered his two sons to Jacob as pledges for Benjamin, if Jacob would entrust him to his care: Jacob might slay them, if he did not bring Benjamin back — the greatest and dearest offer that a son could make to a father. But Jacob refused to let him go. "*If mischief befell him by the way, he would bring down my grey hairs with sorrow into Sheol*" (cf. Gen. 37:35).

THE SECOND VISIT OF JOSEPH'S BRETHREN TO EGYPT, ALONG WITH BENJAMIN. — GENESIS 43

Gen. 43: 1-15. When the corn brought from Egypt was all consumed, as the famine still continued, Jacob called upon his sons to go down and fetch a little corn (little in proportion to their need).

Gen. 43: 3 ff. Judah then declared, that they would not go there again unless their father sent Benjamin with them; for the man (Joseph) had solemnly protested (הָעֵד הָעֵד) that they should not see his face without their youngest brother. Judah undertook the consultation with his father about Benjamin's going, because Reuben, the eldest son, had already been refused, and Levi, who followed Reuben and Simeon, had forfeited his father's confidence through his treachery to the Shechemites (Genesis 34).

Gen. 43: 6 ff. To the father's reproachful question, why they had dealt so ill with him, as to tell the man that they had a brother, Judah replied: "*The man asked after us and our kinsmen: Is your father yet alive? have ye a brother? And we answered him in conformity* (עַל פִּי as in Exo. 34:27, etc.) *with these words* (i.e., with his questions). *Could we know, then, that he would say, Bring your brother down?*" Joseph had not made direct inquiries, indeed, about their father and their brother; but by his accusation that they were spies, he had compelled them to give an exact account of their family relationships. So that Judah, when repeating the main points of the interview, could very justly give them in the form just mentioned.

Gen. 43: 8. He then repeated the only condition on which they would go to Egypt again, referring to the death by famine which threatened them, their father, and their children, and promising that he would himself be surety for the youth (הַנֶּעָר, Benjamin was twenty-three years old), and saying, that if he did not restore him, he would bear the blame (אָמַן to be guilty of a sin and stone for it, as in 1Ki. 1:21) his whole life long. He then concluded with the deciding words, “*for if we had not delayed, surely we should already have returned a second time.*”

Gen. 43:11. After this, the old man gave way to what could not be avoided, and let Benjamin go. But that nothing might be wanting on his part, which could contribute to the success of the journey, he suggested that they should take a present for the man, and that they should also take the money which was brought back in their sacks, in addition to what was necessary for the corn they were to purchase; and he then commended them to the mercy of Almighty God. “*If it must be so, yet do this* (אִפְּוֹא belongs to the imperative, although it precedes it here, cf. Gen. 27:37): *take of the prize* (the most choice productions) *of the land* — a little balm and a little honey (דְּבַשׁ the Arabian dabs, either new honey from bees, or more probably honey from grapes, — a thick syrup boiled from sweet grapes, which is still carried every year from Hebron to Egypt), *gum-dragon and myrrh* (vid., Gen. 37:25), *pictachio nuts and almonds.*” בְּטַנִּים, which are not mentioned anywhere else, are, according to the *Samar. vers.*, the fruit of the *pistacia vera*, a tree resembling the terebinth, — long angular nuts of the size of hazel-nuts, with an oily kernel of a pleasant flavour; it does not thrive in Palestine now, but the nuts are imported from Aleppo.

Gen. 43:12. “*And take second* (i.e., more) *money* (כֶּסֶף מִשְׁנָה is different from מִשְׁנֵה־כֶּסֶף doubling of the money = double money, v. 15) *in your hand; and the money that returned in your sacks take with you again; perhaps it is a mistake,*” i.e., was put in your sacks by mistake.

Gen. 43:14. Thus Israel let his sons go with the blessing, “*God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he may liberate to you your other brother* (Simeon) *and Benjamin;*” and with this resigned submission to the will of God, “*And I, if I am bereaved, I am bereaved,*” i.e., if I am to lose my children, let it be so! For this mode of expression, cf. Est. 4:16 and 2Ki. 7: 4. שְׂבִלְתִּי with the pausal *a*, answering to the feelings of the speaker, which is frequently used for *o*; e.g., יִטְרֶף for יִטְרֶף, Gen. 49:27.

Gen. 43:16-25. When the brethren appeared before Joseph, he ordered his steward to take them into the house, and prepare a dinner for them and for him.

מָבֵהּ the original form of the *imperative* for מָבֵהּ. But the brethren were alarmed, thinking that they were taken into the house because of the money which returned the first time (הָשֵׁב which came back, they could not imagine how), that he might take them unawares (lit., roll upon them), and fall upon them, and keep them as slaves, along with their asses. For the purpose of averting what they dreaded, they approached (v. 19) the steward and told him, “at the door of the house,” before they entered therefore, how, at the first purchase of corn, on opening their sacks, they found the money that had been paid, “*every one’s money in the mouth of his sack, our money according to its weight,*” i.e., in full, and had now brought it back, together with some more money to buy corn, and they did not know who had put their money in their sacks (vv. 20-22). The steward, who was initiated into Joseph’s plans, replied in a pacifying tone, “*Peace be to you (שְׁלוֹם לָכֶם is not a form of salutation here, but of encouragement, as in Jud. 6:23): fear not; your God and the God of your father has given you a treasure in your sacks; your money came to me;*” and at the same time, to banish all their fear, he brought Simeon out to them. He then conducted them into Joseph’s house, and received them in Oriental fashion as the guests of his lord. But, previous to Joseph’s arrival, they arranged the present which they had brought with them, as they heard that they were to dine with him.

Gen. 43:26-34. When Joseph came home, they handed him the present with the most reverential obeisance.

Gen. 43:27. Joseph first of all inquired after their own and their father’s health (שְׁלוֹם first as substantive, then as adjective = שָׁלֵם 33:18), whether he was still living; which they answered with thanks in the affirmative, making the deepest bow. His eyes then fell upon Benjamin, the brother by his own mother, and he asked whether this was their youngest brother; but without waiting for their reply, he exclaimed, “*God be gracious to thee, my son!*” יְיִָהֲנֶךָ for יְיִָהֲנֶךָ as in Isa. 30:19 (cf. Ewald, § 251*d*). He addressed him as “my son,” in tender and, as it were, paternal affection, and with special regard to his youth. Benjamin was 16 years younger than Joseph, and was quite an infant when Joseph was sold.

Gen. 43:30, 31. And “his (Joseph’s) bowels did yearn” (נִכְמְרוּ lit., were compressed, from the force of love to his brother), so that he was obliged to seek (a place) as quickly as possible to weep, and went into the chamber, that he might give vent to his feelings in tears; after which, he washed his face and came out again, and, putting constraint upon himself, ordered the dinner to be brought in.

Gen. 43:32, 33. Separate tables were prepared for him, for his brethren, and for the Egyptians who dined with them. This was required by the Egyptian spirit of caste, which neither allowed Joseph, as minister of state and a member of the priestly order, to eat along with Egyptians who were below him, nor the latter along with the Hebrews as foreigners. “*They cannot* (i.e., may not) *eat* (cf. Deut 12:17; 16: 5; 17:15). *For this was an abomination to the Egyptians.*” The Hebrews and others, for example, slaughtered and ate animals, even female animals, which were regarded by the Egyptians as sacred; so that, according to Herod. ii. 41, no Egyptian would use the knife, or fork, or saucepan of a Greek, nor would any eat of the flesh of a clean animal which had been cut up with a Grecian knife (cf. Exo. 8:22).

Gen. 43:33, 34. The brothers sat in front of Joseph, “*the first-born according to his birthright, and the smallest* (youngest) *according to his smallness* (youth);” i.e., the places were arranged for them according to their ages, so that they looked at one another with astonishment, since this arrangement necessarily impressed them with the idea that this great man had been supernaturally enlightened as to their family affairs. To do them honour, they brought (שָׂפָה, Ges. § 137, 3) them dishes from Joseph, i.e., from his table; and to show especial honour to Benjamin, his portion was five times larger than that of any of the others (יָדָהּ lit., hands, grasps, as in Gen. 47:24; 2Ki. 11: 7). The custom is met with elsewhere of showing respect to distinguished guests by giving them the largest and best pieces (1Sa. 9:23, 24; *Homer*, II. 7, 321; 8, 162, etc.), by double portions (e.g., the kings among the Spartans, Herod. 6, 57), and even by fourfold portions in the case of the Archons among the Cretans (*Heraclid. po* lit., 3). But among the Egyptians the number 5 appears to have been preferred to any other (cf. Gen. 41:34; 45:22; 47: 2, 24; Isa. 19:18). By this partiality Joseph intended, with a view to his further plans, to draw out his brethren to show their real feelings towards Benjamin, that he might see whether they would envy and hate him on account of this distinction, as they had formerly envied him his long coat with sleeves, and hated him because he was his father’s favourite (Gen. 37: 3, 4). This honourable treatment and entertainment banished all their anxiety and fear. “*They drank, and drank largely with him,*” i.e., they were perfectly satisfied with what they ate and drank; not, they were intoxicated (cf. *Hag.* 1: 9).

THE LAST TEST AND ITS RESULTS. — GENESIS 44

Gen. 44: 1-13. THE TEST. — Vv. 1, 2. After the dinner Joseph had his brothers’ sacks filled by his steward with corn, as much as they could hold, and every one’s money placed inside; and in addition to that, had his own silver goblet put into Benjamin’s sack.

Gen. 44: 3-6. Then as soon as it was light (אֶרְבֵּי, 3rd pers. perf. in *o*: Ges. § 72, 1), they were sent away with their asses. But they were hardly outside the town, “not far off,” when he directed his steward to follow the men, and as soon as he overtook them, to say,

“Wherefore have ye rewarded evil for good? Is it not this from which my lord drinketh, and he is accustomed to prophesy from it? Ye have done an evil deed!”

By these words they were accused of theft; the thing was taken for granted as well known to them all, and the goblet purloined was simply described as a very valuable possession of Joseph’s. שָׁפַט: lit., to whisper, to mumble out formularies, incantations, then to prophesy, *divinare*. According to this, the Egyptians at that time practised λεκανοσκοπή or λεκανομαντεία and ὕδρομαντεία, the plate and water incantations, of which *Jamblichus* speaks (*de myst.* iii. 14), and which consisted in pouring clean water into a goblet, and then looking into the water for representations of future events; or in pouring water into a goblet or dish, dropping in pieces of gold and silver, also precious stones, and then observing and interpreting the appearances in the water (cf. *Varro apud August. civ. Dei* 7, 35; *Plin. h. n.* 37, 73; *Strabo*, xvi. p. 762). Traces of this have been continued even to our own day (see *Norden’s Journey through Egypt and Nubia*). But we cannot infer with certainty from this, that Joseph actually adopted this superstitious practice. The intention of the statement may simply have been to represent the goblet as a sacred vessel, and Joseph as acquainted with the most secret things (v. 15).

Gen. 44: 7-9. In the consciousness of their innocence the brethren repelled this charge with indignation, and appealed to the fact that they brought back the gold which was found in their sacks, and therefore could not possibly have stolen gold or silver; and declared that whoever should be found in possession of the goblet, should be put to death, and the rest become slaves.

Gen. 44:10. The man replied,

“Now let it be even (אִם) placed first for the sake of emphasis) according to your words: with whom it is found, he shall be my slave, and ye (the rest) shall remain blameless.”

Thus he modified the sentence, to assume the appearance of justice.

Gen. 44:11-13. They then took down their sacks as quickly as possible; and he examined them, beginning with the eldest and finishing with the youngest; and the goblet was found in Benjamin’s sack. With anguish and alarm at this new calamity they rent their clothes (vid., Gen. 37:34), loaded their asses

again, and returned to the city. It would now be seen how they felt in their inmost hearts towards their father's favourite, who had been so distinguished by the great man of Egypt: whether now as formerly they were capable of giving up their brother, and bringing their aged father with sorrow to the grave; or whether they were ready, with unenvying, self-sacrificing love, to give up their own liberty and lives for him. And they stood this test.

Gen. 44:14-34. RESULT OF THE TEST. — Vv. 14-17. With Judah leading the way, they came into the house to Joseph, and fell down before him begging for mercy. Joseph spoke to them harshly:

“What kind of deed is this that ye have done? Did ye not know that such a man as I (a man initiated into the most secret things) would certainly divine this?”

נִחַדְיָ *augurari*. Judah made no attempt at a defence.

“What shall we say to my lord? how speak, how clear ourselves? God (Ha-Elohim, the personal God) has found out the wickedness of thy servants (i.e., He is now punishing the crime committed against our brother, cf. Gen. 42:21). Behold, we are my lord's slaves, both we, and he in whose hand the cup was found.”

But Joseph would punish mildly and justly. The guilty one alone should be his slave; the others might go in peace, i.e., uninjured, to their father.

Gen. 44:18 ff. But that the brothers could not do. Judah, who had pledged himself to his father for Benjamin, ventured in the anguish of his heart to approach Joseph, and implore him to liberate his brother.

“I would give very much,” says *Luther*, “to be able to pray to our Lord God as well as Judah prays to Joseph here; for it is a perfect specimen of prayer, the true feeling that there ought to be in prayer.”

Beginning with the request for a gracious hearing, as he was speaking to the ears of one who was equal to Pharaoh (who could condemn or pardon like the king), Judah depicted in natural, affecting, powerful, and irresistible words the love of their aged father to this son of his old age, and his grief when they told him that they were not to come into the presence of the lord of Egypt again without Benjamin; the intense anxiety with which, after a severe struggle, their father had allowed him to come, after he (Judah) had offered to be answerable for his life; and the grievous fact, that if they returned without the youth, they must bring down the grey hairs of their father with sorrow to the grave.

Gen. 44:21. To “set eyes upon him” signifies, with a gracious intention, to show him good-will (as in Jer. 39:12; 40: 4).

Gen. 44:27. “That my wife bore to me two (sons):” Jacob regards Rachel alone as his actual wife (cf. Gen. 46:19).

Gen. 44:28. וְאָמַר, preceded by a preterite, is to be rendered “and I was obliged to say, Only (nothing but) torn in pieces has he become.”

Gen. 44:30. “His soul is bound to his soul:” equivalent to, “he clings to him with all his soul.”

Gen. 44:33, 34. Judah closed his appeal with the entreaty,

“Now let thy servant (me) remain instead of the lad as slave to my lord, but let the lad go up with his brethren; for how could I go to my father without the lad being with me! (I cannot,) that I may not see the calamity which will befall my father!”

THE RECOGNITION. INVITATION TO JACOB TO COME DOWN TO EGYPT. — GENESIS 45

Gen. 45: 1-15. THE RECOGNITION. — V. 1. After this appeal, in which Judah, speaking for his brethren, had shown the tenderest affection for the old man who had been bowed down by their sin, and the most devoted fraternal love and fidelity to the only remaining son of his beloved Rachel, and had given a sufficient proof of the change of mind, the true conversion, that had taken place in themselves, Joseph could not restrain himself any longer in relation to all those who stood round him. He was obliged to relinquish the part which he had hitherto acted for the purpose of testing his brothers’ hearts, and to give full vent to his feelings.

“He called out: Cause every man to go out from me. And there stood no man (of his Egyptian attendants) with him, while Joseph made himself known to his brethren,” quia effusio illa affectuum et στοργῆς erga fratres et parentem tanta fuit, ut non posset ferre alienorum praesentiam et aspectum (Luther).

Gen. 45: 2, 3. As soon as all the rest were gone, he broke out into such loud weeping, that the Egyptians outside could hear it; and the house of Pharaoh, i.e., the royal family, was told of it (cf. vv. 2 and 16). He then said to his brethren: “I am Joseph. Is my father still alive?” That his father was still living, he had not only been informed before (Gen. 43:27), but had just been told again; but his filial heart impels him to make sure of it once more. “But his

brethren could not answer him, for they were terrified before him:” they were so smitten in their consciences, that from astonishment and terror they could not utter a word.

Gen. 45: 4, 5. Joseph then bade his brethren approach nearer, and said: “*I am Joseph, your brother, whom he sold into Egypt. But now be not grieved nor angry with yourselves (אֶל-יַחַר בְּעֵינֵיכֶם as in Gen. 31:35) that ye sold me hither; for God hath sent me before you to preserve life.*

” *Sic enim Joseph interpretatur venditionem. Vos quidem me vendidistis, sed Deus emit, asseruit et vindicavit me sibi pastorem, principem et salvatorem populorum eodem consilio, quo videbar amissus et perditus (Luther).*

“*For,*” he continues in explanation, “*now there are two years of famine in the land, and there are five years more, in which there will be no ploughing and reaping. And God hath sent me before you to establish you a remnant (cf. 2Sa. 14: 7) upon the earth (i.e., to secure to you the preservation of the tribe and of posterity during this famine), and to preserve your lives to a great deliverance,*”

i.e., to a great nation delivered from destruction, cf. Gen. 50:20. פְּלִיטָה that which has escaped, the band of men or multitude escaped from death and destruction (2Ki. 19:30, 31). Joseph announced prophetically here, that God had brought him into Egypt to preserve through him the family which He had chosen for His own nation, and to deliver them out of the danger of starvation which threatened them now, as a very great nation.

Gen. 45: 8. “*And now (this was truly the case) it was not you that sent me hither; but God (Ha-Elohim, the personal God, on contrast with his brethren) hath made me a father to Pharaoh (i.e., his most confidential counsellor and friend; cf. 1 Macc. 11:32, Ges. thes. 7), and lord of all his house, and a ruler throughout all the land of Egypt;”* cf. Gen. 41:40, 41.

Gen. 45: 9 ff. Joseph then directed his brethren to go up to their father with all speed, and invite him in his name to come without delay, with all his family and possessions, into Egypt, where he would keep him near himself, in the land of Goshen (see Gen. 47:11), that he might not perish in the still remaining five years of famine. תְּנַרְשׁ: v. 11, lit., to be robbed of one’s possessions, to be taken possession of by another, from יָרַשׁ to take possession.

Gen. 45:12, 13. But the brethren were so taken by surprise and overpowered by this unexpected discovery, that to convince them of the reality of the whole affair, Joseph was obliged to add, “Behold, your eyes see, and the eyes of my

brother Benjamin, that it is my mouth that speaketh unto you. And tell my father all my glory in Egypt, and all that ye have seen, and bring my father quickly hither.”

Gen. 45:14, 15. He then fell upon Benjamin’s neck and wept, and kissed all his brethren and wept on them, i.e., whilst embracing them; “*and after that, his brethren talked with him.*” אֶחָיוּ בֵּן: after Joseph by a triple assurance, that what they had done was the leading of God for their own good, had dispelled their fear of retribution, and, by embracing and kissing them with tears, had sealed the truth and sincerity of his words.

Gen. 45:16-28. INVITATION TO JACOB TO COME INTO EGYPT. — Vv. 16 ff. The report of the arrival of Joseph’s brethren soon found its way into the palace, and made so favourable an impression upon Pharaoh and his courtiers, that the king sent a message through Joseph to his brethren to come with their father and their families (“*your houses*”) into Egypt, saying that he would give them “*the good of the land of Egypt,*” and they should eat “*the fat of the land.*” טוֹב, “the good,” is not the best part, but the good things (produce) of the land, as in vv. 20, 23, 24:10, 2Ki. 8: 9. הַלֵּב, fat, i.e., the finest productions.

Gen. 45:19, 20. At the same time Pharaoh empowered Joseph (“thou art commanded”) to give his brethren carriages to take with them, in which to convey their children and wives and their aged father, and recommended them to leave their goods behind them in Canaan, for the good of all Egypt was at their service. From time immemorial Egypt was rich in small, two-wheeled carriages, which could be used even where there were no roads (cf. Gen. 50: 9, Exo. 14: 6 ff. with Isa. 36: 9). “*Let not your eye look with mourning (אֲחִים) at your goods;*” i.e., do not trouble about the house-furniture which you are obliged to leave behind. The good-will manifested in this invitation of Pharaoh towards Jacob’s family was to be attributed to the feeling of gratitude to Joseph, and

“is related circumstantially, because this free and honourable invitation involved the right of Israel to leave Egypt again without obstruction” (*Delitzsch*).

Gen. 45:21 ff. The sons of Israel carried out the instructions of Joseph and the invitation of Pharaoh (vv. 25-27). But Joseph not only sent carriages according to Pharaoh’s directions, and food for the journey, he also gave them presents, changes of raiment, a suit for every one, and five suits for Benjamin, as well as 300 shekels of silver. הַלְּפֹת שִׁמְלֹת: change of clothes, clothes to change; i.e., dress clothes which were worn on special occasions and frequently changed (Jud. 13:12, 13, 19; 2Ki. 5: 5). “*And to his father he sent*

like these;” i.e., not changes of clothes, but presents also, viz., ten asses “carrying of the good of Egypt,” and ten she-asses with corn and provisions for the journey; and sent them off with the injunction: אַל-תִּרְגֹּזוּ, μη ὀργίζεσθε (LXX), “do not get angry by the way.”

Placatus erat Joseph fratribus, simul eos admonet, ne quid turbarum moveant. Timendum enim erat, ne quisque se purgando crimen transferre in alios studeret atque its surgeret contentio (Calvin).

Gen. 45:25-28. When they got back, and brought word to their father, “Joseph is still living, yea (וְכִי an emphatic assurance, *Ewald*, § 3306) he is ruler in all the land of Egypt, his heart stopped, for he believed them not;” i.e., his heart did not beat at this joyful news, for he put no faith in what they said. It was not till they told him all that Joseph had said, and he saw the carriages that Joseph had sent, that “*the spirit of their father Jacob revived; and Israel said: It is enough! Joseph my son is yet alive: I will go and see him before I die.*” Observe the significant interchange of *Jacob* and *Israel*. When once the crushed spirit of the old man was revived by the certainty that his son Joseph was still alive, Jacob was changed into Israel, the “conqueror overcoming his grief at the previous misconduct of his sons” (*Fr. v. Meyer*).

REMOVAL OF ISRAEL TO GOSHEN IN EGYPT. — GENESIS 46

Gen. 46: 1-7. “*So Israel took his journey (from Hebron, Gen. 37:14) with all who belonged to him, and came to Beersheba.*” There, on the border of Canaan, where Abraham and Isaac had called upon the name of the Lord (Gen. 21:33; 26:25), he offered sacrifices to the God of his father Isaac, *ut sibi firmum et ratum esse testetur faedus, quod Deus ipse cum Patribus pepigerat (Calvin)*. Even though Jacob might see the ways of God in the wonderful course of his son Joseph, and discern in the friendly invitation of Joseph and Pharaoh, combined with the famine prevailing in Canaan, a divine direction to go into Egypt; yet this departure from the land of promise, in which his fathers had lived as pilgrims, was a step which necessarily excited serious thoughts in his mind as to his own future and that of his family, and led him to commend himself and his followers to the care of the faithful covenant God, whether in so doing he thought of the revelation which Abram had received (Gen. 15:13-16), or not.

Gen. 46: 2. Here God appeared to him in a vision of the night (מַרְאֵה, an intensive plural), and gave him, as once before on his flight from Canaan (Gen. 28:12 ff.), the comforting promise, “*I am הָאֵל (the Mighty One), the God of thy father: fear not to go down into Egypt (מִרְדָּתָהּ for מִרְדֵּתָהּ, as in*

Exo. 2: 4 יֵרְדָהּ for יֵרֶת, cf. *Ges.* § 69, 3, Anm. 1); for *I will there make thee a great nation. I will go down with thee into Egypt, and I — bring thee up again also will I, and Joseph shall close thine eyes.*” גַּם-עָלָה an *inf. abs.* appended emphatically (as in Gen. 31:15); according to *Ges. inf. Kal.*

Gen. 46: 5-7. Strengthened by this promise, Jacob went into Egypt with children and children’s children, his sons driving their aged father together with their wives and children in the carriages sent by Pharaoh, and taking their flocks with all the possessions that they had acquired in Canaan. ^{f73}

Gen. 46: 8-27. The size of Jacob’s family, which was to grow into a great nation, is given here, with evident allusion to the fulfilment of the divine promise with which he went into Egypt. The list of names includes not merely the “sons of Israel” in the stricter sense; but, as is added immediately afterwards, “*Jacob and his sons,*” or, as the closing formula expresses it (v. 27), “*all the souls of the house of Jacob, who came into Egypt*” (הַנְּסֻחָהּ for אֲשֶׁר בָּאָהּ, *Ges.* § 109), including the patriarch himself, and Joseph with his two sons, who were born before Jacob’s arrival in Egypt. If we reckon these, the house of Jacob consisted of 70 souls; and apart from these, of 66, besides his sons’ wives. The sons are arranged according to the four mothers. Of *Leah* there are given 6 sons, 23 grandsons, 2 great-grandsons (sons of Pharez, whereas Er and Onan, the sons of Judah who died in Canaan, are not reckoned), and 1 daughter, Dinah, who remained unmarried, and was therefore an independent member of the house of Jacob; in all, therefore, 6 + 23 + 2 + 1 = 32, or with Jacob, 33 souls. Of *Zilpah*, Leah’s handmaid, there are mentioned 2 sons, 11 grandsons, 2 great-grandsons, and 1 daughter (who is reckoned like Dinah, both here and Num. 26:46, for some special reason, which is not particularly described); in all, 2 + 11 + 2 + 1 = 16 souls. Of *Rachel*, “Jacob’s (favourite) wife,” 2 sons and 12 grandsons are named, of whom, according to Num. 26:40, two were great-grandsons, = 14 souls; and of Rachel’s maid *Bilhah*, 2 sons and 5 grandsons = 7 souls. The whole number therefore was 33 + 16 + 14 + 7 = 70. ^{f74}

The wives of Jacob’s sons are neither mentioned by name nor reckoned, because the families of Israel were not founded by them, but by their husbands alone. Nor is their parentage given either here or anywhere else. It is merely casually that one of the sons of Simeon is called the son of a Canaanitish woman (v. 10); from which it may be inferred that it was quite an exceptional thing for the sons of Jacob to take their wives from among the Canaanites, and that as a rule they were chosen from their paternal relations in Mesopotamia; besides whom, there were also their other relations, the families of Ishmael, Keturah, and Edom. Of the “daughters of Jacob” also, and the “daughters of

his sons,” none are mentioned except Dinah and Serah the daughter of Asher, because they were not the founders of separate houses.

If we look more closely into the list itself, the first thing which strikes us is that Pharez, one of the twin-sons of Judah, who were not born till after the sale of Joseph, should already have had two sons. Supposing that Judah’s marriage to the daughter of Shuah the Canaanite occurred, notwithstanding the reasons advanced to the contrary in Gen. 38, before the sale of Joseph, and shortly after the return of Jacob to Canaan, during the time of his sojourn at Shechem (Gen. 33:18), it cannot have taken place more than five, or at the most six, years before Joseph was sold; for Judah was only three years older than Joseph, and was not more than 20 years old, therefore, at the time of his sale. But even then there would not be more than 28 years between Judah’s marriage and Jacob’s removal to Egypt; so that Pharez would only be about 11 years old, since he could not have been born till about 17 years after Judah’s marriage, and at that age he could not have had two sons. Judah, again, could not have taken four sons with him into Egypt, since he had at the most only two sons a year before their removal (Gen. 42:37); unless indeed we adopt the extremely improbable hypothesis, that two other sons were born within the space of 11 or 12 months, either as twins, or one after the other. Still less could Benjamin, who was only 23 or 24 years old at the time (*vid.*, pp. 200 f. and 204 f.), have had 10 sons already, or, as Num. 26:38-40 shows, eight sons and two grandsons. From all this it necessarily follows, that in the list before us grandsons and great-grandsons of Jacob are named who were born afterwards in Egypt, and who, therefore, according to a view which we frequently meet with in the Old Testament, though strange to our modes of thought, came into Egypt *in lumbis patrum*. That the list is really intended to be so understood, is undoubtedly evident from a comparison of the “sons of Israel” (v. 8), whose names it gives, with the description given in Num. 26 of the whole community of the sons of Israel according to their fathers’ houses, or their tribes and families. In the account of the families of Israel at the time of Moses, which is given there, we find, with slight deviations, all the grandsons and great-grandsons of Jacob whose names occur in this chapter, mentioned as the founders of the families, into which the twelve tribes of Israel were subdivided in Moses’ days. The deviations are partly in form, partly in substance. To the former belong the differences in particular names, which are sometimes only different forms of the same name; e.g., Jemuel and Zohar (v. 10), for Nemuel and Zerah (Num. 26:12, 13); Ziphion and Arodi (v. 16), for Zephon and Arod (Num. 26:15 and 17); Huppim (v. 21) for Hupham (Num. 26:39); Ehi (v. 21), an abbreviation of Ahiram (Num. 26:38); sometimes different names of the same person; viz., Ezbon (v. 16) and Ozni (Num. 26:16); Muppim (v. 21) and Shupham (Num. 26:39); Hushim (v. 23) and Shuham (Num. 26:42). Among the differences in substance, the first to be noticed is the fact, that in Num. 26

Simeon's son Ohad, Asher's son Ishuah, and three of Benjamin's sons, Becher, Gera, and Rosh, are missing from the founders of families, probably for no other reason than that they either died childless, or did not leave a sufficient number of children to form independent families. With the exception of these, according to Numbers 26, all the grandsons and great-grandsons of Jacob mentioned in this chapter were founders of families in existence in Moses' time. From this it is obvious that our list is intended to contain, not merely the sons and grandsons of Jacob, who were already born when he went down to Egypt, but in addition to the sons, who were the heads of the twelve tribes of the nation, *all* the grandsons and great-grandsons who became the founders of *mishpachoth*, i.e., of independent families, and who on that account took the place or were advanced into the position of the grandsons of Jacob, so far as the national organization was concerned.

On no other hypothesis can we explain the fact, that in the time of Moses there was not one of the twelve tribes, except the double tribe of Joseph, in which there were families existing, that had descended from either grandsons or great-grandsons of Jacob who are not already mentioned in this list. As it is quite inconceivable that no more sons should have been born to Jacob's sons after their removal into Egypt, so is it equally inconceivable, that all the sons born in Egypt either died childless, or founded no families. The rule by which the nation descending from the sons of Jacob was divided into tribes and families (*mishpachoth*) according to the order of birth was this, that as the twelve sons founded the twelve tribes, so their sons, i.e., Jacob's grandsons, were the founders of the families into which the tribes were subdivided, unless these grandsons died without leaving children, or did not leave a sufficient number of male descendants to form independent families, or the natural rule for the formation of tribes and families was set aside by other events or causes. On this hypothesis we can also explain the other real differences between this list and Numbers 26; viz., the fact that, according to Num. 26:40, two of the sons of Benjamin mentioned in v. 21, Naaman and Ard, were his grandsons, sons of Belah; and also the circumstance, that in v. 20 only the two sons of Joseph, who were already born when Jacob arrived in Egypt, are mentioned, viz., Manasseh and Ephraim, and none of the sons who were born to him afterwards (Gen. 48: 6). The two grandsons of Benjamin could be reckoned among his sons in our list, because they founded independent families just like the sons. And of the sons of Joseph, Manasseh and Ephraim alone could be admitted into our list, because they were elevated above the sons born to Joseph afterwards, by the fact that shortly before Jacob's death he adopted them as his own sons and thus raised them to the rank of heads of tribes; so that wherever Joseph's descendants are reckoned as *one* tribe (e.g., Jos. 16: 1, 4), Manasseh and Ephraim form the main divisions, or leading families of the tribe of Joseph, the subdivisions of which were founded partly by their

brothers who were born afterwards, and partly by their sons and grandsons. Consequently the omission of the sons born afterwards, and the grandsons of Joseph, from whom the families of the two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, who were elevated into tribes, descended, forms only an apparent and not a real exception to the general rule, that this list mentions all the grandsons of Jacob who founded the families of the twelve tribes, without regard to the question whether they were born before or after the removal of Jacob's house to Egypt, since this distinction was of no importance to the main purpose of our list. That this was the design of our list, is still further confirmed by a comparison of Exo. 1: 5 and Deu. 10:22, where the seventy souls of the house of Jacob which went into Egypt are said to constitute the seed which, under the blessing of the Lord, had grown into the numerous people that Moses led out of Egypt, to take possession of the land of promise. From this point of view it was a natural thing to describe the seed of the nation, which grew up in tribes and families, in such a way as to give the germs and roots of all the tribes and families of the whole nation; i.e., not merely the grandsons who were born before the migration, but also the grandsons and great-grandsons who were born in Egypt, and became founders of independent families. By thus embracing all the founders of tribes and families, the significant number 70 was obtained, in which the number 7 (formed of the divine number 3, and the world number 4, as the seal of the covenant relation between God and Israel) is multiplied by the number 10, as the seal of completeness, so as to express the fact that these 70 souls comprehended the whole of the nation of God. ^{f75}

Gen. 46:28-34. This list of the house of Jacob is followed by an account of the arrival in Egypt.

Gen. 46:28. Jacob sent his son Judah before him to Joseph, “to show (להורת) before him to Goshen;” i.e., to obtain from Joseph the necessary instructions as to the place of their settlement, and then to act as guide to Goshen.

Gen. 46:29. As soon as they had arrived, Joseph had his chariot made ready to go up to Goshen and meet his father (יָעַל) applied to a journey from the interior to the desert or Canaan), and “*showed himself to him there* (lit., he appeared to him; נִרְאָה, which is generally used only of the appearance of God, is selected here to indicate the glory in which Joseph came to meet his father); *and fell upon his neck, continuing (עוֹד) upon his neck* (i.e., in his embrace) *weeping.*”

Gen. 46:30. Then Israel said to Joseph: “Now (הַפְעַם) lit., this time) will I die, after I have seen thy face, that thou (art) still alive.”

Gen. 46:31, 32. But Joseph told his brethren and his father's house (his family) that he would go up to Pharaoh (עֲלֶה here used of going to the court, as an ideal ascent), to announce the arrival of his relations, who were אֲנָשֵׁי מִקְנֵה "keepers of flocks," and had brought their sheep and oxen and all their possessions with them.

Gen. 46:33, 34. At the same time Joseph gave these instructions to his brethren, in case Pharaoh should send for them and inquire about their occupation: "Say, Thy servants have been keepers of cattle from our youth even until now, we like our fathers; that ye may dwell in the land of Goshen; for every shepherd is an abomination of the Egyptians." This last remark formed part of Joseph's words, and contained the reason why his brethren should describe themselves to Pharaoh as shepherds from of old, namely, that they might receive Goshen as their dwelling-place, and that their national and religion independence might not be endangered by too close an intercourse with the Egyptians. The dislike of the Egyptians to shepherds arose from the fact, that the more completely the foundations of the Egyptian state rested upon agriculture with its perfect organization, the more did the Egyptians associate the idea of rudeness and barbarism with the very name of a shepherd. This is not only attested in various ways by the monuments, on which shepherds are constantly depicted as lanky, withered, distorted, emaciated, and sometimes almost ghostly figures (*Graul*, *Reise* 2, p. 171), but is confirmed by ancient testimony. According to *Herodotus* (2, 47), the swine-herds were the most despised; but they were associated with the cow-herds (βουκόλοι) in the seven castes of the Egyptians (*Herod.* 2, 164), so that *Diodorus Siculus* (1, 74) includes all herdsmen in one caste; according to which the word βουκόλοι in *Herodotus* not only denotes cow-herds, but *a potiori* all herdsmen, just as we find in the herds depicted upon the monuments, sheep, goats, and rams introduced by thousands, along with asses and horned cattle.

SETTLEMENT OF ISRAEL IN EGYPT; THEIR PROSPEROUS CONDITION DURING THE YEARS OF FAMINE. — GEN. 47: 1-27

Gen. 47: 1-12. When Joseph had announced to Pharaoh the arrival of his relations in Goshen, he presented five out of the whole number of his brethren (מִקְצֵה אָחִיו; on קָצָה see *Gen.* 19: 4) to the king.

Gen. 47: 3 ff. Pharaoh asked them about their occupation, and according to Joseph's instructions they replied that they were herdsmen (רֹעֵה צֹאן, the singular of the predicate, see *Ges.* § 147c), who had come to sojourn in the land (גָּוַר, i.e., to stay for a time), because the pasture for their flocks had failed in the land of Canaan on account of the famine. The king then

empowered Joseph to give his father and his brethren a dwelling (הוֹשִׁיב) in the best part of the land, in the land of Goshen, and, if he knew any brave men among them, to make them rulers over the royal herds, which were kept, as we may infer, in the land of Goshen, as being the best pasture-land.

Gen. 47: 7-9. Joseph then presented his father to Pharaoh, but not till after the audience of his brothers had been followed by the royal permission to settle, for which the old man, who was bowed down with age, was not in a condition to sue. The patriarch saluted the king with a blessing, and replied to his inquiry as to his age,

“The days of the years of my pilgrimage are 130 years; few and sorrowful are the days of my life’s years, and have not reached (the perfect in the presentiment of his approaching end) the days of the life’s years of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage.”

Jacob called his own life and that of his fathers a pilgrimage (מְגוּרִים), because they had not come into actual possession of the promised land, but had been obliged all their life long to wander about, unsettled and homeless, in the land promised to them for an inheritance, as in a strange land. This pilgrimage was at the same time a figurative representation of the inconstancy and weariness of the earthly life, in which man does not attain to that true rest of peace with God and blessedness in His fellowship, for which he was created, and for which therefore his soul is continually longing (cf. Psa. 39:13; 119:19, 54; 1Ch. 29:15). The apostle, therefore, could justly regard these words as a declaration of the longing of the patriarchs for the eternal rest of their heavenly fatherland (Heb. 11:13-16). So also Jacob’s life was little (מְעַט) and evil (i.e., full of toil and trouble) in comparison with the life of his fathers. For Abraham lived to be 175 years old, and Isaac 180; and neither of them had led a life so agitated, so full of distress and dangers, of tribulation and anguish, as Jacob had from his first flight to Haran up to the time of his removal to Egypt.

Gen. 47:10. After this probably short interview, of which, however, only the leading incidents are given, Jacob left the king with a blessing.

Gen. 47:11. Joseph assigned to his father and his brethren, according to Pharaoh’s command, a possession (אֲחֻזָּה) for a dwelling-place in the best part of Egypt, the land of Raëmses, and provided them with bread, “according to the mouth of the little ones,” i.e., according to the necessities of each family, answering to the larger or smaller number of their children. כִּלְכַּל with a double accusative (Ges. § 139). The settlement of the Israelites is called the land of Raëmses (רַעַמְסֵס, in pause רַעַמְסֵס Exo. 1:11), instead of Goshen, either because the province of Goshen (Γεσέμ, LXX) is indicated by the name

of its former capital *Raëmses* (i.e., *Heroopolis*, on the site or in the immediate neighbourhood of the modern *Abu Keisheib*, in Wady Tumilat (vid., Exo. 1:11), or because Israel settled in the vicinity of *Raëmses*. The district of *Goshen* is to be sought in the modern province of *el Sharkiyeh* (i.e., the eastern), on the east side of the Nile, towards Arabia, still the most fertile and productive province of Egypt (cf. *Robinson*, Pal. i. 78, 79). For Goshen was bounded on the east by the desert of Arabia Petraea, which stretches away to Philistia (Exo. 13:17, cf. 1Ch. 7:21) and is called Γεσῆμ Αραβίας in the Septuagint in consequence (Gen. 45:10; 46:34), and must have extended westwards to the Nile, since the Israelites had an abundance of fish (Num. 11: 5). It probably skirted the Tanitic arm of the Nile, as the fields of *Zoan*, i.e., *Tanis*, are said to have been the scene of the mighty acts of God in Egypt (Psa. 78:12, 43, cf. Num. 13:22). In this province Joseph assigned his relations settlements near to himself (Gen. 45:10), from which they could quickly and easily communicate with one another (Gen. 46:28; 48: 1 ff.). Whether he lived at *Raëmses* or not, cannot be determined, just because the residence of the Pharaoh of that time is not known, and the notion that it was at Memphis is only based upon utterly uncertain combinations relating to the Hyksos.

Gen. 47:13-27. To make the extent of the benefit conferred by Joseph upon his family, in providing them with the necessary supplies during the years of famine, all the more apparent, a description is given of the distress into which the inhabitants of Egypt and Canaan were plunged by the continuance of the famine.

Gen. 47:13. The land of Egypt and the land of Canaan were exhausted with hunger. — הַלְלָהּ: from הִלָּל = הִשָּׁלָה, to languish, to be exhausted, only occurring again in Pro. 26:18, *Hithp.* in a secondary sense.

Gen. 47:14. All the money in both countries was paid in to Joseph for the purchase of corn, and deposited by him in Pharaoh's house, i.e., the royal treasury.

Gen. 47:15 ff. When the money was exhausted, the Egyptians all came to Joseph with the petition: "Give us bread, why should we die before thee" (i.e., so that thou shouldst see us die, when in reality thou canst support us)? Joseph then offered to accept their cattle in payment; and they brought him near their herds, in return for which he provided them that year with bread. נָהַל: *Piel* to lead, with the secondary meaning, to care for (Psa. 23: 2; Isa. 40:11, etc.); hence the signification here, "to maintain."

Gen. 47:18, 19. When that year had passed (תָּהָם, as in Psa. 102:28, to denote the termination of the year), they came again “the second year” (i.e., after the money was gone, not the second of the seven years of famine) and said: “We cannot hide it from my lord (אֲדֹנָי, a title similar to *your majesty*), but the money is all gone, and the cattle have come to my lord; we have nothing left to offer to my lord but our bodies and our land.” כִּי אֵם is an intensified כִּי following a negation (“but,” as in Gen. 32:29, etc.), and is to be understood elliptically; lit., “for if,” sc., we would speak openly; not “that because,” for the causal signification of אֵם is not established. תָּם with אֵל is *constructio praegnans*: “completed to my lord,” i.e., completely handed over to my lord. נִשְׂאָר לְפָנַי is the same: “left before my lord,” i.e., for us to lay before, or offer to my lord. “Why should we die before thine eyes, we and our land! Buy us and our land for bread, that we may be, we and our land, servants (subject) to Pharaoh; and give seed, that we may live and not die, and the land become not desolate.” In the first clause נְמוֹת is transferred *per zeugma* to the land; in the last, the word תָּשֵׁם is used to describe the destruction of the land. The form תָּשֵׁם is the same as תִּקַּל in Gen. 16: 4.

Gen. 47:20, 21. Thus Joseph secured the possession of the whole land to Pharaoh by purchase, and “the people he removed to cities, from one end of the land of Egypt to the other.” לְעָרִים, not from one city to another, but “according to (= *κατά*) the cities;” so that he distributed the population of the whole land according to the cities in which the corn was housed, placing them partly in the cities themselves, and partly in the immediate neighbourhood.

Gen. 47:22. The lands of the priests Joseph did not buy, “for the priests had an allowance from Pharaoh, and ate their allowance, which Pharaoh gave them; therefore they sold not their lands.” חֹק a fixed allowance of food, as in Pro. 30: 8; Eze. 16:27. This allowance was granted by Pharaoh probably only during the years of famine; in any case it was an arrangement which ceased when the possessions of the priests sufficed for their need, since, according to *Diod. Sic.* i. 73, the priests provided the sacrifices and the support of both themselves and their servants from the revenue of their lands; and with this *Herodotus* also agrees (2, 37).

Gen. 47:23 ff. Then Joseph said to the people: “Behold I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh; there have ye (אֵת) only found in Eze. 16:43 and Dan. 2:43) seed, and sow the land; and of the produce ye shall give the fifth for Pharaoh, and four parts (יָדָה, as in Gen. 43:34) shall belong to you for seed, and for the support of yourselves, your families and children.” The people agreed to this; and the writer adds (v. 26), it became a law, in

existence to this day (his own time), “with regard to the land of Egypt for Pharaoh with reference to the fifth,” i.e., that the fifth of the produce of the land should be paid to Pharaoh.

Profane writers have given at least an indirect support to the reality of this political reform of Joseph’s. *Herodotus*, for example (2, 109), states that king Sesostris divided the land among the Egyptians, giving every one a square piece of the same size as his hereditary possession (κλήρον), and derived his own revenue from a yearly tax upon them. *Diod. Sic.* (1, 73), again, says that all the land in Egypt belonged either to the priests, to the king, or to the warriors; and *Strabo* (xvii. p. 787), that the farmers and traders held rateable land, so that the peasants were not landowners. On the monuments, too, the kings, priests, and warriors only are represented as having landed property (cf. *Wilkinson*, Manners and Customs i. 263). The biblical account says nothing about the exemption of the warriors from taxation and their possession of land, for that was a later arrangement. According to *Herod.* 2, 168, every warrior had received from former kings, as an honourable payment, twelve choice fields (ἄρουραι) free from taxation, but they were taken away by the Hephaesto-priest *Sethos*, a contemporary of Hezekiah, when he ascended the throne (*Herod.* 2, 141). But when *Herodotus* and *Diodorus Sic.* attribute to *Sesostris* the division of the land into 36 νομοί, and the letting of these for a yearly payment; these comparatively recent accounts simply transfer the arrangement, which was actually made by Joseph, to a half-mythical king, to whom the later legends ascribed all the greater deeds and more important measures of the early Pharaohs. And so far as Joseph’s arrangement itself was concerned, not only had he the good of the people and the interests of the king in view, but the people themselves accepted it as a favour, inasmuch as in a land where the produce was regularly thirty-fold, the cession of a fifth could not be an oppressive burden. And it is probable that Joseph not only turned the temporary distress to account by raising the king into the position of sole possessor of the land, with the exception of that of the priests, and bringing the people into a condition of feudal dependence upon him, but had also a still more comprehensive object in view; viz., to secure the population against the danger of starvation in case the crops should fail at any future time, not only by dividing the arable land in equal proportions among the people generally, but, as has been conjectured, by laying the foundation for a system of cultivation regulated by laws and watched over by the state, and possibly also by commencing a system of artificial irrigation by means of canals, for the purpose of conveying the fertilizing water of the Nile as uniformly as possible to all parts of the land. (An explanation of this system is given by *Hengstenberg* in his *Dissertations*, from the *Correspondance d’Orient par Michaud*, etc.) To mention either these or any other plans of a similar kind, did not come within the scope of the book of Genesis, which restricts itself, in

accordance with its purely religious intention, to a description of the way in which, during the years of famine, Joseph proved himself to both the king and people of Egypt to be the true support of the land, so that in him Israel already became a saviour of the Gentiles. The measures taken by Joseph are thus circumstantially described, partly because the relation into which the Egyptians were brought to their visible king bore a typical resemblance to the relation in which the Israelites were placed by the Mosaic constitution to Jehovah, their God-King, since they also had to give a double tenth, i.e., the fifth of the produce of their lands, and were in reality only farmers of the soil which Jehovah had given them in Canaan for a possession, so that they could not part with their hereditary possessions in perpetuity (Lev. 25:23); and partly also because Joseph's conduct exhibited in type how God entrusts His servants with the good things of this earth, in order that they may use them not only for the preservation of the lives of individuals and nations, but also for the promotion of the purposes of His kingdom. For, as is stated in conclusion in v. 27, not only did Joseph preserve the lives of the Egyptians, for which they expressed their acknowledgements (v. 25), but under his administration the house of Israel was able, without suffering any privations, or being brought into a relation of dependence towards Pharaoh, to dwell in the land of Goshen, to establish itself there (וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ as in Gen. 34:10), and to become fruitful and multiply.

JACOB'S LAST WISHES. — GEN. 47:28-31, AND GENESIS. 48

Gen. 47:28-31. Jacob lived in Egypt for 17 years. He then sent for Joseph, as he felt that his death was approaching; and having requested him, as a mark of love and faithfulness, not to bury him in Egypt, but near his fathers in Canaan, he made him assure him on oath (by putting his hand under his hip, vid., p. 164) that his wishes should be fulfilled. When Joseph had taken this oath, "*Israel bowed (in worship) upon the bed's head.*" He had talked with Joseph while sitting upon the bed; and when Joseph had promised to fulfil his wish, he turned towards the head of the bed, so as to lie with his face upon the bed, and thus worshipped God, thanking Him for granting his wish, which sprang from living faith in the promises of God; just as David also worshipped upon his bed (1Ki. 1:47, 48). The Vulgate rendering is correct: *adoravit Deum conversus ad lectuli caput*. That of the LXX, on the contrary, is *προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄδρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ* (i.e., וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ); and the Syriac and Itala have the same (cf. Heb. 11:21). But no fitting sense can be obtained from this rendering, unless we think of the staff with which Jacob had gone through life, and, taking αὐτοῦ therefore in the sense of αὐτοῦ, assume that Jacob made use of the staff to enable him to sit upright in bed, and so prayed, bent upon or over it, though even then the expression וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ remains a strange one; so that

unquestionably this rendering arose from a false reading of **המטה**, and is not proved to be correct by the quotation in Heb. 11:21. “*Adduxit enim LXX Interpr. versionem Apostolus, quod ea tum usitata esset, non quod lectionem illam praeferendam iudicaret* (Calovii Bibl. illustr. ad h. 1.).

Gen. 48: 1-7. ADOPTION OF JOSEPH’S SONS. — Vv. 1, 2. After these events, i.e., not long after Jacob’s arrangements for his burial, it was told to Joseph (**וַיֹּאמֶר**) “one said,” cf. v. 2) that his father was taken ill; whereupon Joseph went to him with his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, who were then 18 or 20 years old. On his arrival being announced to Jacob, Israel made himself strong (collected his strength), and sat up on his bed. The change of names is as significant here as in Gen. 45:27, 28. Jacob, enfeebled with age, gathered up his strength for a work, which he was about to perform as Israel, the bearer of the grace of the promise.

Gen. 48: 3 ff. Referring to the promise which the Almighty God had given him at Bethel (Gen. 35:10 ff. cf. 38:13 ff.), Israel said to Joseph (v. 5):

“And now thy two sons, which were born to thee in the land of Egypt, until (before) I came to thee into Egypt...let them be mine; Ephraim and Manasseh, like Reuben and Simeon (my first and second born), let them be mine.”

The promise which Jacob had received empowered the patriarch to adopt the sons of Joseph in the place of children. Since the Almighty God had promised him the increase of his seed into a multitude of peoples, and Canaan as an eternal possession to that seed, he could so incorporate into the number of his descendants the two sons of Joseph who were born in Egypt before his arrival, and therefore outside the range of his house, that they should receive an equal share in the promised inheritance with his own eldest sons. But this privilege was to be restricted to the two first-born sons of Joseph. “*Thy descendants,*” he proceeds in v. 6, “*which thou hast begotten since them, shall be thine; by the name of their brethren shall they be called in their inheritance;*” i.e., they shall not form tribes of their own with a separate inheritance, but shall be reckoned as belonging to Ephraim and Manasseh, and receive their possessions among these tribes, and in their inheritance. These other sons of Joseph are not mentioned anywhere; but their descendants are at any rate included in the families of Ephraim and Manasseh mentioned in Num. 26:28-37; 1Ch. 7:14-29. By this adoption of his two eldest sons, Joseph was placed in the position of the first-born, so far as the inheritance was concerned (1Ch. 5: 2). Joseph’s mother, who had died so early, was also honoured thereby. And this explains the allusion made by Jacob in v. 7 to his beloved Rachel, the wife of his affections, and to her death — how she died by his side (**עַלֵּי**), on his return

from *Padan* (for *Padan-Aram*, the only place in which it is so called, cf. 25:20), without living to see her first-born exalted to the position of a saviour to the whole house of Israel.

Gen. 48: 8-22. THE BLESSING OF EPHRAIM AND MANASSEH. — Vv. 8 ff. Jacob now for the first time caught sight of Joseph's sons, who had come with him, and inquired who they were; for "*the eyes of Israel were heavy (dim) with age, so that he could not see well*" (v. 10). The feeble old man, too, may not have seen the youths for some years, so that he did not recognise them again. On Joseph's answering, "*My sons whom God hath given he mere,*" he replied, "*Bring them to me then (בְּקָחֶם-נָא), that I may bless them,*" and he kissed and embraced them, when Joseph had brought them near, expressing his joy, that whereas he never expected to see Joseph's face again, God had permitted him to see his seed. רָאָה for רְאוּת, like עָשׂוּ (Gen. 31:28). פָּלַל: to decide; here, to judge, to think.

Gen. 48:12, 13. Joseph then, in order to prepare his sons for the reception of the blessing, brought them from between the knees of Israel, who was sitting with the youths between his knees and embracing them, and having prostrated himself with his face to the earth, he came up to his father again, with Ephraim the younger on his right hand, and Manasseh the elder on the left, so that Ephraim stood at Jacob's right hand, and Manasseh at his left.

Gen. 48:14, 15. The patriarch then stretched out his right hand and laid it upon Ephraim's head, and placed his left upon the head of Manasseh (crossing his arms therefore), to bless Joseph in his sons. "*Guiding his hands wittingly;*" i.e., he placed his hands in this manner intentionally. Laying on the hand, which is mentioned here for the first time in the Scriptures, was a symbolical sign, by which the person acting transferred to another a spiritual good, a supersensual power or gift; it occurs elsewhere in connection with dedication to an office (Num. 27:18, 23; Deu. 34: 9; Mat. 19:13; Acts 6: 6; 8:17, etc.), with the sacrifices, and with the cures performed by Christ and the apostles. By the imposition of hands, Jacob transferred to Joseph in his sons the blessing which he implored for them from his own and his father's God:

"The God (Ha-Elohim) before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God (Ha-Elohim) who hath fed me (led and provided for me with a shepherd's faithfulness, Psa. 23: 1; 28: 9) from my existence up to this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads."

This triple reference to God, in which the Angel who is placed on an equality with *Ha-Elohim* cannot possibly be a created angel, but must be the "Angel of God," i.e., God manifested in the form of the Angel of Jehovah, or the "Angel

of His face” (Isa. 43: 9), contains a foreshadowing of the Trinity, though only God and the Angel are distinguished, not three persons of the divine nature. The God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked, had proved Himself to Jacob to be “the God which fed” and “the Angel which redeemed,” i.e., according to the more fully developed revelation of the New Testament, ὁ Θεός and ὁ λόγος, Shepherd and Redeemer. By the singular בְּרַךְ (bless, *benedicat*) the triple mention of God is resolved into the unity of the divine nature.

Non dicit (Jakob) benedicant, pluraliter, nec repetit sed conjungit in uno opere benedicendi tres personas, Deum Patrem, Deum pastorem et Angelum. Sunt igitur hi tres unus Deus et unus benedictor. Idem opus facit Angelus quod pastor et Deus Patrum (Luther).

“Let my name be named on them, and the names of my fathers Abraham and Isaac,” i.e., not, “they shall bear my name and my fathers’,” “*dicantur filii mei et patrum meorum, licet ex te nati sint*” (Rosenm.), which would only be another way of acknowledging his adoption of them, “*nota adoptionis*” (Calvin); for as the simple mention of adoption is unsuitable to such a blessing, so the words appended, “*and according to the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac,*” are still less suitable as a periphrasis for adoption. The thought is rather: the true nature of the patriarchs shall be discerned and acknowledged in Ephraim and Manasseh; in them shall those blessings of grace and salvation be renewed, which Jacob and his fathers Isaac and Abraham received from God. The name expressed the nature, and “being called” is equivalent to “being, and being recognised by what one is.” The salvation promised to the patriarchs related primarily to the multiplication into a great nation, and the possession of Canaan. Hence Jacob proceeds: “*and let them increase into a multitude in the midst of the land.*” בְּרַךְ: אַפ. לַעַג., “to increase,” from which the name גִּבְרָה, a fish, is derived, on account of the remarkable rapidity with which they multiply.

Gen. 48:17-19. When Joseph observed his father placing his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, the younger son, he laid hold of it to put it upon Manasseh’s head, telling his father at the same time that he was the first-born; but Jacob replied,

“I know, my son, I know: he also (Manasseh) will become a nation, and will become great, yet (אֶלְנָם) as in Gen. 28:19) his younger brother will become greater than he, and his seed will become the fulness of nations.”

This blessing began to be fulfilled from the time of the Judges, when the tribe of Ephraim so increased in extent and power, that it took the lead of the northern tribes and became the head of the ten tribes, and its name acquired equal importance with the name Israel, whereas under Moses, Manasseh had numbered 20,000 more than Ephraim (Num. 26:34 and 37). As a result of the promises received from God, the blessing was not merely a pious wish, but the actual bestowal of a blessing of prophetic significance and force. — In v. 20 the writer sums up the entire act of blessing in the words of the patriarch: “*In thee (i.e., Joseph) will Israel (as a nation) bless, saying: God make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh*” (i.e., Joseph shall be so blessed in his two sons, that their blessing will become a standing form of benediction in Israel); “*and thus he placed Ephraim before Manasseh,*” viz., in the position of his hands and the terms of the blessing. Lastly, (v. 21) Israel expressed to Joseph his firm faith in the promise, that God would bring back his descendants after his death into the land of their fathers (Canaan), and assigned to him a double portion in the promised land, the conquest of which passed before his prophetic glance as already accomplished, in order to insure for the future the inheritance of the adopted sons of Joseph. “*I give thee one ridge of land above thy brethren*” (i.e., above what thy brethren receive, each as a single tribe), “*which I take from the hand of the Amorites with my sword and bow*” (i.e., by force of arms). As the perfect is used prophetically, transposing the future to the present as being already accomplished, so the words אֲשֶׁר לָקַחְתִּי must also be understood prophetically, as denoting that Jacob would wrest the land from the Amorites, not in his own person, but in that of his posterity. ¹⁷⁶

The words cannot refer to the purchase of the piece of ground at Shechem (Gen. 33:19), for a purchase could not possibly be called a conquest by sword and bow; and still less to the crime committed by the sons of Jacob against the inhabitants of Shechem, when they plundered the town (Gen. 34:25 ff.), for Jacob could not possibly have attributed to himself a deed for which he had pronounced a curse upon Simeon and Levi (Gen. 49: 6, 7), not to mention the fact, that the plundering of Shechem was not followed in this instance by the possession of the city, but by the removal of Jacob from the neighbourhood.

“Moreover, any conquest of territory would have been entirely at variance with the character of the patriarchal history, which consisted in the renunciation of all reliance upon human power, and a believing, devoted trust in the God of the promises” (*Delitzsch*).

The land, which the patriarchs desired to obtain in Canaan, they procured not by force of arms, but by legal purchase (cf. Genesis 24 and 33:19). It was to be very different in the future, when the iniquity of the Amorites was full (Gen. 15:16). But Jacob called the inheritance, which Joseph was to have in

excess of his brethren, שֵׁכֶם (lit., shoulder, or more properly nape, neck; here figuratively a ridge, or tract of land), as a play upon the word *Shechem*, because he regarded the piece of land purchased at Shechem as a pledge of the future possession of the whole land. In the piece purchased there, the bones of Joseph were buried, after the conquest of Canaan (Jos. 24:32); and this was understood in future times, as though Jacob had presented the piece of ground to Joseph (vid., Joh. 4: 5).

JACOB'S BLESSING AND DEATH. — GENESIS 49

Gen. 49: 1-28. THE BLESSING. — Vv. 1, 2. When Jacob had adopted and blessed the two sons of Joseph, he called his twelve sons, to make known to them his spiritual bequest. In an elevated and solemn tone he said,

*“Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you (אָקַרְתִּי for אָקַרְתִּי, as in Gen. 42: 4, 38) at the end of the days!
Gather yourselves together and hear, ye sons of Jacob, and hearken unto Israel your father!”*

The last address of Jacob-Israel to his twelve sons, which these words introduce, is designated by the historian (v. 28) “the blessing,” with which “their father blessed them, every one according to his blessing.” This blessing is at the same time a prophecy. “Every superior and significant life becomes prophetic at its close” (*Ziegler*). But this was especially the case with the lives of the patriarchs, which were filled and sustained by the promises and revelations of God. As Isaac in his blessing (Gen. 27) pointed out prophetically to his two sons, by virtue of divine illumination, the future history of their families; “so Jacob, while blessing the twelve, pictured in grand outlines the *lineamenta* of the future history of the future nation” (*Ziegler*). The groundwork of his prophecy was supplied partly by the natural character of his twelve sons, and partly by the divine promise which had been given by the Lord to him and to his fathers Abraham and Isaac, and that not merely in these two points, the numerous increase of their seed and the possession of Canaan, but in its entire scope, by which Israel had been appointed to be the recipient and medium of salvation for all nations. On this foundation the Spirit of God revealed to the dying patriarch Israel the future history of his seed, so that he discerned in the characters of his sons the future development of the tribes proceeding from them, and with prophetic clearness assigned to each of them its position and importance in the nation into which they were to expand in the promised inheritance. Thus he predicted to the sons what would happen to them “in the last days,” lit., “at the end of the days” (ἐπ’ ἔσχατων τῶν ἡμερῶν, LXX), and not merely at some future time. אֶחָרִית, the opposite of רֵאשִׁית, signifies the end in contrast with the beginning (Deu. 11:12; Isa. 46:10); hence

אֲחֵרֵית הַיָּמִים in prophetic language denoted, not the future generally, but the last future (see *Hengstenberg's History of Balaam*, pp. 465-467, transl.), the Messianic age of consummation (Isa. 2: 2; Eze. 38: 8, 16; Jer. 30:24; 48:47; 49:39, etc.: so also Num. 24:14; Deu. 4:30), like ἐπ' ἑσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν (2Pe. 3: 3; Heb. 1: 2), or ἐν ταῖς ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις (Act. 2:17; 2Ti. 3: 1). But we must not restrict “the end of the days” to the extreme point of the time of completion of the Messianic kingdom; it embraces

“the whole history of the completion which underlies the present period of growth,” or “the future as bringing the work of God to its ultimate completion, though modified according to the particular stage to which the work of God had advanced in any particular age, the range of vision opened to that age, and the consequent horizon of the prophet, which, though not absolutely dependent upon it, was to a certain extent regulated by it” (*Delitzsch*).

For the patriarch, who, with his pilgrim-life, had been obliged in the very evening of his days to leave the soil of the promised land and seek a refuge for himself and his house in Egypt, the final future, with its realization of the promises of God, commenced as soon as the promised land was in the possession of the twelve tribes descended from his sons. He had already before his eyes, in his twelve sons with their children and children's children, the first beginnings of the multiplication of his seed into a great nation. Moreover, on his departure from Canaan he had received the promise, that the God of his fathers would make him into a great nation, and lead him up again to Canaan (Gen. 46: 3, 4). The fulfilment of this promise his thoughts and hopes, his longings and wishes, were all directed. This constituted the firm foundation, though by no means the sole and exclusive purport, of his words of blessing. The fact was not, as *Baumgarten* and *Kurtz* suppose, that Jacob regarded the time of Joshua as that of the completion; that for him the end was nothing more than the possession of the promised land by his seed as the promised nation, so that all the promises pointed to this, and nothing beyond it was either affirmed or hinted at. Not a single utterance announces the capture of the promised land; not a single one points specially to the time of Joshua. On the contrary, Jacob presupposes not only the increase of his sons into powerful tribes, but also the conquest of Canaan, as already fulfilled; foretells to his sons, whom he sees in spirit as populous tribes, growth and prosperity on the soil in their possession; and dilates upon their relation to one another in Canaan and to the nations round about, even to the time of their final subjection to the peaceful sway of Him, from whom the sceptre of Judah shall never depart. The ultimate future of the patriarchal blessing, therefore, extends to the ultimate fulfilment of the divine promises — that is to say, to the completion of the kingdom of God. The enlightened seer's-eye of the patriarch

surveyed, “as though upon a canvas painted without perspective,” the entire development of Israel from its first foundation as the nation and kingdom of God till its completion under the rule of the Prince of Peace, whom the nations would serve in willing obedience; and beheld the twelve tribes spreading themselves out, each in his inheritance, successfully resisting their enemies, and finding rest and full satisfaction in the enjoyment of the blessings of Canaan.

It is in this vision of the future condition of his sons as grown into tribes that the prophetic character of the blessing consists; not in the prediction of particular historical events, all of which, on the contrary, with the exception of the prophecy of Shiloh, fall into the background behind the purely ideal portraiture of the peculiarities of the different tribes. The blessing gives, in short sayings full of bold and thoroughly original pictures, only general outlines of a prophetic character, which are to receive their definite concrete form from the historical development of the tribes in the future; and throughout it possesses both in form and substance a certain antique stamp, in which its genuineness is unmistakeably apparent. Every attack upon its genuineness has really proceeded from an *a priori* denial of all supernatural prophecies, and has been sustained by such misinterpretations as the introduction of special historical allusions, for the purpose of stamping it as a *vaticinia ex eventu*, and by other untenable assertions and assumptions; such, for example, as that people do not make poetry at so advanced an age or in the immediate prospect of death, or that the transmission of such an oration word for word down to the time of Moses is utterly inconceivable, — objections the emptiness of which has been demonstrated in *Hengstenberg’s* Christology i. p. 76 (transl.) by copious citations from the history of the early Arabic poetry.

Gen. 49: 3, 4. Reuben, *my first-born thou, my might and first-fruit of my strength; pre-eminence in dignity and pre-eminence in power.* — As the first-born, the first sprout of the full virile power of Jacob, Reuben, according to natural right, was entitled to the first rank among his brethren, the leadership of the tribes, and a double share of the inheritance (Gen. 27:29; Deu. 21:17). (רֵאֵן: elevation, the dignity of the chieftainship; עֹן, the earlier mode of pronouncing עָן, the authority of the first-born.) But Reuben had forfeited this prerogative. “*Effervescence like water — thou shalt have no preference; for thou didst ascend thy father’s marriage-bed: then hast thou desecrated; my couch has he ascended.*” פִּחֹן lit., the boiling over of water, figuratively, the excitement of lust; hence the verb is used in Jud. 9: 4, Zep. 3: 4, for frivolity and insolent pride. With this predicate Jacob describes the moral character of Reuben; and the noun is stronger than the verb פִּחֹת of the Samaritan, and אַתְרַעַת or אַרְתַּעַת *effervuisti, aestuasti* of the Sam. Vers., ἔξυβρισας of the

LXX, and ὑπερξέσας of *Symm.* יִתְרָה is to be explained by יִתְרָה: have no pre-eminence. His crime was, lying with Bilhah, his father's concubine (Gen. 35:22). חֲלָלָהּ is used absolutely: desecrated hast thou, sc., what should have been sacred to thee (cf. Lev. 18: 8). From this wickedness the injured father turns away with indignation, and passes to the third person as he repeats the words, "my couch he has ascended." By the withdrawal of the rank belonging to the first-born, Reuben lost the leadership in Israel; so that his tribe attained to no position of influence in the nation (compare the blessing of Moses in Deu. 33: 6). The leadership was transferred to Judah, the double portion to Joseph (1Ch. 5: 1, 2), by which, so far as the inheritance was concerned, the first-born of the beloved Rachel took the place of the first-born of the slighted Leah; not, however, according to the subjective will of the father, which is condemned in Deu. 21:15 ff., but according to the leading of God, by which Joseph had been raised above his brethren, but without the chieftainship being accorded to him.

Gen. 49: 5-7. "Simeon and Levi are brethren:" emphatically *brethren* in the full sense of the word; not merely as having the same parents, but in their modes of thought and action. "Weapons of wickedness are their swords." The ἄμαξ lec. מִכְרֶת is rendered by *Luther*, etc., weapons or swords, from כּוּר = כְּרָה, to dig, dig through, pierce: not connected with μάχαιρα. *L. de Dieu* and others follow the Arabic and Aethiopic versions: "plans;" but כְּלֵי חָמָס, *utensils*, or instruments, of wickedness, does not accord with this. Such wickedness had the two brothers committed upon the inhabitants of Shechem (Gen. 34:25 ff.), that Jacob would have no fellowship with it. "Into their counsel come not, my soul; with their assembly let not my honour unite." סוּד, a council, or deliberative *consensus*. תַּחַד, imperf. of יָחַד; כְּבוֹדִי, like Psa. 7: 6; 16: 9, etc., of the soul as the noblest part of man, the centre of his personality as the image of God. "For in their wrath have they slain men, and in their wantonness houghed oxen." The singular nouns אִישׁ and שׂוֹר, in the sense of indefinite generality, are to be regarded as general rather than singular, especially as the plural form of both is rarely met with; of אִישׁ, only in Psa. 141: 4, Pro. 8: 4, and Isa. 53: 3; of שׂוֹרִים שׂוֹר, only in Hos. 12:12. רְצוּן: inclination, here in a bad sense, wantonness. עֵקֶר: νευροκοπήν, to sever the houghs (tendons of the hind feet), — a process by which animals were not merely lamed, but rendered useless, since the tendon once severed could never be healed again, whilst as a rule the arteries were not cut so as to cause the animal to bleed to death (cf. Jos. 11: 6, 9; 2Sa. 8: 4). In Gen. 34:28 it is merely stated that the cattle of the Shechemites were carried off, not that they were lamed. But the one is so far from excluding the other, that it rather

includes it in such a case as this, where the sons of Jacob were more concerned about revenge than booty. Jacob mentions the latter only, because it was this which most strikingly displayed their criminal wantonness. On this reckless revenge Jacob pronounces the curse,

“Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel: I shall divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.”

They had joined together to commit this crime, and as a punishment they should be divided or scattered in the nation of Israel, should form no independent or compact tribes. This sentence of the patriarch was so fulfilled when Canaan was conquered, that on the second numbering under Moses, Simeon had become the weakest of all the tribes (Num. 26:14); in Moses’ blessing (Deuteronomy 33) it was entirely passed over; and it received no separate assignment of territory as an inheritance, but merely a number of cities within the limits of Judah (Jos. 19: 1-9). Its possessions, therefore, became an insignificant appendage to those of Judah, into which they were eventually absorbed, as most of the families of Simeon increased but little (1Ch. 4:27); and those which increased the most emigrated in two detachments, and sought out settlements for themselves and pasture for their cattle outside the limits of the promised land (1Ch. 4:38-43). Levi also received no separate inheritance in the land, but merely a number of cities to dwell in, scattered throughout the possessions of his brethren (Jos. 21: 1-40). But the scattering of Levi in Israel was changed into a blessing for the other tribes through its election to the priesthood. Of this transformation of the curse into a blessing, there is not the slightest intimation in Jacob’s address; and in this we have a strong proof of its genuineness. After this honourable change had taken place under Moses, it would never have occurred to any one to cast such a reproach upon the forefather of the Levites. How different is the blessing pronounced by Moses upon Levi (Deu. 33: 8 ff.)! But though Jacob withdrew the rights of primogeniture from Reuben, and pronounced a curse upon the crime of Simeon and Levi, he deprived none of them of their share in the promised inheritance. They were merely put into the background because of their sins, but they were not excluded from the fellowship and call of Israel, and did not lose the blessing of Abraham, so that their father’s utterances with regard to them might still be regarded as the bestowal of a blessing (v. 28).

Gen. 49: 8-12. Judah, the fourth son, was the first to receive a rich and unmixed blessing, the blessing of inalienable supremacy and power. *“Judah thou, thee will thy brethren praise! thy hand in the neck of thy foes! to thee will thy father’s sons bow down!”* אֹתָהּ, thou, is placed first as an absolute noun, like אֲנִי in Gen. 17: 4; 24:27; יוֹדֶהּ is a play upon יְהוֹדָהּ like אֹדָהּ in Gen. 29:35. Judah, according to Gen. 29:35, signifies: he for whom Jehovah is

praised, not merely the praised one. “This *nomen*, the patriarch seized as an *omen*, and expounded it as a presage of the future history of Judah.” Judah should be in truth all that his name implied (cf. Gen. 27:36). Judah had already shown to a certain extent a strong and noble character, when he proposed to sell Joseph rather than shed his blood (Gen. 37:26 ff.); but still more in the manner in which he offered himself to his father as a pledge for Benjamin, and pleaded with Joseph on his behalf (Gen. 43: 9, 10; 44:16 ff.); and it was apparent even in his conduct towards Tamar. In this manliness and strength there slumbered the germs of the future development of strength in his tribe. Judah would put his enemies to flight, grasp them by the neck, and subdue them (Job. 16:12, cf. Exo. 23:27, Psa. 18:41). Therefore his *brethren* would do homage to him: not merely the sons of his mother, who are mentioned in other places (Gen. 27:29; Jud. 8:19), i.e., the tribes descended from Leah, but the sons of his father — all the tribes of Israel therefore; and this was really the case under David (2Sa. 5: 1, 2, cf. 1Sa. 18: 6, 7, and 16). This princely power Judah acquired through his lion-like nature.

Gen. 49: 9.

“A young lion is Judah; from the prey, my son, art thou gone up: he has lain down; like a lion there he lieth, and like a lioness, who can rouse him up!”

Jacob compares Judah to a young, i.e., growing lion, ripening into its full strength, as being the “ancestor of the lion-tribe.” But he quickly rises “to a vision of the tribe in the glory of its perfect strength,” and describes it as a lion which, after seizing prey, ascends to the mountain forests (cf. Son. 4: 8), and there lies in majestic quiet, no one daring to disturb it. To intensify the thought, the figure of a lion is followed by that of the lioness, which is peculiarly fierce in defending its young. The *perfects* are prophetic; and עֲלֶה relates not to the growth or gradual rise of the tribe, but to the ascent of the lion to its lair upon the mountains.

“The passage evidently indicates something more than Judah’s taking the lead in the desert, and in the wars of the time of the Judges; and points to the position which Judah attained through the warlike successes of David” (*Knobel*).

The correctness of this remark is put beyond question by v. 10, where the figure is carried out still further, but in literal terms.

“The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet, till Shiloh come and the willing obedience of the nations be to him.”

The sceptre is the symbol of regal command, and in its earliest form it was a long staff, which the king held in his hand when speaking in public assemblies (e.g., Agamemnon, Il. 2, 46, 101); and when he sat upon his throne he rested in between his feet, inclining towards himself (see the representation of a Persian king in the ruins of Persepolis, *Niebuhr Reisebeschr.* ii. 145). מַחֲקֵק the determining person or thing, hence a commander, legislator, and a commander's or ruler's staff (Num. 21:18); here in the latter sense, as the parallels, "sceptre" and "from between his feet," require. Judah — this is the idea — was to rule, to have the chieftainship, till Shiloh came, i.e., for ever. It is evident that the coming of *Shiloh* is not to be regarded as terminating the rule of Judah, from the last clause of the verse, according to which it was only then that it would attain to dominion over the nations. עַד כִּי has not an exclusive signification here, but merely abstracts what precedes from what follows the given *terminus ad quem*, as in Gen. 26:13, or like עַד אֲשֶׁר Gen. 28:15, Psa. 112: 8, or עַד Psa. 110: 1, and ἕως Mat. 5:18.

But the more precise determination of the thought contained in v. 10 is dependent upon our explanation of the word *Shiloh*. It cannot be traced, as the *Jerusalem Targum* and the *Rabbins* affirm, to the word שִׁילִי *filius* with the suffix ה = ו "his son," since such a noun as שִׁילִי is never met with in Hebrew, and neither its existence nor the meaning attributed to it can be inferred from שְׁלִיָּה, afterbirth, in Deu. 28:57. Nor can the paraphrases of *Onkelos* (*donec veniat Messias cujus est regnum*), of the Greek versions (ἕως ἐὰν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ; or ὅ ἀπόκειται, as *Aquila* and *Symmachus* appear to have rendered it), or of the *Syriac*, etc., afford any real proof, that the defective form שְׁלָה, which occurs in 20 MSS, was the original form of the word, and is to be pointed שְׁלָה for שְׁלוּ = אֲשֶׁר לוֹ. For apart from the fact, that ש for אֲשֶׁר would be unmeaning here, and that no such abbreviation can be found in the Pentateuch, it ought in any case to read שְׁלוּ הוּא "to whom it (the sceptre) is due," since שְׁלוּ alone could not express this, and an ellipsis of הוּא in such a case would be unparalleled. It only remains therefore to follow *Luther*, and trace שְׁלָה to שִׁילָה, to be quiet, to enjoy rest, security. But from this root *Shiloh* cannot be explained according to the analogy of such forms as כִּידוּר בִּידוּר For these forms constitute no peculiar species, but are merely derived from the reduplicated forms, as קִמַּשׁ, which occurs as well as קִמַּשׁ, clearly shows; moreover they are none of them formed from roots of שִׁילָה. שִׁילָה points to שִׁילוֹן, to the formation of nouns with the termination *ôn*, in which the *liquids* are eliminated, and the remaining vowel ו is expressed by ה (*Ew.* § 84); as for example in the names of places, שְׁלָה or שְׁלוּ, also שִׁילוּ

(Jud. 21:21; Jer. 7:12) and גִּלָּה (Jos. 15:51), with their derivatives שְׁלֵנִי (1Ki. 11:29; 12:15) and גְּלַנִּי (2Sa. 15:12), also אֲבֵדוֹן (Pro. 27:20) for אֲבֵדוֹן (שְׁלָה) (Pro. 15:11, etc.), clearly prove. Hence שְׁלֵוֹן either arose from שְׁלֵוֹן (שְׁלָה), or was formed directly from שוּל = שְׁלָה, like גְּלוֹן from גִּיל. But if שְׁלֵוֹן is the original form of the word, שְׁלָה cannot be an appellative noun in the sense of rest, or a place of rest, but must be a proper name. For the strong termination *ōn* loses its *n* after *o* only in proper names, like מְגִדוֹ, שְׁלֵמָה by the side of מְגִדוֹן (Zec. 12:11) and דוֹדוֹ (Jud. 10: 1). אֲבֵדוֹ forms no exception to this; for when used in Pro. 27:20 as a personification of hell, it is really a proper name. An appellative noun like שְׁלָה, in the sense of rest, or place of rest, “would be unparalleled in the Hebrew *thesaurus*; the nouns used in this sense are שְׁלוֹ, שְׁלָה, שְׁלוֹם, מְנוּחָה.” For these reasons even *Delitzsch* pronounces the appellative rendering, “till rest comes,” or till “he comes to a place of rest,” grammatically impossible. *Shiloh* or *Shilo* is a proper name in every other instance in which it is used in the Old Testament, and was in fact the name of a city belonging to the tribe of Ephraim, which stood in the midst of the land of Canaan, upon an eminence above the village of *Turmus Aya*, in an elevated valley surrounded by hills, where ruins belonging both to ancient and modern times still bear the name of *Seilûn*. In this city the tabernacle was pitched on the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites under Joshua, and there it remained till the time of Eli (Jud. 18:31; 1Sa. 1: 3; 2:12 ff.), possibly till the early part of Saul’s reign.

Some of the Rabbins supposed our *Shiloh* to refer to the city. This opinion has met with the approval of most of the expositors, from *Teller* and *Eichhorn* to *Tuch*, who regard the blessing as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, and deny not only its prophetic character, but for the most part its genuineness. *Delitzsch* has also decided in its favour, because *Shiloh* or *Shilo* is the name of a town in every other passage of the Old Testament; and in 1Sa. 4:12, where the name is written as an accusative of direction, the words are written exactly as they are here. But even if we do not go so far as *Hofmann*, and pronounce the rendering “till he (Judah) come to Shiloh” the most impossible of all renderings, we must pronounce it utterly irreconcilable with the prophetic character of the blessing. Even if Shilo existed in Jacob’s time (which can neither be affirmed nor denied), it had acquired no importance in relation to the lives of the patriarchs, and is not once referred to in their history; so that Jacob could only have pointed to it as the goal and turning point of Judah’s supremacy in consequence of a special revelation from God. But in that case the special prediction would really have been fulfilled: not only would Judah have come to Shiloh, but there he would have found permanent rest, and there would the willing subjection of the nations to his sceptre have actually taken place. Now

none of these anticipations and confirmed by history. It is true we read in Jos. 18: 1, that after the promised land had been conquered by the defeat of the Canaanites in the south and north, and its distribution among the tribes of Israel had commenced, and was so far accomplished, that Judah and the double tribe of Joseph had received their inheritance by lot, the congregation assembled at Shilo, and there erected the tabernacle, and it was not till after this had been done, that the partition of the land was proceeded with and brought to completion. But although this meeting of the whole congregation at Shilo, and the erection of the tabernacle there, was generally of significance as the turning point of the history, it was of equal importance to all the tribes, and not to Judah alone. If it were to this event that Jacob's words pointed, they should be rendered, "till they come to Shiloh," which would be grammatically allowable indeed, but very improbable with the existing context. And even then nothing would be gained. For, in the first place, up to the time of the arrival of the congregation at Shilo, Judah did not possess the promised rule over the tribes. The tribe of Judah took the first place in the camp and on the march (Num. 2: 3-9; 10:14) — formed in fact the van of the army; but it had no rule, did not hold the chief command. The sceptre or command was held by the Levite Moses during the journey through the desert, and by the Ephraimite Joshua at the conquest and division of Canaan. Moreover, Shilo itself was not the point at which the leadership of Judah among the tribes was changed into the command of nations. Even if the assembling of the congregation of Israel at Shiloh (Jos. 18: 1) formed so far a turning point between two periods in the history of Israel, that the erection of the tabernacle for a permanent continuance at Shilo was a tangible pledge, that Israel had now gained a firm footing in the promised land, had come to rest and peace after a long period of wandering and war, had entered into quiet and peaceful possession of the land and its blessings, so that Shilo, as its name indicates, became the resting-place of Israel; Judah did not acquire the command over the twelve tribes at that time, nor so long as the house of God remained at Shilo, to say nothing of the submission of the nations. It was not till after the rejection of "the abode of Shiloh," at and after the removal of the ark of the covenant by the Philistines (1Sa. 4), with which the "tabernacle of Joseph" as also rejected, that God selected the tribe of Judah and chose David (Psa. 78:60-72). Hence it was not till after Shiloh had ceased to be the spiritual centre for the tribes of Israel, over whom Ephraim had exercised a kind of rule so long as the central sanctuary of the nation continued in its inheritance, that by David's election as prince (מֶלֶךְ) over Israel the sceptre and the government over the tribes of Israel passed over to the tribe of Judah. Had Jacob, therefore, promised to his son Judah the sceptre or ruler's staff over the tribes until he came to Shiloh, he would have uttered no prophecy, but simply a pious wish, which would have remained entirely unfulfilled.

With this result we ought not to rest contented; unless, indeed, it could be maintained that because *Shiloh* was ordinarily the name of a city, it could have no other signification. But just as many other names of cities are also names of persons, e.g., Enoch (Gen. 4:17), and Shechem (Gen. 34: 2); so *Shiloh* might also be a personal name, and denote not merely the place of rest, but the man, or bearer, of rest. We regard *Shiloh*, therefore, as a title of the Messiah, in common with the entire Jewish synagogue and the whole Christian Church, in which, although there may be uncertainty as to the grammatical interpretation of the word, there is perfect agreement as to the fact that the patriarch is here proclaiming the coming of the Messiah.

“For no objection can really be sustained against thus regarding it as a personal name, in closest analogy to **שְׁלֹמֹה**” (*Hofmann*).

The assertion that *Shiloh* cannot be the subject, but must be the object in this sentence, is as unfounded as the historiological axiom, “that the expectation of a personal Messiah was perfectly foreign to the patriarchal age, and must have been foreign from the very nature of that age,” with which *Kurtz* sets aside the only explanation of the word which is grammatically admissible as relating to the personal Messiah, thus deciding, by means of *a priori* assumptions which completely overthrow the supernaturally unfettered character of prophecy, and from a one-sided view of the patriarchal age and history, how much the patriarch Jacob ought to have been able to prophesy. The expectation of a personal Saviour did not arise for the first time with Moses, Joshua, and David, or first obtain its definite form after one man had risen up as the deliverer and redeemer, the leader and ruler of the whole nation, but was contained in the germ in the promise of the seed of the woman, and in the blessing of Noah upon Shem. It was then still further expanded in the promises of God to the patriarchs. — “I will bless *thee*; be a blessing, and in *thee* shall all the families of the earth be blessed,” — by which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (not merely the nation to descend from them) were chosen as the personal bearers of that salvation, which was to be conveyed by them through their seed to all nations. When the patriarchal monad was expanded into a dodekad, and Jacob had before him in his twelve sons the founders of the twelve-tribed nation, the question naturally arose, from which of the twelve tribes would the promised Saviour proceed? Reuben had forfeited the right of primogeniture by his incest, and it could not pass over to either Simeon or Levi on account of their crime against the Shechemites. Consequently the dying patriarch transferred, both by his blessing and prophecy, the chieftainship which belonged to the first-born and the blessing of the promise to his fourth son Judah, having already, by the adoption of Joseph’s sons, transferred to Joseph the double inheritance associated with the birthright. Judah was to bear the sceptre with victorious lion-courage, until in the future *Shiloh* the obedience of the nations

came to him, and his rule over the tribes was widened into the peaceful government of the world. It is true that it is not expressly stated that *Shiloh* was to descend from Judah; but this follows as a matter of course from the context, i.e., from the fact, that after the description of Judah as an invincible lion, the cessation of his rule, or the transference of it to another tribe, could not be imagined as possible, and the thought lies upon the surface, that the dominion of Judah was to be perfected in the appearance of *Shiloh*.

Thus the personal interpretation of *Shiloh* stands in the most beautiful harmony with the constant progress of the same revelation. To *Shiloh* will the nations belong. **וְלֹ** refers back to **שִׁלְהָהּ יִקְהָהּ**, which only occurs again in Pro. 30:17, from **יִקְהָהּ** with *dagesh forte euphon.*, denotes the obedience of a son, willing obedience; and **עַמִּים** in this connection cannot refer to the associated tribes, for Judah bears the sceptre over the tribes of Israel before the coming of *Shiloh*, but to the nations universally. These will render willing obedience to *Shiloh*, because as a man of rest He brings them rest and peace.

As previous promises prepared the way for our prophecy, so was it still further unfolded by the Messianic prophecies which followed; and this, together with the gradual advance towards fulfilment, places the personal meaning of *Shiloh* beyond all possible doubt. — In the order of time, the prophecy of Balaam stands next, where not only Jacob's proclamation of the lion-nature of Judah is transferred to Israel as a nation (Num. 23:24; 24: 9), but the figure of the sceptre from Israel, i.e., the ruler or king proceeding from Israel, who will smite all his foes (Gen. 49:10), is taken *verbatim* from vv. 9, 10 of this address. In the sayings of Balaam, the tribe of Judah recedes behind the unity of the nation. For although, both in the camp and on the march, Judah took the first place among the tribes (Num. 2: 2, 3; 7:12; 10:14), this rank was no real fulfilment of Jacob's blessing, but a symbol and pledge of its destination to be the champion and ruler over the tribes. As champion, even after the death of Joshua, Judah opened the attack by divine direction upon the Canaanites who were still left in the land (Jud. 1: 1 ff.), and also the war against Benjamin (Jud. 20:18). It was also a sign of the future supremacy of Judah, that the first judge and deliverer from the power of their oppressors was raised up to Israel from the tribe of Judah in the person of the Kenizzite Othniel (Jud. 3: 9 ff.). From that time forward Judah took no lead among the tribes for several centuries, but rather fell back behind Ephraim, until by the election of David as king over all Israel, Judah was raised to the rank of ruling tribe, and received the sceptre over all the rest (1Ch. 28: 4). In David, Judah grew strong (1Ch. 5: 2), and became a conquering lion, whom no one dared to excite. With the courage and strength of a lion, David brought under his sceptre all the enemies of Israel round about. But when God had given him rest, and he desired to build a house to the Lord, he received a promise through the prophet

Nathan that Jehovah would raise up his seed after him, and establish the throne of his kingdom for ever (2Sa. 7:13 ff.).

“Behold, a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest; and I (Jehovah) will give him rest from all his enemies round about; for *Solomon* (i.e., *Friederich*, Frederick, the peaceful one) shall be his name, and I will give peace and rest unto Israel in his days...and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel for ever.”

Just as Jacob’s prophecy was so far fulfilled in David, that Judah had received the sceptre over the tribes of Israel, and had led them to victory over all their foes; and David upon the basis of this first fulfilment received through Nathan the divine promise, that the sceptre should not depart from his house, and therefore not from Judah; so the commencement of the coming of *Shiloh* received its first fulfilment in the peaceful sway of Solomon, even if David did not give his son the name *Solomon* with an allusion to the predicted Shiloh, which one might infer from the sameness in the meaning of **שִׁלְהָה** and **שִׁלְהָה** when compared with the explanation given of the name Solomon in 1Ch. 32: 9, 10. But *Solomon* was not the true *Shiloh*. His peaceful sway was transitory, like the repose which Israel enjoyed under Joshua at the erection of the tabernacle at Shiloh (Jos. 11:23; 14:15; 21:44); moreover it extended over Israel alone. The willing obedience of the nations he did not secure; Jehovah only gave rest from his enemies round about in his days, i.e., during his life.

But this first imperfect fulfilment furnished a pledge of the complete fulfilment in the future, so that Solomon himself, discerning in spirit the typical character of his peaceful reign, sang of the King’s Son who should have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth, before whom all kings should bow, and whom all nations should serve (Psalm 72); and the prophets after Solomon prophesied of the Prince of Peace, who should increase government and peace without end upon the throne of David, and of the sprout out of the rod of Jesse, whom the nations should seek (Isa. 9: 5, 6; 11: 1-10); and lastly, Ezekiel, when predicting the downfall of the Davidic kingdom, prophesied that this overthrow would last until He should come to whom the right belonged, and to whom Jehovah would give it (Eze. 21:27). Since Ezekiel in his words, “till He come to whom the right belongs,” takes up, and is generally admitted, our prophecy “till Shiloh come,” and expands it still further in harmony with the purpose of his announcement, more especially from Psa. 72: 1-5, where righteousness and judgment are mentioned as the foundation of the peace which the King’s Son would bring; he not only confirms the correctness of the personal and Messianic explanation of the word *Shiloh*, but shows that Jacob’s prophecy of the sceptre not passing from Judah till Shiloh came, did not preclude a temporary loss of power. Thus all

prophecies, and all the promises of God, in fact, are so fulfilled, as not to preclude the punishment of the shins of the elect, and yet, notwithstanding that punishment, assuredly and completely attain to their ultimate fulfilment. And thus did the kingdom of Judah arise from its temporary overthrow to a new and imperishable glory in Jesus Christ (Heb. 7:14), who conquers all foes as the Lion of the tribe of Judah (Rev. 5: 5), and reigns as the true Prince of Peace, as “our peace” (Eph. 1:14), for ever and ever.

Gen. 49:11, 12. In vv. 11 and 12 Jacob finishes his blessing on Judah by depicting the abundance of his possessions in the promised land.

“Binding his she-ass to the vine, and to the choice vine his ass’s colt; he washes his garment in wine, and his cloak in the blood of the grape: dull are the eyes with wine, and white the teeth with milk.”

The participle אָסַר has the old connecting vowel, *i*, before a word with a preposition (like Isa. 22:16; Mic. 7:14, etc.); and בָּנִי in the construct state, as in Gen. 31:39. The subject is not Shiloh, but Judah, to whom the whole blessing applies. The former would only be possible, if the fathers and *Luther* were right in regarding the whole as an allegorical description of Christ, or if *Hofmann’s* opinion were correct, that it would be quite unsuitable to describe Judah, the lion-like warrior and ruler, as binding his ass to a vine, coming so peacefully upon his ass, and remaining in his vineyard. But are lion-like courage and strength irreconcilable with a readiness for peace? Besides, the notion that riding upon an ass is an image of a peaceful disposition seems quite unwarranted; and the supposition that the ass is introduced as an animal of peace, in contrast with the war-horse, is founded upon Zec. 9: 9, and applied to the words of the patriarch in a most unhistorical manner. This contrast did not exist till a much later period, when the Israelites and Canaanites had introduced war-horses, and is not applicable at all to the age and circumstances of the patriarchs, since at that time the only animals there were to ride, beside camels, were asses and she-asses (Gen. 22: 3 cf. Exo. 4:20, Num. 22:21); and even in the time of the Judges, and down to David’s time, riding upon asses was a distinction of nobility or superior rank (Jud. 1:14; 10: 4; 12:14; 2Sa. 19:27). Lastly, even in vv. 9 and 10 Judah is not depicted as a lion eager for prey, or as loving war and engaged in constant strife, but, according to *Hofmann’s* own words, “as having attained, even before the coming of Shiloh, to a rest acquired by victory over surrounding foes, and as seated in his place with the insignia of his dominion.” Now, when Judah’s conflicts are over, and he has come to rest, he also may bind his ass to the vine and enjoy in peaceful repose the abundance of his inheritance. Of wine and milk, the most valuable productions of his land, he will have such a superabundance, that, as Jacob hyperbolically expresses it, he may wash his clothes in the blood of the grape,

and enjoy them so plentifully, that his eyes shall be inflamed with wine, and his teeth become white with milk. ^{f77}

The soil of Judah produced the best wine in Canaan, near Hebron and Engedi (Num. 13:23, 24; Son. 1:14; 2Ch. 26:10 cf. Joe. 1: 7 ff.), and had excellent pasture land in the desert by Tekoah and Carmel, to the south of Hebron (1Sa. 25: 2; Amo. 1: 1; 2Ch. 26:10). סוּוֹתָהּ: contracted from סוּוֹתָהּ, from סוּוֹתָהּ to envelope, synonymous with מְסוּוֹתָהּ a veil (Exo. 34:33).

Gen. 49:13. Zebulun, to the shore of the ocean will he dwell, and indeed (יִשְׁקוּ) *isque*) towards the coast of ships, and his side towards Zidon (directed up to Zidon).” This blessing on Leah’s sixth son interprets the name *Zebulun* (i.e., dwelling) as an *omen*, not so much to show the tribe its dwelling-place in Canaan, as to point out the blessing which it would receive from the situation of its inheritance (compare Deu. 33:19). So far as the territory allotted to the tribe of Zebulun under Joshua can be ascertained from the boundaries and towns mentioned in Jos. 19:10-16, it neither reached to the Mediterranean, nor touched directly upon Zidon (see my Comm. on Joshua). It really lay between the Sea of Galilee and the Mediterranean, near to both, but separated from the former by Naphtali, from the latter by Asher. So far was this announcement, therefore, from being a *vaticinium ex eventu* taken from the geographical position of the tribe, that it contains a decided testimony to the fact that Jacob’s blessing was not written after the time of Joshua. יַמֵּיִם denotes, not the two seas mentioned above, but, as Jud. 5:17 proves, the Mediterranean, as a great ocean (Gen. 1:10). “The coast of ships:” i.e., where ships are unloaded, and land the treasures of the distant parts of the world for the inhabitants of the maritime and inland provinces (Deu. 33:19). *Zidon*, as the old capital, stands for Phoenicia itself.

Gen. 49:14, 15.

“Issachar is a bony ass, lying between the hurdles. He saw that rest was a good (טוֹב *subst.*), and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute.”

The foundation of this award also lies in the name יִשָּׁשָׁר שָׁכָר, which is probably interpreted with reference to the character of Issachar, and with an allusion to the relation between שָׁכָר and שָׁכִיר, a daily labourer, as an indication of the character and fate of his tribe. “Ease at the cost of liberty will be the characteristic of the tribe of Issachar” (*Delitzsch*). The *simile* of a bony, i.e., strongly-built ass, particularly adapted for carrying burdens, pointed to the fact that this tribe would content itself with material good, devote itself to the

labour and burden of agriculture, and not strive after political power and rule. The figure also indicated

“that Issachar would become a robust, powerful race of men, and receive a pleasant inheritance which would invite to comfortable repose.” (According to *Jos. de bell. jud.* iii. 3, 2, Lower Galilee, with the fruitful table land of Jezreel, was attractive even to τὸν ἡκιστα γῆς φιλόπονον).

Hence, even if the simile of a bony ass contained nothing contemptible, it did not contribute to Issachar’s glory. Like an idle beast of burden, he would rather submit to the yoke and be forced to do the work of a slave, than risk his possessions and his peace in the struggle for liberty. To bend the shoulder to the yoke, to come down to carrying burdens and become a mere serf, was unworthy of Israel, the nation of God that was called to rule, however it might befit its foes, especially the Canaanites upon whom the curse of slavery rested (Deu. 20:11; Jos. 16:10; 1Ki. 9:20, 21; Isa. 10:27). This was probably also the reason why Issachar was noticed last among the sons of Leah. In the time of the Judges, however, Issachar acquired renown for heroic bravery in connection with Zebulun (Jud. 5:14, 15, 18). The sons of Leah are followed by the four sons of the two maids, arranged, not according to their mothers or their ages, but according to the blessing pronounced upon them, so that the two warlike tribes stand first.

Gen. 49:16, 17.

“Dan will procure his people justice as one of the tribes of Israel. Let Dan become a serpent by the way, a horned adder in the path, that biteth the horse’s heels, so that its rider falls back.”

Although only the son of a maid-servant, Dan would not be behind the other tribes of Israel, but act according to his name (דָּן, דָּן), and as much as any other of the tribes procure justice to his people (i.e., to the people of Israel; not to his own tribe, as *Diestel* supposes). There is no allusion in these words to the office of judge which was held by Samson; they merely describe the character of the tribe, although this character came out in the expedition of a portion of the Danites to Laish in the north of Canaan, a description of which is given in Judges 18, as well as in the “romantic chivalry of the brave, gigantic Samson, when the cunning of the serpent he overthrew the mightiest foes” (*Del.*). דָּן: κεράστης, the very poisonous horned serpent, which is of the colour of the sand, and as it lies upon the ground, merely stretching out its feelers, inflicts a fatal wound upon any who may tread upon it unawares (*Diod. Sic.* 3, 49; *Pliny.* 8, 23).

Gen. 49:18. But this manifestation of strength, which Jacob expected from Dan and promised prophetically, presupposed that severe conflicts awaited the Israelites. For these conflicts Jacob furnished his sons with both shield and sword in the ejaculatory prayer, “*I wait for Thy salvation, O Jehovah!*” which was not a prayer for his own soul and its speedy redemption from all evil, but in which, as *Calvin* has strikingly shown, he expressed his confidence that his descendants would receive the help of his God. Accordingly, the later Targums (*Jerusalem* and *Jonathan*) interpret these words as Messianic, but with a special reference to Samson, and paraphrase v. 18 thus: “Not for the deliverance of Gideon, the son of Joash, does my soul wait, for that is temporary; and not for the redemption of Samson, for that is transitory; and not for the redemption of Samson, for that is transitory; but for the redemption of the Messiah, the Son of David, which Thou through Thy word hast promised to bring to Thy people the children of Israel: for this Thy redemption my soul waits.” ^{f78}

Gen. 49:19. “Gad — *a press presses him, but he presses the heel.*” The name *Gad* reminds the patriarch of גָּדַד to press, and גְּדוּד the pressing host, warlike host, which invades the land. The attacks of such hosts Gad will bravely withstand, and press their heel, i.e., put them to flight and bravely pursue them, not smite their rear-guard; for עֲקֵב does not signify the rear-guard even in Jos. 8:13, but only the reserves (see my commentary on the passage). The blessing, which is formed from a triple alliteration of the name *Gad*, contains no such special allusions to historical events as to enable us to interpret it historically, although the account in 1Ch. 5:18 ff. proves that the Gadites displayed, wherever it was needed, the bravery promised them by Jacob. Compare with this 1Ch. 12: 8-15, where the Gadites who come to David are compared to lions, and their swiftness to that of roes.

Gen. 49:20. “*Out of Asher (cometh) fat, his bread, and he yieldeth royal dainties.*” לֶחֶמוֹ is in apposition to שֶׁמֶן, and the suffix is to be emphasized: the fat, which comes from him, is his bread, his own food. The saying indicates a very fruitful soil. Asher received as his inheritance the lowlands of Carmel on the Mediterranean as far as the territory of Tyre, one of the most fertile parts of Canaan, abounding in wheat and oil, with which Solomon supplied and household of king Hiram (1Ki. 5:11).

Gen. 49:21. “*Naphtali is a hind let loose, who giveth goodly words.*” The hind or gazelle is a simile of a warrior who is skilful and swift in his movements (2Sa. 2:18; 1Ch. 12: 8, cf. Psa. 18:33; Hab. 3:19). שְׁלֵחָה here is neither hunted, nor stretched out or grown slim; but let loose, running freely about (Job. 39: 5). The meaning and allusion are obscure, since nothing further

is known of the history of the tribe of Naphtali, than that Naphtali obtained a great victory under Barak in association with Zebulun over the Canaanitish king Jabin, which the prophetess Deborah commemorated in her celebrated song (Judges 4 and 5). If the first half of the verse be understood as referring to the independent possession of a tract of land, upon which Naphtali moved like a hind in perfect freedom, the interpretation of *Masius* (on Joshua 19) is certainly the correct one: “*Sicut cervus emissus et liber in herbosa et fertili terra exultim ludit, ita et in sua fertili sorte ludet et exultabit Nephtali.*” But the second half of the verse can hardly refer to “beautiful sayings and songs, in which the beauty and fertility of their home were displayed.” It is far better to keep, as *Vatablius* does, to the general thought: *tribus Naphtali erit fortissima, elegantissima et agillima et erit facundissima.*

Gen. 49:22-26. Turning to Joseph, the patriarch’s heart swelled with grateful love, and in the richest words and figures he implored the greatest abundance of blessings upon his head.

Gen. 49:22. “*Son of a fruit-tree is Joseph, son of a fruit-tree at the well, daughters run over the wall.*” Joseph is compared to the branch of a fruit-tree planted by a well (Psa. 1: 3), which sends it shoots over the wall, and by which, according to Psa. 80, we are probably to understand a vine. **בֵּן** an unusual form of the construct state for **בֶּן**, and **פֶּרֶת** equivalent to **פְּרִיָה** with the old feminine termination *ath*, like **זִמְרָת**, Exo. 15: 2. — **פְּנוֹת** are the twigs and branches, formed by the young fruit-tree. The singular **צֶעֱדָה** is to be regarded as distributive, describing poetically the moving forward, i.e., the rising up of the different branches above the wall (*Ges.* § 146, 4). **עֲלִי**, a poetical form, as in v. 17.

Gen. 49:23, 24.

“*Archers provoke him, and shoot and hate him; but his bow abides in strength, and the arms of his hands remain pliant, from the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob, from thence, from the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel.*”

From the simile of the fruit-tree Jacob passed to a warlike figure, and described the mighty and victorious unfolding of the tribe of Joseph in conflict with all its foes, describing with prophetic intuition the future as already come (*vid.*, the *perf. consec.*). The words are not to be referred to the personal history of Joseph himself, to persecutions received by him from his brethren, or to his sufferings in Egypt; still less to any warlike deeds of his in Egypt (*Diestel*): they merely pointed to the conflicts awaiting his descendants, in which they would constantly overcome all hostile attacks. **מָרָר**: *Piel*, to

embitter, provoke, *laccessere*. רָבוּ: perf. o from רָבַב to shoot. בְּאַיִתָּן: “in a strong, unyielding position” (*Del.*). פָּוּן: to be active, flexible; only found here, and in 2Sa. 6:16 of a brisk movement, skipping or jumping. יָרְעוּ: the arms, “without whose elasticity the hands could not hold or direct the arrow.” The words which follow, “from the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob,” are not to be linked to what follows, in opposition to the Masoretic division of the verses; they rather form one sentence with what precedes: “pliant remain the arms of his hands from the hands of God,” i.e., through the hands of God supporting them. “The Mighty One of Jacob,” He who had proved Himself to be the Mighty One by the powerful defence afforded to Jacob; a title which is copied from this passage in Isa. 1:24, etc. “From thence,” an emphatic reference to Him, from whom all perfection comes — “from the Shepherd (Gen. 48:15) and Stone of Israel.” God is called “the Stone,” and elsewhere “the Rock” (Deu. 32: 4, 18, etc.), as the immoveable foundation upon which Israel might trust, might stand firm and impregably secure.

Gen. 49:25, 26.

“From the God of thy father, may He help thee, and with the help of the Almighty, may He bless thee, (may there come) blessings of heaven from above, blessings of the deep, that lieth beneath, blessings of the breast and of the womb. The blessing of thy father surpass the blessings of my progenitors to the border of the everlasting hills, may they come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the crown of the illustrious among his brethren.”

From the form of a description the blessing passes in v. 25 into the form of a desire, in which the “from” of the previous clause is still retained. The words “and may He help thee,” “may He bless thee,” form parentheses, for “who will help and bless thee.” וְאֵת is neither to be altered into וְאֵל (and from God), as *Ewald* suggests, in accordance with the LXX, *Sam.*, *Syr.*, and *Vulg.*, nor into מֵאֵת as *Knobel* proposes; and even the supplying of מִן before אֵת from the parallel clause (*Ges.* § 154, 4) is scarcely allowable, since the repetition of מִן before another preposition cannot be supported by any analogous case; but אֵת may be understood here, as in Gen. 4: 1; 5:24, in the sense of helpful communion: “and with,” i.e., with (in) the fellowship of, “the Almighty, may He bless thee, let there be (or come) blessings,” etc. The verb תִּתְּנֵנִי follows in v. 26 after the whole subject, which is formed of many parallel members. The blessings were to come from heaven above and from the earth beneath. From the God of Jacob and by the help of the Almighty should the rain and dew of heaven (Gen. 27:28), and fountains and brooks which spring from the great deep or the abyss of the earth, pour their fertilizing waters over Joseph’s land,

“so that everything that had womb and breast should become pregnant, bring forth, and suckle.” ^{f79} הָרָה from הָרָה signifies *parentes* (*Chald., Vulg.*); and תְּאֻנָּה signifies not *desiderium* from תְּאֻנָּה, but boundary from תְּאֻנָּה, Num. 34: 7, 8, = תְּאֻנָּה, 1Sa. 21:14, Eze. 9: 4, to mark or bound off, as most of the Rabbins explain it. נָבַר עַל to be strong above, i.e., to surpass. The blessings which the patriarch implored for Joseph were to surpass the blessings which his parents transmitted to him, to the boundary of the everlasting hills, i.e., surpass them as far as the primary mountains tower above the earth, or so that they should reach to the summits of the primeval mountains. There is no allusion to the lofty and magnificent mountain-ranges of Ephraim, Bashan, and Gilead, which fell to the house of Joseph, either here or in Deu. 33:15. These blessings were to descend upon the head of Joseph, the נִיר among his brethren, i.e., “the separated one,” from נָרָה *separavit*. Joseph is so designated, both here and Deu. 33:16, not on account of his virtue and the preservation of his chastity and piety in Egypt, but *propter dignitatem, qua excellit, ab omnibus sit segregatus* (*Calv.*), on account of the eminence to which he attained in Egypt. For this meaning see Lam. 4: 7; whereas no example can be found of the transference of the idea of *Nasir* to the sphere of morality.

Gen. 49:27. “Benjamin — a world, which tears in pieces; in the morning he devours prey, and in the evening he divides spoil.” Morning and evening together suggest the idea of incessant and victorious capture of booty (*Del.*). The warlike character which the patriarch here attributes to Benjamin, was manifested by that tribe, not only in the war which he waged with all the tribes on account of their wickedness in Gibeah (Jud. 20), but on other occasions also (Jud. 5:14), in its distinguished archers and slingers (Jud. 20:16; 1Ch. 8:40, 12; 2Ch. 14: 8; 17:17), and also in the fact that the judge Ehud (Jud. 3:15 ff.), and Saul, with his heroic son Jonathan, sprang from this tribe (1Sa. 11 and 13 ff.; 2Sa. 1:19 ff.).

Gen. 49:28. The concluding words in v. 28, “*All these are the tribes of Israel, twelve,*” contain the thought, that in his twelve sons Jacob blessed the future tribes. “*Every one with that which was his blessing, he blessed them,*” i.e., every one with his appropriate blessing (אֲשֶׁר *accus.* dependent upon בָּרַךְ which is construed with a double accusative); since, as has already been observed, even Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, though put down through their own fault, received a share in the promised blessing.

Gen. 49:29-33. DEATH OF JACOB. — After the blessing, Jacob again expressed to his twelve sons his desire to be buried in the sepulchre of his fathers (Gen. 24), where Isaac and Rebekah and his own wife Leah lay by the side of Abraham and Sarah, which Joseph had already promised on oath to

perform (Gen. 47:29-31). He then drew his feet into the bed to lie down, for he had been sitting upright while blessing his sons, and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered to his people (vid., Gen. 25: 8). וַיָּנֹחַ instead of וַיָּמָת indicates that the patriarch departed from this earthly life without a struggle. His age is not given here, because that has already been done at Gen. 47:28.

BURIAL OF JACOB, AND DEATH OF JOSEPH. — GENESIS 50

Gen. 50: 1-14. BURIAL OF JACOB. — Vv. 1-3. When Jacob died, Joseph fell upon the face of his beloved father, wept over him, and kissed him. He then gave the body to the physicians to be embalmed, according to the usual custom in Egypt. The physicians are called his servants, because the reference is to the regular physicians in the service of Joseph, the eminent minister of state; and according to Herod. 2, 84, there were special physicians in Egypt for every description of disease, among whom the *Taricheuta*, who superintended the embalming, were included, as a special but subordinate class. The process of embalming lasted 40 days, and the solemn mourning 70 (v. 3). This is in harmony with the statements of Herodotus and Diodorus when rightly understood (see *Hengstenberg*, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 67 ff.).

Gen. 50: 4, 5. At the end of this period of mourning, Joseph requested “the house of Pharaoh,” i.e., the attendants upon the king, to obtain Pharaoh’s permission for him to go to Canaan and bury his father, according to his last will, in the cave prepared by him there. בָּרָה (v. 5) signifies “to dig” (used, as in 2Ch. 16:14, for the preparation of a tomb), not “to buy,” In the expression בְּרִיתִי לִי Jacob attributes to himself as patriarch what had really been done by Abraham (Gen. 24). Joseph required the royal permission, because he wished to go beyond the border with his family and a large procession. But he did not apply directly to Pharaoh, because his deep mourning (unshaven and unadorned) prevented him from appearing in the presence of the king.

Gen. 50: 6-9. After the king’s permission had been obtained, the corpse was carried to Canaan, attended by a large company. With Joseph there went up “*all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt,*” i.e., the leading officers of the court and state, “*and all the house of Joseph, and his brethren, and his father’s house,*” i.e., all the members of the families of Joseph, of his brethren, and of his deceased father, “*excepting only their children and flocks; also chariots and horsemen,*” as an escort for the journey through the desert, “*a very large army.*” The splendid retinue of Egyptian officers may be explained, in part from the esteem in

which Joseph was held in Egypt, and in part from the fondness of the Egyptians for such funeral processions (cf. *Hengst.* pp. 70, 71).

Gen. 50:10 ff. Thus they came to *Goren Atad* beyond the Jordan, as the procession did not take the shortest route by Gaza through the country of the Philistines, probably because so large a procession with a military escort was likely to meet with difficulties there, but went round by the Dead Sea. There, on the border of Canaan, a great mourning and funeral ceremony was kept up for seven days, from which the Canaanites, who watched it from Canaan, gave the place the name of *Abel-Mizraim*, i.e., meadow (אֲבֵל־מִצְרַיִם with a play upon אֲבֵל mourning) of the Egyptians. The situation of *Goren Atad* (the buck-thorn floor), or *Abel-Mizraim*, has not been discovered. According to v. 11, it was on the other side, i.e., the eastern side, of the Jordan. This is put beyond all doubt by v. 12, where the sons of Jacob are said to have carried the corpse into the land of Canaan (the land on this side) after the mourning at *Goren Atad*.^{f80}

Gen. 50:12, 13. There the Egyptian procession probably stopped short; for in v. 12 the sons of Jacob only are mentioned as having carried their father to Canaan according to his last request, and buried him in the cave of Machpelah.

Gen. 50:14. After performing this filial duty, Joseph returned to Egypt with his brethren and all their attendants.

Gen. 50:15-21. After their father's death, Joseph's brethren were filled with alarm, and said, "*If Joseph now should punish us and requite all the evil that we have done to him,*" sc., what would become of us! The sentence contains an *aposiopesis*, like *Psa. 27:13*; and לֵךְ with the imperfect presupposes a condition, being used "in cases which are not desired, and for the present not real, though perhaps possible" (*Ew.* § 358). The brethren therefore deputed one of their number (possibly Benjamin) to Joseph, and instructed him to appeal to the wish expressed by their father before his death, and to implore forgiveness:

"O pardon the misdeed of thy brethren and their sin, that they have done thee evil; and now grant forgiveness to the misdeed of the servants of the God of thy father."

The ground of their plea is contained in וְעַתָּה "and now," sc., as we request it by the desire and direction of our father, and in the epithet applied to themselves, "servants of the God of thy father." There is no reason whatever for regarding the appeal to their father's wish as a mere pretence. The fact that no reference was made by Jacob in his blessing to their sin against Joseph, merely proved that he as their father had forgiven the sin of his sons, since the grace of God had made their misdeed the means of Israel's salvation; but it by no means proves that he could not have instructed his sons humbly to beg for

forgiveness from Joseph, even though Joseph had hitherto shown them only goodness and love. How far Joseph was from thinking of ultimate retribution and revenge, is evident from the reception which he gave to their request (v. 17): “*Joseph wept at their address to him.*” viz., at the fact that they could impute anything so bad to him; and when they came themselves, and threw themselves as servants at his feet, he said to them (v. 19), “*Fear not, for am I in the place of God?*” i.e., am I in a position to interfere of my own accord with the purposes of God, and not rather bound to submit to them myself? “*Ye had indeed evil against me in your mind, but God had it in mind for good* (to turn this evil into good), *to do* (עָשָׂה like רָאָה Gen. 48:11), *as is now evident* (lit., as has occurred this day, cf. Deu. 2:30; 4:20, etc.), *to preserve alive a great nation* (cf. 45: 7). *And now fear not, I shall provide for you and your families.*” Thus he quieted them by his affectionate words.

Gen. 50:22-26. DEATH OF JOSEPH. — Joseph lived to see the commencement of the fulfilment of his father’s blessing. Having reached the age of 110, he saw Ephraim’s בְּנֵי שְׁלֹשִׁים “sons of the third link,” i.e., of great-grandsons, consequently great-great-grandsons. שְׁלֹשִׁים descendants in the third generation are expressly distinguished from “children’s children” or grandsons in Exo. 34: 7. There is no practical difficulty in the way of this explanation, the only one which the language will allow. As Joseph’s two sons were born before he was 37 years old (Gen. 41:50), and Ephraim therefore was born, at the latest, in his 36th year, and possibly in his 34th, since Joseph was married in his 31st year, he might have had grandsons by the time he was 56 or 60 years old, and great-grandsons when he was from 78 to 85, so that great-great-grandsons might have been born when he was 100 or 110 years old. To regard the “sons of the third generation” as children in the third generation (great-grandsons of Joseph and grandsons of Ephraim), as many commentators do, as though the construct בְּנֵי stood for the absolute, is evidently opposed to the context, since it is stated immediately afterwards, that sons of Machir, the son of Manasseh, i.e., great-grandsons, were also born upon his knees, i.e., so that he could take them also upon his knees and show them his paternal love. There is no reason for thinking of adoption in connection with these words. And if Joseph lived to see only the great-grandsons of Ephraim as well as of Manasseh, it is difficult to imagine why the same expression should not be applied to the grandchildren of Manasseh, as to the descendants of Ephraim.

Gen. 50:24. When Joseph saw his death approaching, he expressed to his brethren his firm belief in the fulfilment of the divine promise (Gen. 46: 4, 5, cf. 15:16, 18 ff.), and made them take an oath, that if God should bring them into the promised land, they would carry his bones with them from Egypt. This last desire of his was carried out. When he died, they embalmed him, and laid

him (אֲשֵׁרִי from אֲשֵׁר, like Gen. 24:33 in the *chethib*) “in the coffin,” i.e., the ordinary coffin, constructed of sycamore-wood (see *Hengstenberg*, pp. 71, 72), which was then deposited in a room, according to Egyptian custom (*Herod.* 2, 86), and remained in Egypt for 360 years, until they carried it away with them at the time of the exodus, when it was eventually buried in Shechem, in the piece of land which had been bought by Jacob there (Gen. 33:19; Jos. 24:32).

Thus the account of the pilgrim-life of the patriarchs terminates with an act of faith on the part of the dying Joseph; and after his death, in consequence of his instructions, the coffin with his bones became a standing exhortation to Israel, to turn its eyes away from Egypt to Canaan, the land promised to its fathers, and to wait in the patience of faith for the fulfilment of the promise.

Chronological Survey of the Leading Events of the Patriarchal History

ARRANGED ACCORDING TO THE HEBREW TEXT, AS A CONTINUATION OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE AT P. 77, WITH AN ADDITIONAL CALCULATION OF THE YEAR BEFORE CHRIST.

THE EVENTS.	Year of Migration to Egypt.	Year of Entrance into Canaan.	Year from the Creation.	Year before Christ.
Abram's entrance into Canaan,	1	2021	2137
Birth of Ishmael,	11	2032	2126
Institution of Circumcision,	24	2045	2113
Birth of Isaac,	25	2046	2112
Death of Sarah,	62	2083	2075
Marriage of Isaac,	65	2086	2072
Birth of Esau and Jacob,	85	2106	2052
Death of Abraham,	100	2121	2037
Marriage of Esau,	125	2146	2012
Death of Ishmael,	148	2169	1989
Flight of Jacob to Padan Aram,	162	2183	1975
Jacob's Marriage,	169	2190	1968
Birth of Joseph,	176	2197	1961
Jacob's return from Padan Aram,	182	2203	1955
Jacob's arrival at Shechem in Canaan,	? 187	? 2208	? 1950
Jacob's return home to Hebron,	192	2213	1945
Sale of Joseph,	193	2214	1944
Death of Isaac,	205	2226	1932
Promotion of Joseph in Egypt,	206	2227	1931
Removal of Israel to Egypt,	1	215	2236	1922
Death of Jacob,	17	232	2253	1905
Death of Joseph,	71	286	2307	1851
Birth of Moses,	350	565	2586	1572
Exodus of Israel from Egypt,	430	645	2666	1492

The calculation of the years B.C. is based upon the fact, that the termination of the 70 years' captivity coincided with the first year of the sole government of Cyrus, and fell in the year 536 B.C.; consequently the captivity commenced in the year 606 B.C., and, according to the chronological data of the books of Kings, Judah was carried into captivity 406 years after the building of

Solomon's temple commenced, whilst the temple was built 480 years after the exodus from Egypt (1Ki. 6: 1).

FOOTNOTES

^{ft1} *Kaihinger* seeks to give probability to *Ewald's* idea of the progressive growth of the Mosaic legislation, and also of the Pentateuch, during a period of nine or ten centuries, by the following argument: — “We observe in the law-books of the ancient Parsees, in the *Zendavesta*, and in the historical writings of India and Arabia, that it was a custom in the East to *supplement* the earlier works, and after a lapse of time to reconstruct them, so that whilst the root remained, the old stock was pruned and supplanted by a new one. Later editors constantly brought new streams to the old, until eventually the circle of legends and histories was closed, refined, and transfigured. Now, as the Israelites belonged to the same great family as the rest of the Oriental nations (*sic!* so that the Parsees and Hindoos are Semitic!), and had almost everything in common with them so far as dress, manners, and customs were concerned, there is ground for the supposition, that their literature followed the same course” (*Herzog's Cycl.*). But to this we reply, that the literature of a nation is not an outward thing to be put on and worn like a dress, or adopted like some particular custom or habit, until something more convenient or acceptable induces a change; and that there is a considerable difference between Polytheism and heathen mythology on the one hand, and Monotheism and revealed religion on the other, which forbids us to determine the origin of the religious writings of the Israelites by the standard of the Indian *Veda* and *Purana*, or the different portions of the *Zendavesta*.

^{ft2} Yet we never find in these words of Moses, or in the Pentateuch generally, the name *Jehovah Sabaoth*, which was unknown in the Mosaic age, but was current as early as the time of Samuel and David, and so favourite a name with all the prophets.

^{ft3} Cf. *Hävernicks* Introduction, and the opinions of the Rabbins on *Deu. 31: 9* and *24* in *Meyer's adnotatt. ad Seder Olam*. But as *Delitzsch* still maintains that *Deu. 31: 9 ff.* merely proves that the book of Deuteronomy was written by Moses, and observes in support of this, that at the time of the second temple it was an undoubted custom to read that book alone at the feast of Tabernacles in the year of release, as is evident from *Sota, c. 7*, and a passage of *Sifri* (one of the earliest *Midrashim* of the school of Rab, born c. 165, d. 247), quoted by *Rashi* on *Sota 41*, we will give a literal translation of the two passages for the benefit of those who may not possess the books themselves, that they may judge for themselves what ground there is for

this opinion. The passage from the *Sota* is headed, *sectio regis quomodo*, i.e., *sectio a Rege praelegenda, quibus ritibus recitata est*, and runs thus: — “Transacta festivitatis tabernaculorum prima die, completo jam septimo anno et octavo ineunte, parabant Regi suggestum ligneum in Atrio, huic insidebat juxta illud: a fine septem annorum, etc. (Deu. 31:10). Tum Aedituus (more correctly, diaconus Synagogae) sumto libro legis tradidit eum Primaria coetus (synagogae), hic porrigebat eum Antistiti, Antistes Summo Sacerdoti, Summus Sacerdos denique exhibebat ipsum regi. Rex autem stans eum accipiebat, verum praelegens consedit.” Then follows a Haggada on a reading of King Agrippa’s, and it proceeds: — “Praelegit vero (rex) ab initio Deuteronomii usque ad illa: Audi Israel (c. 4, 4), quae et ipse praelegit. Tum subjecit (ex. c. 11, 13): Eritque si serio auscultaveritis, etc. Dehinc (ex. c. 14, 22): Fideliter decimato, etc. Postea (ex. c. 26, 22): Cum absolveritis dare omnes decimas, etc. Deinde sectionem de Rege (quae habetur, c. 17, 14 ff.). Denique benedictiones et execrationes (ex. cc. 27 et 28) usque dum totam illam sectionem finiret.”

But how can a mere tradition of the Talmud like this, respecting the formalities with which the king was to read certain sections of the Thorah on the second day of the feast of Tabernacles, be adduced as a proof that in the year of release the book of Deuteronomy alone, or certain extracts from it, were read to the assembled people? Even if this rule was connected with the Mosaic command in Deu. 31:10, or derived from it, it does not follow in the remotest degree, that either by ancient or modern Judaism the public reading of the Thorah appointed by Moses was restricted to this one reading of the king’s. And even if the precept in the Talmud was so understood or interpreted by certain Rabbins, the other passage quoted by *Delitzsch* from *Sifri* in support of his opinion, proves that this was not the prevailing view of the Jewish synagogue, or of modern Judaism. The passage runs thus: “He (the king) shall write **אֵת מִשְׁנֵה תּוֹרַת הַזֹּאת**. He shall so this himself, for he is not to use his ancestor’s copy. *Mishneh* in itself means nothing more than *Thorah Mishneh* (Deuteronomy). How do I know that the other words of the *Thorah* were to be written also? This is evident from the Scriptures, which add, ‘to do all the words of this law.’ But if this be the case, why is it called *Mishneh Thorah*? Because there would be a transformation of the law. Others say that on the day of assembly Deuteronomy alone was read.” From this passage of the ancient Midrash we learn, indeed, that many of the Rabbins were of opinion, that at the feast of Tabernacles in the sabbatical year, the book of Deuteronomy only was to be read, but that the author himself was of a different opinion; and, notwithstanding the fact that he thought the expression *Mishneh Thorah* must be understood as applying to the Deuteronomy of the law, still maintained that the law, of which the king was to have a copy taken, was

not only Deuteronomy, but the whole of the Pentateuch, and that he endeavoured to establish this opinion by a strange but truly rabbinical interpretation of the word *Mishneh* as denoting a transformation of the law.

^{ft4} The weakness of the argument against the Mosaic authorship of the Torah, founded upon the account of the death and burial of Moses, may be seen from the analogous case cited by *Hengstenberg in his Dissertations* on the Pentateuch. In the last book of the *Commentarii de statu religionis et republicae Carolo V. Caesare*, by *J. Sleidanus*, the account of Charles having abdicated and sailed to Spain is followed, without any break, by the words: “*Octobris die ultimo Joannes Sleidanus, J. U. L., vir et propter eximias animi dotes et singularem doctrinam omni laude dignus, Argentorati e vita decedit, atque ibidem honorifice sepelitur.*” This account of the death and burial of Sleidan is given in every edition of his *Commentarii*, containing the 26th book, which the author added to the 25 books of the first edition of April 1555, for the purpose of bringing down the life of Charles V. to his abdication in September 1556. Even in the very first edition, *Argentorati* 1558, it is added without a break, and inserted in the table of contents as an integral part of the book, without the least intimation that it is by a different hand. “No doubt the writer thought that it was quite unnecessary to distinguish himself from the author of the work, as everybody would know that a man could not possibly write an account of his own death and burial.” Yet any one who should appeal to this as a proof that *Sleidan* was not the author of the *Commentarii*, would make himself ridiculous in the eyes of every student of history.

^{ft5} According to *Berosus* and *Syncellus*, the Chaldean myth represents the “All” as consisting of darkness and water, filled with monstrous creatures, and ruled by a woman, *Markaya*, or *Ὠμόρωκα* (? Ocean). Bel divided the darkness, and cut the woman into two halves, of which he formed the heaven and the earth; he then cut off his own head, and from the drops of blood men were formed. — According to the Phoenician myth of *Sanchuniathon*, the beginning of the All was a movement of dark air, and a dark, turbid chaos. By the union of the spirit with the All, *Μώτ*, i.e., slime, was formed, from which every seed of creation and the universe was developed; and the heavens were made in the form of an egg, from which the sun and moon, the stars and constellations, sprang. By the heating of the earth and sea there arose winds, clouds and rain, lightning and thunder, the roaring of which wakened up sensitive beings, so that living creatures of both sexes moved in the waters and upon the earth. In another passage *Sanchuniathon* represents *Κολπία* (probably *קול פיה*, the moaning of the wind) and his wife *Βάαυ* (*bohu*) as producing *Αἰών* and *πρωτόγονος*, two mortal men, from whom sprang *Γένος* and *Γενεά*, the inhabitants of

Phoenicia. — It is well known from *Hesiod's theogony* how the Grecian myth represents the gods as coming into existence at the same time as the world. The numerous inventions of the Indians, again, all agree in this, that they picture the origin of the world as an emanation from the absolute, through Brahma's thinking, or through the contemplation of a primeval being called *Tad* (it). — Buddhism also acknowledges no God as creator of the world, teaches no creation, but simply describes the origin of the world and the beings that inhabit it as the necessary consequence of former acts performed by these beings themselves.

^{ft6} According to the Etruscan saga, which *Suidas* quotes from a historian, who was a “παρὸ ἀντοῖς (the Tyrrhenians) ἔμπειρος ἄνθρωπος (therefore not a native),” God created the world in six periods of one thousand years each: in the first, the heavens and the earth; in the second, the firmament; in the third, the sea and other waters of the earth; in the fourth, sun moon, and stars; in the fifth, the beasts of the air, the water, and the land; in the sixth, men. The world will last twelve thousand years, the human race six thousand. — According to the saga of the Zend in Avesta, the supreme Being Ormuzd created the visible world by his word in six periods or thousands of years: (1) the heaven, with the stars; (2) the water on the earth, with the clouds; (3) the earth, with the mountain Alborj and the other mountains; (4) the trees; (5) the beasts, which sprang from the primeval beast; (6) men, the first of whom was Kajomorts. Every one of these separate creations is celebrated by a festival. The world will last twelve thousand years.

^{ft7} Exegesis must insist upon this, and not allow itself to alter the plain sense of the words of the Bible, from irrelevant and untimely regard to the so-called certain inductions of natural science. Irrelevant we call such considerations, as make interpretation dependent upon natural science, because the creation lies outside the limits of empirical and speculative research, and, as an act of the omnipotent God, belongs rather to the sphere of miracles and mysteries, which can only be received by faith (Heb. 11: 3); and untimely, because natural science has supplied no certain conclusions as to the origin of the earth, and geology especially, even at the present time, is in a chaotic state of fermentation, the issue of which it is impossible to foresee.

^{ft8} There is no proof of the existence of such “ethereal waters” to be found in such passages as Rev. 4: 6; 15: 2; 22: 1; for what the holy seer there beholds before the throne as “a sea of glass like unto crystal mingled with fire,” and “a river of living water, clear as crystal,” flowing from the throne of God into the streets of the heavenly Jerusalem, are wide as the poles from any fluid or material substance from which the stars were made upon

the fourth day. Of such a fluid the Scriptures know quite as little, as of the nebular theory of *La Place*, which, notwithstanding the bright spots in Mars and the inferior density of Jupiter, Saturn, and other planets, is still enveloped in a mist which no astronomy will ever disperse. If the waters above the firmament were the elementary matter of which the stars were made, the waters beneath must be the elementary matter of which the earth was formed; for the waters were one and the same before the creation of the firmament. But the earth was not formed from the waters beneath; on the contrary, these waters were merely spread upon the earth and then gathered together into one place, and this place is called Sea. The earth, which appeared as dry land after the accumulation of the waters in the sea, was created in the beginning along with the heavens; but until the separation of land and water on the third day, it was so completely enveloped in water, that nothing could be seen but “the deep,” or “the waters” (v. 2). If, therefore, in the course of the work of creation, the heaven with its stars, and the earth with its vegetation and living creatures, came forth from this deep, or, to speak more correctly, if they appeared as well-ordered, and in a certain sense as finished worlds; it would be a complete misunderstanding of the account of the creation to suppose it to teach, that the water formed the elementary matter, out of which the heaven and the earth were made with all their hosts. Had this been the meaning of the writer, he would have mentioned *water* as the first creation, and not the heaven and the earth. How irreconcilable the idea of the waters above the firmament being ethereal waters is with the biblical representation of the opening of the windows of heaven when it rains, is evident from the way in which *Keerl*, the latest supporter of this theory, sets aside this difficulty, viz., by the bold assertion, that the mass of water which came through the windows of heaven at the flood was different from the rain which falls from the clouds; in direct opposition to the text of the Scriptures, which speaks of it not merely as rain (Gen. 7:12), but as the water of the clouds. Vid., Gen. 9:12 ff., where it is said that when God brings a cloud over the earth, He will set the rainbow in the cloud, as a sign that the water (of the clouds collected above the earth) shall not become a flood to destroy the earth again.

^{ft9} In v. 8 the LXX interpolates *καὶ εἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς ὅτι καλόν* (and God saw that it was good), and transfers the words “and it was so” from the end of v. 7 to the close of v. 6: two apparent improvements, but in reality two arbitrary changes. The transposition is copied from vv. 9, 15, 24; and in making the interpolation, the author of the gloss has not observed that the division of the waters was not complete till the separation of the dry land from the water had taken place, and therefore the proper place for the expression of approval is at the close of the work of the third day.

^{ft10} Most of the objections to the historical character of our account, which have been founded upon the work of the fourth day, rest upon a misconception of the proper point of view from which it should be studied. And, in addition to that, the conjectures of astronomers as to the immeasurable distance of most of the fixed stars, and the time which a ray of light would require to reach the earth, are accepted as indisputable mathematical proof; whereas these approximative estimates of distance rest upon the unsubstantiated supposition, that everything which has been ascertained with regard to the nature and motion of light in our solar system, must be equally true of the light of the fixed stars.

^{ft11} “The breath of God became the soul of man; the soul of man therefore is nothing but the breath of God. The rest of the world exists through the word of God; man through His own peculiar breath. This breath is the seal and pledge of our relation to God, of our godlike dignity; whereas the breath breathed into the animals is nothing but the common breath, the life-wind of nature, which is moving everywhere, and only appears in the animal fixed and bound into a certain independence and individuality, so that the animal soul is nothing but a nature-soul individualized into certain, though still material spirituality.” — *Ziegler*.

^{ft12} For a fuller discussion of the meaning and pronunciation of the name Jehovah vid., *Hengstenberg*, Dissertations on the Pentateuch i. p. 213 ff.; *Oehler* in *Herzog's Cyclopaedia*; and *Hölemann* in his *Bibelstudien*. The last, in common with *Stier* and others, decides in favour of the Masoretic pointing יְהוָה as giving the original pronunciation, chiefly on the ground of Rev. 1: 4 and 5, 8; but the *theological* expansion ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος cannot be regarded as a *philological* proof of the formation of יְהוָה by the fusion of יְהוָה, יְהוָה, יְהוָה into one word.

^{ft13} *The two productions furnish no proof that the Phishon is to be sought for in India. The assertion that the name bdolach is Indian, is quite unfounded, for it cannot be proved that madâlaka in Sanscrit is a vegetable gum; nor has this been proved of madâra, which is possibly related to it (cf. Lassen's indische Althk. 1, 290 note). Moreover, Pliny speaks of Bactriana as the land “in qua Bdelium est nominatissimum,” although he adds, “nascitur et in Arabia Indiaque, et Media ac Babylone;” and Isidorus says of the Bdella which comes from India, “Sordida est et nigra et majori gleba,” which, again, does not agree with Num. 11: 7. — The Shoham-stone also is not necessarily associated with India; for although Pliny says of the beryls, “India eos gignit, raro alibi repertos,” he also observes, “in nostro orbe aliquando circa Pontum inveniri putantur.”*

^{ft14} That the continents of our globe have undergone great changes since the creation of the human race, is a truth sustained by the facts of natural

history and the earliest national traditions, and admitted by the most celebrated naturalists. (See the collection of proofs made by *Keerl*.) These changes must not be all attributed to the flood; many may have occurred before and many after, like the catastrophe in which the Dead Sea originated, without being recorded in history as this has been. Still less must we interpret Gen. 11: 1 (compared with 10:25), as *Fabri* and *Keerl* have done, as indicating a complete revolution of the globe, or a geogonic process, by which the continents of the old world were divided, and assumed their present physignomy.

^{ft15} A striking example of this style of narrative we find in 1Ki. 7:13. First of all, the building and completion of the temple are noticed several times in Gen. 6, and the last time in connection with the year and month (Gen. 6: 9, 14, 37, 38); after that, the fact is stated, that the royal palace was thirteen years in building; and then the writer proceeds thus: "And king Solomon sent and fetched Hiram from Tyre...and he came to king Solomon, and did all his work; and made the two pillars," etc. Now, if we were to understand the historical preterite with *consec.*, here, as giving the order of sequence, Solomon would be made to send for the Tyrian artist, thirteen years after the temple was finished, to come and prepare the pillars for the porch, and all the vessels needed for the temple. But the writer merely expresses in Semitic style the simple thought, that "Hiram, whom Solomon fetched from Tyre, made the vessels," etc. Another instance we find in Jud. 2: 6.

^{ft16} Natural science can only demonstrate the unity of the human race, not the descent of all men from one pair, though many naturalists question and deny even the former, but without any warrant from anthropological facts. For every thorough investigation leads to the conclusion arrived at by the latest inquirer in this department, *Th. Waitz*, that not only are there no facts in natural history which preclude the unity of the various races of men, and fewer difficulties in the way of this assumption than in that of the opposite theory of specific diversities; but even in mental respects there are no specific differences within the limits of the race. *Delitzsch* has given an admirable summary of the proofs of unity. "That the races of men," he says, "are not species of one genus, but varieties of one species, is confirmed by the agreement in the physiological and pathological phenomena in them all, by the similarity in the anatomical structure, in the fundamental powers and traits of the mind, in the limits to the duration of life, in the normal temperature of the body and the average rate of pulsation, in the duration of pregnancy, and in the unrestricted fruitfulness of marriages between the various races."

^{ft17} There was a fall, therefore, in the higher spiritual world before the fall of man; and this is not only plainly taught in 2Pe. 2: 4 and Jude 1: 6, but

assumed in everything that the Scriptures say of Satan. But this event in the world of spirits neither compels us to place the fall of Satan before the six days' work of creation, nor to assume that the days represent long periods. For as man did not continue long in communion with God, so the angel-prince may have rebelled against God shortly after his creation, and not only have involved a host of angels in his apostasy and fall, but have proceeded immediately to tempt the men, who were created in the image of God, to abuse their liberty by transgressing the divine command.

ft18 פִּי used to establish a denial.

ft19 וְנִבְקְחוּ perfect c. ו consec. See *Gesenius*, § 126, Note 1.

ft20 Non omnia incommoda enumerat Moses, quibus se homo per peccatum implicuit: constat enim ex eodem prodiisse fonte omnes praesentis vitae aerumnas, quas experientia innumeras esse ostendit. Aëris intemperies, gelu, tonitrua, pluviae intempestivae, uredo, grandines et quicquid inordinatum est in mundo, peccati sunt fructus. Nec alia morborum prima est causa: idque poeticis fabulis celebratum fuit: haud dubie quod per manus a patribus traditum esset. Unde illud Horatii:

*Post ignem aethera domo
Subductum, macies et nova febrium
Terris incubuit cohors:
Semotique prius tarda necessitas
Lethi corripuit gradum.*

Sed Moses qui brevitati studet, suo more pro communi vulgi captu attingere contentus fuit quod magis apparuit: ut sub exemplo uno discamus, hominis vitio inversum fuisse totum naturae ordinem. CALVIN.

ft21 The numbers in brackets are the reading of the *Cod. Alexandrinus* of the LXX. In the genealogical table, Gen. 11:10 ff., the Samaritan text is the only one which gives the whole duration of life.

ft22 We cannot admit that there is any force in *Hofmann's* argument in his *Schriftbeweis* 1, p. 426, that "the begetting of children on the part of angels is not more irreconcilable with a nature that is not organized, like that of man, on the basis of sexual distinctions, than partaking of food is with a nature that is altogether spiritual; and yet food was eaten by the angels who visited Abraham." For, in the first place, the eating in this case was a miracle wrought through the condescending grace of the omnipotent God, and furnishes no standard for judging what angels can do by their own power in rebellion against God. And in the second place, there is a considerable difference between the act of eating on the part of the angels of God who appeared in human shape, and the taking of wives and begetting of children on the part of sinning angels. We are quite unable

also to accept as historical testimony, the myths of the heathen respecting demigods, sons of gods, and the begetting of children on the part of their gods, or the fables of the book of Enoch (Genesis 6 ff.) about the 200 angels, with their leaders, who lusted after the beautiful and delicate daughters of men, and who came down from heaven and took to themselves wives, with whom they begat giants of 3000 (or according to one MS 300) cubits in height. Nor do 2Pe. 2: 4 and Jude 1: 6 furnish any evidence of angel marriages. Peter is merely speaking of sinning angels in general (ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων) whom God did not spare, and not of any particular sin on the part of a small number of angels; and Jude describes these angels as τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, those who kept not their principedom, their position as rulers, but left their own habitation. There is nothing here about marriages with the daughters of men or the begetting of children, even if we refer the word τούτοις in the clause τὸν ὅμοιον τούτοις τρόπον ἔκπορνέυσασαι in v. 7 to the angels mentioned in v. 6; for ἔκπορνέειν, the commission of fornication, would be altogether different from marriage, that is to say, from a conjugal bond that was permanent even though unnatural. But it is neither certain nor probable that this is the connection of τούτοις. *Huther*, the latest commentator upon this Epistle, who gives the preference to this explanation of τούτοις, and therefore cannot be accused of being biased by doctrinal prejudices, says distinctly in the 2nd Ed. of his commentary, “τούτοις may be grammatically construed as referring to Sodom and Gomorrah, or *per synesin* to the inhabitants of these cities; but in that case the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah would only be mentioned indirectly.” There is nothing in the rules of syntax, therefore, to prevent our connecting the word with Sodom and Gomorrah; and it is not a fact, that “*grammaticae et logicae praecepta* compel us to refer this word to the angels,” as *G. v. Zeschwitz* says. But the very same reason which *Huther* assigns for not connecting it with Sodom and Gomorrah, may be also assigned for not connecting it with the angels, namely, that in that case the sin of the angels would only be mentioned indirectly. We regard *Philippi’s* explanation (in his *Glaubenslehre* iii. p. 303) as a possible one, viz., that the word τούτοις refers back to the ἄνθρωποι ἀσεργεῖς mentioned in v. 4, and as by no means set aside by *De Wette’s* objection, that the thought of v. 8 would be anticipated in that case; for this objection is fully met by the circumstance, that not only does the word οὗτοι, which is repeated five times from v. 8 onwards, refer back to these men, but even the word τούτοις in v. 14 also. On the other hand, the reference of τούτοις to the angels is altogether precluded by the clause καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, which follows the word ἔκπορνέυσασαι. For fornication on the part of the angels could only consist in their going after flesh, or, as *Hofmann*

expresses it, “having to do with flesh, for which they were not created,” but not in their going after *other*, or foreign flesh. There would be no sense in the word **ἑτέρας** unless those who were **ἐκ πορνεύσαντες** were themselves possessed of **σάρξ**; so that this is the only alternative, either we must attribute to the angels a **σάρξ** or fleshly body, or the idea of referring **τούτοις** to the angels must be given up. When *Kurtz* replies to this by saying that “to angels human bodies are quite as much a **ἑτέρα σάρξ**, i.e., a means of sensual gratification opposed to their nature and calling, as man can be to human man,” he hides the difficulty, but does not remove it, by the ambiguous expression “opposed to their nature and calling.” The **ἑτέρα σάρξ** must necessarily presuppose an **ἰδία σάρξ**.

But it is thought by some, that even if **τούτοις** in v. 7 do not refer to the angels in v. 6, the words of Jude agree so thoroughly with the tradition of the book of Enoch respecting the fall of the angels, that we must admit the allusion to the Enoch legend, and so indirectly to Gen. 6, since Jude could not have expressed himself more clearly to persons who possessed the book of Enoch, or were acquainted with the tradition it contained. Now this conclusion would certainly be irresistible, if the only sin of the angels mentioned in the book of Enoch, as that for which they were kept in chains of darkness still the judgment-day, had been their intercourse with human wives. For the fact that Jude was acquainted with the legend of Enoch, and took for granted that the readers of his Epistle were so too, is evident from his introducing a prediction of Enoch in vv. 14, 15, which is to be found in ch. i. 9 of Dillmann’s edition of the book of Enoch. But it is admitted by all critical writers upon this book, that in the book of Enoch which has been edited by *Dillmann*, and is only to be found in an Ethiopic version, there are contradictory legends concerning the fall and judgment of the angels; that the book itself is composed of earlier and later materials; and that those very sections (Ch. 6-16:106, etc.) in which the legend of the angel marriages is given without ambiguity, belong to the so-called book of *Noah*, i.e., to a later portion of the Enoch legend, which is opposed in many passages to the earlier legend. The *fall* of the angels is certainly often referred to in the earlier portions of the work; but among all the passages adduced by Dillmann in proof of this, there is only one (ch. 19: 1) which mentions the angels who had taken wives. In the others, the only thing mentioned as the sin of the angels or of the hosts of Azazel, is the fact that they were subject to Satan, and seduced those who dwelt on the earth (ch. 54: 3-6), or that they came down from heaven to earth, and revealed to the children of men what was hidden from them, and then led them astray to the commission of sin (ch. 64: 2). There is nothing at all here about their taking wives. Moreover, in the earlier portions of the book, besides the fall of the angels, there is frequent reference made to a fall, i.e., an act of sin,

on the part of the stars of heaven and the army of heaven, which transgressed the commandment of God before they rose, by not appearing at their appointed time (vid., ch. 18:14, 15; 21: 3; 90:21, 24, etc.); and their punishment and place of punishment are described, in just the same manner as in the case of the wicked angels, as a prison, a lofty and horrible place in which the seven stars of heaven lie bound like great mountains and flaming with fire (ch. 21: 2, 3), as an abyss, narrow and deep, dreadful and dark, in which the star which fell first from heaven is lying, bound hand and foot (ch. 88: 1, cf. 90:24). From these passages it is quite evident, that the legend concerning the fall of the angels and stars sprang out of Isa. 24:21, 22 (“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall visit the host of the height [צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם], the host of heaven, by which stars and angels are to be understood] on high [i.e., the spiritual powers of the heavens] and the kings of the earth upon the earth, and they shall be gathered together, bound in the dungeon, and shut up in prison, and after many days they shall be punished”), along with Isa. 14:12 (“How art thou fallen from heaven, thou beautiful morning star!”), and that the account of the sons of God in Genesis 6, as interpreted by those who refer it to the angels, was afterwards combined and amalgamated with it.

Now if these different legends, describing the judgment upon the stars that fell from heaven, and the angels that followed Satan in seducing man, in just the same manner as the judgment upon the angels who begot giants from women, were in circulation at the time when the Epistle of Jude was written; we must not interpret the sin of the angels, referred to by Peter and Jude, in a one-sided manner, and arbitrarily connect it with only such passages of the book of Enoch as speak of angel marriages, to the entire disregard of all the other passages, which mention totally different sins as committed by the angels, that are punished with bands of darkness; but we must interpret it from what Jude himself has said concerning this sin, as Peter gives no further explanation of what he means by ἀμαρτήσαι. Now the only sins that Jude mentions are μὴ τηρῆσαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν and ἀπολιπεῖν τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον. The two are closely connected. Through not keeping the ἀρχή (i.e., the position as rulers in heaven) which belonged to them, and was assigned them at their creation, the angels left “their own habitation” (ἴδιον οἰκητήριον); just as man, when he broke the commandment of God and failed to keep his position as ruler on earth, also lost “his own habitation” (ἴδιον οἰκητήριον), that is to say, not paradise alone, but the holy body of innocence also, so that he needed a covering for his nakedness, and will continue to need it, until we are “clothed upon with our hose which is from heaven” (οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ). In this description of the angels’ sin, there is not the slightest allusion to their leaving heaven to woo the beautiful daughters of men. The words may be

very well interpreted, as they were by the earlier Christian theologians, as relating to the fall of Satan and his angels, to whom all that is said concerning their punishment fully applies. If Jude had had the *πορνεία* of the angels, mentioned in the Enoch legends, in his mind, he would have stated this distinctly, just as he does in v. 9 in the case of the legend concerning Michael and the devil, and in v. 11 in that of Enoch's prophecy. There was all the more reason for his doing this, because not only to contradictory accounts of the sin of the angels occur in the Enoch legends, but a comparison of the parallels cited from the book of Enoch proves that he deviated from the Enoch legend in points of no little importance. Thus, for example, according to Enoch 54: 3, "iron chains of immense weight" are prepared for the hosts of Azazel, to put them into the lowest hell, and cast them on that great day into the furnace with flaming fire. Now Jude and Peter say nothing about iron chains, and merely mention "everlasting chains under darkness" and "chains of darkness." Again, according to Enoch 10:12, the angel sinners are "bound fast under the earth for seventy generations, till the day of judgment and their completion, till the last judgment shall be held for all eternity." Peter and Jude make no allusion to this point of time, and the supporters of the angel marriages, therefore, have thought well to leave it out when quoting this parallel to Jude 6. Under these circumstances, the silence of the apostles as to either marriages or fornication on the part of the sinful angels, is a sure sign that they gave no credence to these fables of a Jewish gnosticizing tradition.

^{ft23} The notion that the *Nephilim* were giants, to which the Sept. rendering *γίγαντες* has given rise, was rejected even by *Luther* as fabulous. He bases his view upon Jos. 11: 7: "*Nephilim non dictos a magnitudine corporum, sicut Rabbini putant, sed a tyrannide et oppressione quod vi grassati sint, nulla habita ratione legum aut honestatis, sed simpliciter indulgentes suis voluptatibus et cupiditatibus.*" The opinion that giants are intended derives no support from Num. 13:32, 33. When the spies describe the land of Canaan as "a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof," and then add (v. 33), "and there we saw the *Nephilim*, the sons of Anak among (אֶת lit., from, out of, in a partitive sense) the *Nephilim*," by the side of whom they were as grasshoppers; the term *Nephilim* cannot signify giants, since the spies not only mention them especially along with the inhabitants of the land, who are described as people of great stature, but single out only a portion of the *Nephilim* as "sons of Anak" (בְּנֵי עֲנָק), i.e., long-necked people or giants. The explanation "fallen from heaven" needs no refutation; inasmuch as the main element, "from heaven," is a purely arbitrary addition.

ft24 How thoroughly irreconcilable the contents of this verse are with the angel-hypothesis is evident from the strenuous efforts of its supporters to bring them into harmony with it. Thus, in *Reuter's Repert.*, p. 7, *Del.* observes that the verse cannot be rendered in any but the following manner: "The giants *were* on the earth in those days, and also afterwards, when the sons of God went in to the daughters of men, these they bare to them, or rather, and these bare to them;" but, for all that, he gives this as the meaning of the words, "At the time of the divine determination to inflict punishment the giants *arose*, and also afterwards, when this unnatural connection between super-terrestrial and human beings continued, there arose such giants;" not only substituting "arose" for "were," but changing "when they connected themselves with them" into "when this connection continued."

Nevertheless he is obliged to confess that "it is strange that this unnatural connection, which I also suppose to be the intermediate cause of the origin of the giants, should not be mentioned in the first clause of v. 4." This is an admission that the text says nothing about the origin of the giants being traceable to the marriages of the sons of God, but that the commentators have been obliged to insert it in the text to save their angel marriages.

Kurtz has tried three different explanations of this verse but they are all opposed to the rules of the language. (1) In the *History of the Old Covenant* he gives this rendering: "Nephilim were on earth in these days, and that even after the sons of God had formed connections with the daughters of men;" in which he not only gives to נִפְלִיִּם the unsupportable meaning, "even, just," but takes the imperfect יָבִאוּ in the sense of the perfect בָּאוּ. (2) In his *Ehen der Söhne Gottes* (p. 80) he gives the choice of this and the following rendering: "The Nephilim were on earth in those days, and also after this had happened, that the sons of God came to the daughters of men and begat children," were the ungrammatical rendering of the imperfect as the perfect is artfully concealed by the interpolation of "after this had happened." (3) In "*die Söhne Gottes*," p. 85: "In these days and also afterwards, when the sons of God came (continued to come) to the daughters of men, they bare to them (sc., Nephilim)," where יָבִאוּ, they came, is arbitrarily altered into יוֹסִיפוּ לָבוֹא, they continued to come. But when he observes in defence of this *quid pro quo*, that "the imperfect denotes here, as *Hengstenberg* has correctly affirmed, and as so often is the case, an action frequently repeated in past times," this remark only shows that he has neither understood the nature of the usage to which H. refers, nor what *Ewald* has said (§ 136) concerning the force and use of the imperfect.

ft25 *When, on the other hand, the supporters of the angel marriages maintain that it is only on this interpretation that the necessity for the flood, i.e., for*

the complete destruction of the whole human race with the exception of righteous Noah, can be understood, not only is there no scriptural foundation for this argument, but it is decidedly at variance with those statements of the Scriptures, which speak of the corruption of the men whom God had created, and not of a race that had arisen through an unnatural connection of angels and men and forced their way into God's creation. If it were really the case, that it would otherwise be impossible to understand where the necessity could lie, for all the rest of the human race to be destroyed and a new beginning to be made, whereas afterwards, when Abraham was chosen, the rest of the human race was not only spared, but preserved for subsequent participation in the blessings of salvation: we should only need to call Job to mind, who also could not comprehend the necessity for the fearful sufferings which overwhelmed him, and was unable to discover the justice of God, but who was afterwards taught a better lesson by God Himself, and reprov'd for his rash conclusions, as a sufficient proof of the deceptive and futile character of all such human reasoning. But this is not the true state of the case. The Scriptures expressly affirm, that after the flood the moral corruption of man was the same as before the flood; for they describe it in Gen. 8:21 in the very same words as in Gen. 6: 5: and the reason they assign for the same judgment not being repeated, is simply the promise that God would no more smite and destroy all living, as He had done before — an evident proof that God expected no change in human nature, and out of pure mercy and long-suffering would never send a second flood. "Now, if the race destroyed had been one that sprang from angel-fathers, it is difficult to understand why no improvement was to be looked for after the flood; for the repetition of any such unnatural angel-tragedy was certainly not probable, and still less inevitable" (Philippi).

^{ft26} As the height of the ark was thirty cubits, the three stories of cells can hardly have filled the entire space, since a room ten cubits high, or nine cubits if we deduct the thickness of the floors, would have been a prodigality of space beyond what the necessities required. It has been conjectured that above or below these stories there was space provided for the necessary supplies of food and fodder. At the same time, this is pure conjecture, like every other calculation, not only as to the number and size of the cells, but also as to the number of animals to be collected and the fodder they would require. Hence every objection that has been raised to the suitability of the structure, and the possibility of collecting all the animals in the ark and providing them with food, is based upon arbitrary assumptions, and should be treated as a perfectly groundless fancy. As natural science is still in the dark as to the formation of species, and therefore not in a condition to determine the number of pairs from which

all existing species are descended, it is ridiculous to talk, as *Pfaff* and others do, of 2000 species of mammalia, and 6500 species of birds, which Noah would have had to feed every day.

^{ft27} The geological facts which testify to the submersion of the entire globe are collected in *Buckland's reliquiae diluv.*, *Schubert's Gesch. der Natur*, and *C. v. Raumer's Geography*, and are of such importance that even *Cuvier* acknowledged “Je pense donc, avec MM. Deluc et Dolomieu, que s'il y a quelque chose de constaté en géologie; c'est que la surface de notre globe a été victime d'une grande et subite révolution, dont la date ne peut remonter beaucoup au delà de cinq ou six mille ans” (*Discours sur les révol. de la surface du globe*, p. 190, ed. 6). The latest phase of geology, however, denies that these facts furnish any testimony to the historical character of the flood, and substitutes the hypothesis of a submersion of the entire globe before the creation of man: 1. because the animals found are very different from those at present in existence; and 2. because no certain traces have hitherto been found of fossil human bones. We have already shown that there is no force in these arguments. Vid., *Keerl*, pp. 489 ff.

^{ft28} *Hic igitur fons est, ex quo manat totum just civile et just gentium. Nam si Deus concedit homini potestatem super vitam et mortem, profecto etiam concedit potestatem super id, quod minus est, ut sunt fortunae, familia, uxor, liberi, servi, agri; Haec omnia vult certorum hominum potestati esse obnoxia Deus, ut reos puniant.* Luther.

^{ft29} *Sam. Bochart* has brought great learning to the explanation of the table of nations in *Phaleg*, the first part of his *geographia sacra*, to which *Michaelis* and *Rosenmüller* made valuable additions, — the former in his *spicil. geogr. Hebr. ext.* 1769 and 1780, the latter in his *Biblical Antiquities*. *Knobel* has made use of all the modern ethnographical discoveries in his “*Völkertafel der Genesis*” (1850), but many of his combinations are very speculative. *Kiepert*, in his article *über d. geograph. Stellung der nördlichen Länder in der phönikisch-hebräischen Erdkunde* (in the *Monatsberichte d. Berliner Akad.* 1859), denies entirely the ethnographical character of the table of nations, and reduces it to a mere attempt on the part of the Phoenicians to account for the geographical position of the nations with which they were acquainted.

^{ft30} These analogies overthrow the assertion that the verses before us have been interpolated by the Jehovist into the Elohist document; since the use of the name Jehovah is no proof of difference of authorship, nor the use of יְהוָה for הוֹלִיָד, as the former also occurs in vv. 13, 15, 24, and 26.

^{ft31} This was seen even by *Perizonius* (*Origg. Babyl.* p. 183), who says, “Crediderim hominem hunc utpote venatorem ferocem et sodalium comitatu succinctum semper in ore habuisse et ingeminasse, ad reliquos in

rebellionem excitandos, illud *nimrod, nimrod, h.e. rebellemus, rebellemus*, atque inde postea ab aliis, etiam ab ipso Mose, hoc vocabalo tanquam proprio nomine designatum,” and who supports his opinion by other similar instances in history.

^{ft32} This view of Nimrod and his deeds is favoured by the Eastern legend, which not only makes him the builder of the tower of Babel, which was to reach to heaven, but has also placed him among the constellations of heaven as a heaven-storming giant, who was chained by God in consequence. Vid., *Herzog's Real-Encycl.* Art. Nimrod.

^{ft33} This supposition of *Rawlinson, Grote, M. v. Niebuhr, Knobel, Delitzsch* and others, has recently been adopted by *Ewald* also.

^{ft34} The opinion of the Rabbins and earlier theologians, that the Hebrew was the primitive language, has been generally abandoned in consequence of modern philological researches. The fact that the biblical names handed down from the earliest times are of Hebrew extraction proves nothing. With the gradual development and change of language, the traditions with their names were cast into the mould of existing dialects, without thereby affecting the truth of the tradition. For as *Drechster* has said, “it makes no difference whether I say that Adam’s eldest son had a name corresponding to the name *Cain* from אָהָב, or to the name *Ctesias* from κῆσθαι; the truth of the Torah, which presents us with the tradition handed down from the sons of Noah through Shem to Abraham and Israel, is not a verbal, but a living tradition — is not in the letter, but in the spirit.”

^{ft35} Such explanations of the name as “gate, or house, or fortress of Bel,” are all the less worthy of notice, because the derivation ἀπὸ τοῦ Βήλου in the *Etymol. magn.*, and in Persian and Nabatean works, is founded upon the myth, that *Bel* was the founder of the city. And as this myth is destitute of historical worth, so is also the legend that the city was built by Semiramis, which may possibly have so much of history as its basis, that this half-mythical queen extended and beautified the city, just as Nebuchadnezzar added a new quarter, and a second fortress, and strongly fortified it.

^{ft36} In the old Jewish synagogue the Angel of Jehovah was regarded as the *Shechinah*, the indwelling of God in the world, i.e., the only Mediator between God and the world, who bears in the Jewish theology the name *Metatron*. The early Church regarded Him as the *Logos*, the second person of the Deity; and only a few of the fathers, such as *Augustine* and *Jerome*, thought of a created angel (vid., *Hengstenberg*, *Christol.* vol. 3, app.). This view was adopted by many Romish theologians, by the Socinians, Arminians, and others, and has been defended recently by *Hofmann*, whom *Delitzsch, Kurtz*, and others follow. But the opinion of the early Church has been vindicated most thoroughly by *Hengstenberg* in his *Christology*.

^{ft37} The force of this difference cannot be set aside by the objection that the New Testament writers follow the usage of the Septuagint, where יהוה מלאך is rendered ἄγγελος κυρίου. For neither in the New Testament nor in the Alex. version of the Old is ἄγγελος κυρίου used as a proper name; it is a simple appellative, as is apparent from the fact that in every instance, in which further reference is made to an angel who has appeared, he is called ὁ ἄγγελος, with or without κυρίου. All that the Septuagint rendering proves, is that the translators supposed “the angel of the Lord” to be a created angel; but it by no means follows that their supposition is correct.

^{ft38} The only passage that could be adduced in support of this, viz., Psa. 104: 4, does not prove that God makes natural objects, winds and flaming fire, into forms in which heavenly spirits appear, or that He creates spirits out of them. Even if we render this passage, with *Delitzsch*, “making His messengers of winds, His servants of flaming fire,” the allusion, as *Delitzsch* himself observes, is not to the creation of angels; nor can the meaning be, that God gives wind and fire to His angels as the material of their appearance, and as it were of their self-incorporation. For עֲשֶׂה, constructed with two accusatives, the second of which expresses the *materia ex qua*, is never met with in this sense, not even in 2Ch. 4:18-22. For the greater part of the temple furniture summed up in this passage, of which it is stated that Solomon made them of gold, was composed of pure gold; and if some of the things were merely covered with gold, the writer might easily apply the same expression to this, because he had already given a more minute account of their construction (e.g., Gen. 3: 7). But we neither regard this rendering of the psalm as in harmony with the context, nor assent to the assertion that עֲשֶׂה with a double accusative, in the sense of making into anything, is ungrammatical.

^{ft39} This is not a mere accommodation of Scripture, but the correct interpretation of the obscure hints of the Old Testament by the light of the fulfilment of the New. For not only is the Maleach Jehovah the revealer of God, but Jehovah Himself is the revealed God and Saviour. Just as in the history of the Old Testament there are not only revelations of the Maleach Jehovah, but revelations of Jehovah also; so in the prophecies the announcement of the Messiah, the sprout of David and servant of Jehovah, is intermingled with the announcement of the coming of Jehovah to glorify His people and perfect His kingdom.

^{ft40} The hypothesis, that the history is compounded of Jehovistic and Elohist documents, can only be maintained by those who misunderstand that distinctive meaning of these two names, and arbitrarily set aside the

Jehovah in Gen. 27: 1, on account of an erroneous determination of the relation in which אֱלֹהֵי שָׂדֵי stands to יְהוָה.

^{ft41} *J. G. Wetzstein*, however, has lately denied the identity of Ashteroth Karnaim, which he interprets as meaning Ashtaroth near Karnaim, with Ashtaroth the capital of Og (see *Reiseber. üb. Hauran*, etc. 1860, p. 107). But he does so without sufficient reason. He disputes most strongly the fact that Ashtaroth was situated on the hill Ashtere, because the Arabs now in Hauran assured him, that the ruins of this Tell (or hill) suggested rather a monastery or watch-tower than a large city, and associates it with the *Bostra* of the Greeks and Romans, the modern *Bozra*, partly on account of the central situation of this town, and its consequent importance to Hauran and Peraea generally, and partly also on account of the similarity in the name, as *Bostra* is the latinized form of *Beeshterah*, which we find in Jos. 21:27 in the place of the Ashtaroth of 1Ch. 6:56; and that form is composed of *Beth Ashtaroth*, to which there are as many analogies as there are instances of the omission of *Beth* before the names of towns, which is a sufficient explanation of Ashtaroth (cf. *Ges. thes.*, p. 175 and 193).

^{ft42} The circumstance that in the midst of a list of tribes who were defeated, we find not the tribe but only the *fields* (שָׂדֵי) of the Amalekites mentioned, can only be explained on the supposition that the nation of the Amalekites was not then in existence, and the country was designated proleptically by the name of its future and well-known inhabitants (*Hengstenberg*, Diss. ii. p. 249, translation).

^{ft43} One runs below the Sea of Galilee past Fik and Nowa, almost in a straight line to Damascus; the other from Jacob's Bridge, below Lake Merom. But if the enemy, instead of returning with their booty to Thapsacus, on the Euphrates, by one of the direct roads leading from the Jordan past Damascus and Palmyra, had gone through the land of Canaan to the sources of the Jordan, they would undoubtedly, when defeated at Laish-Da, have fled through the *Wady et Teim* and the *Bekaa* to Hamath, and not by Damascus at all (vid., *Robinson*, *Bibl. Researches*).

^{ft44} The legend of Abram having been king in Damascus appears to have originated in this, though the passage before us does not so much as show that Abram obtained possession of Eliezer on his way through Damascus.

^{ft45} בִּינִיָּהּ, with a point over the second Jod, to show that it is irregular and suspicious; since בִּיִן with the singular suffix is always treated as a singular, and only with a plural suffix as plural.

^{ft46} The objections to this change in the accentuation are entirely counterbalanced by the grammatical difficulty connected with the second explanation. If, for example, אֲנִי is a participle with the 1st pers. suff., it

should be written רֹאֵנִי (Isa. 29:15) or רֹאֵנִי (Isa. 47:10). רֹאֵי cannot mean, “who sees me,” but “my seer,” an expression utterly inapplicable to God, which cannot be supported by a reference to Job. 7: 8, for the accentuation varies there; and the derivation of רֹאֵי from רֹאֵי “eye of the seeing,” for the eye which looks after me, is apparently fully warranted by the analogous expression אֵשֶׁת לְרֹדֵה in Jer. 13:21.

^{ft47} What stands out clearly in this promise — viz., the fact that the expressions “seed of Abraham” (people of Israel) and “land of Canaan” are not exhausted in the physical Israel and earthly Canaan, but are to be understood spiritually, Israel and Canaan acquiring the typical significance of the people of God and land of the Lord — is still further expanded by the prophets, and most distinctly expressed in the New Testament by Christ and the apostles. This scriptural and spiritual interpretation of the Old Testament is entirely overlooked by those who, like *Auberlen*, restrict all the promises of God and the prophetic proclamations of salvation to the physical Israel, and reduce the application of them to the “Israel after the spirit,” i.e., to believing Christendom, to a mere accommodation.

^{ft48} Whether the Dead Sea originated in this catastrophe, or whether there was previously a lake, possibly a fresh water lake, at the north of the valley of Siddim, which was enlarged to the dimensions of the existing sea by the destruction of the valley with its cities, and received its present character at the same time, is a question which has been raised, since Capt. *Lynch* has discovered by actual measurement the remarkable fact, that the bottom of the lake consists of two totally different levels, which are separated by a peninsula that stretches to a very great distance into the lake from the eastern shore; so that whilst the lake to the north of this peninsula is, on an average, from 1000 to 1200 feet deep, the southern portion is at the most 16 feet deep, and generally much less, the bottom being covered with salt mud, and heated by hot springs from below.

^{ft49} But when this pillar of salt is mentioned in Wisdom 11: 7 and *Clemens ad Cor.* xi. as still in existence, and *Josephus* professes to have seen it, *this* legend is probably based upon the pillar-like lumps of salt, which are still to be seen at Mount *Usdum* (Sodom), on the south-western side of the Dead Sea.

^{ft50} Cf. *Lightfoot, opp.* 1, p. 19. This correct estimate of *Luther's* is based upon the following calculation: — When Joseph was introduced to Pharaoh he was thirty years old (Gen. 41:46), and when Jacob went into Egypt, thirty-nine, as the seven years of abundance and two of famine had then passed by (Gen. 45: 6). But Jacob was at that time 130 years old (Gen. 47: 9). Consequently Joseph was born before Jacob was ninety-one; and as his birth took place in the fourteenth year of Jacob's sojourn in Mesopotamia

(cf. 30:25, and 29:18, 21, and 27), Jacob's flight to Laban occurred in the seventy-seventh year of his own life, and the 137th of Isaac's.

^{ft51} We must not think of our European goats, whose skins would be quite unsuitable for any such deception. "It is the camel-goat of the East, whose black, silk-like hair was used even by the Romans as a substitute for human hair. *Martial* xii. 46." — *Tuch* on v. 16.

^{ft52} I cannot discover, however, in Mal. 1: 3 an authentic proof of the privative meaning, as *Kurtz* and *Delitzsch* do, since the prophet's words, "I have hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste," are not descriptive of the natural condition of Idumaea, but of the desolation to which the land was given up.

^{ft53} This reference is incorrect; the *Niphal* is used in Isa. 1:24, the *Hithpael* in Jer. 5: 9-29. Tr.

^{ft54} The fact mentioned here has often been cited as the origin of the anointed stones (*βαίτυλοι*) of the heathen, and this heathen custom has been regarded as a degeneration of the patriarchal. But apart from this essential difference, that the Baetulian worship was chiefly connected with meteoric stones (cf. *F. von Dalberg, üb. d. Meteor-cultus d. Alten*), which were supposed to have come down from some god, and were looked upon as deified, this opinion is at variance with the circumstance, that Jacob himself, in consecrating the stone by pouring oil upon it, only followed a custom already established, and still more with the fact, that the name *βαίτυλοι βαιτόλια*, notwithstanding its sounding like *Bethel*, can hardly have arisen from the name *Beth-El*, Gr. *Βαιθήλ*, since the *τ* for *θ* would be perfectly inexplicable. *Dietrich* derives *βαιτύλιον* from *בַּיְטוּל*, to render inoperative, and interprets it amulet.

^{ft55} Like the cistern *Bir Beshat*, described by *Rosen.*, in the valley of Hebron, or those which *Robinson* found in the desert of Judah (Pal. ii. 165), hollowed out in the great mass of rock, and covered with a large, thick, flat stone, in the middle of which a round hole had been left, which formed the opening of the cistern, and in many cases was closed up with a heavy stone, which it would take two or three men to roll away.

^{ft56} This is the case still with the Bedouins, the Druses, and other Eastern tribes (*Burckhardt, Voleny, Layard, and Lane*).

^{ft57} These words are the oldest proof, that in the native country of the patriarchs, Mesopotamia, Aramaean or Chaldaean was spoken, and Hebrew in Jacob's native country, Canaan; from which we may conclude that Abraham's family first acquired the Hebrew in Canaan from the Canaanites (Phoenicians).

^{ft58} There can be no doubt that vv. 49 and 50 bear the marks of a subsequent insertion. But there is nothing in the nature of this interpolation to indicate a compilation of the history from different sources. That Laban, when making this covenant, should have spoken of the future treatment of his daughters, is a thing so natural, that there would have been something strange in the omission. And it is not less suitable to the circumstances, that he calls upon the God of Jacob, i.e., Jehovah, to watch in this affair. And apart from the use of the name *Jehovah*, which is perfectly suitable here, there is nothing whatever to point to a different source; to say nothing of the fact that the critics themselves cannot agree as to the nature of the source supposed.

^{ft59} *Mamortha*, which according to *Plin.* (h. n. v. 14) was the earlier name of *Neapolis* (Nablus), appears to have been a corruption of Chamor.

^{ft60} This view is generally supported by the earlier writers, such as *Demetrius*, *Petavius* (Hengst. Diss.), etc.; only they reckon Dinah's age at 16, placing her birth in the 14th year of Jacob's service.

^{ft61} This conjecture derives no support from the fact that the manifestations of God are ascribed to *Elohim* in vv. 1 and 9 ff., although the whole chapter treats of the display of mercy by the covenant God, i.e., *Jehovah*. For the occurrence of *Elohim* instead of *Jehovah* in v. 1 may be explained, partly from the antithesis of God and man (because *Jacob*, the man, had neglected to redeem his vow, it was necessary that he should be reminded of it by God), and partly from the fact that there is no allusion to any *appearance* of God, but the words "God said" are to be understood, no doubt, as relating to an inward communication. The use of *Elohim* in vv. 9 ff. follows naturally from the injunction of *Elohim* in v. 1; and there was the less necessity for an express designation of the God appearing as *Jehovah*, because, on the one hand, the object of this appearance was simply to renew and confirm the former appearance of *Jehovah* (Gen. 28:12 ff.), and on the other hand, the title assumed in v. 11, *El Shaddai*, refers to Gen. 27: 1, where Jehovah announces Himself to Abram as *El Shaddai*.

^{ft62} But even if this *Mazzebah* was really preserved till the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, i.e., more than 450 years, and the remark referred to that time, it might be an interpolation by a later hand. The grave was certainly a well-known spot in Samuel's time (1Sa. 10: 2); but a *monumentum ubi Rachel posita est uxor Jacob* is first mentioned again by the Bordeaux pilgrims of A.D. 333 and *Jerome*. The *Kubbet Rahil* (Rachel's grave), which is now shown about half an hour's journey to the north of Bethlehem, to the right of the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, is merely "an ordinary Muslim wely, or tomb of a holy person, a small square building of stone with a dome, and within it a tomb in the ordinary

Mohammedan form” (*Rob. Pal.* 1, p. 322). It has been recently enlarged by a square court with high walls and arches on the eastern side (*Rob. Bibl. Researches.* p. 357). Now although this grave is not ancient, the correctness of the tradition, which fixes upon this as the site of Rachel’s grave, cannot on the whole be disputed. At any rate, the reasons assigned to the contrary by *Thenius*, *Kurtz*, and others are not conclusive.

^{ft63} The occurrence of “Timna and Amalek” in 1Ch. 1:36, as coordinate with the sons of Eliphaz, is simply a more concise form of saying “and from Timna, Amalek.”

^{ft64} *Knobel* also undertakes to explain these names geographically, and to point them out in tribes and places of Arabia, assuming, quite arbitrarily and in opposition to the text, that the names refer to tribes, not to persons, although an incident is related of Zibeon’s son, which proves at once that the list relates to persons and not to tribes; and expecting his readers to believe that not only are the descendants of these troglodytes, who were exterminated before the time of Moses, still to be found, but even their names may be traced in certain Bedouin tribes, though more than 3000 years have passed away! The utter groundlessness of such explanations, which rest upon nothing more than similarity of names, may be seen in the association of *Shobal* with *Syria Sobal* (*Judith* 3: 1), the name used by the Crusaders for *Arabia tertia*, i.e., the southernmost district below the Dead Sea, which was conquered by them. For notwithstanding the resemblance of the name *Shobal* to *Sobal*, no one could seriously think of connecting *Syria Sobal* with the Horite prince *Shobal*, unless he was altogether ignorant of the apocryphal origin of the former name, which first of all arose from the Greek or Latin version of the Old Testament, and in fact from a misunderstanding of *Psa.* 60: 2, where, instead אַרַם צוֹבָה, *Aram Zobah*, we find in the LXX Συρία Σοβάλ, and in the *Vulg.* *Syria et Sobal*.

^{ft65} It is possible that there may be something significant in the fact that it was “as he was feeding his father’s asses,” and that the asses may have contributed to the discovery; just as the whirlpool of Karlsbad is said to have been discovered through a hound of Charles IV, which pursued a stag into a hot spring, and attracted the huntsmen to the spot by its howling.

^{ft66} If this be admitted; then, on the supposition that this list of kings contains all the previous kings of Edom, the introduction of monarchy among the Edomites can hardly have taken place more than 200 years before the exodus; and, in that case, none of the phylarchs named in vv. 15-18 can have lived to see its establishment. For the list only reaches to the grandsons of Esau, none of whom are likely to have lived more than 100 or 150 years after Esau’s death. It is true we do not know when Esau died; but 413 years elapsed between the death of Jacob and the exodus, and Joseph,

who was born in the 91st years of Jacob's life, died 54 years afterwards, i.e., 359 years before the exodus. But Esau was married in his 40th year, 37 years before Jacob (Gen. 26:34), and had sons and daughters before his removal to Seir (v. 6). Unless, therefore, his sons and grandsons attained a most unusual age, or were married remarkably late in life, his grandsons can hardly have outlived Joseph more than 100 years. Now, if we fix their death at about 250 years before the exodus of Israel from Egypt, there remains from that point to the arrival of the Israelites at the land of Edom (Num. 20:14) a period of 290 years; amply sufficient for the reigns of eight kings, even if the monarchy was not introduced till after the death of the last of the phylarchs mentioned in vv. 15-18.

^{ft67} The very fact that the author of Genesis, who wrote in the light of the further development and fuller revelation of the ways of the Lord with Joseph and the whole house of Jacob, represents the career of Joseph as a gracious interposition of *Jehovah* (Genesis 39), and yet makes Joseph himself speak of *Elohim* as arranging the whole, is by no means an unimportant testimony to the historical fidelity and truth of the narrative; of which further proofs are to be found in the faithful and exact representation of the circumstances, manners, and customs of Egypt, as *Hengstenberg* has proved in his *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, from a comparison of these accounts of Joseph's life with ancient document and monuments connected with this land.

^{ft68} As the expression "at that time" does not compel us to place Judah's marriage after the sale of Joseph, many have followed *Augustine* (qusaet. 123), and placed it some years earlier. But this assumption is rendered extremely improbable, if not impossible, by the fact that Judah was not merely accidentally present when Joseph was sold, but was evidently living with his brethren, and had not yet set up an establishment of his own; whereas he had settled at Adullam previous to his marriage, and seems to have lived there up to the time of the birth of the twins by Thamar. Moreover, the 23 years which intervened between the taking of Joseph into Egypt and the migration of Jacob thither, furnish space enough for all the events recorded in this chapter. If we suppose that Judah, who was 20 years old when Joseph was sold, went to Adullam soon afterwards and married there, his three sons might have been born four or five years after Joseph's captivity. And if his eldest son was born about a year and a half after the sale of Joseph, and he married him to Thamar when he was 15 years old, and gave her to his second son a year after that, Onan's death would occur at least five years before Jacob's removal to Egypt; time enough, therefore, both for the generation and birth of the twin-sons of Judah by Thamar, and for Judah's two journeys into Egypt with his brethren to buy corn. (See Gen. 46: 8 ff.)

^{ft69} *Credibile est aliquod fuisse indicium, quo Josephum innocentem esse Potiphari constiteret; neque enim servi vita tanti erat ut ei parceretur in tam gravi delicto. Sed licet innocuum, in carcere tamen detinebat, ut uxoris honori et suo consuleret (Clericus).* The chastity of Egyptian women has been in bad repute from time immemorial (Diod. Sic. i. 59; Herod. ii. 111). Even in the middle ages the Fatimite *Hakim* thought it necessary to adopt severe measures against their immorality (*Bar-Hebraei*, chron. p. 217), and at the present day, according to *Burckhardt* (arab. Sprichwörter, pp. 222, 227), chastity is “a great rarity” among women of every rank in Cairo.

^{ft70} See my *Bibl. Antiquities*, § 17, 5. The reference, no doubt, is to the ἑσθητα λινέην, worn by the Egyptian priests, which was not made of linen, but of the *frutex quem aliqui gossipion vocant, plures xylon et ideo LINA inde facta xylina. Nec ulla sunt eis candore mollitiave praeferenda. — Vestes inde sacerdotibus Aegypti gratissimae. Plin. h.n. xix. 1.*

^{ft71} *Luther* in his version, “privy councillor,” follows the rabbinical explanation, which was already to be found in *Josephus* (*Ant. ii. 6, 1*): κρυπτῶν εὐρετής, from צפנת = צפונות *occulta*, and פענח *revelator*.

^{ft72} *Joseph nihil aliud agit quam ut revelet peccatum fratrum hoc durissimo opere et sermone. Descendunt enim in Aegyptum una cum aliis emtum frumentum, securi et negligentes tam atrocis delicti, cujus sibi erant conscii, quasi nihil unquam deliquissent contra patrem decrepitum aut fratrem innocentem, cogitant Joseph jam diu exemtum esse rebus humanis, patrem vero rerum omnium ignarum esse. Quid ad nos? Non agunt poenitentiam. Hi silices et adamantes frangendi et conterendi sunt ac aperiendi oculi eorum, ut videant atrocitatem sceleris sui, idque ubi perfecit Joseph statim verbis et gestibus humaniorem se praebebat eosque honorifice tractat. — Haec igitur atrocitas scelerum movit Joseph ad explorandos animos fratrum accuratius, ita ut non solum priorum delictorum sed et cogitationum pravaram memoriam renovaret, ac fuit sane inquisitio satis ingrata et acerba et tamen ab animo placidissimo profecta. Ego durius eos tractassem. Sed haec acerbitas, quam prae se fert, non pertinet ad vindicandum injuriam sed ad salutarem eorum poenitentiam, ut humilientur.* *Luther.*

^{ft73} Such a scene as this, with the emigrants taking their goods laden upon asses, and even two children in panniers upon an ass’s back, may be seen depicted upon a tomb at *Beni Hassan*, which might represent the immigration of Israel, although it cannot be directly connected with it. (See the particulars in *Hengstenberg*, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*.)

^{ft74} Instead of the number 70 given here, *Exo. 1: 5*, and *Deu. 10:22*, *Stephen* speaks of 75 (*Act. 7:14*), according to the *LXX*, which has the number 75 both here and *Exo. 1: 5*, on account of the words which follow the names

of Manasseh and Ephraim in v. 20: ἐγένοντο δὲ οἰοὶ Μανασσῆ οὐς ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ ἡ παλλακῆ ἡ Σύρα τοῦ Μαχίρ Μαχίρ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Γαλααδ υἱοὶ δὲ Εφραὶμ ἀδελφοῦ Μανασσῆ Σουταλαὰμ καὶ ἀάμ. υἱοὶ δὲ Σουταλααίμ Εδώμ: and which are interpolated by conjecture from Gen. 1:23, and Num. 26:29, 35, and 36 (33, 39, and 40), these three grandsons and two great-grandsons of Joseph being reckoned in.

^{ft75} This was the manner in which the earlier theologians solved the actual difficulties connected with our list; and this solution has been adopted and defended against the objections offered to it by *Hengstenberg* (Dissertations) and *Kurtz* (History of the Old Covenant).

^{ft76} There is no force in *Kurtz's* objection, that this gift did not apply to Joseph as the father of Ephraim and Manasseh, but to Joseph personally; for it rests upon the erroneous assumption, that Jacob separated Joseph from his sons by their adoption. But there is not a word to that effect in v. 6, and the very opposite in v. 15, viz., that Jacob blessed Joseph *in* Ephraim and Manasseh. *Heim's* conjecture, which *Kurtz* approves, that by the land given to Joseph we are to understand the high land of Gilead, which Jacob had conquered from the Amorites, needs no refutation, for it is purely imaginary.

^{ft77} *Jam de situ regionis loquitur, quae sorte filiis Judae obtigit. Significat autem tantam illic fore vitium copiam, ut passim obviae prostent non secus atque alibi vepres vel infrugifera arbusta. Nam quum ad sepes ligari soleant asini, vites ad hunc contemptibilem usum aeputat. Eodem pertinet quae sequuntur hyperbolicae loquendi formae, quod Judas lavabit vestem suam in vino, et oculis erit rubicundus. Tantam enim vini abundantiam fore intelligit, ut promiscue ad lotiones, perinde ut aqua effundi queat sine magno dispendio; assiduo autem largioreque illius potu rubedinem contracturi sint oculi.* CALVIN.

^{ft78} This is the reading according to the text of the Jerusalem Targum, in the London Polyglot as corrected from the extracts of *Fagius* in the *Critt. Sacr.*, to which the Targum Jonathan also adds, “for Thy redemption, O Jehovah, is an everlasting redemption.” But whilst the Targumists and several fathers connect the serpent in the way with Samson, by many others the serpent in the way is supposed to be Antichrist. On this interpretation *Luther* remarks: *Puto Diabolum hujus fabulae auctorem fuisse et finxisse hanc glossam, ut nostras cogitationes a vero et praesente Antichristo abduceret.*

^{ft79} “Thus is the whole composed in pictorial words. Whatever of man and cattle can be fruitful shall multiply and have enough. Childbearing, and the increase of cattle, and of the corn in the field, are not our affair, but the mercy and blessing of God.” — *Luther*.

^{ft80} Consequently the statement of *Jerome* in the *Onam. s. v. Area Atad* — “locus trans Jordanem, in quo planxerunt quondam Jacob, tertio ab Jerico lapide, duobus millibus ab Jordane, qui nunc vocatur Bethagla, quod interpretatur locus gyri, eo quod ibi more plangentium circumierint in funere Jacob” — is wrong. *Beth Agla* cannot be the same as *Goren Atad*, if only because of the distances given by *Jerome* from Jericho and the Jordan. They do not harmonize at all with his *trans Jordanem*, which is probably taken from this passage, but point to a place on this side of the Jordan; but still more, because *Beth Hagla* was on the frontier of Benjamin towards Judah (Jos. 15: 6; 18:19), and its name has been retained in the fountain and tower of *Hajla*, an hour and a quarter to the S.E. of *Riha* (Jericho), and three-quarters of an hour from the Jordan, by which the site of the ancient *Beth Hagla* is certainly determined. (Vid., *Robinson*, Pal., ii. p. 268 ff.)]