

→ *THE HEBREW STUDENT* ←

VOL. II.

NOVEMBER, 1882.

No. 3.

THE LITERARY STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

BY PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D.,
Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

The Bible is composed of a great variety of writings of holy men under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, in a long series extending through many centuries, preserved to us in three different original languages, the Hebrew, the Chaldee and the Greek, besides numerous versions. These languages were themselves the products of three different civilizations which having accomplished their purpose passed away, the languages no longer being used as living speech but preserved only in written documents. They present to us a great variety of literature, as the various literary styles and the various literary forms of these three languages have combined in this one sacred book of the Christian church making it as remarkable for its literary variety as for its religious unity.

The Bible is the sacred Canon of the Church of Christ, the infallible authority in all matters of worship, faith and practice. From this point of view it has been studied for centuries by Jew and Christian. Principles of interpretation have been established and employed in building up systems of religion, doctrine and morals. The divine element which is ever the principal thing, has been justly emphasized; and the doctrine of Inspiration has been extended by many dogmatic divines so as to cover the external letter, the literary form and style in the theory of verbal inspiration. Yet notwithstanding this claim of Inspiration for the form, comparatively little attention has been given to the form itself; that is to the

languages and the literature of the Bible, until recent times. The fact has been too often overlooked, that it has not seemed best to God to create a holy language for the exclusive vehicle of his Word or to constitute peculiar literary forms and styles for the expression of his revelation. But on the other hand, as he employed men rather than angels as the channels of his revelation, so he used three human languages with all the varieties of literature that had been developed in the various nations using these languages in order that he might approach mankind in a more familiar way in the *human* forms with which they were acquainted and which they could readily understand.

This human side of the Bible has been to a great extent neglected by theologians. It is true that great attention has been given in recent times to the languages of the Bible in the schools of Gesenius, Ewald and Olshausen, and to the original texts by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort and others; and to the exegesis of the particular writings in numerous commentaries; and to the introductory questions of date, authorship, structure and integrity of writings by a considerable number of scholars; but the literary forms and styles have not shared to any extent in this revival of Biblical studies. And yet these are exactly the things that most need consideration in our day, when Biblical literature is compared with the other sacred literatures of the other religions of the world, and the question is so often raised why we should recognize the Bible as the inspired word of God rather than the sacred books of other religions, and when the higher criticism is becoming the most important factor in Biblical studies of our day.

Bishop Lowth in England, and the poet Herder in Germany, toward the close of the last century called the attention of the learned world to this neglected theme, and invited them to the study of the Scriptures as sacred literature, but little advance has been made since their day, owing doubtless, to the fact that the conflict between the churches and Rationalism has been raging about the history, the religion and the doctrines, and to some extent as to the original text and the details of Biblical introduction in questions of authenticity and integrity of writings; but the finer literary features have not entered into the controversies to any extent until quite recent times, in the school of Kuenen, by Matthew Arnold and others. De Wette, Ewald, and especially Reuss have made valuable contributions to this subject, but even these masters of Exegetical Theology have given their strength to other topics. Now there lies open to the student of our day, one of the most interesting and inviting

fields for research, whence he may derive rich spoils for himself and the church; not only for the purpose of apologetics, but for constructive dogmatics.

The most obvious divisions of literature are poetry and prose. These are distinguished on the surface by different modes of writing, and to the ear by different modes of reading; but underneath all this is a difference of rhythmical movement. It is indeed difficult to draw the line scientifically between poetry and prose even here, for as Lanier says: "Prose has its rhythms, its tunes and its tone-colors, like verse; and, while the extreme forms of prose and verse are sufficiently unlike each other, there are such near grades of intermediate forms, that they may be said to run into each other, and any line claiming to be distinctive must necessarily be more or less arbitrary." Hence rhetorical prose and works of the imagination in all languages approximate closely to poetry. Says Prof. Shairp, "Whenever the soul comes into living contact with fact and truth, whenever it realizes with more than common vividness, there arises a thrill of joy, a glow of emotion. And the expression of that thrill—that glow is poetry." Now the Bible is full of such poetry, as it deals with the noblest themes and stirs the deepest emotions of the soul. Poetry is also the music of speech; the measured and balanced movement of emotion. Religion naturally assumes this movement to express its emotions in the worship of God, and the Biblical religion above all others. Notwithstanding this fact, the poetry of the Bible is written in the MSS. preserved, and is printed in the Hebrew and Greek texts, as well as the versions with few exceptions exactly as if it were prose; and the Hebrew scribes who divided the Old Testament Scripture and pointed it with vowels and accents dealt with it as if it were prose and even obscured the poetic form by their ignorant and careless divisions of verse and sections, so that the poetic form in many cases can be restored only by a careful study of the unpointed text and a neglect of the Massoretic sections.

I. *Hebrew Poetry* is characterized by a remarkable simplicity of structure and movement. The lines are arranged in parallelism of thought and emotion, and are synonymous, antithetical or synthetic in a great variety of forms, in the distich, tristich, tetrastich, pentastich, hexastich, octastich and occasionally in greater numbers of lines. The lines are measured by words or word accents, the poet having the power of combining two or more words at times under one accent. This measurement by words is the simplest and earliest form of poetry, the measurement by syllables

of the Aramaic, and by quantity of the feet of the Greek coming later in poetic development. Usually three, four or five words make up the line of Hebrew poetry. The lines are arranged in strophes or stanzas, sometimes with refrains, sometimes with initial letters in the order of the alphabet, and sometimes with certain catch words. These simple principles unfold into an exceeding rich variety in the numerous specimens of Hebrew poetry in the Old Testament, and in quite numerous pieces in the New Testament where the Aramaic original is a little obscured by the Greek form; for not only the songs of the forerunners, but very many of our Savior's discourses, sections of the epistles and a good part of the Apocalypse are poetry. Now these principles of Hebrew poetry must be carefully studied by the interpreter who would ascertain the spirit and sense of the passage. The meaning of a passage is determined by its relation in the system of parallelism of the line or the strophe. Would any interpreter of Homer, or Æschylus be able to understand them or teach others to understand them without a knowledge of their metres, and with the whole written as if they were prose? What would you do with the odes of Horace, the lyrics of Dryden, the dramas of Shakespeare, if these were all written without distinction of parts, and with the uninterrupted steady flow of prose? If Hebrew poetry has been understood at all notwithstanding such lamentable ignorance let us thank God for his grace, but let us not presume upon it, and tempt God any longer by such persistent neglect of the forms of grace and beauty of His Word. The study of Hebrew Poetry as poetry, reveals to us beauties of thought and grandeur of emotion in the Word of God never experienced before. It may be that the Lord has been reserving this higher knowledge of His Word for seasons of greater spiritual exaltation when the church will become less dogmatic, less ecclesiastical, less polemical and narrow, but more devout, more consecrated, more catholic, more intimate in common with God, and more absorbed in worship than at present or in the past. The progress that exegetes are now making into the higher exegesis and the higher criticism will lead to higher attainments in sacred knowledge and sacred practice. The time will soon come when Hebrew poetry will be as well known as Greek and English poetry, and when its influence will pervade all our preaching and worship, and clothe our accidental logic with a wealth of color and warmth of emotion so much needed for effective Christian work.

Hebrew poetry may be divided into three general classes, Lyric, Gnostic and Composite. (1) *Lyric* poetry is the earliest development of lit-

erature. We find it scattered through the various historical and prophetic books, and also in the great collection of Hebrew lyric poetry, the Psalter. The three pieces ascribed to Moses, Ex. xv, Psalm xc, and Deut. xxxii, subdivide lyric poetry into the hymn, the prayer and the song. The hymn is found in rich variety;—the evening hymn, the morning hymn, the hymn in a storm, hymns of victory or odes as that of the victory over the Egyptians, Ex. xv, over the Moabites, Num. xxi, the ode of the battle of Beth Horon, Josh. x, the song of Deborah, Judges v, the thanksgiving as in the song of Hannah, and many pieces of Isaiah, the grand oratorio, Ps. xcii-c, and the most of the fourth and fifth books of the Psalter containing the greater and lesser Hallel, the Hallelujah Psalms and doxologies. The prayers are found in rich variety, evening and morning, litany before a battle, prayers for special and national deliverance; Psalms of lamentation, penitence, religious meditation, of faith and assurance in all the rich variety of devotion. These are most numerous in the Psalms ascribed to David, and may be regarded as especially the Davidic type although the xc Psalm ascribed to Moses and Hab. iii are among the most wonderful specimens as the one traverses the past and compares the frailness of man with the everlasting God, and the other marches into the future and bows with trembling in the presence of the most sublime Theophany. A special form of this class is the dirge, as the laments of David over Jonathan and Abner, and in the exceedingly elaborate and artistic book of Lamentations and not infrequently in the Prophets. The songs are abundant and in every variety: The sword song of Lamech, the birth song of Sarah, the blessing of the patriarchs Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Aaron, and the swan song of David. In the Psalter we have songs of exhortation, warning, encouragement, historical recollections, prophetic anticipations, the love song. The Psalms of Asaph are chiefly of this class.

(2) *Gnomic* poetry has but few specimens in the historical books; but a rich collection is embraced in the Proverbs consisting of fables, parables, proverbs, riddles, moral and political maxims, satires, philosophical and speculative sentences. There are upwards of five hundred distinct complets, synonymous, antithetical, parabolical, comparative, emblematical, besides fifty larger pieces of three, four, five, six, seven and eight lines, with a few poems, such as the temperance poem (xxiii. 29-35) the pastoral (xxvii. 22-27) the pieces ascribed to the poets Aluqah, Agur and Lemuel, the Alphabetical praise of the talented wife (xxxi. 10-30), and the great admonition of Wisdom in fifteen advancing discourses (i-ix).

(3) *Composite* poetry starts in part from a lyric base as in prophecy, beginning with the blessings of Jacob and Moses and the poems of Balaam, and in lesser and greater pieces in the prophetic writings, the Song of Songs, and Lamentations; in part from a Gnostic base as in the book of Job and Ecclesiastes. Herein is the climax of Hebrew poetic art, where the dramatic and heroic elements combine to produce in a larger whole ethical and religious results with wonderful power. While these do not present us epic or dramatic or pastoral poems in the classic sense, they yet use the epic, dramatic and pastoral elements in perfect freedom, combining them in a simple and comprehensive manner for the highest and grandest purposes of the prophet and sage inspired of God, giving us productions of poetic art that are unique in the world's literature. The dramatic, epic and pastoral elements are *means* used freely and fully, but not *ends*. These forms of beauty and grace are simply forms which do not retard the imagination in admiration of themselves, but direct it to the grandest themes and images of piety and devotion. The wise men of Israel present us in the ideals of the Shulemite, Job, and Koheleth types of noble character, moral heroism and purity that transcend the heroic types of the Iliad or Æneid wrestling as they do with foes to their souls far more terrible than the spears and javelins and warring gods of Greek or Trojan, advancing step by step, through scene after scene and act after act to holy victory in the fear of God; victories that will serve for the support and comfort of the human race in all time, which has ever to meet the same inconsistencies of evil, the same assaults on virtue, the same struggle with doubt and error, therein so vividly and faithfully portrayed to us. The prophets of Israel play upon the great heart of the Hebrew people as upon a thousand stringed lyre, striking the tones with divinely guided touch, so that from the dirge of rapidly succeeding disaster and ruin, they rise through penitence and petition, to faith, assurance, exultation and hallelujah, laying hold of the deep thoughts and everlasting faithfulness of God, binding the past and present as by a chain of light to the impending Messianic future; seeing and rejoicing in the glory of God which though now for a season shrouded behind the clouds of disaster is soon to burst forth in a unique day.

II. *Prose Literature* is also contained in the Sacred Scriptures in rich variety.

(1) *History* constitutes a large portion of the Old and New Testaments. In the Old Testament there are two distinct kinds of history; the Levitical and the Prophetic. The Levitical is represented by Chronicles,

Ezra, and Nehemiah, and extends backward into the Elohist section of the Pentateuch. It is characterized by the annalistic style, using older sources, such as genealogical tables, letters, official documents and entering into the minute details of the Levitical system, and the organization of the State, but destitute of imagination and of the artistic sense. The Prophetic is represented by the books of Samuel and Kings and extends backward into the Jehovistic sections of the Pentateuch. It is characterized by the descriptive style, using ancient stories, traditions, poetic extracts and entire poems. It is graphic in delineation, using the imagination freely, and with fine artistic tact.

In the New Testament we have four biographical sketches of the noblest and most exalted person who has ever appeared in history, the God-Man, Jesus Christ, in their variety giving us memoirs in four distinct types, the highest in the Gospel of John, where the person of Jesus is set in the halo of religious philosophical reflection from the point of view of the Christophanies of Patmos. The book of Acts presents the history of the planting and training of the Christian Church, using various sources and personal reminiscences.

All these forms of history and biography use the same variety of sources as histories in other ancient literature. Their historical material was not revealed to the authors by the divine Spirit, but gathered by their own industry as historians from existing material and sources of information. The most that we can claim for them while distinguishing Inspiration from Revelation, is that they were inspired by God in their work so that they were guided into truth and thereby preserved from error—certainly as to all matters of religion, faith and morals; but to what extent further in the details and external matters of their composition is still in dispute among evangelical men. It is also disputed to what extent their use of sources was limited by Inspiration, or in other words, what kinds of sources were unworthy of the use of inspired historians. There are those who would exclude the Legend and the Myth which are found in all other ancient history. If the legend in itself implies what is false—it would certainly be unworthy of divine inspiration to use it; but if it is the poetical embellishment of naked facts, one does not readily see why it should be excluded from the sacred historians' sources any more than snatches of poetry, bare genealogical tables, and records often fragmentary and incomplete, such as are certainly found in the historical books. If the myth implies in itself necessarily Polytheism or Pantheism, or any of the elements of false religions it would be unworthy of divine inspiration. It is

true that the classic myths which lie at the basis of the history of Greece and Rome, with which all students are familiar, are essentially Polytheistic; but not more so than the religions of these peoples and all their literature. It is also true that the myths of Assyria and Babylon as recorded on their monuments are essentially Polytheistic. Many scholars have found such myths in the Pentateuch. But over against this there is one striking fact that stands out in the comparison of the Biblical narratives of the Creation and the Flood, with the Assyrian and Babylonian; namely, that the Biblical are Monotheistic, the Assyrian Polytheistic. But is there not a Monotheistic myth, as well as a Polytheistic? In other words, may not the poetic form of the myth be appropriate to Monotheistic as well as to Polytheistic conceptions? May it not be an appropriate literary form for the true Biblical religion as well as the other ancient religions of the world? However we may answer this question *a priori*, it is safe to say that the term *myth* at least has become so associated with Polytheism in later usage and in the common mind, that it is unwise if not altogether improper to use it in connection with the pure Monotheism and supernatural revelation of the Bible, if for no other reason—at least for this—to avoid misconception, and in order to make the necessary discriminations. For the discrimination of the religion of the Bible from the other religions must ever be more important than their comparison and features of resemblance. There is no such objection to the term legend, which in its earliest and still prevalent use, has a prevailing religious sense, and can cover without difficulty all those elements in the Biblical history which we are now considering. There is certainly a resemblance to the myth of other nations in the close and familiar association of the one God with the ancestors of our race, and the Patriarchs of Israel, however we may explain it. Whatever names we may give to these beautiful and sacred traditions which were transmitted in the families of God's people from generation to generation, and finally used by the sacred historians in their holy books;—whatever names we may give them in distinction from the legends and myths of other nations, none can fail to see that poetic embellishment natural and exquisitely beautiful, artless and yet most artistic, which comes from the imagination of the common people of the most intelligent nations, in these sources that were used by divine inspiration in giving us ancient history in its most attractive form. Indeed the imagination is in greater use in Hebrew history than in any other history with all the oriental wealth of color in the Prophetic historians.

The dialogues and discourses of the ancient worthies are simple, natural and profound. They are not to be regarded as exact reproductions of the words originally spoken, whether preserved in the memory of the people and transmitted in stereotyped form, or electrotyped on the mind of the historian or in his writing by divine inspiration; but they are rather reproductions of the situation in a graphic and rhetorical manner, differing from the like usage in Livy and Thucydides, Herodotus and Xenophon only in that the latter used their reflection and imagination merely; the former used the same faculties guided by divine inspiration into the truth and restrained from error.

In Biblical history there is a wealth of beauty and religious instruction for those students who approach it not only as a work of divine revelation from which the maximum of dogma, or of examples and maxims of practical ethics are to be derived; but with the higher appreciation and insight of those who are trained to the historian's art of representation and who learn from the art of history, and the styles and methods of history, the true interpretation of historical books, where the soul enters into the enjoyment of the concrete, and is unwilling to break up the ideal of beauty, or destroy the living reality, for the sake of the analytic process, and the abstract resultant, however important these may be in other respects, and under other circumstances.

(2) Advancing from historical prose, we come to the *oration*. The Bible is as rich in this form of literature as in its history and poetry. Indeed the three run insensibly into one another in Hebrew Prophecy. Rare models of eloquence are found in the historical books, such as the plea of Judah (Gen. XLIV. 18-34); the charge of Joshua (Jos. XXIV); the indignant outburst of Jotham (Judges IX); the sentence pronounced upon Saul by Samuel (1 Sam. XV); the challenge of Elijah (1 Kings XVIII). The three great discourses of Moses in Deuteronomy are elaborate orations, combining great variety of motives and rhetorical forms, especially in the last discourse to impress upon Israel the doctrines of God, and the blessings and curses, the life and death involved therein.

The Prophetical books present us collections of inspired eloquence which for unction, fervor, impressiveness, grandeur, sublimity and power surpass all the eloquence of the world, as they grasp the historical past and the ideal future, and entwine them with the living present for the comfort and warning, the guidance and the restraint of God's people. Nowhere else do we find such depths of passion, such heights of ecstasy,

such dreadful imprecations, such solemn warnings, such impressive exhortations, and such sublime promises.

In the New Testament the three great discourses of Jesus and his parabolic teaching present us oratory of the Aramaic type; simple, quiet, transparent, yet reaching to unfathomable depths, and as the very blue of heaven,—every word a diamond, every sentence altogether spirit and life, illuminating with their pure searching light, quickening with their warm pulsating throbbing love.

The discourse of Peter at Pentecost will vie with Cicero against Cataline in its conviction of the rulers of Israel, and piercing the hearts of the people. The discourses of Paul on Mars Hill, and before the Jews in Jerusalem, and the magnates of Rome at Caesarea, are not surpassed by Demosthenes on the Crown. We see the philosophers of Athens confounded, some mocking, and others convinced unto salvation. We see the Jewish mob at first silenced, and then bursting forth into a frantic yell for his blood. We see the Roman governor trembling before his prisoner's reasonings of justice and judgment to come. We do not compare the orations of Peter and Paul with those of Cicero and Demosthenes for completeness, symmetry and artistic finish; this would be impossible, for the sermons of Peter and Paul are only preserved to us in outline, but taking them as outlines, we maintain that for skillful use of circumstance, for adaptation to the occasion, for rhetorical organization of the theme, for rapid display of argument, in their grand march to the climax, and above all in the effects that they produced, the orations of Peter and Paul are præeminent.

Nowhere else save in the Bible have the oratorical types of three distinct languages and civilizations combined for unity, and variety of effect. These Biblical models ought to enrich and fortify the sermon of our day. If we could study them as literary forms, as much as we study Cicero and Demosthenes, as models of sacred eloquence, the pulpit would rise to a new grandeur and sublimer heights and more tremendous power over the masses of mankind.

(3) The *Epistle* may be regarded as the third form of Prose Literature. This is the contribution of the Aramaic language to the Old Testament in the letters contained in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. But it is in the New Testament that the Epistle receives its magnificent development in the letters of James, Peter, Paul, Jude and John, some familiar, some dogmatic, some ecclesiastical, some pastoral, some specu-

lative and predictive; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. we have an elaborate essay.

How charming the letters of Cicero to his various familiar friends! What a loss to the world to be deprived of them! But who among us would exchange for them the epistles of the Apostles? And yet it is to be feared that we have studied them not too much as doctrinal treatises perhaps, but too little as familiar letters to friends, and to beloved churches, and still less as literary models for the letter and the essay. It might refresh and exalt our theological and ethical treatises, if their authors would study awhile with Paul in his style and method. They might form a juster conception of his doctrines and principles. They certainly would understand better how to use his doctrines, and how to apply his principles.

(4) *Fiction* is represented in the New Testament in the parables of Jesus. It is also represented in the apocryphal books of Tobit and Susanna, and in the books of Maccabees in the stories about the mother of the Maccabee sons, and about Zerubbabel and truth. It is true these are not canonical and inspired, but they illustrate the part that fiction played in the literature of the Hebrews of the centuries between the Testaments. We might also bring into consideration the part that fiction played in the Agada of the Jews in the various midrashim.

Many divines have thought that the books of Esther and Jonah should be classed as fiction. Any *a priori* objection to fiction as unworthy of inspiration is debarred by the parable of Jesus. With reference to these books, it must therefore be entirely a question of induction of facts. The beautiful story of Zerubbabel and truth, with its sublime lesson, "Truth is mighty, and will prevail," loses nothing in its effect by being a story and not history. The wonderful devotion and self-sacrifice of the Maccabee mother, and the patient endurance of the most horrible tortures by her sons, which have stirred and thrilled many a heart, and strengthened many a pious martyr to the endurance of persecution are no less powerful as ideal than as real. So it would be with Jonah and Esther if they could be proved to be fiction. The model of patriotic devotion, the lesson of the universality of divine providence and grace would be still as forcible, and the gain would be at least equal to the loss, if they were to be regarded as inspired ideals rather than inspired statements of the real. The sign of the Prophet Jonah as a symbol of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is as forcible if the symbol has an ideal basis as if it had an historical basis. Be this as it may, the element of

fiction is sufficiently well represented in the Old Testament in the story of the Shulemite in the Song of Songs, and in the elaboration of the historical person and trials of Job into one of the grandest ideals of the imagination, and in the soul struggles of Koheleth.

These are then the most general forms of literature contained in the Sacred Scriptures. They vie with the literary models of the best nations of ancient and modern times. They ought to receive the study of all Christian men and women. They present the greatest variety of form, the noblest themes, and the very best models. Nowhere else can we find more admirable æsthetic as well as moral and religious culture. Christian people should urge that our schools and colleges should attend to this literature, and not neglect it for the sake of the Greek and Roman, which with all their rare forms and extraordinary grace and beauty, yet lack the oriental wealth of color, depths of passions, heights of rapture, holy aspirations, transcendent hopes, and transforming moral power.

Our College and University training and the drift of modern thought lead us far away from oriental thought and emotion, and the literature that expresses them. Few there are who enter into the spirit and life of the Orient as it is presented to us in the Sacred Scriptures. It is not remarkable that the Old Testament is to many a dead book, exciting no living, heartfelt interest. Here is a new and interesting field for the student of our day. The young men are entering into it with enthusiasm. The Church of Christ will be greatly enriched by the fruits of their labors. This study of Biblical literature is appropriately called Higher Criticism to distinguish it from Lower Criticism which devotes itself to the study of original texts and versions. There are few who have the patience, the persistence, the life-long industry in the examination of minute details that make up the field of Lower Textual Criticism. But the Higher Criticism is more attractive. It has to do with literary forms and styles and models. It appeals to the imagination and the æsthetic taste as well as to the logical faculty. It kindles the enthusiasm of the young. It will more and more enlist the attention of the men of culture and the general public. It is the most inviting and fruitful field of Biblical study in our day. We will not deny that the most who are engaged in it are rationalistic and unbelieving and that they are using it with disastrous effect upon the Scriptures and the orthodox faith. There are few believing critics, especially in this country. There is also a wide-spread prejudice against these studies and an apprehension as to the results. These prejudices are unreasonable. These apprehensions are to be deprecated. It is impos-

sible to prevent discussion. The church is challenged to meet the issue. It is a call of Providence to conflict and to triumph of evangelical truth. The divine word will vindicate itself in all its parts. These are not the times for negligent Elis or timorous and presumptuous Uzzahs. Brave Samuels and ardent Davids who fear not to employ new methods and engage in new enterprises and adapt themselves to altered situations, will overcome the Philistines with their own weapons. The Higher Criticism has rent the crust, with which Rabbinical Tradition has encased the Old Testament, overlaying the poetic and prophetic elements with the legal and the ritual. Younger Biblical scholars have caught glimpses of the beauty and glory of Biblical Literature. The Old Testament is studied as never before in the Christian Church. It is beginning to exert its charming influence upon ministers and people. Christian Theology and Christian life will ere long be enriched by it. God's blessing is in it to those who have the Christian wisdom to recognize and the grace to receive and employ it.

THE GENUINENESS OF ISAIAH'S PROPHECIES.

BY REV. WM. H. COBB, UXBRIDGE, MASS.

A glance at the present state of the disputed question will prepare us to go into the merits of it.

The great majority of American Christians have taken little interest until recently in the theories of so-called historical criticism. Thus it has come to pass in the case before us that at least nine-tenths of our intelligent church-members assume without question that the whole book of Isaiah came from the pen of the son of Amoz; while most of those who comprise the remaining tenth regard doubt upon this point as merely one of the vagaries of German neology. On the other hand, in Germany itself, few respectable scholars remain who have not yielded more or less to the prevailing tendency to cut the book into sections varying in date and authorship.

Ewald, in his great work on the prophets, imputes to those who deny the Babylonian authorship of the last twenty-seven chapters, "motives altogether reprehensible." So Weber, as quoted by Delitzsch, regards the traditional view as manifesting "a devilish self-hardening against the scientific conscience." Despite the grim humor of this last expression

it was doubtless written mainly in earnest. Delitzsch himself, with more caution than candor, allows his arguments for the integrity of Isaiah to stand, in the successive editions of his commentary, though one need look no further than the articles lately published in this journal to find him quoting from the "Babylonian Isaiah." Much more conservative is Nägelsbach, author of the commentary in the Lange series; yet even he admits several interpolations. One is hardly surprised that Kuenen, in searching out a reliable basis for his "History of Israel" should profess to "know for certain" that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah belong to the second half of the 6th century B. C. Yet there are signs that this firm foundation is yielding, by concessions from within, as well as attacks from without. The most recent, perhaps the most important, commentary comes from England; that of Rev. T. K. Cheyne (2nd ed. 1882), whose work is highly commended by Robertson Smith. A previous volume of his, "The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Considered" appeared in 1871. At that time Mr. Cheyne went all lengths with Ewald; at present, he gives up important ground, so far as concerns the *local* origin of the prophecies of Isaiah. About three-fourths of the book he now believes to have been written in Palestine. But far from maintaining the unity of Isaiah, he tends in the contrary direction, holding that the sixty-six chapters consist of more than a dozen fragments, written by perhaps ten different authors, at periods varying from the middle of the eighth to the middle of the fifth century. Not more than twenty-seven chapters, he thinks, can be ascribed to Isaiah with much probability. Here is confusion worse confounded. The sober student is fair to ask on what grounds these astonishing dissections are made. The frank answer of many Continental critics would be: "There is no such thing as predictive prophecy; since the so-called Isaiah foretells deliverance under Cyrus from the Babylonian captivity, he must have lived about the time of Cyrus."

This position has been fearlessly avowed by Gesenius, Knobel, Hitzig, Ewald, Wellhausen, and others. The majority of students in this country will deem it an unwarranted theological prejudice, and simply oppose to it the authority of our Master and Lord (e. g. in Luke xxiv. 27). To do Mr. Cheyne justice he does not hold, in this respect, with the destructive school. When we inquire for the further reasons of the view we are examining, they reduce themselves to alleged incompatibilities, in point of style and diction, between the sections of the prophecy. Questions of style are exceedingly complex, involving so much of the personal ele-

ment as to be practically indeterminate. The argument from diction, however, deserves a more important place in this controversy than has usually been assigned to it. Defenders of the unity of Isaiah have aimed to show that the formidable lists of peculiarities in phraseology brought forward on the other side are not sufficient to prove diversity of authorship. For the most part, they have not been bold enough to assume that if Isaiah wrote the book as a whole there must be a multitude of unconscious threads of coincidence in point of language binding the entire work together, and to stake their case upon observed facts of this nature. Dr. Nägelsbach, however, has given at the close of his commentary a laborious collection of materials embracing the entire vocabulary of the suspected portions, with their occurrences in the undisputed chapters also, but he gives no summary of results. He expresses his belief, it is true, that the unity of authorship is thereby confirmed; still, he speaks so hesitatingly as not to carry conviction. The value of the list, moreover, is seriously lessened by the many errors running through it, so that an entire revision would be necessary to make it trustworthy. My own work in this department was begun and completed in total ignorance of Nägelsbach's researches. Referring for details to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April and October 1881, and for January 1882, I will simply indicate the plan pursued. By a series of careful enumerations, there was ascertained the whole number of words in the Hebrew vocabulary, then the number in each main division of Isaiah, in the entire book, in the earlier prophets, the later prophets, and the prophets as a whole; also the commonest and the rarest words in the so-called later Isaiah, with a few other particulars. It was thence proved that the vocabulary of Isaiah B presents striking affinities with that of the earlier prophets (especially Isaiah A) and striking diversities from that of the later prophets. This appeared both from the *number* of coincident words and from their *character*. For instance, while 848 of B's words are found in A, only 735 occur in the exile-prophet Ezekiel, though his prophecy is about twice as long as A's. Again, there are eight words found in both parts of Isaiah and nowhere else, but only one word peculiar to Isaiah B and the period of the exile. The books of the Old Testament I arranged in groups according to two systems of classification, and the vocabulary of Isaiah B (excepting proper names, and words so common as to be indecisive) was taken up word by word, the number of occurrences of each word in all the classes was recorded, and the occurrences in Isaiah were cited by chapter and verse. From this "Hebrew Index"

tables were deduced, proceeding from the more rare to the more frequent words, and showing by each particular grouping that the language of B belongs in the class which includes A and can readily be excluded from Ezekiel's class.

A concluding article is given in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July 1882, carrying out with great detail an examination of the local color of Isaiah B as compared with that of Isaiah A on the one hand and the late prophets on the other. It will be seen that this argument advances a stage from the mere grouping of words to the comparison of ideas. Beginning with inorganic nature, I have gone through the vegetable, animal and human kingdoms, noting agreements and disagreements, and finding that, whoever wrote the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah, it cannot be fairly denied that his environment was very like that of the genuine Isaiah, and very unlike the scenery of Babylon. As it would be manifestly improper to judge a house from a brick, I will give no illustrations from this portion of the article. But the evidence examined next, that drawn from the names of God, does not lose its force when stated in brief. It appears from induction (as might have been judged *a priori*) that most of the earlier prophets use these divine titles with great freedom, while in later times there seemed to be a special sacredness attached to two or three names, which caused a loss of spontaneity. Thus Ezekiel almost always employs "Jehovah" or "Adonai Jehovah." But both parts of Isaiah blend with these a rich variety of other terms in such a way as to be characteristic of the earlier prophets and to several also a minute and evidently undesigned correspondence of part with part. The particular terms they employ have sometimes a special weight in the argument. Thus "the Holy One of Israel," occurring 14 times in each part, is found nowhere else among the prophets, except twice in the last chapters of Jeremiah, which seem to presuppose Isaiah's predictions against Babylon. Again, the Divine title "King," the idea at the root of the theocracy, is frequently met with both in writers before and after the exile; its absence from the undisputed prophecies of that period is certainly a natural circumstance; yet it is found in both parts of Isaiah. Equally natural is the fact that the writers of the exile abstain from that title of God so common among the prophets—"Jehovah Sabaoth." The victorious leader of Israel's "hosts," the God of her "armies" was not likely to be invoked by that name when those forces were defeated and humbled. Yet "Jehovah Sabaoth" occurs six times in Isaiah B, as well as often in Isaiah A.

I close with a specimen or two of the inferences which may be drawn from the rare words common to both parts. There are two Hebrew nouns from the root "to be white," meaning *white linen*. חֹר and חוֹר. These same forms are also found from an entirely different root, "to hollow out," and mean *a hole*. Isaiah A uses חֹר for white linen, and חוֹר for hole; the later writers reverse this. Isaiah B uses but one of these words, חוֹר, but uses it in the sense of *hole*, thus differing from the later writers and agreeing with Isaiah A. In fact, this is one of the eight words occurring only in the two parts of Isaiah. Another interesting case is פּוֹרֶה *a wine-press*, which occurs once in B and once in Haggai, nowhere else. A wine-press has two receptacles, one for treading the grapes, the other for receiving the juice. Isaiah B uses פּוֹרֶה of the former, Haggai of the latter. But as פּוֹרֶה comes from the verb "to bruise," it must have meant originally the upper part of the wine-press, which would place B among the older writers. So יִקֵּב means the upper receptacle in Isaiah A, the lower in Jeremiah.

The advantages of the line of argument I have pursued is that it is independent of doctrinal assumptions either Christian or anti-Christian. The facts pertaining to the language of our present book of Isaiah seem to indicate clearly that the sixty-six chapters are rightly ascribed to a single age and a single author.

TRACES OF THE VERNACULAR TONGUE IN THE GOSPELS.

BY PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH.

I.

The existence of an original Hebrew Matthew is very dubious, as I have shown in my "Neue Untersuchungen über Entstehung und Anlage der kanonischen Evangelien" (1853). The Gospel *κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβραίους*, as it appears from its fragments, was neither the original Matthew nor a Hebrew interpolation of it, but a Hebrew version and partly transformation of the Greek Matthew. We know by Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13, that in Matth. iii. 4 "his meat was locusts and wild honey" the Ebionitic Gospel removed the locusts, and gave the reading: *καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ μέλι ἄγριον οὐ ἡγεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα ὡς ἔγκρις ἐν ἐλάτῳ*. This interpolation presupposes the Greek text. For in Ex. xvi. 31 it is said that the taste of the Manna was like wafers (לֶחֶם. ἔγκρις) made with honey. This passage of the Law carried the Ebionites from the *ακριδες*

(locusts) to *εγκρίδες* (honey cakes), and they changed the locusts into vegetable manna as sweet as wafers with honey.

Nevertheless it is certain that the original tradition of the deeds and sermons of our Lord was preserved in the Aramaic language of Palestine, which in the Talmud is called סורס' as a dialect of the Syrian. This is probable in itself, and there are not a few traces which justify this conclusion.

An instance of these traces is Luke xxiv. 42, where the authorized version in conformity with the received text runs thus: "And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish and of a honeycomb." The revised version omits the words, "and of a honeycomb," and remarks only in the margin that they are added by many ancient authorities. Westcott and Hort, in their excellent introduction and appendix to their new recension of the New Testament text, give p. 72 sq. a thorough examination of witnesses, which ends with the result that *καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου* (*κηρίου*) is "a singular interpolation, evidently from an extraneous source, written or oral."

I think, it can be shown how this difference concerning what the disciples gave to the Lord had arisen. The word for fish was in the vernacular tongue כּוּרָא, and טּוּא is the verb which signifies to broil or roast, particularly a fish (*Pesachim* 76b). Hence the Palestinian tradition said that the disciples gave him מְטוּיָא דְכוּרָא. In the same language the honeycomb has a similar name, כּוּרִיתָא. This assonance of the two words caused some ambiguousness of the tradition, another form of which related that they gave him מְנַתָּא דְכוּרִיתָא דְדוּבְשָׂא "a piece of a honeycomb." The Evangelist, as it is proved by critical inquiry, received *μέρος ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ*, but ancient readers, well acquainted with the still living tradition, combined with the form preferred by Luke, the other which presented כּוּרִיתָא instead of כּוּרָא. Yet it is also possible that the oldest tradition related that they gave him מְנַתָּא דְכוּרִיתָא דְדוּבְשָׂא and that Luke omitted the second as an erroneous addition.

"THE DAY OF THE ETERNAL."

By Rabbi HENRI GERSONI, Chicago.

יום הנה:

This little poem consists of the concluding verses of a long poem on *עני הרת*, "The power of the religious law", by Samuel Joseph Fin, of Vilna. The author of this poem and of several important works on Jewish history and literature, and the editor of a Hebrew periodical, *הברמל*, is still living. In the form of his poetical works he is not felicitous, since he sacrifices all beauty of rhythm and measure to the expression of his ideas. But his ideas are lofty and the expression of the same is clear and comprehensive; and this betrays clear consciousness and logical thought.

יש יום אמר אלהים. יום הוא כרוח
 יעמוד אז האמת בשמש בין צבאות שמים
 וכוכבים מסביב לו יסוב כל לב ורוח
 ואל כל הגיוני נפש ישלח קרנים
 אז כל-אפסי ארץ בגאון יהיה יצהלו
 ירן כל-היקום כי דעת אל גברה
 נשאי דגליו מקדם בשמו עתה יתהללו
 כי מאתם יצאה תורה הופיעה נהרה
 במחול אהבה כל-העמים יצאו שכם אחד
 כי בני אלהים אחד הן המה גם יחד.

There is a day, so saith the Lord, a day it is in spirit
 When like the sun 'mong heavenly hosts, the truth will stand,
 And like the planets, around it will revolve every heart and spirit,
 And to all the yearnings of the soul it will send radiant rays.
 And the ends of the earth will then rejoice in the greatness of the Eternal,
 The entire creation (existence) will sing, for the wisdom of the Lord hath prevailed;
 The bearers of His banners in olden times will now glory in His Name,
 For from them the teaching went forth (by which) the light shone forth.
 All the nations in one accord will go out (join) in a dance of love,
 For they are each and all together the sons of One God.

THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE.

BY RABBI ISAAC M. WISE.

The Hebrew Union College, located in Cincinnati, 494 W. 6th Street, was established in 1846 by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. A majority of all Hebrew Congregations in this country, including the largest, are members of this "Union," and contribute to it one dollar annually for each member. The "Union" elects in its bi-annual conventions, a Board of Directors, who govern the College in all affairs not left to the Faculty.

The Faculty elected by the Board of Examiners, consists of the following gentlemen :

Rabbi Isaac M. Wise, President and Professor of Hebrew Philosophy and History.

Rev. Dr. Mielzener, Professor of the Talmud and Rabbinic jurisprudence.

Solomon Eppinger, Esq., Preceptor of the Talmud, and Professor of Exegesis p.t.

Ignatius Mueller, Esq., Assistant in Hebrew.

Henry Berkowitz, Esq., Assistant in History.

Two of the teachers, Rev. Dr. M. Lilienthal and Louis Aufrecht, Esq., died this year, and no successors have been appointed yet.

The session extends from the first Monday of September to the last week in June, annually, from 3 to 6 p. m., daily except Sunday, with liturgical exercises every Saturday afternoon.

There are registered this year forty-two students, one female, all Jews, although the law of the college excludes none on account of their religious confessions. The college is perfectly free, no fees whatever are exacted. All text books are furnished gratuitously to the students, and the indigent are furnished with all the common necessities of life.

The library in the college building of about 8,000 volumes comprises the principal works of the Hebrew literature, Biblical, Rabbinical, historical, philosophical, poetical, etc., together with Syriac, Arabic and other Semitic works, Lexica, grammars, etc., and a fair selection of English, German, French, Italian and other works. It is at the disposal of the students and teachers, and of all outsiders who seek information.

The college is divided in two departments, preparatory and collegiate. One of its preparatory departments is in New York City, under the superintendency of Rev. Dr. Gottheil. The pupils of the preparatory departments must be graduates or students of the Cincinnati high school, or any similar institute, must know some Hebrew and the Bible History, to be registered. The curriculum of this department is this :

1st year.—Hebrew etymology ; exercises in translation from English into Hebrew ; reading the original of one book of the Pentateuch, Joshua and Judges, two chapters with *Rashi's* rabbinical commentary ; also two books of Mishnah, usually *Aboth* and *Sanhedrin*, history from 536 to 167 B. C.

2nd year.—Hebrew Grammar completed, exercises continued ; Bible reading, one book of Pentateuch, I. and II. Samuel, and a number of Psalms memorized ; four books of Mishnah, twenty pages of Talmud, and history from 167 to 20 B. C.

3d year.—Aramaic Grammar, Hebrew exercises continued ; Bible reading, one book of the Pentateuch, I. and II. Kings with the *Targum* and *Rashi* to some chapters ; Psalms memorized ; thirty pages Talmud ; Casuistics in the code of Moses Maimonides ; History to 70 A. C.

4th year.—Aramaic Grammar, rabbinical dialect ; Hebrew exercises continued ; Bible reading, one book of the Pentateuch, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah ; Psalms memorized ; thirty pages of the Talmud ; the first book (with the exception of *Akkum*) in the code by Moses Maimonides ; literary history to 70 A. C.

Graduates of this department receive the degree of Bachelor of Hebrew, or *Chaber*, and may enter the rabbinical or collegiate department.

Students of the collegiate department are required to be graduates or students of the academical course in the Cincinnati University, or a similar institute, and must be graduates of the examination in the above curriculum.

The collegiate department takes four years. Its curriculum comprises besides the usual theological studies, the Hebrew and Aramaic also the Syriac and Arabic languages. The test for graduation is, 1st, the ability to read and expound critically and historically any given passage in Bible and commentaries, Talmud and Casuists, philosophers and poets of the Hebrew ; 2nd, Sufficient knowledge of literary history, casuistics and jurisprudence of the synagogue, the various forms of worship, and the historical development of Jewish doctrine. 3d, Homiletic and liturgic competency, and 4th, a university degree. He receives the degree of Rabbi and may receive two years later the degree of D. D.

The students of this department read steadily the Bible with ancient and modern paraphrases and commentaries, the Talmud with commentaries and casuists, and *Midrashim* or homiletics. Of the Jewish metaphysicians, they read chiefly the works of Maimonides, Bechai, Halevy, Albo and Saadia. In history they follow Graetz and Jast, Zunz, Munk and Dukes, Geiger and Steinschneider.

The first class of Rabbis will graduate in July, 1883, composed of seven students.

Annually the Union of American Hebrew Congregations appoints three commissioners to examine the classes. The most prominent Rabbis of America have alternately discharged this duty. Their reports, published with the proceedings of the Union have been unanimously very favorable.

Similar institutions exist, two in Berlin, one in Breslau, one in Pest, and one in Paris, besides private institutions not connected with academical studies, which are very numerous in Europe, especially in Hungary, Poland and Russia ; also in Asia and Africa.

GENERAL NOTES.

The Demand of the Present.—We are coming now, as it would seem, to the culmination of the struggle. The battle rages around the citadel. No drones or cowards are wanted now. It is not the incompetent and the unfaithful who can serve the church in such a crisis. She can well afford to spare the idlers and stragglers and faint-hearted from the ranks. The times emphatically demand those who shall be prepared to acquit themselves like men. He has a very low conception of the work of the ministry, of the solemn duties and the momentous responsibilities which it involves, who can suffer himself to be slack and negligent in his preparation for it or inactive or half-hearted in his discharge of it. And he gives little evidence of being called of God to the office and little prospect of usefulness and success in it, who does not engage, whether in his preparatory studies or in the actual labors of the ministry, with a holy enthusiasm, throwing himself into them with all the energy of his nature—resolved by the aids of divine grace to make the most of the powers and faculties which God has given him in the special line of this high calling; seizing with eagerness every opportunity within his reach, and training himself by all available methods to the highest measure of fitness he can secure to be entrusted with the care of souls, to be an ambassador of God to men, to be a steward of the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. If a charge so weighty and so sacred as this will not stir the energies of a man to the utmost, the least that can be said is, that he shows that he has no appreciation of this high and holy office, and no fitness for it. But besides this general demand which is always laid upon all ministers and candidates for the ministry, to use the utmost zeal in the whole round of their professional and preparatory studies, there is a call to special diligence and thoroughness now in the circumstances which have already been recited. If supineness were ever admirable, there is a loud call for alertness at the present time. There is a demand now, as never before, for high Biblical scholarship, for well-trained exegetes and critics—for men well versed in the critical and speculative attacks made upon the word of God, and who are well prepared to defend it. The present phases of critical and speculative assault upon the Scriptures, need create no alarm, as though they were more formidable than their predecessors; but though these should be repulsed and prove short-lived, that will not end the strife. The assault will be renewed at some fresh point or in some other form. And now that the critical battle is brought to our own doors, it will not do to wait till defenders of the faith in other lands work out a solution for us. We must have an English and American scholarship that is fitted to grapple with these questions as they arise. We need in the ranks of the pastorate, men who can conduct Biblical researches and who can prosecute learned critical inquiries; who can do, in their own chosen field of Scripture study, what German evangelical pastors have done—such as Baehr in his "Symbolism of the Mosaic Cultus," and Ranke in the critical defence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and Fuller in the interpretation of the Prophet Daniel, and Keil, who published his learned defence of the books of Chronicles and Ezra when he was only a licentiate. —Green's "*Moses and the Prophets.*"

A Collection of Oriental MSS.—The Trustees of the British Museum have just acquired a most important collection of Oriental MSS., consisting of 138 volumes, more or less fragmentary, containing: 1. Arabic commentaries of the Bible, with the Hebrew text written by Karaite Jews; 2. Liturgies and hymns both of the Karaites and the Rabbinic Jews; 3. Karaite polemical treatises; 4. Grammatical, lexicographical, and philosophical treatises. Among the commentaries with the Hebrew text are some of the highest importance. They rank among the oldest Arabic MSS. hitherto known. Three are dated A. H. 348=A. D. 958, A. H. 359=A. D. 1004, and A. H. 437=A. D. 1045. The British Museum has hitherto possessed only one single MS. of this kind dated A. H. 398=A. D. 1007. Besides being of so early a date these MSS. show the cause of the law laid down in the Talmud "that the sacred Scriptures must not be written in any other but the square Hebrew characters." They demonstrate for the first time that the Jews were in the habit of writing the Scriptures in other characters. Another point of extreme interest to the Oriental student is the fact that though the commentaries are written in Arabic they contain large quotations from Anan's commentaries in Aramaic, thus proving beyond doubt that Anan, the founder of the Karaites, wrote in Aramaic, the language spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ. Biblical students will feel a debt of gratitude to the trustees for having secured this important collection for our national museum, which now possesses not only the largest number of, but the most valuable MSS. of the Old Testament. We have to add that the Jewish Persian MSS., the importance of which has been lately pointed out in these columns, have also been secured for the British Museum.—*London Times.*

First Hebrew Books.—The first Jewish book was printed in Mantua (Italy). It was the *Fur. Orach Chayim*, by R. Jacob ben Asher, which is dated 14 Sivan. (June 6th), 1476, to which was added one-third of *Yoreh De'ah*. The man who established this enterprise was Abraham Kunat (כונטר) ben Solomon, a doctor of medicine. He and his wife, Estellina, learned typography and then established the office in Mantua, where he published five different Jewish works. (Zunz, in his *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*.) The oldest Hebrew publications in Germany come from Prague, where in 1513 Gershom Cohen ben Solomon established his typographical office, known up to the middle of the seventeenth century as the Gersonides printers' family (1513—1657.) The first Hebrew Bible was printed in 1488, in Soncino (Italy), a folio volume of 373 pages, no title page, by Joshua Solomon ben Israel Nathan, with the aid of the dyer, Abraham ben Chayim, of Pesaro.

The Biblical Hebrew.—The Biblical Hebrew is remarkable for the simplicity and regularity of its structure, and is well fitted for being employed in the composition of such narratives as are contained in the historic portions of the Old Testament. It is also admirably suited for devotional, aphoristic, poetical, and prophetic compositions. It appears already fully developed in the pages of the Pentateuch. In numerous instances its words present vivid representations of the objects to which they refer. Many of them suggest to the reader a host of interesting associations. It may be said with truth that no translation, in certain cases, could possibly convey to the reader the full significance of that which is expressed or suggested by the Hebrew terms. It contains words so forcible and

rich in meaning, and so closely related to other kindred terms, that the most qualified translator will find himself working under an almost depressing sense of his inability adequately to accomplish his task. To render the Psalms of David into any ancient or modern tongue, in such a manner as that the Version shall convey neither more nor less than that which would be derived from an intelligent perusal of the original, is a task never likely to be accomplished. All that can be done is to seek after something like an approximation to such a Version.—*Craik*.

The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch.—Adopting the canon of Hume, that of two miracles we should believe that which is the less marvelous and incredible, I accept the miracle, if it be one, of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, rather than the theory which makes it either the growth of centuries or the work of a modern Jew of the time of Ezra. The difficulties attending the last theory are vastly greater than those which surround the first. As easily could I believe that the basaltic pillars which compose the Giant's Causeway were the work of the fabulous race whose name they bear, and not the production of the earth's central fires. I believe, then, that the Pentateuch is a work of the Mosaic age, and largely the work of Moses himself; that it has come down to us with few, very few, dislocations, interpolations, and corruptions; and that it will be handed down to coming ages as an admired monument of the wisdom, learning, and arts of that remote age,—as a monument of an early revelation of the divine will, to restore and elevate the race. I believe that the more thorough the investigations are which are directed to the examination of this book, the more profound and searching the scholarship which is devoted to the inquiry of its age and authorship, the more successful the endeavors of the explorers of the ancient monuments on the Nile and the Tigris in exhuming sculptured tablets and opening tombs whose walls are pictured history, the more brilliant the success of the Rawlinsons, the Layards, and the Hinckses, the Smiths and the Sayces, in deciphering the cuneiform inscriptions on the walls of the palaces of the successors of Ninus, and of the Wilkinsons and the Lepsius and the Mariettes in interpreting the painted symbols and hieroglyphic histories in the tombs of the Pharaohs contemporary with Abraham and Joseph and Moses, the more certainty will be given to the conclusions which I have reached, or, at least, to which I have pointed the way: that THE PENTATEUCH IS SUBSTANTIALLY OF THE MOSAIC AGE, AND LARGELY, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, OF MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.—*Stebbin's "A Study of the Pentateuch."*

Importance of Hermeneutics.—Perhaps no branch of theological science exerts an influence so great and fruitful as Formal-General Hermeneutics, which furnishes to the theologian his methods of interpretation. It decides, to a certain degree, the systems of dogmatics, instruction in religion, the faith of the people, and often the peace of the Church.

One may see, by the place it occupies in Exegetical Theology, the high position which it holds. It aspires to nothing less than to be the key to the Sacred Books, unlocking all the science and learning founded upon them. Without it, Dogmatics must be uncertain; and consequently our doctrinal views must rest upon an unstable foundation.

It goes still further. It applies logic to the study of the sacred volume. It demands as auxiliaries, besides learning and criticism, reason and method, philosophy, psychology, and all the means which God has given to men to discover the truth. It is in that way unceasingly occupied in bringing into harmony reason and revelation, in illustrating the one by the other, and in making manifest between them that accord which is one of the grand proofs of the divine perfection and heavenly origin of our faith. Well directed, it enables us to contemplate the Holy Scriptures in all their native purity, in all their divine depth, in their intimate relations to the perfections of God on the one hand, and to the heart of man on the other. In other words it exhibits them in all their beauty, at once human and divine. It thus reanimates the faith, and founds it solidly upon truth and reason. It prevents, as far as possible, false interpretations and false systems, which are so frequently causes of unbelief.

If ever the Church of Christ be united in the bond of peace and love; if she ever arrive at the unity of the faith; or, rather, if she ever approach this ideal goal—impossible perhaps to be attained here below—it will be by an interpretation of the Holy Scriptures at once devout, experimental, intelligent, and clear; which is, in short, by a true and complete science of Hermeneutics.—*Elliott and Hershaw's Hermeneutics.*

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Eve of an Agitation.—"All the signs of the times indicate that the American church, and, in fact, the whole of English-speaking Christendom, is upon the eve of an agitation upon the vital and fundamental question of the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible, such as it has never known before."—This is the opening sentence of Professor William Henry Green's "Moses and the Prophets," which has just appeared. Our readers will find among the "General Notes" of this number another extract from the same Introduction. This statement is not an exaggerated one. It is made by one who is in a position to judge well the "signs of the times." No man in this country is better qualified to appreciate the situation than Professor Green. He is no alarmist, yet he sounds the note of alarm. He might, indeed, have gone further, for it may be soberly said that we are no longer upon the *eve* of agitation; we are in the midst of it. The time has passed when the attention of the church shall be wholly taken up with theological controversy. A fundamental question has come up, upon the decision of which rests all our faith. Is the Bible what it claims to be? Is it what the church, since its institution, has supposed it to be? Is it the Word of God? Nothing less than this is involved in the question at hand. Who is to decide it? Who does not feel it his duty, at least, to look into the question, and, so far as it is in his power, to fit himself to understand the points at issue? Is this not, in very truth, obligatory upon every man who professes to herald God's truth to perishing souls?

Scientific Biblical Knowledge.—"I call all teaching *scientific*," said Wolf, the critic of Homer, "which is systematically laid out and followed up to its original sources." Such teaching is scientific, and only such. The critical study of

the remains of classical authority in the original languages is the only means of obtaining a scientific knowledge of that authority. This is none the less true of Biblical knowledge. Need one hope to gain a scientific knowledge of Biblical antiquity except through the medium of the languages in which it has been transmitted to us? And surely no one can be satisfied with any other than a scientific knowledge. It is for the lack of just such knowledge that the Church to-day suffers. Those who represent the Church before the world have Biblical knowledge, that is to say, some of them have; but of what sort? Many, in high position, have as little truly scientific knowledge of the Bible, as the average school-boy, of Homer. They can quote texts in proof of this or that doctrine, they can argue without limit, questions of an entirely irrelevant character; but a genuine scientific knowledge of the Bible, of its facts, and their interpretation they do not have. The reason of this is twofold: Those who are now in the active ministry did not while in the Seminary, receive the training in this department of theological work, which they ought to have had, nor do the men who are to-day in the theological seminary, receive either the needed amount, or, in many cases, the right kind of instruction. Sufficient time is not given for the *study of the Bible*, and too often even the time allowed is frittered away in fruitless discussion. Yet the fact that a man does not obtain this knowledge in the Seminary, is no reason why he should not have it. Taken all in all, very little is even supposed to have been gotten during a theological course. Must a *pastor* give up all hope of being a *scholar*? Is it not a radical defect in our ministry that they allow their pastoral duties to draw them from their study? The common cry is "lack of time." It ought to be remembered, however, that often where time cannot be *found* for a given work, it can be *made*. In view of the present demand "for the highest Biblical scholarship" is it not well for us to consider whether more time cannot profitably be devoted to study which is strictly Biblical, whether a scientific Biblical knowledge is not within the reach of every one of us, if we will but reach out our hand and take it?

Exegetical Presumption.—It scarcely seems credible that the body of men who constitute the "St. Paul Academy of Natural Science," after hearing "A Lecture on Man, his Origin, and Movements, as Indicated by Mythology, Language and History," by Chas. S. Bryant, A. M., should request its publication. One cannot imagine the motives which prompted this request. For the sake of the "Academy," and the city which it represents, we hope that the request was made only with the view of indicating to the world how much ignorance, misrepresentation and assumption could be condensed by one man into one address. Several appendices are added to this lecture; among others, a translation and interpretation of Gen. 11. 21, 22, which certainly are far beyond anything before published in explanation of these verses. Many of our readers have seen an extract, headed "*The Ages of the Patriarchs*," which was printed in the *Popular Science Monthly*, and thence copied into many of the secular papers. This is another of the appendices, and there are others of an equally wonderful character. This matter is referred to here for two reasons: (1) Because several letters have been received, asking for a statement in regard to the pamphlet, but chiefly (2) because it is desired to call

attention to the necessity of denouncing unsparingly all attempts to foist upon the skeptically inclined masses such absurd and abominable trash. Many, notwithstanding the imbecility and conceit which would seem to be at once apparent, have been influenced by this man. He professes to be a scholar, and modestly proposes soon to give a translation of the first fifteen chapters of Genesis, as a contribution towards a translation of the Bible, which shall be made by non-sectarian scholarship. *Ab uno disce omnes*: Gen. II, 21, 22: And Jehovah Elohim caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he desired in marriage a fair one of his own likeness; and she was set apart prepared as a bride for marriage. And Jehovah Elohim gave him for a wife, the one in his likeness, which he had chosen from his own image; and she abode with Adam.

The translator says that this, "as near as the language will allow is a literal, accurate English translation."

QUESTIONS+AND+ANSWERS.

[*Questions of general interest, relating to the Old Testament and to the Hebrew Language will be published in one number of The Hebrew Student and the answers to these questions will be published in the succeeding number. It is expected that the answers as well as the questions shall be furnished by readers of the journal. The initials of the interrogator and of the answerer will be appended in each case. Readers are requested to forward to the Editor questions which may occur to them from time to time, and answers to such questions as they may see proper to consider.*]

NEW QUESTIONS.

12. Why does **לְמַנְצָח** occur in the Psalms, sometimes with and sometimes without **מֵעַתָּה** under **ל**? F. W. B.
13. How is the word **יְרוּשָׁלַם** pronounced? Is **Ĥirēq** to be sounded before the **ם**, thus making a diphthong with the **Pättāh**? F. W. B.
14. What is the meaning of the inverted **Vāv** which occurs several times in Ps. 107 between the 22d and 28th verse? F. W. B.
15. Why is the vowel-notation throughout Gesenius made to differ from Webster, Worcester or the authorities? T. M. B.
16. How can we account for the remarkable similarity in the order of words in Hebrew and English prose? B. F. W.
17. Is there any periodical published in pure Hebrew? B. F. W.
18. What is the difference in meaning between **בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם** and **בֵּין מַיִם וּבֵין מַיִם**? V. O. S.
19. It is said that **Vāv** Conjunctive, which comes to stand before a tone-syllable, may be pointed with pretonic **־**. This is the case in **תְּהוּ וְהוּ** (Gen. I. 2). Why not also in **וְחִשְׁבָה**? W. H. W.
20. In how far are the Massoretic points a commentary on the text? W. H. W.

21. In Ps. 66, 9, what is the force of the negative **לֹא**, and of the article in **לְמוֹט**? C. C. H.
22. What is the principle underlying the use of the Imperfect with Vāv Conversive for the Perfect and *vice versa*? M. M. M.

FORMER QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

2. Where can I get the most *authoritative* and *exhaustive* statement about the early inhabitants of Canaan? Our mummied friend, Rameses II, waged war with the Hittites, the Egyptians afterwards were engaged with the Philistines; but in what period, and in what succession did the early people inhabit Canaan before Abraham became a Westerner? C. A. H.

The following authorities may be mentioned: *Stack's* Gaza; *Knobel's* Völkertafel der Genesis; *Mover's* Phönizier; *Hitzig's* Urgeschichte; *Ewald's* History of the People of Israel; *Kenrick's* Phoenicia; *Bleek's* Introduction to the Old Testament.

3. In the Baer and Delitzsch text, there occur several cases where **־** is found before **־**, e. g. **פָּתְרוּן** Isa. III. 17. Are not these errors in pointing? M. L. H.

For Qāmēts-hātūph Baer not seldom uses **־**, in order to make a misunderstanding impossible, since it might be read ā or â; but it is inconsequent.

Dr. H. L. Strack, Prof. of Theology, Univ. of Berlin.

4. What is the force of the word **אָמַר** in Ex. II. 14?

This word is used of inner speech or thought as in 1 Sam. XX. 4; 1 Kings V. 19 (Hebrew). The passage may be paraphrased as follows: "Dost thou say (to thyself) to kill me (that thou wilt kill me) as thou killedst the Egyptian?" See Dr. August Dillmann's Commentary, Leipzig, 1880.

(Rev.) Charles R. Brown, Franklin Falls, N. H.

5. What is the difference between the Qāl Passive Participle and the Niph'āl Participle?

The so-called Qāl Passive Participle is probably the remnant of a lost conjugation. To be noticed chiefly is the use of the Niph'āl Participle with the "idea of abiding quality and even future necessity;" e. g. **נִרְאָה** to be feared, terrible; **נִחְמָד** to be desired.

6. What are some of the best books giving information concerning the manners, customs, language, etc., of the Egyptians at the time of the Exodus?

S. C. D.

Geikie's Hours with the Bible, vol. II; *Wilkinson's* Manners and Customs of Ancient Egyptians; *Hengstenberg's* Egypt and the Books of Moses.

7. What is the explanation of the use of the point after Sh'vâ in **נִחְמָד** Gen. III. 6 (Baer and Delitzsch text)? M. B. L.

The point after Sh'vâ is an invention of Baer. In the latest edition of Gesenius (Kautzsch), 1881, § 13. 2 this fact is referred to. In Schrärer's *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1879, I have written concerning and against several unnecessary innovations of Baer, among them this. Whoever writes נִחְמָד must also consistently write קִטַּל, and so after every silent Sh'vâ. DR. H. L. STRACK.

8. Does Gesenius' Grammar recognize the doctrine of the intermediate or half-open syllable? H. L. S.

The edition of Gesenius' Grammar, translated by Davies and edited by Mitchell, recognizes the doctrine of an intermediate or half-open syllable, but furnishes no clear presentation of the subject. The best treatment will be found in Davidson's *Hebrew Grammar*.

9. I understand, of course, that when a final He is treated as a consonant, this fact is indicated by Mäppiq. But the question rises, when is it a consonant, and when is it merely a vowel-letter? H. L. S.

This can be learned only from observation and the study of the Lexicon. It is known, e. g., to be a vowel-letter in the feminine termination הַ, and in ל'יה verbs.

10. Why is ה written small in the word בְּהִבְרָאִים (Gen. II. 3)? O. A. B.

"The marginal note is הִזְעִירָא, *small He*, which the Rabbis explain as a mystic reference to the future diminishing and passing away of the material creation, or as suggestive of the anagram בְּאִבְרָהִים in *Abraham*, for whom, together with his seed the universe was created, and which some critics have doubtfully conjectured to indicate a reading with ה omitted."—*Green's Chrestomathy*.

11. What is the best construction of the words וְכֹל שִׁיחַ (Gen. II. 5)?

G. A. B.

It seems best to make this expression the subject of יְהִיָה, and *no shrub of the field was yet in the earth*, tho' it is possible either (1) to make it the subject of עֲשׂוּת (v. 4) as is done in the A. V., or (2) to begin a new sentence with בְּיוֹם, making ׀ equivalent to *then*.

BOOK+NOTICES.

[All publications received, which relate directly or indirectly to the Old Testament, will be promptly noticed under this head. Attention will not be confined to new books; but notices will be given, so far as possible, of such old books, in this department of study, as may be of general interest to pastors and students.]

C. H. M's NOTES.*

C. H. M.'s "Notes" consist of homilies, and rarely have we found anything more wearisome. Their prolixity is tedious. They lack almost every quality of a good commentary. Their value to one who wants a work which will help him to ascertain the real meaning of the Scriptures is zero. There could hardly be found better examples of eisegesis. Many of the interpretations and statements are false. The author says that "it was the blood that made the difference, and nothing else," between the Israelites and Egyptians on that night when was slain the first-born in every home of the latter, and quotes Rom. III. 23. The Scriptures teach that "the blood" did not make this difference, but was only the visible sign of the different relations which these nations sustained toward God. In another place he says "that sacrifice is the basis of worship." According to the Scriptures the sole basis of worship is God's worthiness and sacrifice is itself worship. The same inexactness, confusion of terms and erroneous teachings pervade these volumes. They contain some truth, but it is in the proportion of one kernel of wheat to a bushel of chaff, and we are decidedly averse to doing so much winnowing.

THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE STUDY OF THE RISE OF OUR DOCTRINES.†

In his address Mr. Duff rightly assumes that "a student of Christian theology must make himself at home in Semitic manners of life, of speech, of thought; for our Lord and the people about him, with few exceptions, were Jews. They spoke a Semitic language, Jesus spoke it, lived through it, preached in it, not in Hebrew certainly, but in Aramaic, we might almost say in Syriac. None of his preaching that we have is in the form in which he preached it, but we have a record of it in the form in which preachers repeated it in other lands in another language. Some of it, indeed, has been quite recast, we may say, for Aramaic and Greek are two radically different languages. As forms of thought they are quite different, and a thing said in Aramaic may need much change of shape before there can be a repetition of it in Greek. For this reason he who will know what Jesus thought and said, needs to comprehend how Semitic people think. He who will study the theology of some foreign country, will get a poor idea of it from translations of

*Notes on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, 3 vols. by C. H. M., F. H. Revell, Chicago, Publisher.

†The Use of the Old Testament in the Study of the Rise of our Doctrines. Address at Air-dele College, Bradford, on Entrance on Work there as Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Theology, with Adjunct Professorship of Mathematics, Sept. 18, 1878. By Archibald Duff, A. M., Andover, Mass.; W. F. Draper.

that country's theological books. Fortunately, the study of Old Testament Hebrew gives us a good entrance to the mode of thought of Semitic peoples." According to Mr. Duff, among the doctrines which the student for the Christian ministry should study in their Hebrew original are these: I. Divine Sovereignty, II. God's Love, III. The Hereafter. The discussion is vigorous, very interesting and suggestive. The argument for the thorough study of the Hebrew Scriptures is especially strong. The address could be studied with profit by beginners in the history of Christian doctrines.

OUTLINES OF PRIMITIVE BELIEF.*

One of the good signs of the times is the deep interest manifested in the relations of the world's various religions to Christianity. In no other way can its immense superiority be so fully demonstrated as by those full and fair comparisons, the best materials for which are so amply furnished by such diligent students as Mr. Keary. His connection with the British Museum gave him access to information within the reach of but few, and he has made the most of his advantages. His present work displays thorough knowledge of his theme, great skill in the management of his discussion, and admirable literary ability. He has made a most arid subject wonderfully attractive. His book is full of matured thought and valuable learning, and his investigations are arranged in the most convenient and interesting manner for the reader. He has not attempted to explain the origin of belief, but to describe its character among the Indo-European races. He gives the result of his studies of the Vedas, Homer, Hesiod, the Eddas and Sagas, and Mediæval legends and epics. His book will prove helpful, if studied with that true mental independence which characterizes the best students. His conclusions are so largely biased by his philosophy, which we believe to be very faulty, that they must be subjected to the severest historical and logical tests before acceptance. Thus, in his discussion of the "Nature of Belief," which occupies the first fifty pages, Mr. Keary does not undertake to say what kind of a being the first man was, though he strongly hints that he was hardly above the brute; but he is not in doubt in regard to the mental and moral natures of the primitive Aryan. These existed only in embryo, and religion was therefore devoid of all ideas of right and wrong, and bore no relation to morality. Belief was—for that matter, still is—simply "the capacity to worship"; and religion, as we find it, has passed through three distinct stages. "The first is the fetich-worshiping stage, when man's thoughts are concentrated purely upon visible concrete substances. The second we call the nature-worshiping stage. In it the objects of belief are still external and sensible, but they are also, in a certain degree, generalized, and are not often tangible. The third is the anthropomorphic or ethical stage, when the divinity is conceived as a being like mankind, and the ethical qualities of that being have to be taken fully into account. The reasoning by which this position is maintained is very inconclusive. For example, it does not follow that because all earliest languages are rude and express their ideas in physical terms, that those ideas originated through contact with the physical world. Equally illogical is the statement that "looking upward aroused some moral thoughts" which led men to endow "the high thing," a tree or mountain, with "moral qualities." Just as unsound are his other arguments for the progressive development of religion, for the evidence which he adduces shows that wherever we find a primitive faith, we find the notion of personality, "the voice of God in man seeking for a *Personal* object of worship." He, however, assumes a primitive Fetichism which has no thought beyond the material object.

**Outlines of Primitive Belief among the Indo-European Races.* By Charles Francis Keary, M. A., F. S. A., of the British Museum. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Sold by Jansen, McClurg & Co. Price \$2.50.

RECENT PAPERS

RELATING TO OLD TESTAMENT TOPICS.

- The Karaites Manuscripts. DR. RUELF. *Juedische Literaturblatt*. XI. No. 33.
- The Logical Methods of Prof. Kuenen. PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D.D. *Presbyterian Review*. October.
- The Value for Textual Criticism of the Older Translations of the Psalms. DR. FRIEDRICH BARTH, SR. *Jahrbuecher fuer Protestantische Theologie*. II. No. 4.
- The Citation from the Book of Wars, Num. XXI. 14, 15. DR. FRANZ DELITZSCH. *Zeitschrift fuer die Kirchtliche Wissenschaft und Kirchtliches Leben*, Nos. 6 and 7.
- The Methods for the Development of the Old Testament Chronology in the Talmud. SUCKERMANN. *Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaftliche Theologie*. No. 4.
- Ezekiel's Vision of the Temple. KUEHN. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, No. 4.
- The Feast of the Tabernacles. *The Sabbath Visitor*, Sept. 29.
- Ecclesiastes XII, 1-7. J. T. McCLURE, D. D. *United Presbyterian*, Sept. 28.
- Genesis XXVII, 40. *Juedische Literaturblatt*. XI, No. 35.
- Genesis XVIII, 4; XXI, 2; Ex. XL, 15. DR. KRONER. *Juedische Literaturblatt*, XI, No. 37.
- The Sabbath in the Cuneiform Records, PROF. FRANCIS BROWN. *Presbyterian Review*, October.
- The Old Testament in the Christian Church. J. B. GREGG. *New Englander*, July.
- Prophecy in History. JOSIAH COPLEY, ESQ. *Presbyterian Banner*, Sep. 27.
- The Home of the Hebrew Race. I. S. MOSES. *Der Zeitgeist*, Aug 31.
- Celebrities of the Talmud. RABBI JOHANAN BEN NOEHPAH. *Jewish Record*, September 8.
- Chips from a Talmudic Workshop. *American Israelite*, Aug. 4, 11, 18, 25.
- Reflections on Assyriology and Judaism. McDONALD. *American Israelite*, Aug. 18, 25, Sept. 1, 8.
- Assyriology and Judaism. AARON HAHN. *American Israelite*, Oct. 6.
- Judaism the connecting link between Science and Religion, EMMA LAZARUS. *American Hebrew*, Sept. 1.
- Biblical Research. *Jewish Messenger*, Aug. 4.
- Alexandria. *American Israelite*, Aug 25.
- Cairo. *American Israelite*, Aug 25.
- The Nile in the Popular Faith and Customs of the Egyptians. D. A. TRAILOETTER. *Zeitschrift fuer die Kirchtliche Wissenschaft und Kirchtliches Leben*, Nos. 6 and 7.
- Certain alleged Immoralities of the Bible. G. W. LOUGAN. *Christian Quarterly Review*, July.
- The Politics of Haggai and Zechariah. DR. LIEBMAN ADLER. *American Hebrew*, Sep. 13.
- The Synod of Rabbis at Erfurt in 1391. DR. J. CARO. *Juedische Literaturblatt*, XI, Nos. 28 and 29.