THE BIBLICAL WORLD

CONTINUING

The Old and New Testament Student

VOLUME III. APRIL, 1894 NUMBER 4

No CHRISTIAN student of the Old Testament can fail to be interested in the question of Christ's attitude toward it. If he is really a Christian in the sense of acknowledging the supreme authority of Jesus Christ, and if he is really a student of the Old Testament, not simply an occasional reader of it, he must of necessity be deeply interested to know what Jesus thought about the Old Testament.

THERE is abundant reason to believe that Jesus was very familiar with the Old Testament. Its narratives and its laws, its psalms and its prophecies, are all referred to by him in a way that suggests an easy familiarity with every part of the book. It is even more certain that Jesus had a profound insight into the Old Testament. His interpretations of the Old Testament passages are equally removed on the one hand from that mere superficial literalness which can see no meaning in a sentence which is not involved in a mere definition of its words; and, on the other, from that false profundity which finds in words a thought never intended by the person who uttered them. It is not too much to say that he is the ideal interpreter; with keen and true insight he finds his way to the very heart of a passage, and brings forth what indeed other men have not seen, but which, when he states it, they see to be really involved in the words of the Old Testament, or in the fact to which the words refer.

Another not less marked characteristic of Jesus' use of the

Old Testament is the fact that he constantly looks at it from the religious point of view, and employs it for religious purposes. Not that he turns history into allegory, and ritual into type to force from them an unwilling sermon. This is as far as possible from his method. Narrative is to him narrative; ritual is ritual; psalm is psalm, but *all* is prophecy, all is scripture given for the religious instruction of men, and valuable for this religious teaching. His conception of the Old Testament is evidently identical with that expressed by the apostle Paul in the assertion that "Every Scripture given by inspiration of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness."

The Old Testament Scripture thus conceived of, Jesus accepted as true and as of divine authority. Not only does he constantly argue with the Jews on this basis, but in a passage in which it is evident that "the law and the prophets" is a comprehensive phrase for the moral teachings of the Old Testament, he declares that he came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil; and adds that one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be accomplished.

But the term interpreter is not large enough to describe in full the attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament. He is its critic also; not indeed in the hostile sense of that term, but in its judicial sense.

He could speak burning words of adverse criticism when the occasion demanded, as his attitude toward Pharisaism abundantly shows. But for the Old Testament he has no such words. Even the Sermon on the Mount, portions of which have sometimes been interpreted as a criticism of the Old Testament law, is primarily directed against the Pharisaic misinterpretation of the law rather than against the law itself. And yet, when we study this discourse attentively, we see that in his criticism of Pharisaism Jesus cuts deeper than Pharisaism itself. And when we come to examine other passages, such as those in which he speaks of fasting, of clean and unclean meats, and of divorce, we see even more clearly that Jesus distinctly and definitely intended to

supersede by his teachings some of the teachings and ordinances of the Old Testament. While emphatically reaffirming the great fundamental principles of the Old Testament ethics and religion, he yet recognizes that certain elements of the Old Testament system imperfectly illustrate these principles, and expresses his disapproval of them. Such discrimination of one part of the Old Testament system of religion from another involves criticism of the Old Testament on his part. It does not indeed involve the denial of its divine origin, or of its authority for those to whom it first came. The imperfect element which he rejects and eliminates may easily be, as in one instance he declared that it was, the result of a necessary adaptation to the low standard of character or intelligence prevalent among those to whom the law was given. None the less, such discrimination and elimination show that Jesus occupied the position of a critic toward the Old Testament. He did not put himself in opposition to it, in the proper sense of the term, but he did put himself above it. His position was not that of one who went to the Old Testament as to a law book, by whose mandates he was bound, or as to a supreme revelation which was to him a final court of appeal. It was rather that of one who, by his own insight, could penetrate to the heart of truth, or had within himself a fountain of truth, and who, by virtue of that fact, sat in judgment upon all revelations of truth and systems of teaching, measuring them by himself, not himself by them. Thus testing Pharisaism he declared it hollow and false at the heart of it, a human invention that obscured the truth given by God. Thus testing the Old Testament he recognized it as given by God through the hands of men, declared its great fundamental principles to be eternally true, enunciated those principles more clearly, and claimed for them a more consistent and thorough-going application than had been given even in the Old Testament itself. The outcome of his criticism of the Old Testament is, on the one side, the annulling, explicitly or impliedly, of some of its minor provisions, not as positively and for all time wrong, but as temporary and imperfect; and, on the other hand, the emphatic reaffirmation of its essential and central teachings.

THUS far we have been speaking of the attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament viewed as a book of morals and religion. What shall be said of his attitude toward the narratives of the Old Testament looked at from the point of view of history, and toward the traditional theories accepted by the Jews of his day concerning the authorship of Old Testament books? If what we have said above is true, it must be evident that he held no view concerning the authority of the narratives as narratives, which would have deterred him from calling in question their historical character if he had seen sufficient reason for doing so. It must be equally evident that he would have had no hesitation in disputing the traditions respecting the authorship of the Old Testament books, if there had been any sufficient reason for doing so. It must certainly be granted also that we have no evidence that he ever did explicitly call in question either the historical character of the narratives, or the correctness of the traditions respecting the authorship of the books. On the contrary, he constantly adopts the language of current opinion on these matters.

The question therefore reduces itself to an inquiry into the reasons for his conduct in this respect. Some have taken it as evidence that, while sharply disagreeing with the Pharisees in their conception of religion, he yet held with them the current views on the historical character and authorship of the Old Testament, and included these views in his teaching as an essential part of it. To others it has seemed that it is rather to be explained as in effect silence on his part, an employment of the language of current opinion simply as current, without thereby expressing any judgment concerning the correctness of it; an accommodation of his language to that of the times because his mission did not require him, indeed scarcely permitted him, either to approve or to correct current opinion on these questions.

There are certainly strong arguments for this latter view. In the first place there is the obvious fact already mentioned, that Jesus' whole interest in the Old Testament, as in everything else, is in its religious significance. The lily of the field he treats not as a botanist but as a teacher of religion; the birds of the

heaven, not as an ornithologist, but as a preacher ; the books of the Old Testament, not as a literary critic, but as a seer gifted with divine insight into truth. The analogy of his method in dealing with the world of external nature leads us to believe that he would not encumber his teaching with the consideration of scientific questions having but remote relation to his own mission.

But a more direct and positive argument for this view is found in the fact that Christ's references to these matters of literary criticism are only incidental, never constituting the chief subject of his discourse. To such an extent is this true that almost without exception the value of the reference to the Old Testament remains, for the purposes of religious teaching, the same, whether the then current view respecting Old Testament history, to which the language is conformed, be correct or not. This is in marked contrast with his reference to the ethical and religious teachings of the Old Testament. We know what Jesus believed about the religion of the Old Testament, for he spoke with emphasis and with discrimination. Its great fundamental principles he emphatically reaffirmed ; its minor defects he criticized ; its whole ritual system he tacitly ignored and germinally abolished. But it is impossible to point to any such discriminating and clear treatment on his part of the literary and historical questions pertaining to the Old Testament. There is a marked difference in his attitude toward the two matters. On the one he is outspoken and explicit. The other he ignores. He neither affirms nor denies. He uses the language of current opinions when he speaks at all, but not in such way as to suggest that he meant to affirm the correctness of these opinions. His treatment suggests rather that these were to him merely matters of conventional forms of expression, on which he laid no stress one way or the other.

If it be urged that Christ's recognition of the Old Testament as of divine origin excludes the possibility of his questioning the strictly historical character of its narratives, or the correctness of the traditional views respecting their authorship, it must be answered that this reasoning is itself excluded by his recognition of imperfection in the Old Testament, even from the point of view of religion and morals, and his emphatic repudiation of traditional

views on these latter matters. If it be said that the adoption of current language without accepting current opinions involves dishonesty, it is to be answered that this is not the common conviction of men. Scholars who doubt or deny the Homeric authorship of the Iliad, nevertheless speak of Homer's Iliad without suspicion of dishonesty. Not one man in one hundred really knows whether Shakspeare wrote Hamlet, or whether Milton wrote Paradise Lost. Yet to preface every quotation made for illustrative purposes with an expression of doubt on the question of authorship would be insufferable pedantry. There is no tinge of pedantry about Jesus Christ. His employment of the language of current opinion cannot fairly be regarded as a definite expression of judgment on questions of literary criticism never even raised in his day. Certainly it would be difficult to prove that Jesus did not accept the traditional views on questions of the literary and historical criticism of the Old Testament. Scarcely less certain is it that the New Testament affords no sufficient evidence that he did accept the traditional views. The true statement seems to be rather that he never, in the proper sense of the words, expressed any opinion on these purely literary and historical questions.

THE bearing of all this on the question of what kind of historical and literary criticism is possible to one who acknowledges the authority of Jesus Christ is obvious. Reverently it must be said that he who accepts Jesus Christ as his authority and his guide may rightly feel himself not only permitted but impelled to enter with fearlessness on the search for truth, untrammeled by tradition, but guided, in all matters on which Jesus has spoken, by his more than human insight.

On the basis of this fundamental principle it must be recognized that a criticism which denies the truth or divine authority of the great fundamental teachings of the Old Testament, or ignores its religious value, comes into conflict with Jesus; but that a criticism which recognizes these things finds no bar in his teachings to the fullest and frankest investigation of all questions of the authorship and historical character of the Old Testament books, untrammelled by any presumption as to the agreement of its results with the views currently held in Jesus' day or in our own.

THE FAITH OF JESUS.

By The Rev. Thomas C. Hall,
Chicago.

Faith as a subjective persuasion and an objective norm.—The faith that Jesus asked: his use of words; faith in the Fourth Gospel.—The real faith of Jesus is a new life.

Careless use of the expressions "the faith of Jesus Christ" and the "Christian faith" has led to an almost insuperable difficulty existing in the minds of many in distinguishing between the subjective faith and the various attempts to give it an objective expression in language. The law of gravitation is one thing, acting, so far as we know, all through space; and our formulation of that law, which may yet have to be modified by increasing refinement in physical measurements and knowledge, is quite another thing. Not even the exhaustive treatment by Cremer of the words πιστεύειν, πίστις and πιστός brings adequately to light the deep underlying difference between the objective and subjective use of the word πίστις. Very properly Cremer does emphasize the element of personal trust that always enters into the New Testament word. "It is a persuasion which is based upon trust and knowledge" (Cremer's Lexicon). It has, moreover, says the same writer, as a most fundamental characteristic, "a personal relationship." It is evident indeed that such a personal relationship as is based on trust in Jesus either as friend or healer or teacher must more or less consciously modify the whole life of the one trusting. As he becomes analytical and reflective he will seek to formulate the changes brought about by this new relationship. The subjective πίστις will become, by meditation, the object of his discoursive reason. And as the analytic mind seeks to thus formulate faith, it may become purely objective to the thinking mind. According to our confidence in the ability of the discoursive reason thus to formulate faith, will this formulation be identified with our actual πίστις.

We cannot wonder, then, that in the history of faith we find all stages of this process marked by the same set of terms, and deep confusion arising from confounding attitudes *implied* in faith with the extreme objective attempts to express it in a *Regula Fidei*. The rise of the rule of faith is an interesting history, baleful in its course, a history that had reached its most degrading state as early as the bigoted and thoroughly unchristian type of thought represented by Tertullian.

The faith that Jesus demanded in others was a personal confidence that must sooner or later develop an identity between the content of the faith of teacher and taught; hence personal relationship is the basis, and the acceptance of a body of teaching (διδαχή), however a logical outcome, is still but an outcome. With neither question, that of the relationship implied by Jesus as necessary to individual and world salvation, nor the content of the body of teaching that springs from that relationship, has the so-called systematic theology of the Church ever much busied itself.

To answer the first of these questions let the student turn to the way Jesus himself used the words πίστις and πιστεύειν. At once we see that "to believe" is to accept the person of Jesus. One large class of passages represents Christ as challenging acceptance of him as a healer (Matt. 18 : 13; Mark 5 : 36; 9 : 24, and all the passages where faith precedes a cure). It is perfectly evident from many of these passages that the knowledge possessed about Jesus was the very slightest. The man born blind and cured by Christ wants to know who he is that he may accept him (John 9 : 36). The whole story is instructive as an example of faith in Christ as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, and so the logical outcome of dependence upon Jesus as a healer and friend. Even where Jesus is believed in as the Messias the evidence is not lacking that only the crudest ideas of what the Messias was prevailed among many. Philip and Nathanael discover the Messias very early in Jesus (John 1 : 45–50). But it was only towards the close that Jesus said, "have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" (John 14 : 9). "The little ones believe on him" and not about him (Mark 9 : 42). It

was not a theory about him, nor yet a distinctly defined doctrine of his person, for this was hidden even from his adult disciples. Peter's simple creed would not have satisfied the Nicene Council (John 6 : 6 ; Matt. 16 : 16). We cannot blame intelligent men for trying to bring that simple creed into living connection with a philosophy of God and human life, but it has been a grave mistake to suppose that this human synthesis is either "the faith" of which the New Testament speaks as necessary to salvation, or is to be identified with the πίστις of Jesus. Faith is as a grain of mustard seed with inherent life, and is not identical with any intellectual propositions which may be more or less the outcome of that faith. No doubt close questioning would have elicited from such faithful ones as the man cured of the palsy (Matt. 9 : 2) more or less coherent explanations of their opinions about Christ, and why they accepted him as healer. But it was not their imperfect opinions that Christ praises, but their attitude of life toward him. This attitude results first in conduct and then, no doubt, later in more or less imperfect theories about him. It was not correct opinion about Christ's deity and sonship that Christ missed when he asked his followers amid the storm "Where is your faith?" (Luke 8 : 2). It was the lack of personal confidence in him, their "fearfulness" (Mark 4 : 40) which he gently reproves. And in Luke 18 : 8 when Christ asks the question, "Shall he find faith (on earth)?" (πίστιν or τὴν πίστιν, Tischendorf 8th edition gives the article which W. and H. omit), the context clearly indicates that reception of him at his second coming as the king is the matter in doubt.

It is worthy of note that the fourth Gospel never uses the word πίστις, but the verb is used in such a way as to leave no manner of doubt as to just what Christ understood by "believing on him." The first definition of his person and office that Christ recognizes as "believing," is on the part of Nathanael, who calls him "King of Israel" and "Son of God" (John 1 : 50). Naturally Nathanael knew nothing of an immaculate birth or a resurrection from the dead ; nor can the phrase "Son of God" be any clear metaphysical description of Christ's person, seeing that even the chosen apostles failed to comprehend his unique

personality until after Pentecost. Many believed "on his name, seeing the signs which he did. That is to say, his name "Ἰησους" or Jesus and his claimed title as "the anointed" suggested one in the long line of succession among those who should redeem Israel. The conceptions of redemption were crude in the extreme. No doubt a leader in a struggle for national independence was often the highest hope cherished. But even this crude reception Christ accepts as the basis of a better hope, but he did not trust himself to such believers (John 2 : 24). Faith in him was no break from the spiritual succession of the Old Testament, and involved no knowledge not to be found there. It is a monstrous abuse of exegesis, however, to claim that any of the metaphysical refinements of Nicene orthodoxy have a place in the Old Testament. Nicodemus ought to have understood the new divine birth (John 3 : 10), and had he understood it he would have possessed a saving faith, and then, as there was opportunity offered, he would have received and understood divine messages (John 3 : 11), but the perfect knowledge of Christ grows out of the implanted faith (3 : 5) and not saving faith out of knowledge; it is for believing hearts that the Son of Man is lifted up (John 3 : 14–15).

For the most part, in John's use of πιστεύειν the thing involved is the acceptance of the "word of Jesus" on the basis, of course, of confidence in him as a man and teacher, so John 4 : 50. The man whose child was saved can have had only the most confused ideas of Christ's divinity, or even teaching, but personal confidence in Christ, even in crudest form, as healer and teacher is reckoned as "faith" by Christ, as we see from Matthew 8 : 9. So we find the Samaritans "believing" on the basis of the imperfect knowledge and testimony of a poor, ignorant woman. In some way, in some sense, Jesus was to be the "Saviour of the world" (John 4 : 42). Faith has to revolutionize old habits, old superstitions, and overcome old prejudices; hence believing apostles with a believing faith, and far more intelligent conceptions and intellectual apprehensions of Christ, still failed for years to reach what the Samaritans grasped at once, that Christ was a world-Saviour. Happily, eternal life depends not on cor-

rect intellectual apprehension of Christ, or possibly the martyr James might fail before the judgment-seat, but on the whole attitude of heart and life toward Christ (John 5 : 24 and 5 : 46). And it is this attitude toward him that evidences the attitude toward God (John 6 : 28–40). In him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and he just so far became a test of the heart's attitude toward God. For judgment was Christ come into the world (John 9 : 39). The Pharisees knew enough, Christ had no quarrel with their orthodoxy, but it was dead. Their ears heard no prophetic voices, their eyes beheld no visions (Mark 4 : 12). Faith is a new life, its fruitage in conduct, opinion and social habit is often crude and in this life always tentative. It was this faith that Christ found not, but came to bring to a world weary of Pharisaic legalism and finespun philosophy. He came not to reveal the metaphysical subtleties of Nicene orthodoxy in respect to his divinity, but to impart that divinity to all to whom his spirit spoke, awakening longings the world could not satisfy. This divine life is found where Christ is intellectually unknown or wholly misunderstood, and this life is ἡ πίστις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

JESUS CHRIST AND GAUTAMA BUDDHA AS LITERARY CRITICS.

By The Rev. Frederick F. Kramer, M.A.,
Colorado Divinity School.

The decay of Brahmanism.—The revolt of Buddha.—His rejection of the entire sacred literature.—His wrong motives.—Spread of Buddhism.—Its character.—Deification of Buddha.—The Old Testament canon.—Work of the scribes corresponds to later Brahmanism.—Jesus Christ rejected not all the Hebrew writings but the later additions.—Comparison with Buddha and Buddhism from this point of view.

The history of religious development in India has been divided into four periods: The first period is that of the primitive Vedic religion, called by Max Müller the poetic period (cir. 1800–1400 B.C.) The second was the Indra period (cir. 1400–1000 B.C.). During this period we note the beginning of a classified priesthood and fixed ritual. The third is the period of Brahmanism (1000–600 B.C.), brought about by the culmination of a priest caste and a change in the theocratic system. Finally we have the fourth period (600–200 B.C.), called by Müller the Sutra period, during which the art of writing began to be practiced. It will only be necessary for our purpose to consider the fourth period in detail.

About 600 B.C., Brahmanism became a speculative philosophy. The Brahmins arrogated to themselves the priesthood and sought to shut out the people from the esoteric wisdom, by which the old worship had been superseded. This caused a reaction against the priest caste. The people no longer believed in the gods, and why should there be need of mediators? In the old times everybody knew the Vedas by heart. They were the prayers of the people. Now the art of writing began to be practiced, but the Brahmins interdicted any writing down or reading of the sacred literature, thus anticipating the action of the church in the Middle Ages with respect to the Bible.

Opposition soon appeared to the priestly rights of the Brah-

mins. A restoration of the old forms of worship was demanded, but with no result. About the year 550 B.C., Gautama or Sakhya Muni, as he was also called, was born. He was of high rank, of royal blood. He was, moreover, an independent thinker and possessed a bold and indomitable nature. Becoming convinced of the falsity of the Brahman teaching, he struck at the root of the entire system. The foundation of Brahmanism was its sacred literature: the Vedas, Brâhmanas and Upanishads. Gautama declared these to be forgeries. He asserted that man could, without priestly mediation, and without belief in the sacred books, gain perfection. Gautama, by his total and unqualified rejection of the sacred literature of Brahmanism, placed himself on record as the worst radical literary critic of ancient times. But his action, as well as his motive, was entirely wrong. For, in the first place, we must remember that, although philosophic speculation had obscured the purpose and meaning of the sacred books, these books, nevertheless, contained elements of truth. The sacred literature of every primitive religion bears some approximation to Revelation. The innate feeling of dependence upon some higher power, because it is found in all races, places upon the religious systems of these races something like a divine seal. The maxim, *vox populi, vox dei*, often misapplied, holds in this question of the oldest Indian religion. A people that has worshiped in the words of the old Vedic hymns, bears testimony to certain elements of truth contained in these hymns.

In the second place, we must note the false motive of Gautama. Popular sentiment was against the despotic and arbitrary priestcraft of the Brahmans. It was a curse to the people. Brahmanism was a huge dragon, that crushed with his mighty body, and blighted with his poisonous breath, everything and everybody. The man who kills this monster will be the liberator and benefactor of his race. Now, although we cannot deny the sincerity of Gautama's convictions, we must, nevertheless, feel that he allowed himself to be carried away by a desire for popular praise. The fact that he utterly rejected all the preëxisting beliefs shows this.

The literary criticism of Gautama was accepted by the people, and the doctrines, which superseded the now discredited Brahmanism, were adopted by multitudes. Gautama attained unto the perfection which was the aim of his doctrine. He became the Buddha, "the Enlightened." Buddhism, as the new faith was called, spread with astonishing rapidity over India, Ceylon, Burma, Thibet, China and Japan. Century after century rolled on. Brahmanism continued to wane and Buddhism to rise until today, when we may estimate that of all the inhabitants of the earth thirty per cent. are Buddhists, and twelve per cent. Brahmanists.

The question which now arises is, this: Is Buddhism an improvement upon Brahmanism?

Brahmanism was the result of a degeneration from monotheism to polytheism. Brahmanism, though corrupt and the vehicle of oppression, nevertheless retained some features of true worship. The people still believed in gods, and were, consequently, restrained in a measure from wrong doing, through fear; and stimulated to good actions by a desire to please the deities. The results were still beneficial.

How is it with Buddhism? We quote from Max Müller: "He (Buddha) denies the existence, not only of a creator, but of any absolute being. According to Buddhist tenets, there is no reality anywhere, neither in the past nor in the future. True wisdom consists in perceiving the nothingness of all things, and in a desire to become nothing, to be blown out, to enter Nirvâna." Here we find nothing either to restrain or encourage. The social and moral code of Buddhism is almost perfect, but adhesion to it is not prompted by a desire to better mankind, but only to benefit self.

Although Gautama shattered the old pantheon he laid the foundation of one still greater by his act. He unwittingly prepared the way for his own enthronement as a deity. Even after his death (477 B.C.) the two elements accompanying so many developments of religion, legend and anthropomorphism began to operate. The earthly life of the Buddha began to be obscured by legends. There is a large number of these legends, and they

purport to trace the history of the earthly life of the Buddha from the time of his birth into the world to his death. Kern, in his "*Buddisme in Indië*," says of them: "If we consider that these legends possess an historical constituency, we must, at the same time, acknowledge that almost all moments, from the wonderful birth (of Buddha) are nothing but mere fiction, a concatenation of flagrant untruths."

The anthropomorphic feature of Buddhism is manifested in the conception of the person of the Buddha. Although Gautama appeared during a period of time in which men were of ordinary stature, he is said to have been from twelve to eighteen feet in height. Again, he is represented as being able to reach heaven in three strides. He is larger than a certain evil spirit whose length was four thousand eight hundred miles. It is because of these conceptions that the followers of Buddha, in erecting his statues, tried to make them as gigantic as possible. This is illustrated by the image of Buddha erected at Kamakura, Japan, in 1250, which is still in an excellent state of preservation. This image is of bronze, nearly fifty feet in height.

It is easily seen from the legends and the conceptions of the person of Buddha, that he is believed to be a god. On no other ground can these superhuman qualities be ascribed to him. To the minds of people outside the pale of divine revelation, God is merely a man endowed with marvelous physical and mental powers.

We may sum up the results of Buddha's literary criticism as follows: (1) Rejection of the old faith, which, though degenerated, still retained some elements of a primitive monotheism. (2) Disbelief in higher powers. (3) Deification of Gautama the Buddha, and the creation of a new pantheon. (4) A grotesque worship, in which personal action is of no value (compare the prayer wheels of Thibet). (5) The crushing of all high ideals by a belief in the sole reality of the present.

Gautama Buddha, the ancient literary critic of whom we have just treated, was an Aryan; the other ancient critic, whose work we wish to compare with that of the founder of Buddhism, was a Semite; his name, Jesus of Nazareth. In studying the his-

tory of Jesus' treatment of the Sacred Scriptures of the Hebrews, we shall find many things strikingly in accord with the history of the Sacred Books of the East. There are, however, differences, and where these appear we will find the truth of the one kind of criticism over the other.

The art of writing was known to the Hebrews centuries before it was practiced in India. "The Lord said unto Moses, Write these for a memorial in a book (Ex. 17:14; cf. also, Ex. 24:4; 34:27; Num. 33:2). It is not surprising, then, to find that the Hebrew Scriptures were known and read before the birth of Buddha, and codified shortly after his death. Like the Sacred Books of the Brahmins, their "revealed" writings, the Hebrew Scriptures, were divided into three parts: *Torah*, Law; *Nebiim*, Prophets; *Ketubim*, Holy Writings. But like the Indian books, these divisions belong to different ages. They form, in fact, three distinct canons, the first canon is that of the Law. This is the foundation of the Hebrew worship, and hence corresponds to the ancient Vedas. The second canon is that of the Prophets, including most of the historical books, together with the prophets (except Daniel). This canon corresponds in time, but not in matter, to the Brâhmanas. The third canon is that of the Holy Writings, and has its counterpart in the Upanishads (hermit meditations). Note the meditative character of the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon, Lamentations and Ecclesiastes, which form the greater part of the Holy Writings.

Although the art of writing was practiced by the Hebrews nearly a thousand years before it came into vogue in India, it nevertheless ceased to be employed in *Hebrew* (rejecting the late authorship of Daniel) about the same time that the Sacred Books of the East began to be preserved in writing. The close of the canon is followed by a period of philosophic speculation in Palestine, founded upon the Scriptures, and corresponding to the Sutra period in India. This is seen in the professional labors of the scribes and rabbis.

As the result of the labors of these scholars, we have the body of Talmudical Literature, embraced under the heads of Mishna, Tosephta, Jerusalem Talmud, Babylonian Talmud, to which we

may also add the Midrashim and Targums. Of these productions there are two classes: Halacha and Haggada. Halacha is the traditional law, and Haggada forms the legends, religious and moral. This Talmudical Literature was at the first transmitted *orally*. The Mishna was written down at about the end of the second century A. D., and the entire mass had received its permanent form in writing by the end of the fifth century A. D.

The influence of the work of the Rabbis upon the Old Testament was immense. Although we find excellent precepts and much fine religious feeling expressed, we also find that these gems are overlaid and hidden by a veneering of puerile, hypercritical and grossly material teachings, the result of the time-serving philoso phy of the Pharisees. But the most pernicious result of all this misspent labor, was the substitution of *tradition* in the place of the Sacred Scriptures.[1]

We see, then, that at the time of Jesus of Nazareth, philosophical speculation had superseded the plain teachings of the Old Testament Books. We note a condition of affairs similar to that which we witnessed in the development of Buddhism. The problem which confronted Gautama confronted Jesus. The solution also lay in a question of literary criticism. Jesus solved it in a manner directly opposite to that employed by the Ayran critic. He accepted the old literature, the Old Testament, and rejected tradition.

But the central figure of the Old Testament prophecies was the Messiah, and since Jesus of Nazareth claimed to be the fulfilment of these prophecies, the skeptic may answer that it was to the interests of Jesus to accept the Scriptures and reject tradition. In reply to this objection, we will only say that Gautama rejected the Sacred Books of India and by founding a philosophy was deified. Jesus of Nazareth took the opposite course. In the face of the teachings of a domineering priesthood, popular opin-

[1] "The words of the scribes are more lovely than the words of the law; the one are important, the other trifling; the words of the scribes are all important." To neglect the precepts of the phylacteries is a violation of the law, but is not counted a sin; but he who makes five divisions (instead of four), and thus adds to the rules of the doctors, is guilty." "The words of the elders are more important than those of the prophets." These sentences from the Talmud put tradition above the law of Moses.

ion and the accepted methods of worship, he boldly accepts the Old Scriptures and declares all current teaching, doctrine and opinions to be false. His course was not only difficult but fraught with peril. But he took this course not because it was more difficult but because it was true. It was because the Incarnate Son of God must declare the will of his Eternal Father. The fact also remains that, although the Messiah was the center around which the old prophetic structure was reared, the hope of a Messiah on the high planes indicated by the Old Testament Books, was dead, killed by Pharisaism and Scribism. Antiochus Epiphanes, "the scourge of God," would have had greater chances of being accepted as the Messiah than the lowly carpenter's son, because he had royal dignity and the force of arms behind him.

As in the case of Buddha, legends began to group themselves around the earthly life of Christ. These are contained in the so-called Apocryphal Gospels. These, however, were nullified by the authentic histories—the Four Gospels. Anthropomorphism did not appear, because the old literature retained the idea of One Supreme Spiritual Ruler.

It has been estimated that over thirty-two per cent of mankind are Christians. This number is steadily increasing. This vast multitude also attests the truth of Christ's criticism of the Old Testament, not, however, as man, but as God. A few comparisons between Christ and Buddha may be here made, in conclusion, to emphasize this belief. Buddha founded a system which was a speculative philosophy with religious embellishments. Christ founded a church with a positive belief in a Triune God, Omnipotent and Omniscient, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. Buddhism as a religion is attractive because it presents but two alternatives to the believer, either that he will become a Buddha or else enter Nirvâna. Christianity, on the other hand, embraces a system of rewards and punishments. Buddhism has never spread beyond those countries into which it was introduced by its first missionaries. Buddhism has touched all the nations that it will ever effect. It is a religion for the oriental. Here and there we will find an occidental who, attracted by the esoteric doctrines, in themselves vague and unsub-

stantiated, claims adherence to the "wise" Sakhya. Christianity has encircled the globe. Buddhism is a local religion, whereas Christianity is a universal faith. Buddha did not claim divinity for himself and was deified. This fact deals the death blow to Buddhism as a religion. It is one of the most potent truths of psychology that man knows his own being. He knows that he is mortal. Gautama certainly never taught or implied that he was anything else. We see, then, that the god of Buddhism, although not literally made with hands, is, nevertheless, of human creation. He is, therefore, no god. Christ, on the other hand, was always conscious of his divinity and boldly taught his pre-existence. Buddha as a critic became a false teacher. The sacred books of India which he rejected are also false, because there is but one recorded revelation of God upon which Christ has placed the seal of God.

HOW MUCH DO I STUDY THE BIBLE, AND HOW?

Responses to this Question from Working Pastors.

II.—Rev. J. L. Withrow, D.D.,
The Third Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

III.—Rev. O. P. Gifford,
Immanuel Baptist Church, Chicago.

Study of the Scriptures attests their divine origin: should lead to urging others to accept them as a whole: nothing but unquestioning certainty will avail for this: hence unremitting study: English versions sufficient.—Bible study should permeate all study: especially related to the study of men: is studied critically: is studied sympathetically: with prayer.

I study the Scriptures from two to three hours for one hour that I give to any other book. And the more I dwell upon them the more they attest to my deepest needs their divine origin. So much so, that it seems to me poorly spent time touching them that is not taken to induce others to receive the volume as God's words, with neither ifs nor ands of any other element in it that is worth mentioning. I use the A. V. and the R. V., and the Greek and Hebrew. I read no other Oriental tongue. The Greek Testament is very precious. I do not read the Hebrew with critical scholarship, although I do as an ordinary scholar. To my thought, however, the English versions, aided by exegetical helps from the Hebrew and Greek, furnish any pastor with what he needs for both food and fire. The greatest lack of my preaching and of the preaching I hear is enthusiastic and intelligent presentation of the Scriptures as the oracles of God. I have no knowledge of having ever helped a single hearer out of his head or heart troubles with anything else than a full expression of a full faith in the straight assertions of Holy Scriptures. Hence I study them by books, by topics, by verses, and any other way that lets me deeper into them.

J. L. W.

How much do I study the Bible, and How? A hearer once complimented Dr. Lyman Beecher on the power of a sermon, and asked, "Doctor, how long were you writing it?" "Forty years, Sir," was the quick reply. All his thinking life went into it, as it must into every work which is well done.

How much? My business is with the Bible as the Word of God, and with men as the children of God; as the farmer studies the seed and the soil, and relates the two, so I try to study the Bible and men, and relate the two. I study men in the light of the Word, and the Word to get light for all men, all questions of casuistry, ethics, life, are brought to the Bible for settlement, so that when studying at all I am studying the Bible. Its statements are always present in my mind when reading history, science, literature of any sort; any and all truth I find is classified in its relation to those statements, with the double purpose of getting a better understanding of the Bible, and of giving that better understanding to men.

All my reading thus serves the double purpose of enriching my mind, thus fitting me to help others, and of understanding the Bible, thus helping me to God's thoughts, that they may become man's thoughts, and God's ways, that they may become man's ways.

How? I. Critically; seeking to find just what the writer said, and what he meant when he said it. I assume that the text I have tells what the writer did. Assume it after study of questions of authenticity and genuineness; assume it on my faith in the Christian scholarship of men who have as much at stake as I have, and are far better qualified than I am to settle questions of scholarship. Taking the best text I can get, I bring to it the best lexicon, grammar, commentary I can procure (Meyer, Ellicott, Godet, Westcott, Lightfoot, Smith, Dods, Driver). Men of vision as well as grammar and lexicon. Having found what the author said, I try to find why he said it; and try to reproduce the occasion, the surroundings, the needs to be met, the questions settled, the principles involved. To reproduce the past as Pius Æneas saw it reproduced in Dido's new city. Spend a day with Paul in Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, distinguish between the

eternal principle at stake and the temporary limited application of it to the point in view. This compels study of history, archæology, politics, the contrast between eternal principles and changing conditions, the danger of treating certain statements as exhaustive of truth, when they were meant to be only applications of truth to specific needs. The water of life is always more than the bucket with which it is drawn, and the principle in an epistle or gospel is larger than the local application, but one need to know the local application to understand the principle. Texts are not points of departure, but springs in the heart of oases. The student should camp on the oasis, but study to enlarge it and conquer something of the desert by giving free flow to the truth.

Study the man who wrote, get at his inner life, the civilization of which he is the product, and in which he is a producer; get at his family affairs, early education, religious convictions; get the personal equation in his report of celestial phenomena. The Gospel is according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, that word according may carry much in the way of interpretation, no two men see the same rainbow, "Put yourself in his place," get his point of view. To do that you need to be on intimate terms with him, and this means careful study.

II. Sympathetically. The truth is more than the text, as the soul is more than the body. The tailor may get the surface measurement of a man, but the tape-line makes no friends. Lexicon and grammar, critical study may get the surface of the text, but only sympathy can touch its soul. "Faith comes by hearing," and in these days by reading, but the loan of ears or eyes will not get at the treasure of the text; soul speaks to soul, heart to heart, sympathy is the soul of scholarship.

This last involves, of course, prayer as a preparation; prayer as a condition; prayer as an atmosphere enswathing the soul, that the light, breaking forth from the Word, may be mediated to the soul of the student. It also involves the Holy Spirit. If "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," their truth can become our truth only as we are moved

by the Spirit. Thought runs from mind to mind, love from heart to heart, truth from soul to soul.

When Paul, Peter, John, Jesus speak of life, death, faith, love, find what they meant, why they said it, what the temporal application, what the eternal principle, and what the present application of that principle is and ought to be. O. P. G.

THE FRATRICIDE: THE CAINITE CIVILIZATION. GENESIS IV.

By WILLIAM R. HARPER,
The University of Chicago.

The language and style of the section.—Difficulties in 4:17–24.—The parallel tables.—Important expressions in the biblical narrative.—The outside material.—The character and purpose of the biblical material in comparison with the outside.—The biblical material concerning the Cainite civilization.—Similar material in other literatures.—The writer's preface.

The material for our study is found in Genesis 4 : 1–26 and 5 : 29.[1] These passages describe the fratricide, the judgment of the fratricide, the beginnings of civilization in Cain's line, the sword-song of Lamech, and the expectation through Noah. This material is prophetic in its character and presents characteristics in some respects similar to those of Genesis 2 and 3.

I. We may first consider in a preliminary way some of the more important points which present themselves :

1. The language of this section abounds in words and expressions found only in the writings assigned by the analysis to the prophetic author. The list is, of necessity, omitted.

2. The style of the section permits the introduction of stories and traditions. Here belong the story of Cain and Abel, the connecting of the origin of the various arts with Cain's descendants, the introduction of Lamech's song, and the several digressions from the genealogical list. It is throughout vivid, picturesque, marked by the absence of all sameness, with a large admixture of the conversational element, the insertion of the poetical fragment, and the covering up in a large measure of the genealogical table. The anthropomorphic element is seen in the

[1] Among other references may be stated the following; *Dods*, Genesis; *Kalisch*, Genesis; *Dillmann*, Die Genesis; *Delitzsch* (*Franz*), Genesis; *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, chapters 4 and 5; *Schrader*, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament; *Harper* and *Green*, The Pentateuchal Question, Genesis i-xii; *Hebraica*, Volume V.; *Ewald*. History of Israel, Volume I.; *Budde*, *Die Biblische Urgeschichte*; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, Volume I., chapters 11, 12; *Goldziher*, Mythology among the Hebrews; *Smith*, Bible Dict., articles on Cain, Abel, and other names in the chapter; *Cory*, Ancient Fragments; *Æschylus*, Prometheus Bound, vss. 447–471.

conversation between Cain and Jehovah. The didactic element is seen in the teachings sought to be conveyed by the stories of severe punishment inflicted upon Cain and the account of the development of evil influences.

3. The passage 4 : 17–24 presents some difficulties:[1] (1) In these verses Cain is represented as an agriculturalist, and as building a city; while the representation in 4 : 2–16 makes him an outcast from the society of men and a typical nomad. (2) The popular query as to the wife of Cain is not answered in the chapter, which, with other data, seems to point to the fact that this is a section of some different account in which the attendant circumstances also were different. (3) It is as difficult to find the men required for the building of the city (or village) as to find the woman who should serve as Cain's wife. (4) The writer in this passage seems to be explaining the origin of the civilization of his own times, and one may fairly ask the question whether this narrative presupposes on the part of its author a knowledge of the deluge.

4. One cannot fail to notice certain resemblances between the genealogy of chapter 4 and that of chapter 5. The following table seems to deserve attention:

THE GENEALOGIES IN GENESIS 4 AND 5.

The man	Adam
Abel	
Seth	Seth
Enosh	Enosh
Cain	Kenan
Enoch	Mahalalel
Irad	Jared
Mehujael	Enoch
Methuselah	Methuselah
Lamech	Lamech
Noah	Noah
Jabal, Jubal, Tubal.	Shem, Ham, Japheth.
	Shem, Ham, Japheth.

[1] See Hebraica, Vol. V., 1, pp. 32 ff.

It will be noted that the table of chapter 4 gives a list containing seven members ending in the triple division, that it also contains the three collateral names, Seth, Enosh, Noah, and a second triple division. Chapter 5 gives a list of ten members, but the three extra members are the same as the three collateral names of the other table. A comparison of the two tables shows that the names are largely the same, except that Mehujael and Enoch are transposed. The similarity appears much more clearly in the Hebrew than in the names as we have them. Other changes are Methushael to Methuselah, Mehujael to Mahalalel, Irad to Jared, Cain to Kenan. It will further be noted that it was the Enoch of Cain's line whose name was given to the first city, while the Enoch of Seth's line "walked with God." The Lamech of Cain's line had two wives, and sang the song of vengeance connected with the invention of the sword. The Lamech of Seth's line was the father who hoped from the birth of his son for consolation and rest. Lenormant in "Beginnings of History,"[1] has presented with much force and plausibility the view that, in general, the meanings of the names of one line carry with them a good signification, while those of the other convey a bad signification. This is seen especially in the case of Mehujael, which means "stricken by God," whereas the corresponding Mahalalel means "praise or glory of God."

5. The peculiar features of 5 : 29 are to be observed. Among other things we see: (1) The sudden break in the rigid style of the chapter as a whole; (2) the use of the name "Jehovah"; (3) the presence of ideas represented by the words "sorrow," "cursed," "repenting"; (4) the prediction of relief; (5) the pun on the name "Noah" (rest). These and other points which might be mentioned seem to indicate a separate origin for this verse which has been transferred from the prophetic narrative to the priestly table of chapter 5 by the editor.

II. We may now consider the story of the fratricide.

1. 4 : 1–16, *the biblical material: Cain and Abel.* (1) The word "Cain" means "possession"; "Abel" means "son." The interpretation of Luther, in accordance with which the words

[1] Page 182, ff.

"by the help of" are omitted, furnishes an idea which is surely fanciful, namely, that Eve supposes herself to have borne the Messiah.

(2) *Their offerings to God.* These were made literally "at the end of days," which means "after a while." The word used for offering is the word which means "meal offering." Naturally Cain presents of the fruit of the ground, and Abel, of the firstlings and of the fat. Many questions present themselves, for the answers to which we have no space. Does the narrative represent the offerings as spontaneous? Why were firstlings selected? why the fat? Is it possible that this narrative is colored by the ideas which were in vogue at the time of the writer, and that, consequently, the full development of sacrifice, which seems to be presented, is something which had its origin long after, but which is here ascribed by the writer to this most early period?

(3) *The reception of the offerings.* Man is represented as allowed to sacrifice animals, although no permission has as yet been given to use their flesh for meat. The bloody sacrifice is the more pleasing to Jehovah. How was the rejection of the one and the acceptance of the other indicated? By fire from heaven as in later times, or by prosperity and peace of mind granted the offerer? It is plain from the narrative that the real occasion of the rejection of Cain's offering was the fact that he was "not doing well."

(4) *The anger of Cain.* Cain is represented as being angry with both Abel and God. The conversation between him and God is anthropomorphic in the extreme. He is told that if he "does well there will be a lifting up." This, according to some, was the lifting up of the face so that he could be ever after bright and cheerful; according to others, a lifting up of sin, that is, pardon. But "if he does not well," sin is represented as a wild beast crouching to spring. This is the meaning of the word in Arabic and in Assyrian.[1] This wild beast is eager to possess the man, and he is advised to obtain control over him.

(5) *The murder of Abel.* Cain is represented as talking the

[1] We may compare with Lenormant, "Beginnings of History," page 176, the Assyrian *Rabiç*, a class of seven demons, the strongest of the infernal spirits, and among the Arabs, the fallen angels who were cast out with Adam.

matter over with Abel. According to the Septuagint he said to him, "Let us go into the field," and when they had gone into the field he slew him.

(6) *The sentence.* Here again familiar conversation between the man and the Deity is reported, and when Cain denies that he is his brother's keeper, the answer is made from heaven, "What hast thou done? Hark! thy brother's blood is crying unto me from the ground." Then follows the curse: Cain shall be "cursed from (does it mean 'away from,' that is punishment, or 'out of?') the earth." No longer will a resting place be furnished him or fruit of the ground be given him; he shall henceforth be a fugitive and a wanderer in the earth.

(7) *The murderer's complaint.* The criminal now appreciating the great sin which he has committed cries out, "My iniquity is greater than can be forgiven." Is this the representation of the narrative? Has Cain really repented? No. A better interpretation is, "My punishment is greater than I can bear." He thinks not of the sin, but of the shame which has come upon him. He fears that those who meet him in other parts of the earth will slay him. Of whom now is he afraid? Of other members of Adam's family, of men of another race, perhaps pre-Adamites, or does "Cain's imagination people the earth with inhabitants," though none exist?

(8) *The sign given Cain.* The criminal is seemingly pardoned; at all events, seven-fold vengeance is threatened upon the man who shall touch him, and a sign is given him (we remember how frequently a sign was given in Old Testament times that an event was or was not to happen) that no one will slay him. It was not the idea of the writer that a mark was set on Cain. What kind of a mark would have protected him? would a mark not rather have injured him?

(9) *Cain's residence.* Cain goes out and dwells in the land of Nod. This is the same word that is employed above and translated "wanderer"; he dwells, therefore, in the "land of the wanderer"; the name is symbolic, there being no such land. According to the narrative, he goes out alone, and yet upon the birth of his son a city is built and the son's name given to it.

2. *The mass of outside material* which may, without question, be connected directly or indirectly with this story is very great. The reader is referred to Lenormant's "Beginnings of History,"[1] We may do no more than mention a list of topics thus connected: (1) The third month of the Babylonian calendar is the month of brick-making or city-building; the corresponding sign of the Zodiac is the Twins; and thus in a remarkable way we find associated the idea of two brothers in connection with city building.

(2) In many stories that have come down to us from antiquity there are connected the death of a human being, generally a brother, and the building of a city or temple. Here may be mentioned the death of Agamenes in connection with the building of Apollo's temple at Delphi, the death of Remus in connection with the building of Rome, the death of Olus at the dedicating of the foundations of Jupiter Capitolinus, the slaying of a virgin at the founding of Tarsus.

(3) One may also compare the slaying of the youngest of the three Corybantes by his brothers, the important part played by the fratricide in the Cabiric mysteries, the death of the child-saviour among the Pelasgians.

(4) The Phœnician cosmogony of the Sanchoniathon of Philo contains reference to the same subjects.

3. *The character and purpose* of the biblical material in comparison with this outside material may now be considered. (1) What really is the relation of the biblical story to the outside stories? Shall we say that the outside stories are derived from the biblical, and are later and deteriorated forms of the original biblical material? This cannot be shown to be true. It is equally incorrect to suppose that the biblical has been borrowed from the outside stories. It is quite certain, however, that the biblical story and the outside stories are sisters coming from a common source, this common source being naturally a true statement of the fact involved. The Hebrew writer given precious truth from on high presents that truth through a story familiar to the people. The character of the biblical as compared with

[1] Pp. 147–217.

the outside stories is seen at a glance. It is free in its form from impurity of every kind, whatever may have been the form of the story as it was known to the idolatrous ancestors of the Israelites. As we have it, the myth is gone; the exuberant polytheism is gone; all that degrades and lowers is gone. The form of the story is here, just as the rite of circumcision was retained. It is only in the form of the story that there is any resemblance, and this form has been thoroughly cleansed and purified. We may ask why God did not choose a different form that there might be no possible joining of the sacred and profane. The answer is sufficient, that God does not work in that way. One may also ask why he allowed slavery, polygamy to continue; why he allowed Abraham to adopt the language of the Canaanites, from whom he wished to keep him separate; why he adopted the same list of clean and unclean animals, as that accepted by other nations. The fact is that he built upon the material that was at hand. But one must recognize that the meaning of the story is altogether new; the transaction is recognized as a crime, and punished as a crime; there is no justification of it. It is closely connected with the first sin, indeed grows out of it. Cain is warned, but warned in vain. The real meaning of a thousand such stories, as those of Romulus and Remus, of the Cabiri, and the Corybantes would not equal in influence on human life the story of Cain and Abel as we have it in the prophetic writer. In the outside stories the murderer is too frequently deified. How striking the contrast! Still further, our story is characterized by a spirit entirely unique; it is throughout didactic and religious.

We may now ask what was the purpose of the writer as shown in this new form, meaning, and spirit? Why did our writer change so greatly the material he had at hand? Because he was moved by a desire to help his fellow men,—to show by the story of the past the enormity of sin, the unavoidable consequences which follow; because, in brief, the writer was a prophet and religious teacher, a man whose heart burned with zeal for better living, and who therefore writes this, the prophecy of the past. But whence this purpose and the skill to give it execution? If

it were merely natural genius, how explain the total absence of such genius in nations of older civilization, of loftier intellectual activity? We may not deny that there is beneath and above all this the plan and the purpose of a mighty and beneficent God.

III. *The narrative of the Cainite civilization* (Genesis 4: 17–26). As before, we may consider (1) the divisions of the biblical material.

1) *The building of a city.* Did Cain find his wife in Nod, descended from a branch of the human race distinct from Adam; did he marry a sister and thus commit incest; or did the original document of which this story is a fragment contain an account here omitted? We must adopt one of these three explanations. It should be remembered that the word "Enoch," the name of the first city, means "dedication," or "initiation." Cain becomes a city-builder. Here, evidently, is a great step forward in civilization. Does this not contradict the statement that he was to be a fugitive and a vagabond? It is to be noted, however, that the narrative did not say that he should be such all his life. To build a city requires men. Whence came these men? It must be remembered that some time may have elapsed after the statement.

2) *The beginning of cattle tending.* With Jabal is connected the beginning of cattle-tending. The word "cattle" includes, of course, cows, camels, asses. Here is an advance upon the shepherd life of Abel. With this same patriarch is connected tent-dwelling, and this suggests "migration, commerce, adventure." Whatever meaning we assign the word Jabal, it is evident that it is symbolical.

3) *The beginning of music.* With Jubal (meaning, perhaps, "producing sound") we have the beginning of instrumental music.

4) *The beginning of manufacturing bronze and iron.* With Tubal-cain, meaning "spearsmith," began the age of manufactures. Our narrative makes no mention of a stone age. Are we to understand that copper and iron came at the same time, and were invented by the same man? or that the invention of one led rather to that of the other? Any attempt to connect with these

names the names of the heathen gods Apollo and Vulcan is unscientific.

5) *The beginning of polygamy.* The names of Lamech's wives mean "light" and "shadow." It is hardly possible that the host of mythological references connected with day and night are not in some way related. This is the first notice of polygamy. It is noted in order to be condemned. The whole presentation indicates that, in the writer's mind, it is a sin.

6) *The sword-song of Lamech.* This is probably the oldest piece of literature extant. It is a question whether it should be incorporated as a song of menace, in which case its idea would be "Now that I have a sword, I shall slay," etc., or as a song celebrating the invention of the sword, or as a song of triumph. Lenormant's remark may be quoted. "It breathes so decided a tone of primitive ferocity, that one would naturally put it in the mouth of a wild man, a savage of the stone age, dancing around the corpse of his victim, brandishing a bludgeon or the jaw bone of a cave bear, from which he has learned to fashion for his use a terrible weapon." The form, the mode, and the spirit breathe antiquity. It is a song of vengeance. Cain was to have been avenged seven-fold, but Lamech, in view of the invention of the sword, seventy and seven.

7) *The name of Cain's descendants to Lamech.* These have already been considered. See page 265. The remarkable similarity to the names of Seth's descendants cannot be overlooked.

2. *The outside material* for our consideration may be gathered from many quarters. We may only mention the topics under which it may be collected:

1) *Genealogical tables among Semitic nations.* It has been shown[1] that while Aryan nations have handed down primitive history in the form of myths and legends, Semitic nations have transmitted this primitive history in the form of genealogical tables. The Arabs have their genealogical series of historic and prehistoric names. The Phœnicians show the same thing in the genealogy of Sanchoniathon. It will be remembered that Ezekiel

[1] Baron D'Eckstein, the Asiatic Journal, 1855

in chapter 23 personifies thus Samaria and Jerusalem as Oholah and Oholibah.

2) *The sons of Lamech.* Passing over all that stands related to the two wives of Lamech, the work of cattle tending, the art of music, the manufacturing of bronze and iron, the sister Naamah, we may consider briefly suggestions that have been made concerning Lamech's sons. Some have proposed to treat them as a triad of divinities, but it should be remembered that while other nations ascribe the invention of arts to the gods and demigods, our writer carefully resists any such temptation and speaks only of man. Some understand them to represent castes. Here are compared the three Aryan castes, namely, the Viças or craftsmen, the Brahmans, or artists and scholars, and the Kçatriyas, or warriors. There has also been suggested a connection with the caste system found among the Babylonians. But all this is without foundation. We have here not three modes of life but two: that of the music and pastoral life and that of the smith. Others have suggested that in these names we are to find ethnic personifications, types of human figures. In this case, accord ing to Knobel, the Canaanites represent the Mongolian or Chinese. D'Eckstein in an article already referred to, makes these remarks: "Instead of gods, the Semitics place man at the head of their genealogies. Here we do not meet with heroes, sons of gods or demigods, offshoots of the one god in so many divine manifestations; here are shepherds, patriarchs, leaders of pastoral tribes, and this pure Semitic type is used to describe all the outlying human kind. The patriarchs of this character should always be taken collectively, as standing for their actual family, the collateral branches of their kindred, or even the tribe as a whole, including servants and slaves. They figure in a double sense, as a simple unit and as a collective unit. The genealogical method is fixed among the Hebrews and Arabs." We cannot well enter into a discussion of this question. It seems probable, however, that in this way the sacred narrative represents great divisions of the human family.

3) *What now is the writer's purpose?* To show the origin of things, but something more. He is tracing the consequences

of sin. The order is clear. (1) The sin in Eden, the banishment of man, and closely following (2) the brother's quarrel, the beginning of murder, then (3) the murderer builds the first city, the seat of all that is wicked and corrupt, and through his descendants, evil in name and evil in character, come (4) the arts—with every invention a farther wandering from the primitive methods of life, (5) music, the accompaniment of a luxurious and debauched life, (6) the sword, an instrument for injury and crime. Here, too, began (7) polygamy—a thing contrary to God's will, a curse to all who practice it. (8) That terrible blood revenge, to mitigate which ancient lawgivers tried every form of legislation—the scourge of society, began likewise with Lamech, the descendant of Cain.

Our writer is tracing the development of sin, the consequences of that first story—the fall. It is the prophetic text already used in the preceding chapters, the text on which every chapter of prophetic origin is based. This is a high and noble purpose; not historical and scientific, but religious. And the purpose is executed by making use of material, the form of which was familiar to all, an important educational principle; the wrong ideas which had been connected with that form had been displaced by new ideas and thus a double end is attained. This, if our preachers would but accept it, is an important homiletical principle. For the principles of teaching and for the principles of preaching, we may well accept as guides the world's best teachers and the world's best preachers, the men of God of biblical times.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHRISTIAN TOWARDS THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE.

By PROFESSOR L. W. BATTEN,
Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

Christians classified according to their fitness to judge the results of higher criticism and according to the attitude they take: The motives influencing their decision: Fear of the results of the higher criticism: The dangers only apparent: Proper attitude toward the investigation of unknown truth: New views of the Bible may permit higher conceptions of God's character; The Old Testament prophets submitted their prophecies to the test of time; This was the test prescribed in the law of Moses—This should be our method.

It would be trite to call attention at this day to the great changes wrought by the remarkable strides in biblical scholarship within the past few years. It would be quite apart from my purpose to discuss the causes which have led to this great advance. My concern is with the actual attitude of Christians to-day towards the higher criticism of the Bible. If one inquire into this he will find a strange condition of things.

There are three classes of Christians whose attitude merits our consideration. First, the biblical scholars, those who have not only followed the discoveries and discussions as they have poured forth in bewildering abundance, but have also themselves studied the questions involved. These men have all found their places. Their attitude is already fixed, and for the most unalterable, whether they be the leaders of the new movement, the conservative sifters of the bold speculations, or the determined opponents of the whole new school.

Second, there are the educated Christians with some knowledge of theology, but without the special equipment for biblical criticism. To this class the clergy as a rule belong. They read the more popular expositions of the results of criticism, but have not time to master the original works. These, too, have usually classed themselves for or against the advanced tendency. The

advanced scholars find their most bitter antagonists among this class. The clergy feel a peculiar responsibility to their congregation. They have usually taken a vow to uphold the truth, which means, or is at all events interpreted to mean, the truth as it has been handed down to them. They conceive it therefore their mission to be conservators of old ideas, rather than as channels by which God shall give fresh light to the world. Their office therefore assumes the priestly rather than the prophetic character. Their preaching would be seriously modified by the partial acceptance of the new ideas, yes, even by the recognition of their possible truth. Barrels of old sermons would be rendered useless in a moment. Directly or indirectly they would be obliged to retract a great deal that they had delivered with solemn emphasis as eternal truth. Hence it is that the chief adherents of the new views are found among the younger clergy, who are naturally looking for new truth to preach, and who can proclaim the new teaching without embarassment. There are notable exceptions. There are men among the clergy who believe with Emerson that consistency is the bane of small minds, who preach what they believe today irrespective of what they preached a year or ten years ago.

Third, there is the average intelligent Christian, who reads his favorite religious papers, listens attentively to what comes in his way, studies his Bible with such light as he has, but who is without much knowledge of the work done by scholars, and lacks the equipment to make him even a competent judge amidst the confusing arguments of the combatants. In this class the great majority of Christians will gladly place themselves. Their work has been given them, and in doing that they cut themselves off from the possibility, except in rare cases, of doing work which belongs to others. In Christian thought they can only follow, they do not hope to lead. They do not dream of moulding the opinions of others, and hold their own always open to the influence of those whom they trust. In this class also there are some who have ranged themselves on the one side or the other. Plenty are to be found stoutly maintaining that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or that it is a composite structure of a time long

after Moses. But they would not find it easy to defend either the one position or the other. They know something of the results, but little of the data upon which the results are based. But the peculiarity of this class is that those whose minds are firmly made up are proportionately few. There are many perplexed and bewildered. They have often heard that the new views will ultimately undermine the very foundations of their faith. They fear the new movement as an enemy of their religion. They can see that many things are changed by the acceptance of the results of the new criticism. They are told truly that their whole Bible must be read in a new light, and from a new point of view if the results of the so-called higher criticism are accepted.

The last are the ones who need help and guidance to see that the higher criticism is not the horrible demon it has so often been pictured, but simply a method for the scientific study of the literary problems of the Bible. The writer was recently present at a meeting of clergymen at which several attempted in vain to define the higher criticism. No wonder that the laity are bewildered by it. A desire to offer some helpful suggestions to this class has prompted this article.

Among the three great classes into which all truth may be divided, the known, the unknown, and the unknowable, many have shown a fondness for the last. They like to cut off all further discussion by pronouncing the verdict—this is unknowable. Some scientific men especially have shown a strong inclination to treat religious problems in this way. But in the scientific world, as Lubbock has beautifully shown, many things once pronounced unknowable have since become known. Religious truth, like scientific truth, is, as a matter of fact, divided largely between the known and the unknown. One who has learned the lessons of history will not pronounce many things unknowable. The known, however, is infinitesimal compared to the unknown. What the wisest scholar knows is but a drop in a bucket compared to what he does not know. And no one realizes this so well as the wise scholar. But the unknown may at any time become the known. God has revealed much, but he

has left much more unrevealed. We know much about the Bible, but there is much more that we do not know. The patient labor of scholars may bring portions of this great unknown field to light at any time. God has not condemned us to graze always in the well-trodden pastures of our forefathers. Each age may discover the truth which is necessary for its own peculiar needs. Hence we Christians can never cut off the study of what is purported to be new truth by crying "impossible"; still less by assailing it and trying to beat it down. What then shall be our attitude towards the results of those who claim that they have discovered new, and in some respects revolutionary, truths about the Bible?

It seems singular that the Christian world has not applied the noble lesson of Gamaliel to their case. The Jewish authorities were determined to put down what they with good reason from their point of view regarded as a dangerous heresy. Gamaliel agreed with them about the doctrine, but not about the method of opposing it. Here is his method: "And now I say unto you, refrain from those men, and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown: but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God" (Acts 5:38, 39). This surely would be the safest guide for us today. We might put it in this form: All truth is from God, and like him is eternal, unchangeable and indestructible. All falsehood is from the Devil, the father of lies, and is certain of destruction. If men speak falsehood, God will destroy it without our help; if they speak truth, our attacks may indeed cause the speakers pain and loss, but they will be as fruitless as wicked.

Then we come to the great question which Pilate asked so flippantly that he did not wait for the answer: "What is truth?" We will all agree to hold ourselves ready to accept the truth as soon as we know it to be such. But how are we to know? If Hananiah the prophet declares that Babylon will fall within two years, and Jeremiah the prophet contradicts him (Jer. 28), how were the people to know whom to believe? If one great scholar says Isaiah wrote all of the book called by his name, and another

equally great scholar says he did not, how can we who are not biblical scholars know which statement is true? Gamaliel's counsel offers two helpful suggestions.

First, do not pronounce the new false because it is apparently contradictory to opinions which we have long cherished. This is the fundamental mistake, and the source of untold unchristian strife. The new teaching seems to make shipwreck of our belief. In the confusion, the old seems to be falling to pieces with only a new, unfamiliar, and unwelcome fact to take its place. We have not the patience to examine the wreck, or we should see that our old ideas do contain a germ of truth, which no new notions can change or destroy, and that our faith is only modified, not destroyed, and that the new truth joining hands with the old gives us something better and stronger than either the old or the new by itself. Let me illustrate by a bold example. One has ultra-conservative views about the Bible. He reads (1 Sam. 16) that God told Samuel to practice deception in order to keep his real designs from Saul. He sets about to devise a host of reasons to justify God's strange conduct. But after a time he gets a different conception of the Bible; he perceives that Samuel feared for his life, and naturally attributed to God the plan which suggested itself to insure his safety. What is the effect? He has parted with the doctrine of an infallible book, but he has gained the doctrine of a perfectly holy God who will not deceive. Is not the gain infinitely greater than the loss?

Second, Gamaliel rightly believed that time would settle the question whether the new doctrine was of God or men. That was essentially Jeremiah's only reply to Hananiah. That is the canon of prophecy laid down in the Bible itself: "When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken: the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously" (Deut. 18 : 22).

This method requires great patience, but it is the only safe and Christian course. Much better let a supposed heretic stand before the bar of slowly forming public opinion than compel him to plead his case before a body of his peers, who are stirred with

passion and blinded by prejudice, from the very nature of the case.

To sum up the case in a word then, the people who are without special facilities for studying and judging must wait quietly and patiently while the battle rages among the masters, and when the strife ends, if they have watched intelligently, they can easily tell who the victors are, and they may be sure that God gives the victory to the truth.

THE BEARING OF CRITICISM ON EDIFICATION:

ILLUSTRATED BY A STUDY OF I SAM. XXII. 22–23.

By The REV. PROFESSOR T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.,
Oxford.

The practical value of the newer criticism of the Old Testament has not yet perhaps been sufficiently dwelt upon by those who are at the same time students and ministers of Christ. And yet it requires but a very slight acquaintance with thoughtful artisans to be aware that objections to the Old Testament may to a large extent be made by supplying the deficiencies in their early education, so far as it relates to the Old Testament. I am entirely ignorant of attacks directed against this part of the Bible by American objectors (except an able but, as it seems to me, uncritical pamphlet by Colonel Ingersoll), but I venture to assume that there is a family likeness brought forward by sincere sceptics of the Anglo-Saxon race, whether on one side of the Atlantic or the other.[1] One way of meeting these attacks, as I have remarked, is to give intelligent artisans, or at least their leaders, some acquaintance with that critical view which is, as many think, slowly but surely revolutionizing the study of the Old Testament. And it seems best to begin with communicating the elements of such a view to those who, though not of the artisan class themselves, are yet connected by nearness of residence or otherwise with those excellent and at present somewhat dangerous persons to whom I have referred. Scholars have, it is true, enough to do in their own workshops and lecture-rooms, but if they are also ministers, or at least ardent adherents of some branch of the Christian church, it may perhaps befit them to

[1] It may be best to refer to a layman's evidence on the relation of the English artisans to the official teachers of the Bible. Mr. W. Rossiter (a well-known popular lecturer, kindled to the "Enthusiasm of Humanity" by the famous F. D. Maurice) contributed, about 1885, an important article on the subject to the *Contemporary Review*.

come out of their comparative seclusion and do their best, however inadequate this may be, to relieve the present distress. This has not, at least in my own country, been often attempted; perhaps we in England are lacking in that spirit of unquenchable hope, which nevertheless we admire, and which my Anglican brethren specially noticed in the lamented Bishop Phillips Brooks. I have before me two brightly written and much eulogized volumes, one relating to the Book of Genesis, the other to narratives and to prophetical portions of the Old Testament, and with all their brilliance and popularity of manner, I notice with surprise how unfaithful the respected writers are to the critical principles with which they are supposed to be, at least to some extent, identified. And while fully appreciating the terse, sometimes poetic, and always sympathetic style, I marvel at the indiscriminate praise lavished on writers, who through timidity have folded their hands in the presence of a difficulty which has year by year increased till, except to faith and hope, it may well appear insurmountable, viz., the repugnance to what is thought the barbarous and outgrown narratives and teachings of the Old Testament. Now it may well be thought that first attempts to supply a practical need are of necessity poor or inadequate, but no one need hesitate to receive a stimulus from them on that ground. And so I will venture to refer to a work published last year, and entitled "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism," which has, of course, the faults of all first attempts, added to the pardonable weakness of offering some old and some half-buried new matter to the more aspiring class of students.

In the first part of this book the Book of Samuel is presented as a subject of study for laymen who are not themselves artisans, but more or less interested in that important class of the community. It being assumed that analytic criticism must precede a *genuinely* historical study of the Old Testament narratives, the results of Kittel's analysis, as given in Professor Kautzsch's admirable new translation of the Old Testament, are quoted in full, since beyond them it would have been difficult to go when the book was written. Then the character of David as affected

by these results and by the historical study of the Eastern races is considered at length, and lastly the typical narrative of David and Goliath is presented, first with a view to the enjoyment of the story, and then, so far as seemed possible or at least expedient, with an eye to edification. An unfriendly reviewer has remarked that the story of Odysseus could be treated in the same way. So it could, provided that the preachers or lecturers believed that there was a genuine, however small, kernel of fact in the story, and also that Odysseus held a prominent place in the period of preparation for the coming of Jesus Christ. In this case, the story of Odysseus can, it is clear, only have been omitted by accident from the volume of Christian Scriptures.

The object of the doubtless feeble first attempts which I am making, under difficulties peculiar to the services in a provincial cathedral, is "to apply modern methods of study to the Old Testament with just sufficient precision to bring out the gradualness of divine revelation, to emphasize and illustrate the essential facts and truths of the Scriptures, and to solve the difficulties and correct the misapprehensions of infidel objectors," and this work has to be done in sections of at most half an hour's duration. The following pages are extracted from one of these sections (or sermons), which forms a supplement to those already printed in the "Aids" on parts of the Books of Samuel.

It has been pointed out in the "Aids" (pp. 7–13) that there existed side by side in parts of Samuel different accounts of one and the same fact, which may either be variants of the same tradition or represent almost or entirely different views of what actually took place. Among these different accounts, some have reference to the regal career of Saul; we have what may be called a secular view, and we have also what must undoubtedly be described as the religious view current three centuries after the facts. The following pages are concerned with this religious view, which is evidently different from, though more or less plausibly harmonizable with, the secular view. The religious view will be found in 1 Sam. 8; 10:17–27a; 12; 13:7b–15a (cf. 10:8), and chap. 15, and it is more particularly of chap. 15 that I

am speaking. The secular view is clearly traceable in 1 Sam. 9:1–10:16, 27b (following the LXX. with Revised Version margin), 11:1–11, 15. This is in accordance with Kittel's analysis, though it is for critics to consider whether L. A. Bähler's suggestion is not worthy of adoption, according to which 10:26b and 27a ought to stand where we now read 11:7b and 8.[1]

Let us start from 1 Sam. 15:22–23: "And Samuel said, Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of divination, and stubbornness is as idolatry and teraphim. Because thou hast rejected the word of Jehovah, he hath also rejected thee from being king." The words of verse 22 are a very early attestation of the truth that God is spirit (*i. e.* of a spiritual nature), and that those who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. It is impossible, however, for anyone who has absorbed the idea of historical development to believe that these words were actually spoken in the semi-barbarous age to which Saul belongs. All who open their eyes to facts must be well aware that the religion of David, though it had in it some germs of progress, was widely different from that of Isaiah, not to say of the Book of Psalms, and will admit that, even taking the narratives as they stand, the religion of Saul was at any rate not superior to that of David. And if the critical facts on which the best scholars are agreed be

[1] To show the effect of this critical change I will give here the verses which are affected by it. Saul, it will be remembered, was a plain citizen when Nahash, king of Ammon, threatened a grievous insult to the men of Jabesh-Gilead.

"And, behold, Saul came following the oxen out of the field; and Saul said, What aileth the people that they weep? And they told him the words of the men of Jabesh. And the Spirit of God (*i. e.* a martial enthusiasm) came mightily upon Saul when he heard these words, and his anger was kindled greatly. And he took a yoke of oxen, and cut them in pieces, and sent them throughout all the borders of Israel by the hand of messengers, saying, Whosoever cometh not forth after Saul (and after Samuel), so shall it be done unto his oxen. And there went with him the men of valor whose hearts God had touched. But certain base fellows said, How shall this man save us? And they (*i. e.* Saul's valiant followers) said unto the messengers that came, Thus shall ye say unto the men of Jabesh-Gilead, Tomorrow, by the time the sun is hot, ye shall have deliverance. . . . . And the people said unto Saul, Who is he that said, Shall Saul reign over us? bring the men that we may put them to death."

accepted, it will be clear that neither Saul nor Samuel can have held the views expressed in the above passage. Tradition tells us that the God whom the Israelites of Saul's time worshiped had such great delight in sacrifices that when the people had forsaken Jehovah, and consequently, as we are told, were subjugated by the Philistines, Samuel had to offer up a lamb in order to appease Jehovah (1 Sam. 7:9), and bring victory to the Israelites. Samuel, too, as tradition said, was in the habit of going about in the land and blessing the periodical sacrifices of the different civic communities (1 Sam. 9:2–5), and though no doubt he delivered oracles to the people, yet there is no evidence that the people regarded these oracles as in the least degree more sacred than their sacrificial rites. Religiously, then, it is incredible that Samuel should have uttered the words of the text. Nor are they, from a moral point of view, at all more credible. It is impossible that Samuel the prophet should in moral influence have been behind the rude warrior Saul. The savage custom, prevalent among barbarous races, of devoting both human beings and dumb animals taken in war to the national god by slaying them, was, it would appear, beginning to go out among the Israelites. Saul, therefore, and the people "spared Agag and the best of the sheep and of the oxen and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them." This is what we find in 1 Sam. 15:9; the statement of Saul in vss. 15 and 21, that Saul and the people took a part of the spoil to sacrifice to Jehovah, seems to be a mere fiction, put suitably enough into the mouth of the terrified Saul by the narrator. Or, if this supposition be rejected, Saul had at any rate no intention of slaying Agag, whereas Samuel "hewed Agag in pieces before Jehovah" (vs. 33). Nevertheless, though elements in the narrative may not be historical, it is difficult to accept it as a whole. It is even difficult to see where the impiety of Saul consisted, even from the point of view of the narrator. There seems to have been no intentional disobedience on Saul's part, and Jehovah, as we learn from the next chapter, "looketh not on the outward appearance, but on the heart" (16:7).

If I were to stop here, I should be like those who would feed the hungry with stones instead of bread. Mere negative criticism is always unsatisfactory; nor is it charitable to pull down if you cannot re-build the edifice better. Criticism tells us that chapter 15 belongs to an independent account of Samuel and Saul, composed probably in northern Israel and at earliest contemporary with Hosea. The account doubtless embodies valuable traditional elements, but these have been combined and modified in accordance with the religious ideas of the noblest and best Israelites of the time of that prophet. The picture of Saul and Samuel which it gives is, therefore, not completely accurate, and chapter 15 in part is rather a sermon addressed to the contemporaries of Hosea than an historical description of a long past age. It may be and probably is an historical fact that Saul fought with and overcame the Amalekites, also that he was less ruthless in the hour of victory than the Judges, his predecessors, also that he quarreled with the seer Samuel; but more than this must be left entirely uncertain. The narrator had no thought of us his modern readers; his mind was concentrated on the work of extracting edification for his own times from some of the many traditions current respecting the dim heroic age.

The writer of whom I speak was probably, as we have seen, a northern Israelite. There is nothing to indicate a connection with Judah, and he presents affinities in language and in ideas to two great writers, one of whom certainly and the other almost certainly belonged to the northern kingdom. The best known of these two writers is Hosea, who confined his ministry almost entirely to the northern kingdom. Hosea is a tender-hearted prophet. He has some great ideas, but they are suffused with emotion, and though he is faithful to his message it costs him repeated struggles to be so. In this he is not so very unlike the prophetically-minded writer whom criticism reveals to us in 1 Samuel 15, and the other passages which describe the prophetic view of the career of Saul. For there cannot be the shadow of a doubt that he paints Samuel after his own likeness, and that those two finely contrasted passages, 1 Samuel 10:24

and 15:35,[1] were dictated by his own sympathies. The motto, "Look in thine heart and write," was by none more fully carried out than by the prophetic narrators of the history of Israel. Here is another point of resemblance between Hosea and our narrator. Hosea is no great lover of the institution of kingship; his experience of royalty in northern Israel was so unfavorable that it would seem as if he almost doubted the possibility of a good king, and this may be the reason why this book contains no prophecy of the Messiah. In 13:11 he even says, "I give thee a king in mine anger, and take him away in my wrath;" which is exactly parallel to what our unknown narrator says with reference to Saul in the eighth and fifteenth chapters of 1 Samuel.

There are some other important respects in which our narrator is akin not only to Hosea but to Isaiah. Isaiah is loud in his complaint of those who in the management of the state neglect the prophetic counsel. "Woe to the rebellious children," he says in chapter 30, "that take counsel, but not of me, and make a league, but without my spirit, that they may add sin to sin." And the unknown narrator of the life of Saul seeks to enforce the same lesson by the supposed banishment of that ancient king who ventured to deviate from the letter of the command of Samuel.

Again, Isaiah addressing the rulers of Jerusalem exclaims indignantly in the name of Jehovah, "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed-beasts; and I delight not in blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats" (Isaiah 1:11). And Hosea declaims in similar language speaking for his God, "I delight in mercy, and not in sacrifice, and in the knowledge of God more than in burnt offering" (Hosea 6:6).

These three passages and these alone fully explain the meaning of the text. Such words could not have been uttered in the days of Saul and Samuel, for they presupposed a conception of

[1] 1 Samuel 10:24, "And Samuel said, See ye him whom Jehovah hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted and said, Long live the king."

1 Samuel 15:35, "And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death, for Samuel inwardly mourned for Saul."

prophecy and a respect on the part of kings for the prophetic order, also a view of the spiritual nature of God, and of the immense relative insignificance of sacrifice such as neither Samuel or Saul possessed.

And now consider how important the disciples of Hosea and Isaiah must have regarded these ideas, that one of them actually transformed an episode in the heroic age of Israel in order to throw them into bolder relief. He spoke of Saul and Samuel, but he thought of Jeroboam II. and Hosea. We need not, therefore, trouble ourselves about the psychological or historical impossibilities of the story. The essential point to remember is that whereas in the eleventh century B.C. the Israelites were still in morality and religion semi-barbarous, only three centuries later they produced a few such men as Hosea and Isaiah, men who were as clear sighted on the fundamentally moral character of true religion and on the all-importance of sound religious principle to the the rulers of a people as any Christian thinker can be.

To me, I confess, this appears a marvel of the first order, and one of the greatest proofs of the supreme position of the biblical religion that in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., when nonconformity was vastly more difficult and more dangerous than it is now, men could be found to say that from the highest point of view sacrifices were of little or no moment. The most striking passage in which this truth is affirmed is in the Book of Jeremiah, where we read in unconscious opposition to the later belief of the Mosaic origin of the Levitical Law, "Thus saith Jehovah (God) of Hosts, the God of Israel: Add your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices and eat the flesh (*i. e.*, go on offering sacrifices; they are no better than so much unconsecrated flesh meat). For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the Land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: But this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you" (Jeremiah 7:21–23). In the Psalms we find the same idea expressed in a more positive form. "Offer

right sacrifices," we read in Psalm 4 : 5, "and put your trust in Jehovah." The best sacrifice is obedience in those matters which formalists are tempted to omit, or if there be a second sacrifice it is like unto the first. Open lips are the necessary adjuncts of open hearts. Obedience and thanksgiving are the true divine service.

I said that such words as those of Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah are marvellous in the eighth and seventh centuries ; they are still more so when repeated in the fifth and sixth centuries after the return of the Jews from Babylon, from which period our present Psalter comes to us. How, we ask in perplexity, could such words have been written, or at any rate sung, in the age of those founders of legalism—Ezra and Nehemiah ? The true answer probably is that there were already different schools of thought in the same church. There were those who inclined toward a purely spiritual religion and those who preferred a religion of elaborate forms ; both sorts of churchmen lived together in peace. Let us follow their example and suffer schools of thought to exist undisturbed in our midst. We have all of us at least one point in common in addition to our Christian character and our reverence for the past history of our church, namely, that we believe in the essential spirituality of religion. In forms as forms none of my readers I hope believes. Some of us may value symbols more, some less ; but for symbols apart from the thing symbolized, no member of any of the reformation churches can have the least reverence. Let us be content with this agreement, and let us bear to have different views respecting the symbols (whether these symbols be the sacrament, or the written forms of prayer, or the Bible) expressed from time to time. And if, when the natural tendency to over-value symbols threatens to become dangerous, a reformer should arise, calling us back to the spirituality of the prophets, let us not be impatient with him, but remember the attitude of the Master himself toward the law. "The Sabbath was made for man," he said, "not man for the Sabbath," *i. e.*, there are times when seeming irreverence is according to the will of God. And when denounced for transgressing the law for holding intercourse with publicans and

sinners, he replied, referring to the prophet Hosea, "Go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice; for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners" (Matthew 9 : 13).

Thus the great saying of 1 Samuel 15 : 22 was in substance reaffirmed by Christ eight hundred years after it was first uttered. Our Lord did not mean precisely the same thing as either Hosea or Hosea's disciple. All three agreed in preferring moral to material sacrifices, but while Hosea specified as an example of such sacrifice the civic virtues of brotherly love or helpfulness, and Hosea's disciple the royal virtue of obedience to the prophetic counsels, our Lord put forward the necessity (which we ourselves are just beginning to feel more strongly) of personal friendly intercourse with those whom we desire to raise in the moral scale. The varieties of moral sacrifice are indeed too numerous to catalogue, and one person cannot be a rule for another. The all-important thing is to maintain the spirit from which all true sacrifice flows. That spirit is a spirit of universal love—a spirit which, among the Israelites, could only arise when the old intense but narrow class-policy had given place to a common feeling of nationality, and when to this feeling had been added the consciousness that the privileges of Israel were not merely for herself but for the good of humanity. The saying in Hosea 6 : 6 may be great, but that in Isaiah 19 : 24–25 is greater. And now may I ask, in conclusion, does not this latter saying presuppose the great prophecy of the servant of Jehovah in Isaiah 42 : 1–4? Much more might be urged in behalf of this view than the ordinary commentators have yet said.

Comparative-Religion Notes.

An Exhibition of Religions in Japan.—Rev. Joseph Cook in a recent lecture calls attention to the latest news from Japan respecting a proposed Parliament of Religions. He says: "Among the echoes of the world's first Parliament of Religions there has come to us from beyond seas nothing more suggestive and resonant than the news that the Mikado of Japan, a consecrated ruler whose family line antedates the Cæsars, has ordered a competitive exhibition of the religions in his Empire. In the list of these he includes Christianity. Each faith is to justify itself by its history, its best books, its characteristic doctrines and institutions, its harmony with conscience, its reasonable expectations for the future, and especially by its acknowledged effects when transmitted into life. The Emperor has caught with large, if not entire, accuracy the key-note of the World's Parliament of Religions. His scheme is novel and almost startling, but no one fears that Christianity, if fairly represented in this original method of studying its contrasts and contacts with rival faiths, can fail to seem absolutely peerless to educated and conscientious men. Of course no such exhibition can cause a final verdict to be given, for centuries of experience will yet testify to the merits and demerits of religions, and Christianity fears no rivalry before the court of ages. This competitive examination of creeds and the resulting deeds is to be held in Kioto, a noble and venerable city, the joy of the whole Empire, always spoken of by the Japanese with reverential tenderness and exulting pride."

Islam as a Civilizer in Africa.—A French traveler in the Soudan, sent upon a government mission in these regions, has given some interesting and important testimony to what Mohammedanism has done for these regions. He says, among other things, the following: "That which most struck us, when, penetrating the basin of the Charé, we were advancing in the direction of Lake Tchad, was the political organization which the Mussulman rulers of Central Soudan had imposed on the pagan populations subjected to their rule. We must truly acknowledge that the expansion of Islam introduces a considerable progress into these lands. Many of these tribes, up to this time a prey to barbarism, whose political and social concept did not extend beyond the family and village, among which intestine war prevailed in a chronic state, are to-day, in their dependence on a Mussulman ruler, enjoying a state of civilization certainly superior to that of the populations which Islam has not yet touched. No doubt the Mussulman conquest does not proceed without at first causing ruin and bloodshed. All round the Mussulman states of the Soudan exists a sort of frontier "march" which gradually encroaches upon

the fetichist populations and in which the implantation of Islam does not take place without blows and conflicts. But so soon as submission is an accomplished fact, so soon as the ruler is sure of having before him a people respectful of his authority, he limits himself to a sort of overlordship, reduced to a regulation of the most general matters, which leaves to the native his personality, his beliefs and his traditions."

"In making these statements we are not to conclude that the civilization of Islam is the only one which is forever suitable to the population of Central Soudan. We mean only that it marks an undeniable progress beyond the rudiments of the social organization of the fetichists, that it is a stage, perhaps necessary, towards civilization such as we understand it, and that in any case political prudence demands that we accept the Mussulman organization where it is established; instead of opposing it we must utilize it, and restrict ourselves for the moment simply to stopping the transportation and recruiting of slaves, as we have done in our African possessions of the North and the West. Furthermore, for yet a long time the Mussulman will be here, as the Chinaman in the extreme East, the necessary intermediary between the native buyers or producers and the European buyers. Has he not already elevated the economic and political condition of the greater part of the native populations of the Soudan? As for ourselves, from the time that we left the pagan regions we were protected from the ill-will of the half-hostile barbarous petty chiefs, always ready for attack and pillage. We were then offered provisions in fair abundance, the chiefs showed themselves disposed to aid us in our march, and the Mussulman traders, that traverse Central Soudan to exchange gum, ivory and caoutchouc with the manufactured products of European origin, did not hesitate to serve us with guides, or to lend us their coöperation." E. B.

The Bible in the Sunday School.

THE REAL PURPOSE OF SUNDAY SCHOOL WORK AND ITS ACCOMPLISHMENT.

1. Professor Geo. M. Forbes.
2. Rev. W. C. Bitting,

I. The real purpose of Sunday school work is *objectively* to secure a comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures as the highest Revelation of God, and, *subjectively*, to secure the spiritual culture and power which come from contact with that Revelation.

II. The chief obstacle to securing a comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures is a vicious method of study. The chief defects in prevalent methods are these: (a) Lack of *continuity;* the Scripture is studied in isolated fragments. (b) Lack of *adaptation*, little attempt is made to select and adjust subject matter with reference to age and mental development. (c) Lack of *unity;* the *plan* of study has no beginning and no end; there is no definite goal, and no organization of work with reference to it.

The chief obstacle to securing spiritual culture and power is the unconsecrated teacher. The teacher alone can make the Revelation *living* and *real*, can transmute the dry letter of the word so as to furnish food for the soul and give impulse to the life.

III. The ideal system will, of course, correct the defects above noted by substituting for the existing system, or lack of system, a well-matured curriculum of biblical study involving the true principles of continuity, adaptation and unity. This will give *reality* to Sunday school study. The prevailing system is so superficial, so hollow, that it involves a kind of false pretense, a kind of dishonesty, and misses altogether the mighty incentive which springs from solid *progressive* acquisition.

The University of Rochester. G. M. F.

The purpose of the Bible school should be to acquaint its members with the Bible, and to lead them to Christ—the first in order to the second. It is of utmost importance that the Bible should be *studied*, and not used as a reservoir of texts for sermonettes. We most honor the Word when we rely upon the Holy Spirit to use the truth in the Word, instead of our words about it.

The difficulties are in teachers who are ill-informed about what they try to teach, in scholars who have wrong conceptions of the Word and its study,

and in the reluctance of both teachers and scholars to undertake any scheme that requires real study. Fifteen years of close observation have convinced me that the so-called study now done amounts to almost nothing. Our schools have become so used to relying on "helps" that personal effort to do honest work is at the minimum. Nearly every pastor knows this. Excuse it as we may, the fact is there.

The defects of the present prevailing method are indicated in the difficulties noted above. It is a mistake to call it a "system." It is the severest indictment of that "system," that, after twenty years of use, it has produced such teachers and students as we now have. By its fruits it is known. The rank and file of those who have been nourished on it are so deficient on the very matters that they have been supposed to "study" that, with them, ministers can take nothing for granted, but must ever deal with beginnings. It is so tightly tied to the the homiletic idea, and there is room for so little else, that what it has imparted is fragmentary, destitute of perspective, and valueless, almost, as to method. The enthusiasm it is supposed to have created is mainly with those who have prepared the "helps," and the faithful few who would try to do genuine study under any plan.

The ideal system will be in value, educational; in method, historical; in process, inductive; with reference to the pupil, adapted to his attainment both in material and method; in scope, comprehensive; as to thoroughness, outline at first as the preparation for future minute study; in all things, as far as possible, abreast of the best that pedagogics can suggest.

One great difficulty in the way of using any new system, as I have found in the effort to introduce one, is the proneness of teachers and scholars to treat the new according to the irrational methods of the old. The African, accustomed to carry mud on his head for building his house, will put a wheelbarrow of material in the same place when he first handles it.

I feel sure that if we studied the Bible literature as we do the purely human, the glory of *the* book would be at once discovered, its power felt, its help experienced, and the large number of those between ages of fourteen and twenty years, whom we now find it so difficult to hold, would be interested to a degree hitherto unknown. May God speed the day. W. C. B.

NEW YORK CITY.

Exploration and Discovery.

THE LATEST DISCOVERY FROM THE EGYPTIAN FAYUM.

By James Henry Breasted,
Royal Museum, Berlin.

The soil of that fertile district in the Nile valley known as the Fayum has been rich in the treasures it has offered us during the last five years. In a previous number of this periodical the writer gave some account of the remarkable portrait mummies found there by Brugsch and Flinders Petrie, and now deposited in London and Berlin. The remains preserved in that region have brought us a further contribution of far greater interest from a historical point of view, being the most important find since upper Egypt furnished us with the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter last year.

There is at present lying in the store-rooms of the Royal Museum here, a large mass of dirty, torn and worm-eaten papyri, brought from the Fayum by Brugsch, which formed the official records of the provincial government in this rich farming district during the first few centuries after Christ. As fast as they can be properly mounted on glass plates and made readable they are being deciphered and published by the young doctors of the Museum, chiefly by Dr. Krebs. They are for the most part Greek, with occasionally some Coptic, and contain everything imaginable in the way of records, from a trust deed, a bill of sale, or a receipt, to a formal complaint lodged with the magistrate by one old market woman against another, for having entered her house unprovoked, beating the plaintiff, and then ascending the stairs to the latter's attic, where she abstracted a sum of money concealed in a chest, and went away with it. Out of all this heterogeneous collection there is gradually coming forth a very complete picture of Roman administration in an Egyptian province, a fact much appreciated by the historian, and something hitherto entirely impossible. It is among these papyri that my friend Dr. Krebs recently found an unpretentious looking piece about three and a-half by eight inches, containing twenty-four lines of Greek text, little thinking that it contained in those twenty-four lines enough to reconstruct one of the most important imperial edicts which the Roman government ever issued.

Before presenting the text a word of introduction will be necessary. The first Roman sovereign to recognize in Christianity peculiar elements entirely at variance and incompatible with the theory of Roman government was the Emperor Decius (249–251 A. D.) What had hitherto been sporadic opposi-

tion, always local and very ineffective, now became the official and recognized policy of the central government. An imperial edict went forth commanding that any person suspected of being a Christian should appear before the local magistrates and prove his fidelity to the government by sacrificing in their presence to the gods. The zeal and faithfulness of the local magistrates were not entirely trusted with the execution of these enactments, and they were therefore reinforced by a board of five prominent citizens. Before this body, then, the luckless brother was brought, and if he refused to sacrifice in their presence, after repeated commands, he was put to death. If, however, he obeyed, and went through the necessary ceremonies, he was freed and given a certificate officially signed, stating that he had done so. If at any future time he were apprehended by the authorities he could show this certificate and obtain immediate release. Such a writing was called a *libellus*, as indeed was any such writing issued by the government, and the holder was called a *libellaticus*. The reader will perceive at once the enviable security enjoyed by the *libellaticus*. To the weaker brethren on the one hand and to the corrupt Roman officials on the other this circumstance offered a great opportunity. For a small bribe the officials would issue the *libellus* to the fearful brother, without requiring his fulfilment of the ceremonies commanded in the edict. Without realizing the wrongfulness of this compromise the *libelli* were bought by some; but also by many who were fully aware of the evil of it, and a regular tariff was soon established. The word *libellus* soon acquired a special and an odious significance among the faithful brethren, who scorned this method of escaping molestation by the authorities, and no more hateful term of reproach could be devised than that of *libellaticus*. The question as to what the proper attitude of the church toward these *libellatici* should be soon became the theme of much discussion among the heads of the church, which continued for a long time, and occasioned a deal of dissension among the reverend bishops. But notwithstanding all this, no copy of a *libellus* has ever been found nor enough of the requirements of the imperial edict of Decius to render its restoration possible, until Dr. Krebs' recent discovery among the above-mentioned papyri of the Fayum.

I translate below, line for line (indicating the *lacunæ* by . . . .):

To the supervisors of the sacrifices
of the village of Alexander's Island,
by Aurelius Diogenes (the son) of Satabus,
of the village of Alexander's
Island; about 72 years (old), a scar
over right eye-brow. And always
sacrificing to the gods I have
continued, and now in
your presence according to
the things commanded (us),
I have sacrificed and . . . .

. . . . of the beasts . . . .
. . . . and I call upon you
to bear witness.
I salute you.
I, Aurelius Diogenes have given it.
Aurelius . . . .
sacrificing . . . .
. . . . I bear witness.
Year one of Emperor Cæsar
Gaius Messius Quintus
Trajan Decius Pius
Felix Augustus
Epiphi 2.

[1]The document tells its own story. The village of Alexander's Island is known as far back as the third century before Christ, and was located on an island in one of the lakes of the Fayum. That the persecution of Decius should have been carried into so small and insignificant a place is evidence that it was vigorously pushed, and the hopeless task of crushing out the rising faith was begun with the expectation of entire success. Here also were acting the board of five citizens above mentioned, as the first line shows. To these men, or to the Roman official acting with them, the aged Aurelius goes. Whether he was a Christian or not does not appear, but he claims to have always faithfully sacrificed to the state gods, and inference is that he was still a disciple of the state religion who had wrongfully fallen under suspicion of being a Christian; but if the above form was one regularly used by the state, then the same phrase, "I have always continued sacrificing to the gods," would be found also in the *libelli* issued to Christian petitioners. There is, therefore, no ground for asserting that this old man was not one of the weak-kneed brethren who took advantage of the sale of *libelli*.

Unfortunately just those lines (11–13) which describe the ceremonies of sacrifice performed by the holder of the document are badly broken. They of course contain the explanation of "the things commanded us" 1 : 10. After "I have sacrificed and . . ." in line 11, the restoration to ἔπιον made by Harnack is certainly plausible from the contemporaneous literature of the fathers, but on paleographic grounds it is purely a guess. But the restoration of ἐγευσάμην after "of the beasts" is without doubt correct, as the end of the word σαμην is still very plain at the beginning of line 12. The ceremony therefore consisted in sacrificing, drinking the libation, and tasting the flesh of the sacrifice. This having been performed, either actually or in the convenient imagination of the official, the document already handed in by the petitioner

[1]The document has just been published by Dr. Krebs in the *Sitzungsberichte der Koeniglich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Vol. XLVIII, with an excellent photograph of the original, in all respects as good as the document itself. Harnack's review is just appearing in the Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1894, No. 2.

was ready for the official attest and signature. These are contained in lines 17–19 (in italics). They are written in a coarse, hurried style, entirely different from the beautiful hand in which the document itself is inscribed. The latter is the work of a careful and trained clerk who has written many of the same sort, but the signature, as might be expected, is that of a hurried and careless official. In addition to its being so badly written the texture of the papyrus under the signature is badly broken away and the whole is therefore very difficult to decipher. But the one word still legible at the beginning of line 18 is quite significant, *θύοντα* "sacrificing." Note the accusative case which indicates that the official witnessed "*him* sacrificing."

The same regular hand which wrote the first sixteen lines had already affixed the date below, leaving room for the signature between, as we now see it. This date is the second day of the month Epiphi in the first year of Decius, or June 26, 250 A.D.

By this discovery the long controversy as to exactly what a *libellus* was, is settled beyond all argument. It is evident that the document was not offered by the Roman official but was made out by some scribe at the request of the petitioner himself; but it had no value whatever until he had handed it in to the local magistrate who would sign it whether the petitioner had sacrificed or not, provided the necessary bribe was forthcoming. Further than this, the imperial edict of Rome which occasioned the first systematic persecution of the Christian church can now be reconstructed in all its essentials. They were: (1) the appointment of the board of five above-mentioned to assist the local authorities, (2) the systematic persecution of men, women and children who would not sacrifice, drink the libation and taste the sacrifice, (3) the severest punishment for those officials who failed to carry out the edict to its fullest.

Out of the dread years which so sorely tried the rising church, out of the vast whirlpool which marked Rome's final efforts to annihilate a faith which, less than three-quarters of a century later, was to become the state religion of Rome herself—out of those far centuries which seem so unreal to us of today, has come this little fragment, like a voice from the dead, to tell us more vividly what that period of storm and stress brought to the individual believer in the early church. To every student of church history it is a message which will be as welcome as it was unexpected, for the completion of a picture which has always lacked just this last vivid touch.

Notes and Opinions.

Interpretation of Rom. 8:3–4.—Paul's claim for the Gospel, as set forth immediately after the salutation in this Epistle, is that it is the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth. Salvation is deliverance from sin. This is what Paul claims as the preëminent superiority of the Gospel. He admits, and even claims, that the law cannot effect this. Not that the law is imperfect as law, but that in consequence of the weakness and sinfulness of human nature, the perfect law cannot make man righteous. In the passage now under consideration he is setting forth this special excellence of the Gospel. He says that it can do what the law could not do. Just what is it that he says the law could not do? Two things—one preliminary and the other ultimate.

(1) The law could not condemn sin in the flesh. But did not the law condemn sin? Does not the law that says "thou shalt not steal" condemn theft? Certainly the law condemns what it forbids. The law forbids the breaking down of the fence that was meant to protect the growing crop, but it does not condemn as theft the act of the hungry ox that breaks the fence to reach the green grass. The ox is not capable of resisting the impulse of his appetite. Men say much the same for the starving man who steals a loaf of bread. A similar plea is made in behalf of transgressors of the law. Men by reason of their weakness through the flesh are incapable of keeping the law, and so are not convicted of sin by the law. But when God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh—having the same human nature that we have, and he obeyed the law perfectly, being tempted in all points like as we are, and yet without sin, he showed that the fault is not in the law, by reason of its unsuitableness to man's nature, and thus he condemned man's sin, and convicted him as a sinner. Thus Christ's perfect obedience to the law, when in the flesh and under the pressure of temptation, condemned sin in the flesh and vindicated the law as good.

(2) But all this was but preparatory to something ultimate, which is set forth in verse 4. The Gospel is the power of God to make men righteous, or as set forth in this verse: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." Christ came not merely to condemn the transgressor of the law and leave him without excuse, but to deliver the transgressor from condemnation and to enable him to obey the law in its spirit as well as in its letter. Whereas man is weak through the flesh, Christ came to give him the Holy Spirit to enable him to do what through the weakness of the flesh he could not do—fulfill the ordi-

nance of the law. Faith is the consent of the will to the Spirit's exercise of his power in the soul. But before the soul will consent to this power of the Spirit, it must be convicted of sin. Christ's obedience to the law is proof of man's sin in disobeying the law, and also of His power to enable the sinner to obey it. The soul, convicted of sin and conscious of its weakness through the flesh, is ready for the offer of the gospel. Accepting this offer by faith, he receives the Holy Spirit, and walks henceforth no longer after the flesh but after the Spirit, thus fulfilling the righteousness of the law. N. S. B.

The Name of Pharoah.—A recent number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* contains a letter from President P. Le Page Renouf on the derivation of the name Pharoah. M. Renouf maintains that the name Pharoah cannot be of Egyptian origin, but is a purely Hebrew designation of the king of Egypt. A corresponding case is our use of the term Mandarin applied to certain Chinese officials, a word that does not exist in the Chinese language. He finds both etymological and historical substantiation for his opinion. The word *per āa* or rather *peru āau* is sometimes used to denote the king of Egypt. But the sign for *per*, according to Brugsch, is polyphonous and frequently has the value *bu*. The investigations of M. Renouf lead him to believe that *bu* was its regular value in divine and royal names. Moreover the name *pa ura āa* is a title given in the time of Rameses II. to *foreign* princes and only subsequently adopted by the Egyptian kings, especially those of foreign origin, such as Darius, Cambyses and the Ptolemies. It seems impossible, therefore, that the name Pharoah could have been thus derived. On the other hand, there exists ample basis for Hebraic derivation. The great variety of opinion that formerly prevailed concerning the meaning of the root *pārā'* in the opening words of the Song of Barak and Deborah, Judges 5:2, has given place to a general consensus in favor of the Septuagint "to lead." *pir'āh* occurs but twice, in Deut. 32:42 and in the above mentioned verse. Each passage is poetical and archaic, and in each the word clearly means "princes." Then, too, in Arabic we have a corresponding root affording like meaning. It is only strange that with these facts at hand we should have thought it at all necessary to go outside Semitic languages for the etymology of Pharoah. The fact that the term Pharoah was not applied by the Egyptians to their kings until after the existence of foreign rulers among them is one of considerable significance from the view-point of the Hexateuchal analysis.

The "Lost" Ten Tribes.—A recent sensible discussion of this subject, by P. Asmussen, in a German periodical, is pointed out and summarized by *The Independent*. The fact is, says the author, the ten tribes never were "lost." Both in the Books of Kings and in the Assyrian inscriptions we have records of the deportations of the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom, and in leading particulars the accounts agree. In 734 Tiglath-Pileser led into captivity

the people of Gilead and of Galilee, and the districts of Issachar, Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali, Northern Dan, Eastern Manasseh and Gad were incorporated into the Assyrian monarchy. The last king of Israel accordingly ruled over nothing but what was afterward called Samaria, *i. e.*, the territory of Ephraim, West Manasseh, and the remnants of Benjamin. (Benjamin had not been joined to Judah, as is generally supposed; but Judah had extended her boundaries in the north at the expense of Benjamin, as early as the reigns of David and Solomon. The district of Reuben had disappeared during the time of the Kings). From this limited territory Sargon, in 722, according to his own report, led into captivity 27,280 persons, and later on until 711 some few more. In both deportations from all ten tribes the entire number of captives could not have numbered more than fifty thousand, including women and children. The system of deportation then practised by the despots never sent the entire population of a land into exile, but only those influential families who might stir up rebellion against the conqueror, and the artisans who made weapons. These captives formed a small minority in the communities where they settled, and being not very zealous Jews religiously, they underwent a religious and social amalgamation with the foreign people. (It was different with the Babylonian exiles of a century and a half later; they were zealous Jehovists, and were promised a Return, so that they adhered to Judaism, lived together in Babylon, the prophetic activity continued, and some of them later returned to Jerusalem as a congregation of legal zealots). Those who were deported from the Northern Kingdom were an insignificant number compared with the masses that remained, perhaps one-tenth. They were not tribes, nor large parts of tribes, but only individuals, or at most families. These persons were "lost," to be sure, but the tribes as such remained in Canaan, and absorbed the heathen settlers that were sent in. In later times the division into tribes signified little or nothing, the division into tribal territory was not regarded. In general, the Jew of the New Testament era knew as little from what tribe he came as does the modern Jew. Among modern Jews all these tribes, without any doubt, have their descendants. In other words, the "lost" tribes never have been and are not now "lost."

Christ and the Old Testament.—Professor Sanday wrote, some years ago, in his *Oracles of God*, concerning the question whether Jesus' reference to Old Testament books as the works of certain persons decided the question of their authorship, the following statement: "I should be loath to believe that our Lord *accommodated* his language to current notions, knowing them to be false. I prefer to think, as it has been happily worded, that 'He *condescended* not to know.'" Speaking upon the same subject in his Bampton Lectures of last year, just now published, he said: "Is there not what we might perhaps call a *neutral zone* among our Lord's sayings? Sayings, I mean, in which he takes up ideas and expressions current at the time, and uses without really endorsing them." As such a saying he cites the question which Christ

addressed to the Pharisees concerning the 110th Psalm (Matt. 22:45), and adds: "It was not criticism or exegesis that was at issue. The true methods of these might well be left for discovery much later. The Pharisees were taken upon their own ground; and the fallacy of their conclusion was shown on their own premises. All we need say is, that our Lord refrained from correcting these premises. They fell within his neutral zone."

An editorial in the *Expository Times* for January called Professor Sanday to account for having adopted the theory of Christ's knowledge which he had at first expressed himself as "loath to believe." He replied through a letter in the next issue that he was not conscious of any such alleged change of opinion: "In my last book I am not speculating as to causes, I am merely describing a certain class of facts, not from the inner side of the divine consciousness, but as they are presented to us. If I were compelled to give an opinion as to the ultimate cause of the facts, I believe that I should express myself very much as I did three years ago; I should say that our Lord's silence or condescension to the views of his contemporaries on the points in question was, in some mysterious way, connected with his assumption of the limitations of human nature. But the truth is, that I much prefer not to speculate on this profound subject at all. . . . . There is a *refraining* on the part of our Lord. But I do not think we can regard this refraining as merely the suppression *at the moment* of something which it was (so to speak) on his lips to say, but did not say. I imagine that it goes much farther back, and was in fact implied in the limitations which he assumed when he became man. The one great *condescension* includes all smaller condescensions."

Agrapha: Sayings of our Lord not Recorded in the Four Gospels.—It is not a strange phenomenon to any one who understands the origin of our Gospels and the formation of the New Testament canon that there are certain sayings of Jesus quite surely authentic which did not get into the Gospels as first written in their present form. That there are such has always been recognized. A good list of them may be found in Canon Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, Appendix C, or, in Dr. Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, Vol I., pp. 162–7; the fullest collection and discussion of them is in Resch's *Agrapha* (Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig). Resch presents seventy-four which he regards as authentic extra-Gospel sayings of Jesus, and one hundred and three others which have been handed down but which he regards as unauthentic.

Rev. Walter Lock discusses some of these supposed authentic sayings in *The Expositor* for January and February. There are three sources, he says, from which these sayings come: (1) from other books of the New Testament as undoubtedly Acts 20:25, "it is more blessed to give than to receive"; probably also a semi-quotation in James 1:12, "he shall receive the crown of life which the Lord promised to them that love him," cf. 2 Tim. 4:8; 1 Pet. 5:4; Rev. 2:10; and it is possible that many other sayings are similarly repro-

duced in the Epistles and Apocalypse. (2) the second source, both in amount and in authority, is certain manuscripts of the New Testament, which present some additions to the text approved by the majority. These additions have been rejected or in some way distinguished in the Revised Version, cf. Matt. 6:13; Mark 9:29, 49; 16:9–20; Luke 9:55; 23:34; John 7:53–8:11. Some or all of these additions were quite probably authentic words of Jesus, but were not in the first manuscripts of our Gospels. (3) quotations found in early Christian writers, and in lost Gospels. They are mainly from the sub-Apostolic Fathers in the beginning of the second century; Clement of Alexandria, Origen and the pseudo-Clementine writings at the end of the second and beginning of the third centuries; and the books which bear on church discipline and order, especially the Didascalia (250–300 A. D.), and the latest editions of the Apostolic Constitutions (c. 350 A. D.)

What authority may we reasonably assign to these extra-canonical sayings? each must stand or fall on its own evidence and merits. It seems fair to claim, says Mr. Lock, that such of them as won their way into general acceptance in the current church texts of the Gospels for many centuries have such strong attestation that we cannot hesitate to regard them as genuine. Of the others many are probably authentic, but they may not be used as the text of the Gospels. The Agrapha form the fringe of the Gospel narrative, making it difficult to draw a line sharply between that which is authentic and canonical, and that which is not; yet the fringe implies a garment well woven and strong to which it is attached.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE SECOND JEREMIAH. By G. H. SKIPWITH, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* for January, 1894. Pp. 278–98.

Since the critical analysis of the Hexateuch has been carried to so high a degree of perfection, Mr. Skipwith sets himself to examine the structure and growth of the Book of Jeremiah. His article deals broadly with the prophecies of the restoration, chapters 3 and 30—33 and 50, and 51. The author is content at the outset to assume the genuineness of 3:6–15 against the assertions of Cornill in a recent article (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. IV., p. 671). These verses seem to be the original model of Ezek. 23, hence form a *terminus a quo* for the series of prophecies under consideration. In verse 16 we find a *terminus ad quem*—a post-exilic interpolation, irrelevant to the subject of the preceding verses, while verse 17, according to Driver, presents characteristics of Jeremiah. Another element in the criticism of this group of prophecies is afforded by chapters 50 and 51, assigned by Cheyne, Driver and Cornill to a late exilic period. Wellhausen notes the peculiar structure, the "constantly recurring lyrical parenthesis" of Isaiah 40 *seq*. The same structure characterizes Jer. 50 and 51. The prophet of these chapters was, like the "Second Isaiah," a student, and in some degree an imitator of his predecessors.

The presence in the text under consideration of a passage derived from some earlier prophetic author presents a difficulty with one of two possible solutions; it may be either a quotation or an addition by some scribe. "The only proof of interpolation consists in the absolute irrelevance of the passage inserted." Such intrusions are frequent throughout the Book of Jeremiah. One may be recognized in the quotation from Hab. 2:13, which now forms the present conclusion of the prophecy (51:58*b*). The first half is no doubt genuine, and no doubt misplaced. Perhaps it once stood at the end of verse 44, where we now read, "Yea, the wall of Babylon shall fall." More appropriately it might stand after verse 32, or perhaps verse 33. The true conclusion of this chapter is verse 57, and verse 58 must be regarded as an appendix. There are likewise other evident transpositions and interpolations which break the continuity of thought in these chapters. Their loose structure renders it easy to distinguish the component parts of this prophecy, and especially to separate from the passages announcing the fall of Babylon those which relate to the restoration of Israel. Passages 50, 1–4 and 17–20 are at least out of place, interrupting the text in which they are imbedded. Notes of time similar in character are found at the beginning of 50:4–7 and in the genuine portions of 3:16, 17, 18, and in 33:15.

The general character of the narratives of the book should receive attention. They are a collection, originating primarily with Jeremiah himself as related in chapter 36, containing prophecies older than the fourth year of Jehoiakim, as found in chapters 1–24, followed by 25, then 46 : 3–12 ; 47 ; 48 (striking out glaring interpolations), 49 : 1–33. To this original collection many additions were made (36 : 32). The employment by Jeremiah of perhaps several amanuenses may be sufficient to account for numerous variations in orthography which distinguish chapters 27–29. The rays of light found in these chapters may be attributable to an interpolator, who desired to render the darkness of the background for the benefit of the exiles.

Chapters 30–33 display numerous evidences of later manipulation, in fact, as Cheyne says in the *Pulpit Commentary*, "they form a kind of book in themselves." It is prefaced (30 : 2) by a convenient fiction (cf. 51 : 59–64), the reason for which is assigned in verse 3, in a manner which indicates the date and occasion of publication, viz., the return from the exile. If chapter 30 contains anything that is Jeremiah's it is to be found in verses 5–6 and 12–15. As a whole the chapter seems to be the work of a collector and student of former prophetic utterances. There is a break between chapters 30 and 31. The former, excepting verses 18–21, contains little that is original, the latter includes passages of the highest originality and beauty. There are many parallels with "deutero-Isaiah." The remainder of one section, chapters 32–33, have reached us in great disorder, revealing several recensions at different periods in the past.

The general conclusion reached is that Jer. 3 : 16–18 ; 30 and 31, and (at least in part) 33 : 1–8 and 14–26 ; 50 : 4–7 and 17–20, and other parts of 50–51 relating to the restoration of Israel and Judah, as well as clauses interpolated in 2 : 3 and 16 : 18 are all the work of a single student and imitator of former prophecies, whom the author has ventured to name the "Second Jeremiah."

Cheyne's Pulpit Commentary on Jeremiah and Cornill's article above referred to, form the basis of Mr. Skipwith's discussion. He carries out, though with some crudity, the principles of Wellhausen and Cheyne. Predictive prophecy is fiction, they say, and conclusive evidence of some later hand. It is simply *vaticinium post eventum*. Now cut out all such references in Jeremiah and you have simply a series of inexplicable prophecies, without a ray of light, without one beam of hope. It would make the book a picture of blackness and despair. True, there are undoubtedly evidences of later hands, but that a dividing line lies where marked by the author is purely speculative. Ezekiel can be torn into shreds by the same handiwork. This is higher criticism without its reason. PRICE.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

The Young People's Course.—The course of Bible Study for organizations for Christian work is meeting with continued success. Over 1,700 students are now at work, some studying alone, and others in clubs ranging in membership from two to forty. Expressions of pleasure in their work are continually coming from these students. The following is but a fair specimen of the usual comments:

"I am glad to say that an earnest interest is manifested in the Bible study. The younger members, especially, seem conscientious in following the directions and suggestions for daily study, and in the use of their note-books. At our meetings we have followed the club programs you sent, with such additions as suggested themselves. The papers on special topics have been pleasing, and were cheerfully prepared.

For myself the study is so absorbing that I find the hours too short to follow out the lines of thought and research which constantly present themselves for attention."

The work seems to appeal to no one religious denomination, and to no one class of Christian people more than another. A club of thirty-three members in Utah comprises believers in the following creeds: Methodist, Presbyterian, Mormon, Christian, Congregational, Lutheran, Spiritualist. A few clubs have been formed in colleges among members of the Y. M. C. A. The two largest clubs, numbering between thirty and forty members, are in Champaign, Ill., and Fernwood, Ill. Worcester, Mass., has two large clubs, and Newburgh, N. Y., possesses the same distinction. An interesting club of about twenty-five members has been formed from the bright educated young people in a Bohemian church in Chicago. Many other clubs of unique interest might be mentioned if space allowed.

Action was taken at the recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the Illinois Christian Endeavor Union whereby the course is officially adopted by the Union, and every effort is being made to introduce it into the work of the Societies throughout the state. Although no official endeavor has been made to secure students abroad, a recent mail brings two names from China, and the information that the Christian Endeavor Union of New South Wales has officially indorsed the course and recommends its adoption by all societies.

A club has been organized in the Epworth League of the Englewood M. E. Church, Chicago, of which Dr. Mandeville is pastor. This club has secured for itself the services of a teacher, Mr. C. W. Votaw, of the University of Chicago, who meets its members weekly and will carry them through

the course. The weekly meeting brings together between fifty and seventy-five members of the League.

Sunday School Work.—As reported in the January issue of THE BIBLICAL WORLD, a committee from the American Institute of Sacred Literature was invited to meet with the International Lesson Committee in Philadelphia, March 14, to consider the best methods of selection and treatment of Biblical material for use in the Sunday School.

In response to this invitation the following letter was presented to the committee by Dr. F. K. Sanders, the Eastern representative of the Institute.

To the International Lesson Committee,
Philadelphia, Pa.:

CHICAGO, March 10, 1894.

GENTLEMEN,—We beg to express our appreciation of the honor conferred upon our organization by your invitation to send representatives to confer with you and your committee upon a subject of such vital interest to us all as that to be discussed, namely, a consideration of the best methods of selection and treatment of biblical material for use in the Sunday School.

I regret to say that it is impossible for us to present officially a direct concensus of the opinions of the members of our Board of Directors, no meeting of the Directors having been held since the matter was presented to us. We believe, however, that the following statements represent not only the opinion of the members of our Board as a body, but those of our world-wide constituency as well. We have, therefore, no hesitation in presenting them for the consideration of your honored Committee, whose great and effective work in the past we heartily appreciate.

We therefore advocate the *planning of a system of lessons such that the pupil who pursues it will gain a comprehensive and connected knowledge of biblical history and teaching*, it being held that homiletical teaching should be based upon a systematic study of biblical facts. We suggest three ways in which such a system might be brought about.

1. The whole Biblical material might be divided into seven parts, to each part of which a year might be assigned in which the whole material of that period might be comprehensively and connectedly studied.

2. The whole biblical material might be divided into three or four parts, and this material might be treated through one period of three or four years from one point of view; for example, with emphasis upon the *historical* side, and through a second period of three or four years from a different point of view; for example, with emphasis upon the *teachings*. This is not necessarily inconsistent with the plan of uniform lessons.

3. The purpose could be partially accomplished by assigning, in addition to the regular course based upon the principles heretofore followed by the International Committee, a course of alternative, supplemental lessons, the specific aim of which should be to give the pupil such a comprehensive and connected knowledge as that referred to above. These lessons would be

intended especially for more advanced classes who had already pursued the regular course of lessons. The Scripture material for such a course of lessons must necessarily be selected with reference to a treatment according to this method.

The determination of the general system, as well as the elaboration of the details, is a work of so much difficulty as to make it seem desirable that the International Committee should associate with itself *an Advisory Committee* consisting of two sections, one of Old Testament specialists, and one of New Testament specialists, to assist in this particular part of the work.

We therefore recommend the appointment of such a committee.

May we express, in closing, our belief,

1. That principles such as the above have become essential to the best results in Sunday school work.

2. That the incorporation of these principles in the present International system would not necessitate a disorganizing process.

3. That this work may most properly and most effectively be done by the committee which has so long guided the work of the Sunday School world.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM R. HARPER,
Principal of the Institute of Sacred Literature.

The following is a reprint of the report of the conference by the Secretary of the International Committee:

At a meeting of the International Sunday-school Lesson Committee held in Philadelphia, March 14 and 15, 1894, the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, I. That the general lessons for 1896 and thereafter the following course shall be pursued: 1. A longer lesson than has been common shall be indicated, and its topic shall be so stated, when practicable, as to cover this entire lesson, and to show the historical connection and progress. 2. A certain portion shall be marked as "selected verses," which may be printed in "Lesson Helps" when the publishers so desire, and may be the sole lesson for those who prefer short lessons. 3. Memory verses and golden texts shall be given as heretofore.

Resolved, II. That a separate course of Primary Lessons shall be prepared, to begin with 1896.

The request that Advisory Committees be appointed to confer with the Lesson Committee was considered, but was not thought to be practicable. The Lesson Committee, however, will gladly welcome any suggestion in regard to the selection of lessons which those interested in the work may send them.

WARREN RANDOLPH,
Secretary of the Committee.

March 16, 1894.

Work and Workers.

ANOTHER work upon the History of the Church during the First Six Centuries, by Archdeacon Cheetham, is soon to be published by Macmillans, adding to the already long list.

THE excellent work which Rev. Buchanan Blake is doing for the Old Testament in his series of books entitled *How to Read the Prophets* is further extended by the appearance of his fourth volume upon *Ezekiel.*

CASSELLS have made a good contribution to Biblical Introduction by separating the various introductions to the books as found in Ellicott's Handy Commentary to the Old and New Testaments, and publishing them by themselves in two volumes.

A SERIES of articles which will awaken unusual interest and thought will be begun in the April number of the *Expository Times.* The subject is *The Theology of Isaiah*, and the author is Professor A. B. Davidson, of New College, Edinburgh, whose *Book of Job* in the Cambridge Bible series, and *Book of Hebrews* in the Handbooks for Bible Classes series, are well known.

A FOURTH edition of Dr. Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* is about to be published. The new editor is Rev. Edward Miller, formerly Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. The work is greatly enlarged, and will be in two volumes, Bell & Sons, London, publishers. The third edition is now ten years old, so that there was abundant occasion for a revision of the work, and the best efforts have been put forth to bring the work up to date.

A NEW volume in the *Theological Educator* series (Whittaker, New York) is out, and is upon a theme which will attract attention. It is *The Theology of the New Testament*, by Professor W. F. Adeney, M.A., who occupies the chair of New Testament Introduction, History and Exegesis in New College, London. Its success will be assured if it proves itself deserving of a place by the side of other works in the same series contributed by Professors Dods, Moule, Warfield, Wright, Simcox, and other scholars.

A NEW *Dictionary of the Syriac Language* will shortly be published by T. & T. Clark (Edinburgh), in conjunction with a Berlin house. The Dictionary is being prepared by Dr. C. Brockelmann, of Breslau, and will contain an Introduction by Professor Noeldeke. It is to comprise some eight hundred quarto pages, and will be printed from new type by Drugulin of Leipzig. It will probably be issued in parts, as has now become customary in the first appearance of dictionaries, and Part I. will be ready this summer.

THE original language of the Fourth Book of Esdras was Greek, but this is not now extant. The current English translation of the work is from a Latin version, and there were also other translations of it into other tongues. Professor Dobie, of Edinburgh, is preparing a critical edition of the Ethiopic version of the writing. He has at his hand a large number of manuscripts of this version, ten or more of them belonging to the British Museum alone, while others are found in the libraries of Paris and Berlin. The work will be acceptable.

IT IS always a triumph for the general public when some important work which has been held at an inaccessibly high figure is at last put upon the market at a reasonable price. Professor Jowett's *Notes and Dissertations on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians and Romans*, though not of first importance in their department, is yet a work which one may profitably consult. The announcement therefore is gratifying that a new edition of this work, in two volumes (Murray, London) will soon appear, edited by Professor Lewis Campbell. The original material has been condensed, but probably not to the disadvantage of the reader.

WITH its January number, *The Thinker* entered upon its third year, and makes itself even more indispensable to the biblical scholar. The ninety-six pages of each issue contain valuable contributions to the study of the Bible and theology. Dr. Gloag is publishing a series of articles upon the Synoptic Problem, Dr. Stalker upon the Book of Enoch, and Professor Roberts upon Some Prominent Difficulties in the Gospels. Each number also contains abstracts of ten or twelve of the leading articles in this department which are appearing in current issues of the leading American, Canadian, English, German, French and other journals. A department has this year been added which treats of the Sunday School Lessons.

LAST September, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine, took the step which the Western Seminaries have many of them taken in establishing an English Department for the training of those who cannot, for lack of college preparation, pursue the regular course. The new arrangement was of course experimental, but the results have been such as to show its need, and now all signs point to the permanence of the department. Professor George W. Gilmore, of Brooklyn, N. Y., was engaged as instructor, to have charge of the biblical work of the Department. He was graduated from Princeton College in 1883, and from Union Theological Seminary in 1886. He has in preparation, for publication during the summer, a work entitled *The Johannean Problem: a resumé of the affirmative argument*, intended for the general public.

A NEW, revised edition of Professor Driver's *Life and Times of Isaiah* has been issued. The changes are not many, but are of interest. The prophecy in chapters 24–27 was in the first edition assigned to the period imme-

diately before the Babylonian Captivity; it is now transferred to the early years after the return, a change already announced in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* The prophecy 21 : 1–10, regarded still in the text as belonging possibly to the time of Isaiah, is further discussed in the appendix, where it is thought probably to date from a later period. The treatment of the prophecies concerning Edom in chapters 34–35 has been partly rewritten, and a more definite opinion has been expressed about the date. Minor additions are made at various points, and an appendix discusses recent views about the dates of a number of the prophecies. Two new and useful indexes have been added, an index of subjects and an index of texts.

THE sixth series of the *Expositor's Bible* is now complete by the appearance of Professor Lumby's volume upon *The Epistles of St. Peter.* The seventh series, to be issued during the present year, is already begun, the first number to appear being Principal H. C. G. Moule's volume upon *The Epistle to the Romans.* His contribution to the *Cambridge Bible* series upon the same Epistle will bespeak a welcome for this latest work. The next numbers to be issued will be *The Second Book of Kings*, by Archdeacon Farrar; *The First Book of Chronicles*, by Professor W. H. Bennett; *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, by Rev. James Denney. These three volumes may be expected by the middle of the year. After them will come *The Book of Numbers*, by Rev. R. A. Watson, and *Psalms, Vol. III.*, by Dr. Alex. Maclaren. The series has now covered the entire New Testament, and the most important part of the Old Testament, the Prophetic Books from Ezekiel on, being still unprepared, also a scattering few less prominent books. In a year or two more the great and useful work will be complete.

THE *Expository Times* notices with commendation the prominence and care that are given to the book review department of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review.* To many of its readers this feature must be the most interesting and valuable portion of the magazine. In these days of innumerable books the only hope for the non-professional man, or indeed for many who may well be called professional, is in the competent and candid reviews of the new works by scholars in the respective departments. The latest publications upon a subject ought to be, and sometimes are, the best. How shall one know whether a new book is worthy of one's purchase? By ascertaining what the new book contains, what the point of view is from which it was written, what its relation is to previous works upon the same subject, and what the consensus of opinion is among scholars as to the correctness and usefulness of the book. The periodical which gives this information concisely and promptly will be estimated at its true worth, and the *Review* deserves the good things said of it on this score by the English contemporary.

A NEW WORK is about to be published by the Palestine Exploration Fund (Watt & Son, London), which promises to become one of the most popular of the many books hitherto issued by that Society. It is entitled *A Mound of*

Many Cities, or Tell el Hesy Excavated. The author is Mr. F. J. Bliss, M.A., of America, who carried to completion the work of investigation which Professor Flinders Petrie started at this point. The results of the excavation of this Tell, or Mound, the first to be unearthed in Palestine, are full of interest. It contains the remains certainly of eight, probably of eleven, cities which were successively built upon the same site, one upon the ruins of the other, during the long period from 2000 B. C. to 400 B. C. The last city, destroyed about the latter date, was not rebuilt, and the mound, grass-grown, has remained unoccupied and undisturbed until this work of excavation was begun. The broken pottery and other remains found on the various levels indicate the approximate dates of the several buried cities. A cuneiform letter on a clay tablet was found which is important, being a communication from the Governor of Lachish to the Egyptian Pharoah, written by Zimradi (or Zimride), who is mentioned in the Tell el Amarna tablets as Governor of Lachish, and who was murdered by the servants of the Pharoah. The book will be illustrated by over two hundred and fifty pictures of plans, elevations and excavated relics.

AT THE University of Pennsylvania, during February and March, a course of eight Readings in English from the Hebrew Prophets was given by Professor Morris Jastrow. The purpose of the series was to illustrate the historical and archæological data furnished by the prophetical books of the Old Testament. The plan pursued was to select a chapter from the writings of some prophet as the basis for the hour's study, introduce it with some general remarks on the salient traits in style and thought of the writer, and then give a fresh translation of the original with explanations of terms and phrases. This was followed by an interpretation of the chapter. The historical situation was brought out, with the aid of the historical records of the nations with whom the Hebrews were thrown in contact. The bearings of recent researches and explorations in the Orient formed a prominent feature of the lectures, and the collections in the University Museum and Library furnished many illustrations. Some of the selections brought out the popular views of the Hebrews regarding life after death, Canaanitish and Syrian worship, and phases of social life among the ancient eastern peoples. The several topics of the Readings were as follows: (1) Isaiah, chaps. 15 and 16, main theme Israel and Moab; (2) Jeremiah, chap. 48, main theme Judah and Moab; (3) Isaiah, chaps. 13 and 45, main theme Popular Conceptions of Life after Death; (4) Isaiah, chap. 5, main theme Israel and Yahwe; (5) Amos, chaps. 1–6, main theme Samaria's Sins; (6) Ezekiel, chaps. 16–18, main theme Semitic Modes of Worship; (7) Jeremiah, chap. 32, main theme Phases of Social Life in Palestine; (8) Micah, chaps. 2–4, main theme Before and After the Exile. The work was distinctly popular in its character, and the good attendance and large interest suggested the wisdom of extending the series of Readings at a later time.

Book Reviews.

The Reasonable Christ. A Series of Studies. By GEORGE E. MERRILL. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Company, 1893.

This book is a series of fourteen studies upon the different periods and aspects of Christ's life. As stated in the preface, but one purpose animates the volume: to present the Christ of the gospels as One who satisfies the reason as well as the heart of believers. It does not, therefore, endeavor to expound the grounds of belief, but simply to fix the mind of the reader on Christ as being his own vindication and as rationally explaining the claims of Christianity. Its simple story of Christ's life as reasonable in purpose and spirit forms an effective background for the presentation of the supernatural and miraculous in Christianity. Its moral is very clear, that the claims of miraculous power could not appear unreasonable in a life that was otherwise so reasonable and convincing. As being, thus, half expository and half apologetic, the book furnishes much interesting material for thought.

C. E. W.

Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON, Professor in the University of Chicago. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Chicago: 1893. pp. 22 and 215. Price, $1.50.

The language of the New Testament has a peculiar fascination and aggravation for the classical scholar. Inasmuch as it is Greek, he cannot consider it alien to his studies, but its irregularities and solecisms make him desire to correct and reduce all to rule as he would an exercise in Greek composition. Certainly the New Testament writers did not use Greek elegantly. They made the mistakes natural to those who acquire a language very unlike their own from men who speak various dialects and who belong to the unlettered class of the community. Some of us know what blunders an American is likely to commit in his use and misuse of German prepositions and other particles. The Septuagint translation of the Old Testament is full of such confusions, which we can well understand. For example, our expression *to fight with one* is ambiguous; it may mean either to fight against him or on his side; but the Greek is properly unambiguous. In the Septuagint, however, the corresponding ambiguity of the Hebrew is often transferred to the Greek. The language of the New Testament is not so near the classical norm as might be thought by those who notice only the classical parallels adduced for this and that word and construction. Many of these so-called parallels have to be

sought in remote corners of Greek literature; they are exceptional rather than regular.

To bring New Testament Greek under scientific rules, is no slight problem. Two German grammars—those of Winer and Buttmann—admirably translated by Professor Thayer, then of Andover, but now of Harvard, have done much to provide a sound basis for exegesis. We welcome in the book before us a new work on one (and the most important) part of this field; the syntax of the cases presents fewer difficulties. The author makes clear in his preface the limitations of his plan. "It is designed to assist English-speaking students in the task of translating the Greek New Testament into English forms of thought and expression. . . . The book is written, therefore, in the interest not of historical but of exegetical grammar, not of philology as such, but of philology as an auxiliary of interpretation." Thus the most elaborate article of the work is that which treats of the different methods of dealing with indirect discourse in Greek and English—intended to clear the minds of not very advanced students and to prepare for exact translations. A similar article deals with the translation of the Greek aorist.

The professional philologist will regret that the historical method has not been followed more freely, but he has no right to complain since the author does not undertake to provide for him. Occasionally statistics are given, as in § 407, and a bit of historical grammar, as in § 88 and § 405; but too often the reader finds only a general statement that such a construction is "rare" or "frequent" or "found in a few instances," and references to the grammars of Goodwin or Hadley for the Attic usage. The reviewer here is obliged to believe that the author erred. With more statistics and definite information, the book would have had for the careful student an increased value out of all proportion to the additional labor of the author or the extra cost of printing. If the work is intended simply to assist in the task of translating, it need not have been so elaborate and full. If this practical limit is to be exceeded, the book should satisfy the scientific wants of philological scholars. Disputed passages like the use of the aorist participle in connection with Christ's preaching to the "Spirits in Prison" in general are not discussed. The author shows good judgment in avoiding the strict classicism of Meyer's commentary, and in recognizing the tendencies of the language which have been fulfilled in the Modern Greek. But the reference in § 223 to Professor Jebb's essay on this subject is insufficient. The main facts should have been stated. The references to grammatical works and articles are good and full on some subjects, but in his desire to be concise the author has left his work in this respect a trifle uneven.

The author evidently has made the problems of the book his own, and here publishes in condensed form the results of careful, scholarly thought and study as well as pedagogical experience. His treatment of the participle seems particularly independent. His adoption of an unfamiliar nomenclature for the division of participles, however, seems unfortunate. The general accept-

ance of the proposed system is extremely improbable, and the efforts necessary to render this nomenclature familiar to those who have been trained to use ordinary grammars, will be much greater than the advantage gained.

The form of the book is pleasant. Most students will find it more easily intelligible than the works of Buttmann and Winer, and its size will not frighten them. The proof-reading is good. A curious slip (to my mind) is the use of *shall* for *will*, repeated more than once in the discussion of indirect discourse. In ordinary good usage, *I shall go* becomes in indirect discourse *he says he will go;* while here it is turned into *he says he shall go*. Must we abandon the distinction between shall and will?

American scholars have done a good work in the grammatical study of Greek. No English scholars in Greek syntax can be matched with our Professor Goodwin and Professor Gildersleeve, while Goodwin's Moods and Tenses and Grammar and the Hadley-Allen Grammar are the chief authorities on this subject in Great Britain. Professor Thayer's translation of Winer and Buttmann are most serviceable, and the book before us is a distinct contribution to the same end of exact grammatical study, without which all exegesis rests on a rotten foundation. T. D. S.

Calwer Bibel-Lexicon. Redigiert von Dekan Lic. Th. Paul Zeller. Zweite durchgesehene Auflage.

Although this Bible Dictionary has found many readers in Germany, as is evidenced by the exhaustion of the first edition within ten years, it is comparatively unknown elsewhere. It is probably safe to say that many scholars outside of the fatherland are all but ignorant of its existence. Yet this neglect is undeserved, for the work, though of a distinctly popular type, has been carefully compiled, and contains a large number of articles by writers of repute which well deserve to be more widely read. Many of the notes on natural history bear the name of Dr. Fraas, one of the contributors to Riehm. The many articles on subjects directly or indirectly connected with Assyriology are from the pen of Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, of Breslau, and constitute one of the most interesting and useful features of the volume. Whilst it would be rash to pronounce them superior to the splendid series of articles by Schrader in Riehm, they unquestionably merit attention even from those familiar with the latter. The article on Nimrod mentions with approval the reading of the name of the hero of the Babylonian epic as "Gilgames" (according to Professor Delitzsch originally "Gibilgames"), which is strangely ignored in the corresponding article in the second edition of Riehm. The articles on Antichrist, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles to the Corinthians, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, are by Godet. Orelli has dealt with the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Psalter, and the Books of Daniel and Zechariah, as well as with Hebrew Poetry, Offerings, the Sabbath, and the lives of the leading patriarchs. Professor Oettli, of

Basle, has supplied articles on Samuel, Solomon, the Book of Proverbs, and other subjects. One article, on "Name-giving among the Hebrews," has been contributed by Professor Nestle. Professor Kittel, the well-known author of the History of the Hebrews, is responsible for several articles on widely different themes including Music, War, Dress, Chariot, Chronology, Deutero-Isaiah, and the Books of Moses. The last mentioned gives a very brief but admirable survey of the results of recent criticism on the origin of the Pentateuch. The writer's own view, as stated here, agrees substantially with that propounded at much greater length in his history. The volume is clearly printed in good, bold type, though unfortunately not in Roman characters, and comprises nearly 1,000 pages, with a colored frontispiece, three maps and 537 illustrations which are all of sufficient size to be intelligible and pleasing, and the price is a little under two dollars.

W. Taylor Smith.

Current Literature.

BOOKS.

GENERAL.

Freckelton, P. W. Smith, J. F., Lloyd, W. etc., Religion and Modern Thought, and other essays. (London, Green, 1894, pp. 206, 8vo). 2s. 6d.

Henschel, A. Die Bibel ist Gottes Wort. (Berlin, 1894; pp. 72, 16mo). 40d.

Lightfoot, Bishop, a biography. Reprinted from the Quarterly Review, with prefactory note by the Bishop of Durham. (New York, Macmillan & Co., 8vo). 9s.

Schlatter, A. Einleitung in die Bibel. 2 Aufl. (Calw und Stuttgart, 1893; pp. iv + 527, 8vo). M. 3; bound M. 3.75.

Scott, A. Sacrifice: its prophecy and fulfilment. The Baird Lecture for 1892–93. (Edinburgh, Douglas, 1894; pp. 384, 8vo). 7s. 6d.

Stead, F. H. The Kingdom of God: a plan of study in 3 parts. Part I, The Kingdom in Israel; II, The Kingdom in the Synoptic Sayings of Jesus; III, The Kingdom in Apostolic Times. (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1893; 18mo). Each, 6d.

Valentine, L. Palestine, past and present, pictorial and descriptive. 140 engravings and a series of colored plates. (London & New York; F. Warne & Co., Small 4to). $1.50.

Villa, K. Die Bibel und ihre Verbreitung; ein Vortrag. (Stuttgart, 1893; pp. 16, 8vo). 10d.

Westcott, B. F. The Incarnation and Common Life. (New York, Macmillan & Co., 8vo).

Ziese, J. H. Die Inspiration der heilige Schrift. Ein Beitrag. (Schleswig, Bergas, 1894; pp. 47, 8vo). M. 1.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Bickell, G. Das Buch Job, nach Anleitung der Strophik und der Septuaginta auf seine ursprüngliche Form zurückgeführt und im Versmasse des Urtextes übersetzt. (Wien, Gerold's Sohn, 1893). M. 2.

Farrar, F. W. The Second Book of Kings (Expositor's Bible). (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 8vo). 7s. 6d.

Geikie, C. Landmarks of Old Testament History: Samuel to Malachi. 8vo. 6s.

Hirsch, S. R. Der Pentateuch Uebersetzt und Erklärt, 3 Teil: Leviticus, 2te Auflage (Frankfurt, am Main, Kaufmann, 1893; pp. 648, 8vo). M. 2.50; bound M. 4.

Huxley, T. H. Science and Hebrew Tradition: Essays (collected essays, vol. 4). (London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1893; pp. 338, 8vo). $1.25.

Huyge, Ch. La chronologie des livres d'Esdras et de Néhémie. (Paris, 1893; pp. 46, 8vo).

Jastrow, M. Der 90ste Psalm. (Leipzig, 1893; pp. 14, 8vo).

Malan, S. C. Original Notes on the Book of Proverbs, mostly from Eastern writings. Vol. iii, ch. xxi–xxxi. (London, Williams & Norgate, 1893; pp. viii + 603, 8vo). 12s.

Marti, K. Der Einfluss der Ergebnisse der neuesten Alttestamentlichen Forschungen auf Religionsgeschichte und

Glaubenslehre; Vortrag (Braunschweig, Schwetschke und Sohn, 1894; pp. 59, 8vo).

Moss, R. W. From Malachi to Matthew. Outlines of the History of Judea from 440 to 4 B.C. (London, C. H. Kelly, 1804; pp. 254, 8vo). 2s. 6d.

Niebuhr, A. Versuch einer Reconstruction des Deboraliedes. (Berlin, 1893; pp. 48, 8vo).

NEW TESTAMENT.

Adeney, W. F. The Theology of the New Testament. (New volume of the Theological Educator). 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Egger, A. Die Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der Schriften des Neuen Testamentes. Populärer Nachweis derselben. (Einsiedeln, Benziger und Co., 1894; pp. 24, 12mo).

Gospel according to St. Peter: A study by the *Author of Supernatural Religion*. (London and New York, Longmans & Co., 8vo). 6s.

Lisco, H. Paulus Antipaulinus. Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung der ersten 4 Kapitel des 1 Korintherbriefes. (Berlin, G. W. F. Müller, 1894; pp. viii + 192, 8vo). M. 4.

Lumby, J. R. The Epistles of St. Peter (Expositor's Bible). (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1894; pp. 394, 8vo). 7s. 6d.

Moule, H. C. G. The Epistle to the Romans (Expositor's Bible). (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1894, 8vo). 7s. 6d.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, hrsg. v. O. v. Gebhardt und A. Harnack. Band xi. Heft 4. Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testamente, von *W. Bousset*, M. 4.50; Band xii. Heft 1. Der Chronograph aus dem 10 Jahre Antonins, von *A. Schlatter*, M. 4. (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1894).

Weizsäcker, Carl von. The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. Translated from the second and revised edition by James Millar. Vol. I. (London, Williams and Norgate, 8vo). 10s. 6d.

ARTICLES.

GENERAL.

Cave, Alfred. Sin and Evil as thought of in the Ethnic Religions. (The Thinker, Jan. 1894, 43-49).

Gladden, Washington. The New Bible. (Arena, Feb. 1894).

Goodenow, S. B. Primeval Man (Biblioth. Sacra, 1894, 158-164).

Horton, R. F. Christian Teachers of the Nineteenth Century. Benjamin Jowett. (The Thinker, Feb. 1894, 132-7).

Marshall, J. T. Traces of Syriac Influence in the Text of the Vulgate. (London, Academy, Feb. 3, 1894, 105-6).

Stalker, James. The Book of Enoch I, II. (The Thinker, Jan. & Feb., 1894; pp. 19-26; 113-20).

Steude. Christenthum und Naturwissenschaft. (Neue Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theologie, iii, part 1).

Tolstoi, Count Leo. Religion and Morality. (Contemporary Review, March 1894).

OLD TESTAMENT.

Asmussen, P. Die zehn Stämme. (Zeitschr. d. deutsch. Palästinavereins, xvi. Heft 4).

Berle, A. A. Semitic Literary Notes; Review of the products of recent Semitic Study. Bibl. Sac. 1894, 168-75).

Böklen. Bemerkung zu Deut. 33:12. (Theol. Stud. und Kritiken, 1894, 365-66).

Caldemeyer. Urim und Tummim. (Neue Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theologie, iii. Heft 1).

Cheyne, T. K. Malachi and the Nabataeans. (Zeitschr. f. Alttestl. Wiss., xiv. 142-3).

Doederlein, J. Das Lernen Immanuels. [Jes. 7, 15]. (Evang. Kirch. Ztg., 1893, No. 46, cols. 762-66).

Doorninck, A. van. De Simsonsagen. Kritische Studiën over Richt. 14-15. (Theol. Tijdschr., 1894, 14-32).

Driver, S. R. Archæology and the Old Testament. (Contemp. Review, March).

Einsler, A. Ueber den Aussatz im Heiligen Lande. (Zeitschr. d. deutsch. Palästinavereins, xvi. Heft 4).

Guidi, I. Sopra Genesi ii. 19. (Transactions of the 9th Internat. Congress of Orientalists, ii. 64-67).

Halévy, J. Recherches bibliques: Notes pour l'interprétation des Psaumes [suite] Psaume VII. (Revue sémitique, 1894, 1-12).

Howorth, H. H. A criticism of the sources and the relative importance and value of the canonical book of Ezra and the apocryphal book known as Esdras I. (Transactions of the 9th Internat. Congress of Orientalists, ii., 68-85).

Howorth, H. H. The Septuagint version versus The Hebrew Text of the Bible IV. (London, Academy, Feb. 17, 1894, p. 149.

Kohn, S. Samareitikon und Septuaginta. (Monatsschr. f. d. Wiss. d. Judenthums, N. F. 2 (38), Oct. '93, 1-7; Nov. '93, 49-67).

Ley. Emendationen zu I Sam. 9:24 und Jes. 53. (Theol. Stud. und Kritiken, 1894, 367-8).

Löhr, M. Der Sprachgebrauch des Buches der Klagelieder. (Zeitschr. f. Alttestl. Wiss. xiv. 31-50).

Löhr, M. Sind Threni iv. und v. makkabäisch? (*Ibid.*, 51-60).

Lotz, W. Die Inspiration des Alten Testamentes und die historische Kritik I. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr. 1894, 46-68; 148-175).

Marti, K. Der gegenwärtige Stand der Alttestamentl. Wiss. I. (Theol. Zeitschr. aus d. Schweiz, 1894, 21-40).

Martin, W. W. The Suffering Servant, as recorded in Isaiah liii. (Bibl. Sacra, 1894, 143-57).

Margoliouth, G. Job xix. 17. (London, Academy, 1893, Dec. 30, cols. 589*b*-590*a*) *cf. Cheyne*, (*ibid.*, 1894; Jan. 6, col. 15*a*), and *Margoliouth* and *Neubauer*, (*ibid.*, Jan. 13, cols. 36*b*-36*c*).

Nestle, E. The Variorum Septuagint. A proposal for a future edition of Dr. Swete's Old Testament in Greek. (Transactions of the 9th Internat. Congress of Orientalists, ii. 331-333).

Potwin, T. S. The Composition and Date of Deuteronomy I. (Bibl. Sacra, 1894, 1-19).

Sach, Israel. Les chapitres xvi–xvii., du livre de Josué. (Rev. des études juives xxvii. No. 53, 61-69).

Schlatter, A. Die Bene Parisim bei Daniel ii., 14. (Zeitschr. f. Alttestl. Wiss. xiv. 145-50).

Silberstein, S. Ueber den Ursprung der im Codex Alexandrinus und Vaticanus des dritten Königsbuches der Alexandrinischen Uebersetzung überlieferten Textgestalt, Schluss. (Zeitschr. f. Alttest. Wiss. xiv. 1-30).

Waller, C. H. The Prayers of David, the son of Jesse. (The Thinker, Jan. 1894, 12-19).

Zenner, J. K. Zu Genesis 6:6, und Psalm 93:4. (Zeitschr. f. Kathol. Theol., 1893, 173).

NEW TESTAMENT.

Acts II. 9, by F. J. G. (London, Athenæum, Feb. 24, 1894, 246).

Banks J. S. The Atonement in Modern Theology. (The Thinker, Jan. 1894, 49-57).

Belser. Paul's Reisen nach Korinth. (Theol. Quartalschr. 1894, 15-47).

Beyschlag, W. Über die Aussprüche Jesu an Petrus; Evang. Math. xvi. 17-19. (Revue Internat. de Théol. iii. 47-69).

Brown, David. The Westcott and Hort Text of the Greek Testament tested by its results, III. (The Thinker, Feb. 1894, 101-7).

Bruce, A. B. St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, 14. The Flesh as a Hindrance to Holiness. (Expositor, March).

Curtius, E. Paulus in Athen. (Sitzungsberichte der königl. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, 1893, 925-38).

Deane, W. J. The Appearance of the Dead at the Resurrection of Christ, Math. 27: 51-53. (The Thinker, Feb. 128-32).

Dods, Marcus. The Righteousness of Christ's Kingdom. (Expositor, March).

Döderlein, J. Wie ist er denn sein Sohn? [Math. 22: 45]. (Evang. Kirchenztg., 1893, No. 45 cols. 746-47).

Döderlein, J. Wann sah Abraham den Tag Christi? [Joh. 8.] (*Ibid.*, No. 50, cols. 825-26).

Gloag, P. J. The Synoptic Problem. I. The Nature of the Problem. II. The Theory of Mutual Dependence. (The Thinker, Jan.–Feb. 1894, 7-12 & 107-13).

Knoke, K. Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Lukas 16:11. (Theol. Stud. und Kritiken, 1894, 369-73).

Lemme. Zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols. (Neue. Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theologie iii, 1).

Macmillan, Hugh. The Mark of the Beast, Rev. 19:20. (The Thinker, Feb. 1894, 120-28).

Macmillan, Hugh. Outer Darkness, Jude 13. (*Ibid.*, Jan. 1894, 39-43).

Menzies, A. The Parable of the Talents. (*Ibid.*, Jan. 1894, 26-32).

Potwin, T. S. The Old Syriac Version of The Lord's Prayer: its rendering of ἐπιούσιος. (Biblioth. Sacra, 1894, 165-68).

Rosenthal, F. Das letzte Passahmahl Jesu und der Tag seines Todes. (Monatschr. f. d. Wiss. des Judenthums, 38, N. F. 2, 97-108).

Smith, G. A. Trachonitis and Ituraea. (Expositor, March).

Watson, J. The Premier Ideas of Jesus. 3. Sin an act of self-will. (Expositor, March).

Watson, R. R. The Shepherd, God and Man. (Expositor, March).

Whitefoord, R. The New Testament Mysteries. (*Ibid.*).

Wright, Arthur. On the Proper Names in St. Mark's Gospel. (*Ibid.*).

REVIEWS.

GENERAL.

Gutschmid, A. v. Kleine Schriften, hersg. v. Frz. Rühl. iv. Bd. (Rev. by E. Schürer, Theol. Ltztg., 1894, No. 3).

Knight, W. Aspects of Theism. (London, Academy, March 3, 181-2, A. Benn).

Slater. The Faith and Life of the early Church. (Adolf Harnack, Theol. Ltztg., 1894, No. 3).

Stokes, Sir G. G. Natural Religion. Gifford Lectures for 1893. (A. Benn, London, Academy, March 3, 181-2).