

follow the day of deliverance, when His cause will prevail, and the faithful remnant will do His will. The death-agony of the Hebrew State is yet the birth-pang of the Kingdom of God. All this means a higher conception of God, of course, but here, as everywhere in the Old Testament, it is through the knowledge of Yahweh's purpose that the prophet wins his assurance of the character of the God of Israel.

E. L. ALLEN.

*Westminster College, Cambridge.*

### The Ages of the Patriarchs.

It will probably be admitted by now that, whether the ways of P are dark and vain or not, they are at any rate peculiar. Nor would it be worth while to track him any further in his arithmetical work but for the fact that he occupies so very important a position in post-Deuteronomic Jewish history. The man whose work permeates Judaism from Ezra to Shammai is deserving of a little detective toil; and it is in his numbers that we see him most clearly. He, more than most men, *monstratur digito*.

Let us then take his second list of names and figures, the one contained in the eleventh chapter of Genesis. That he meant, in this list, to mark a decline in human longevity is obvious; and that there is a certain connexion between the two series is equally clear. For example, the total years of Shem, 600, correspond to the 600 lived by Noah before the Flood, and betoken a lowered maximum as compared with the thousand of Adamite man. Again, there is a likeness between Terah and Noah. Each of these had three sons, certainly not of the same age. A round number, 500 in the one case, 70 in the other, is therefore taken as a rough approximation to the age of the father at the time of the birth of the sons.

Regarding then this interdependence as fairly established, we notice at once that the second and third in the Postdiluvian genealogy are treated exactly like the second and third in the Antediluvian. We saw, it will be remembered, that for Seth and Enos P multiplied 65 by 3, and gave 7 parts of the resulting 195 to Seth, and 6 to Enos. To Arpachshad and Shelah (the ages being smaller) he assigns the simple 65, again giving the father 7 parts, and the son 6.

Now in three generations after Shem the

maximum life declines to 500, half the Antediluvian. Therefore, for Arpachshad's latter years, P divides Seth's 807, as well as he can, by 2, obtaining 403: and then, noticing that 403 equals  $13 \times 31$ , he is so charmed with the result that he repeats it for Shelah. As for Arpachshad's total, 438, he probably observed with pleasure that it falls short of 500 by twice 31, or 62.<sup>1</sup>

In the case of Eber, his proceeding is obscure; but it seems to me not impossible that he made his first column 34 in order that the sum of the first three 'initials' of the second batch of patriarchs might be 99, and so fall short by one of Shem's initial. He then restored this 99 to Eber's total by adding it to the year-number 365. But we must remember that 34 is twice 17; and 17 is a favourite factor of P's. It divides the 595 of Lamech, and the 119 of Nahor: we shall, in fact, meet it pretty often.

When we reach the third batch, P's method becomes curious to the last degree. The word Peleg might well suggest *division*; for he does indeed divide. Taking his ruling number 30, he sees that it equals 11 and 19. He then multiplies 11 by 19, and gets 209. The total is thus 239. For Reu, he starts with this 239, and splits it into 23 and 9. Adding these, he arrives at 32 for the first column; multiplying them, he produces 207 for the second; and when he finds that 32 and 207 make 239 once again, his delight may be conceived. Can he do it again? He tries 30 once more, the *corpus vile* being now Serug: 30 is 20 and 10. Multiply 20 by 10; answer 200; total 230. Since the maximum age for the third batch seems fixed at half 500, or 250, all these totals are just what he requires.

The figures for Nahor, the last but one in the list, are somewhat uncertain; the variations in the LXX and the Samaritan being here quite unsystematic. It cannot fail to be noticed, also, that the name appears twice, and that if we omit it here we get 7 generations from Shem to Serug, as from Adam to Lamech in the list of J. But, taking the Massoretic text as it stands, we may observe that he seems to mark a further diminution of the maximum to 200: in any case his years are few, like those of Lamech, the last but one on the Antediluvian list. Now 200 is a fifth of 1000: divide Lamech's 595 by 5, and we have 119, Nahor's second figure; while his total 148 is

<sup>1</sup> The sum of the three *totals* of Batch II is 1331—cp. the  $13 \times 31$  above; and cp. Peleg below.

$37 \times 4$ , as Lamech's 777 is  $37 \times 21$ . Simple subtraction gives the first column.<sup>1</sup>

With Terah all that P had to do was to add to the 70 the magic symbol 65, and 135 is the result.

It may be interesting to glance for a moment at a few of P's other figures. Let us pass on one side the portentous calculations of Nu 2 and 3:<sup>2</sup> there is much besides. The 100 of Abraham before the birth of Isaac was doubtless traditional; but it is worth remark that Abraham was 75 when he received the Promise, and lived 75 years after its fulfilment; that Isaac's life divides itself into three 60's, and that of Moses into three 40's; while Jacob not only lived twice 65 years before going down to Egypt, but saw just as much of Joseph after the reunion as before, for Joseph was 17 when sold for a slave, and Jacob lived 17 years after arriving in Goshen: that Sarah lived 127 years, and so did Amram the father of Moses: that Joseph and his descendant Joshua both lived 110 years: that Jacob's total years are 147, *i.e.*  $7 \times 7 \times 3$ —there being other 7's in his life—and that Ishmael's number is 137, that is, 100 plus the 37 which has so often appeared among our factors. Repetition, indeed, and a certain perverted symmetry mark P's arithmetical work wherever we can trace it.

The question arises as to the influences which led him into these strange vagaries. The answer can scarcely be doubtful. He must, we may say with almost absolute certainty, have been the pupil of Babylonian astrologers and professors. If so, our little study adds a confirmation, if any was

	Initial.	Final.	Total.	Maximum.
Shem . . . .	100	500	600	600
Arpachshad . . . .	35	403	438	
Shelah . . . .	30	403	433	500
Eber . . . .	34	430	464	
Peleg . . . .	30	209	239	250
Reu . . . .	32	207	239	
Serug . . . .	30	200	230	
Nahor . . . .	29	119	148	200?
Terah . . . .	70	135	205	

<sup>1</sup> But also Nahor's 29 + Terah's 70 = 99.

<sup>2</sup> The well-known discrepancy in the counting of the Levites makes calculation difficult.

needed, to the opinion of critics that his work dates from the Exile, and is tinged throughout with colours derived from Chaldea.

The Massorettes do not give the 'Total' column; but that P had it in mind is, I think, certain. The scribes probably omitted it as useless.

For Nahor, the LXX give 79, or 179 in first column and 125 in the second.

It is perhaps worth noticing that the sum of the years from Arpachshad to Terah, plus the 75 of Abraham down to the Promise, amount to the year-number 365.

The statement that 'Shem begat Arpachshad two years after the Flood,' which has given much trouble to the commentators, is probably to be explained by universal continence during the Flood year.

E. E. KELLETT.

*Leys School, Cambridge.*

### Was Lazarus 'the beloved disciple'?

MR. GRIFFITH and several other writers have recently favoured the view, which was considered by the late Dr. Swete only to be rejected by him, that Lazarus was the author of the Fourth Gospel.

Some formidable objections, however, can be brought against this theory.

In Jn 12<sup>10, 11</sup> we are told that the chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death, because by reason of him many believed on Jesus. This being the case, how comes it that Lazarus, if he be identical with 'that other disciple known unto the high priest,' can move about so freely in the court and palace during the Lord's trial, without being molested—whereas Peter is subjected to awkward questions concerning his associations with Jesus of Nazareth?

Secondly, according to St. Mark, the Lord takes three of the disciples apart from the others to witness His agony in the garden of Gethsemane. But Lazarus's name does not occur amongst them. The three are Peter, James, and John (14<sup>83</sup>).

If, according to the view of Mr. Griffith, Lazarus was with Christ 'to the end, with Him at the trial, with Him at the Cross, and was early at the tomb,' is it likely that he should not also have been included in that inner circle, chosen to witness that which in a very sacred sense was 'the secret of the Lord' revealed beneath the olive trees? Mr. Griffith specially states that Lazarus was 'in the secrets of