THE HEBREW STUDENT.

VOL. II. MAY, 1883. NO. 9.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FIFTY-FIRST PSALM.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL,

New London, Conn.

The Davidic authorship of the 51st Psalm is denied by modern rationalistic criticism. Ewald places it among "the songs of the dispersion of the people, and the destruction of the Kingdom." Hitzig ascribes it to the unknown writer of Isaiah XL-LXVI. DeWette assigns it to an unknown Exilian prophet, and Prof. W. Robertson Smith inclines to the same view. Olshausen and v. Lengerke sweep it into the Maccabæan period. All agree that David did not write it.

The superscription is, as we know, historical. It refers the Psalm to David, and to a well-known incident in his life. Its historical trustworthiness was accepted by the Jews from the earliest times. The reasons for denying its trustworthiness are both general and specific. Of the former the following are urged:

1. The Psalm does not allude to the affair of Bathsheba, nor to the specific sin of adultery. True, nor is it necessary that it should. Every one in the Kingdom knew what David's heinous sin, פֶּשַׁע *absolute wickedness*, was. As it is, every penitent heart can read its own sin into David's tearful confession.

2. A lack of conformity between the Psalm and the narrative in 2 Sam. XII. According to the latter, David is aroused from his sinful security by Nathan's coming. David confesses his sin, and is at once assured of God's forgiveness; but in the Psalm he is represented as imploring it most earnestly. This objection loses sight of the differ-

ence between a mere official announcement of pardon, and a sinner's conscious appropriation of the assurance of forgiveness; the one precedes the other by a longer or shorter interval.

3. The Psalm speaks of many sins, and cannot therefore be David's. Set beside this the objection that in v. 4 it speaks not of many sins, but of one sin against the Lord, and cannot therefore be David's, and the two objections cancel each other. David's sin against God branched out into many sins against his fellow-men; his sins against his fellow-men combined into one transcendent sin against God.

4. "The whole experience of David with Nathan moves in another plane. The psalmist writes out of the midst of present judgments of God (the Captivity)."* The first statement is simply not true, for the Psalm receives its only adequate interpretation from that very experience. The second statement, including the parenthesis, is a gratuitous assumption destitute of proof.

5. "The situation of the Psalm does not necessarily presuppose such a case as David's."† Neither does it necessarily presuppose any other case than David's. The Psalm fits into the known facts of his life as it does not fit into the life of any other known man. To attribute it to "a prophet laboring under a deep sense that he has discharged his calling inadequately, and may have the guilt of lost lives on his head," or to "collective Israel in the Captivity," is to force the Psalm into a fictitious situation demanded by the exigencies of a mere theory.

The more serious objections to the traditional interpretation are supposed to arise from a critical examination of particular words and phrases. Such objections are the following:

1. In the 14th verse (Heb. 16) the writer prays, "Deliver me from bloods (דָּמִים)." We know that David was constructively guilty of murder in procuring Uriah's death. To translate דָּמִים *blood-guiltiness*, or *guilt of murder*, would at once point to David as the author of the Psalm. Such an interpretation must be avoided. Reuss‡ translates the clause as a prayer for protection against "being murdered"! —a rendering for דמים, for which no parallel exists in the whole range of Hebrew literature. Prof W. R. Smith§ asserts that the phrase "'Deliver me from blood-guiltiness' is to be understood after Ps.

---

* W. R. Smith's "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." Lecture VII., note 11.
† Ib.
‡ Le Psautier, Paris, 1875.
§ *In loc. cit.*

XXXIX., 8, 'Deliver me from all my transgressions, and make me not the reproach of the foolish.'" If the phrases which are supposed to interpret each other were identical, still there would be no absolute certainty that the meaning was identical in the minds of the unknown writers, who, according to modern criticism, may have been widely separated in time and circumstances. But they are not identical. הַצִּילֵנִי מִכָּל פְּשָׁעַי in Ps. XXXIX., 8 is not the same as הַצִּילֵנִי מִדָּמִים in Ps. LI., 16, and to interpret the latter by the former is sheer folly, for פשעים is never synonomous with דמים. The singular דָּם retains almost invariably the literal meaning *blood*. Gesenius and Fuerst (latest editions) explain the plural as meaning *Blutthat, a deed of blood*, איש דמים *a bloodthirsty man*, whence it comes to mean in general *Blutschuld, blood-guiltiness*, and בית, עיר דמים, *a house, a city upon which rests the guilt of blood*. So in later Hebrew the plural signifies *bloodshed, murder* (Levy, neuhebræisches u. chald. Wœrterbuch). The LXX render it τὰ αἵματα, the plural being used in classical Greek, as in Hebrew, to denote *bloodshed, murder*. דמים occurs not far from fifty times in the Old Testament, and in every instance has reference, directly or indirectly, to the shedding of innocent blood. In two instances other meanings have been suggested. The first occurs in Is. I., 15, "Your hands are full of bloods." But this very sense of blood-guiltiness, so far from being excluded, seems to be clearly indicated as the reason why Jehovah would not accept the sacrifices of his people. The other passage, Ezek. XVIII., 13, declares that a son who is a robber, a shedder of blood, and guilty of various other crimes, shall not live; "he shall surely die: his *bloods* shall be upon him." Gesenius refers to this passage under the definition *blood-guiltiness (Blutschuld)*. It does not mean in this instance "mortal sin," as Prof. Smith wishes to render it. The passage means simply, that, when the wicked son perishes, the responsibility for the loss of his life rests upon himself—the blood-guiltiness is upon him alone. When, therefore Prof. Smith affirms that "דמים does not necessarily mean the guilt of murder," he affirms what is not true, for this is precisely what it does mean, and nothing but the necessity of perverting facts in the interest of a theory would have suggested giving to this word any other than its ordinary meaning.

2. "יְשַׁע," says Prof. Smith, "is, I believe, always used of some visible delivery and enlargement from distress. God's wrath is felt in chastisement, His forgiveness is the removal of affliction, when his people cease to be the reproach of the foolish." But יְשַׁע does not always

refer to visible deliverances (Ps. XXV., 5 : CXXXII., 9, 16. Cf. Delitzsch *in loc.*). Nor has it an exclusively national reference, as the above phrase "his people" adroitly insinuates. The word is used in the sense of personal deliverance no less than three times in the 18th Psalm. But the 18th Psalm is included by Ewald, Hitzig, and by Prof. Smith himself in the excessively small residuum of unquestionably Davidic Psalms. It follows that this word, so far as it gives any clew to the author of the 51st Psalm, points far more to David than to a later unknown prophet who sees in God's salvation nothing beyond an external saving act in behalf of the people.

3. "At present says the Psalmist God desires no material sacrifice, but will not despise a contrite heart..... He lives therefore in a time when the fall of Jerusalem has temporarily suspended the sacrificial ordinances."* The whole force of this objection lies in the tacit assumption contained in the phrase "at present," i. e., during the Captivity; the subsequent conclusion is only a formal statement of this unwarranted assumption. "Thou desirest not sacrifice," says the Psalmist. In the next phrase ואתנה he implies a possession of the privilege of sacrifice, if with Ewald (Syntax § 347) and Driver (Heb. Tenses § 64) the ו be understood as the ו of sequence before the voluntative—"that" or "so that I should give it"; if it be taken alternatively as in the E. V. and by Delitzsch and Perowne—"else would I give it" —this privilege is distinctly affirmed. The latter is the view of the LXX who translate "If thou desiredst sacrifice, I would have given it." The Psalmist is not debarred from sacrificing by lack of opportunity. All this about the temporary suspension of sacrificial ordinances is read into his words, which indicate that he in common with the godly in Israel perceived the nullity of ceremonies in the absence of a humble and penitent heart.

4. "The whole thought of the Psalm is most simply understood as a prayer for the restoration and sanctification of Israel in the mouth of a prophet of the Exile. For the immediate fruit of forgiveness is that the singer will resume the prophetic function of teaching sinners Jehovah's ways. This is little appropriate to David, whose natural and right feeling in connection with his great sin must rather have been that of silent humiliation than of an instant desire to preach his forgiveness to other sinners."† The anointing with oil signified to David and to Saul not only an official, but a prophetic endowment with the

* W. Robertson Smith, *in loc. cit.*
† W. Robt. Smith, *in loc. cit.*

spirit of God (1 Sam. X., 10; XVI., 13). David combined in a pre-eminent manner the royal and prophetic functions. By his psalms he became the great instructor and prophet of his people. The latter function was interrupted by his sin. His inner life was overclouded. The communion between his soul and God was broken. He had lost his way. He needed to be restored, to feel again the overflowing joy of God's salvation before he could begin to sing aloud of his praise or to teach transgressors his way. It is difficult to conceive of one to whom the prayer and vow in vs. 12 and 13 are more appropriate, than to this royal poet and prophet struggling out of Egyptian darkness into the sunshine of God's favor.

5. "Build thou the walls of Jerusalem." Reuss remarks, "The poet prays God to *rebuild* the walls of Jerusalem. The walls therefore are broken down." He sees in the last two verses convincing proof that so far as the whole Psalm is concerned "we are far from David's epoch." This is the conclusion of modern rationalistic critics generally. Many of those who unhesitatingly ascribe the body of the Psalm to David, feel constrained to ascribe the closing verses to a later author "who wished to accommodate this hymn to the circumstances of the people going into or returning from exile" (Maurer, *Com. in V. Test.*). In favor of the Davidic origin of these verses it may be said that "rebuild" is a *rare* (Fuerst) use of בנה; that it means more frequently *to strengthen, enlarge*, and that the Psalmist uses it in this sense. It may be said furthermore that the prayer is to be spiritualized, because the Psalmist perceives that unless God take pleasure in Zion and build the walls thereof "they labor in vain that build."* But these and similar suggestions fail to meet the case. In spite of all that can be said there is a palpable lack of harmony between these verses and those immediately preceding. The point of view is different. The former are written with a vivid recognition of the insufficiency of material sacrifices. These are not depreciated, but appreciated at their proper worth in comparison with the sacrifices of a broken spirit with which God is better pleased. The last two verses, while not precisely contradicting the former, seem to have been added, as Perowne suggests, "expressly to correct wrong inferences which might possibly have been drawn from verses 16, 17, as to the worth of sacrifices enjoined by the Law." In the one case, the point of view harmonizes with the lofty spiritual intuitions of the whole Psalm; in the other it relapses toward

* That the phrase זבחי־צדק in the last verse is found also in the 4th Psalm, which is unquestionably Davidic, is not a decisive indication of authorship, as it occurs also in Deut. XXXIII., 19.

an external ritualism. There, if God desires material sacrifices, they are in readiness, which indicates that sacrifices flourished; here the twice repeated אז "then," pointing to a future restoration of Jerusalem, indicates that sacrifices had ceased. These and other discrepancies, to be felt rather than expressed, make it certain that the closing verses come from a later hand. Is this a valid reason for rejecting the Davidic authorship of the entire Psalm? Not at all. It shows that two lines of thought so divergent come from different sources. If the close of the Psalm be a post-exilic liturgical addition, the Psalm itself must have originated at an earlier time, when a freer and loftier view obtained respecting the spiritual value of sacrifices. The Psalm ends naturally and without abruptness with verse 19 (Heb.).

Thus far we have met objections. Are there any positive reasons for identifying the author of this Psalm with the poet-King of Israel?

1. The few intimations in the Psalm as to the life and character of the author correspond with what is known of David. The writer seems to have had a wide influence, since he promises to teach sinners Jehovah's ways. He was a poet of rare psychological penetration and of spiritual power. He had been guilty of one or more sins of peculiar heinousness, including the crime of shedding innocent blood. The Holy Spirit had been given to him, but his sin had almost driven that Spirit from his breast. Add to these facts the tone of profound penitence that breathes throughout the Psalm, the humble trust in God's mercy, and the eager striving to return to him, and we have a combination of circumstances that point to "the man after God's own heart," as they do not point to any other man.

2. We may reverse this process. A careful study of the life, character, and genius of David confirms the impression that we owe this song to him. Ewald's summary of David's character (Hist. of Israel, 3, pp. 57–58. Eng. Tr.) gives in every essential respect a wonderfully correct portrait of the author of the 51st Psalm.

3. There is a striking parallel between this Psalm and 2 Sam. XII. The first words which fell from David's lips after Nathan's "Thou art the man" had aroused him from his sinful torpor were חטאתי ליהוה "I have sinned against the Lord." Almost the first expression of the Psalm is "against thee I have sinned" לך חטאתי, in both instances a vivid apprehension of the nature of sin as being primarily against God. When Nathan asked "Wherefore hast thou despised the word of the Lord, *to do this evil in his sight?*" לעשות הרע בעיניו, we hear an immediate echo in the Psalmist's confession, "Against thee only have I

sinned, *and done this evil in thy sight*," והרע בעינך עשיתי. In the words "That thou mightest be justified in thy speech, pure in thy judgment," there is a clear reference to the just judgments which God pronounced upon him (2 Sam. XII., 11, 14.) by the mouth of the prophet. The coincidences between the Psalm and the recorded history are too close to be accidental. They cannot be explained except by admitting that the author of the Psalm is also the leading actor in the history.

We have seen that the earlier as well as the later rationalistic criticism denies the Davidic authorship of this Psalm, but for different reasons. The earlier critics projected the whole Psalm into the period of the Captivity chiefly because of the last two verses; the later critics achieve the same result in the interest of a theory which makes the Pentateuch a forgery dating from the time of Ezra. In Prof Smith's special polemic against the Psalm he gives many reasons why it could not have come from David's hand; but the real reason is carefully concealed. It is this. If David wrote this Psalm, the Levitical code must have existed before his day; for there is hardly another Psalm which is so saturated with the spirit and phraseology of the Levitical legislation. The words כבס, טהר, חַטָּא, באזוב, טהור are peculiarly Levitical terms, which, though used in a spiritual sense, indicate a familiar acquaintance with the Mosaic ritual. This of course is fatal to the theory. Therefore the Psalm cannot be David's. The theory must be saved even if the word of God be made a lie.

The rationalistic criticism of this Psalm wrests it from the one recorded event in Old Testament history which above all others seems adapted to call forth such an utterance of overwhelming penitence; and from the one man who beyond all others could explore the dark secrets of the inward part, and report its hidden and far-reaching iniquities in terms of such unfeigned abhorrence, profound contrition, and humble reliance on Divine mercy, as put his penitential psalms, of which the 51st is chief, by themselves, unique, and unparalleled in the literature of the world. What is gained by it? Does it subserve any higher conceptions of religious truth, or even of secular history? The hallowed association of the Psalm are destroyed. Sever it from the personal experience of the man after God's own heart, swing it down the centuries to nobody knows where, credit it to nobody knows whom, strip it of individual reference by making it only an expression of sorrow for a nation's apostasies, and this grandest of penitential lyrics is at once shorn of its hitherto unapproachable power to mould the utterance of the soul's profoundest

consciousness of guilt. This power grows out of the essential identity of personal experience in all ages. But if the Psalm is not founded on the Psalmist's own experience, if it is not a voice crying from the abyss into which he sees himself plunged by sin, if it is only a lamentation over the idolatries of a sinful nation, it cannot, without perversion of thought, voice our consciousness of personal guilt.

If this Psalm does not come from the hand and heart of David, if it does not bear the unmistakable stamp of his genius, if it does not correspond with the known facts of his life, it is safe to say that one of David's Psalms is yet to be found.

THE LITTLE BOOK OF THE COVENANT.

BY PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D. D.,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.

The book which Moses was commanded to write as the basis of the Covenant (Ex. XXXIV., 27), is called the little book of the Covenant, to distinguish it from the book which Moses wrote as the basis of the original Covenant at Sinai (Ex. XXIV., 4) which is called the greater book of the Covenant on account of its much greater extent. The latter embraces the section Ex. XX., 22,–XXIII., the former the section Ex. XXXIV., 11–26. This little book of the Covenant is scarcely larger than the tables of the Covenant (Ex. XX., 1–17). Indeed it is now the common opinion of critics that we have here another decalogue. It is true the critics differ in their arrangement of these commands, but as there have always been differences in the synagogue and the church as to the arrangement of the "Ten Commandments of the tables" such differences of opinion as to the arrangement cannot destroy the consensus as to their number in either case. There are some critics who hold that this decalogue was written upon the tables (Ex. XXXIV., 28), on account of "the words of the covenant", which seem to go back upon "write thou these words, for upon the basis of these words do I conclude a covenant with thee and with Israel" (v. 27); and also on account of the verb וַיִּכְתֹּב which has no subject expressed and where the most natural interpretation finds the subject in Moses, the subject of the verbs which immediately precede. This would then be the execution of the command given in v. 27. This would then force us to the conclusion that these tables contained the decalogue of vs. 11–26.

and not the decalogue of Ex. XX., 2–17. If the section Ex. XXXIV., 11–28 stood by itself we could not escape this conclusion; but if we go back to Ex. XXXIV., 1, we find the promise that Jehovah will write upon these tables the same commands that were upon the former tables destroyed by Moses, and these were certainly the ten words of Ex. XX., 2–17. This forces us to supply the subject Jehovah to ויכתב in thought or to take the verb as having an indefinite subject and then render it as a passive. "The words of the covenant, ten words *were written* upon the tables." The chief critics of this decalogue of the little book of the Covenant have been: Hitzig: *Ostern und Pfingsten*, 1838, p. 42; Bertheau: *Die sieben Gruppen Mosaischer Gesetze*, 1840, p. 92; Wellhausen: *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theologie*, 1876, p. 554. These agree in the main in their results, and show a decided progress in their study of the subject. Others have expressed their views, e. g., Ewald in his *Gesch. des Volkes Israel, 3te Ausg.*, II. p. 238, but even this prince of exegetes has given no reasons for his arrangement. So far as he differs from the others he stands by himself and has no followers, so far as we know. Kayser, in his *Vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels*, 1874, p. 58, agrees entirely with Hitzig. We present in a table the arrangement of the three chief authorities:

	Hitzig.	*Bertheau.*	*Wellhausen.*
1st Command,	vs. 12–16.	v. 18.	vs. 14–16.
2d "	17.	19–20	17.
3d "	18.	21.	18.
4th "	19–20.	22a.	19–20.
5th "	21.	22b.	21.
6th "	22.	23–24.	23–24,
7th "	23–24.	25a.	25a.
8th "	25.	25b.	25b.
9th "	26a.	26a.	26a.
10th "	26b.	26b.	26b.

Hitzig's arrangement is accepted by Bertheau for six of the commands. Bertheau improves upon Hitzig by distinguishing two commands in v. 25, which has been accepted by Wellhausen and is correct. He also distinguished two commands in v. 22, which verse is thrown out by Wellhausen as a later interpolation. Bertheau's mistake was in regarding vs. 11–17 as the Introduction of exhortation to this decalogue. Wellhausen has improved upon Bertheau by making 14–16 the first command, and v. 17 the second command, falling back on the

arrangement of Hitzig, save that he properly throws vs. 11–12 into the Introduction. We agree with Bertheau in regarding v. 22a as a separate command, but we differ from him by combining v. 22b with vs. 23–24 as a single command. We differ from all in taking vs. 18–20 as a single command.

We present the following scheme as the one most satisfactory to ourselves:

The Introduction, Verses 11–13.

"Keep thou that which I am commanding thee to-day. Behold I am about to drive out before thee the Amorite and the Canaanite, and the Hittite and the Perizzite and the Hivite and the Jebusite. Take heed to thyself lest thou conclude a covenant with the inhabitants of the land upon which thou art about to come, lest it become a snare in thy midst. Nay their altars ye shall tear down and their *Mazzeboth* ye shall break down and their *Asherim* ye shall cut in pieces."

This introduction mentions the six chief nations of Canaan, the same as those given in the larger book of the Covenant (XXIII., 23) and also in the Deuteronomic code (Deut. XX., 17), but in each case they are in a different order. The altars were the places of sacrifice to other gods. They were unfit for the sacrifices to Jehovah. The *Mazzeboth* were stone pillars used in the worship of *Baal* the Sun god. The *Asherim* were evergreens, or pillars of evergreen wood, used in the worship of *Ashera*, the goddess of life and fertility. These were to be destroyed by tearing down, breaking down, cutting in pieces.

First Command, Verses 14–16.

"Surely ye shall not worship another God (אֵל אַחֵר), for Jehovah, his name is zeal (קַנָּא). The zealous God (אֵל קַנָּא) is He. (Take heed) lest thou conclude a covenant with the inhabitants of the land and when they go whoring after their gods and sacrifice unto their gods, they invite thee and thou eat of their peace-offerings (זֶבַח), and thou take some of their daughters for thy sons and when their daughters go whoring after their gods they make thy sons go whoring after their gods."

This command corresponds with the first of the tables of the covenant (Ex. XX., 3): "Thou shalt have no other gods (אלהים אחרים) before me." This command in the table has no reason attached as is the case with our first command. The reason assigned in our first command corresponds however with the reason given in the table to the

second command (Ex. xx., 5): "For I, Jehovah, thy God am a zealous God (אֵל קַנָּא)" And our command uses also the word for worship (הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה) used in the second command of the tables (Ex. xx., 5). This favors the view that the reasons assigned in Ex. xx., 5, really belong to the first and second commands of the tables, these two being thus grouped. The view that the two were really one is opposed by the fact that our second command which follows without reasons, corresponds with the second command of the tables.

The verses of exhortation (15–16) simply unfold the meaning of קַנָּא. As Jehovah is the husband of Israel he demands the exclusive affection and allegiance of his people. Any worship of other gods, is as a wife going away from her husband after other lovers. Any participation in their peace-offerings, or communion meals (זבח) is committing whoredom with them. It may be questioned whether the exhortation was written in the little book of the Covenant itself and whether it may not be an exhortation of Moses in connection with the delivery of the commands to the people.

Second Command, Verse 17.

"Molten gods (אֱלֹהֵי מַסֵּכָה) thou shalt not make thee."

This corresponds with the second command of the tables (xx., 4), but without the reasons, which are here associated with the previous command, as we have seen. The second command of the tables is "Thou shalt not make thee any graven image (פֶּסֶל) or any form (תְּמוּנָה) of anything," &c. There we have the specification of the graven or carved image of wood, here we have the molten image of metal. Neither mention the image of stone. But in neither case are we to conclude that other images were allowed than those specified. It is in accordance with the concrete character of these early laws, that they mention a specimen of a class and do not generalize.

Third Command, Verses 18–20.

"The feast of *Mazzoth* thou shalt keep. Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread as I commanded thee, at the season of the month *Abib;* for in the month *Abib* thou didst go out from Egypt. All firstlings of the womb are mine and all thy male possessions, the firstlings of the cattle and sheep. And the firstlings of the ass thou shalt redeem with a sheep. And if thou canst not redeem it thou shalt break its neck. All the first-born of thy sons thou shalt redeem, and thou shalt not appear in my presence empty." This third command is dis-

puted as to its extent. The critics agree, so far as we know, in limiting it to v. 18, and making vs. 19–20 an additional command with reference to the first-born. We combine for these reasons: (1) There is a reference back to the institution of the feast of unleavened bread (מצות) at the Exodus. The law of the first-born is associated with that institution in the Jehovistic narrative Ex. XIII., 12 sq. as here, and there is a remarkable verbal correspondence between the two passages. Indeed this little book of the Covenant is the code of the Jehovist. It is best therefore in both cases to attach the two things together as one institution and one command. (2) There is a certain correspondence between the two decalogues as far as it goes. We have noted this in the first and second commands already considered. The next command in our series is the Sabbath law. It seems to us best to regard this command as the fourth in both decalogues. (3) The most of those who separate here two commands, combine the two great feasts of v. 22 in one command, which seems to us improper. The feasts of *'Asiph* and *Shabu'oth* are as distinct from one another as the *Mazzoth* is from both of them, and the three ought to appear in three separate commands. Looking now at the command itself, we observe that it is the *Mazzoth* feast rather than the Passover that is brought into view. This is in accordance with the Jehovistic narrative (XIII., 3–10), which also lays stress on the feast of unleavened bread. The month אָבִיב is the month of green ears, called by the Elohist the first month (XII., 18), and after the exile *Nisan*. The expression תֵּזְכָר is doubtless a copyist mistake for הֵזְכָר as we rightly have it in the Jehovistic narrative (XIII., 12). The command "They shall not appear in my presence empty" is regarded by Ewald as a distinct command, but without sufficient reason. This is also found in the greater book of the Covenant (XXIII., 15) in connection with the feast of unleavened bread; but in the Deuteronomic code (Deut. XVI., 16) is extended to all the feasts. It is therefore a subordinate feature of the feasts which might appear here or elsewhere without much difference.

Fourth Command, Verse 21.

"Six days shalt thou work and on the seventh thou shalt keep Sabbath. In ploughing and reaping thou shalt keep Sabbath."

This fourth command is much briefer than the fourth of the tables. The elaborate reasons given in Ex. XX., 11, in reference to the creation of the world and in Deut. V., 14–15, with reference to the deliverance

from Egyptian bondage, are here omitted and we have no reasons at all. We note also that our command does not correspond with the first section of the fourth command in the tables. "Remember the Sabbath day to sanctify it" (Ex. XX., 8). "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it" (Deut. V., 12), but with the following section "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jehovah thy God" in which both versions of the tables agree, only our fourth command even shortens that. We prefer to render שבת "to keep Sabbath" not only to correspond with the noun שַׁבָּת of the tables, but also because it is more proper in itself than "rest." Our command gives an additional feature in the last sentence "In ploughing and reaping," that is in the busiest seasons of the year, when the temptation to work would be strongest, they were yet to observe the Sabbath.

Fifth Command, Verse 22a.

"And the feast of the *Shabu'oth* thou shalt observe at the first fruits of the wheat harvest."

Bertheau is the only critic, so far as we know, who makes this a separate command, and yet we do not hesitate to follow him, on account of the inherent propriety of distinguishing the three great feasts as three separate commands, and the impropriety of associating two in one command and a single one in another. This feast is called here the *Shabu'oth*, or feast of weeks, although it is mentioned as a harvest feast at the time of the first fruits of the wheat harvest. The greater book of the Covenant calls it the חַג הַקָּצִיר—the feast of the harvest (XXIII., 16). The Deuteronomic code (XV., 10) calls it the feast of weeks, as here.

Sixth Command, Verses 22b—24.

"And the feast of *'Asiph* at the circuit of the year (thou shalt observe). Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the face of the lord Jehovah, the God of Israel. For I will dispossess nations from thy presence, and I will make thy boundary broad in order that no one may desire thy land when thou goest up to appear in the presence of Jehovah thy God three times in the year."

The most of the critics find a new command in the summons to appear thrice a year in Jehovah's presence, but we cannot consent to this, for this command is really as much an appendix to these feasts as the command "they shall not appear in my presence empty" is an ap-

pendix to the feast of unleavened bread. In the greater book of the Covenant, the commands with reference to the three feasts are embraced in the opening: "Three times thou shalt keep feast unto me, in the year" (XXIII., 14) and the closing "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear in the presence of the lord Jehovah" XXIII., 17). Indeed the reason assigned in v. 24 as well as the command of v. 23 both belong to the three feasts, and combine the four commands respecting sacred times in a group, just as in the decalogue of the tables the first and second commands make up a group with a common reason. The third feast is called *'Asiph*,=Ingathering. So also in the greater book of the Covenant (XXIII., 16). In the Deuteronomic code (XVI., 13) it is called חַג הַסֻּכֹּת=feast of tabernacles. So also in the priest code (Lev. XXIII., 35). The time here specified is תְּקוּפַת הַשָּׁנָה. In the larger book of the Covenant it is בְּצֵאת הַשָּׁנָה (XXIII) in the going forth of the year.

Seventh Command, Verse 25a.

"Thou shalt not slaughter with leavened bread (חָמֵץ) the blood of my peace-offering (זבח)."

Eighth Command, Verse 25b.

"And the peace-offering (זבח) of the feast of the Passover shall not remain until morning."

These are separate commands as Bèrtheau and Wellhausen rightly decide. If they were one we would expect the qualification "feast of the Passover" to be attached to the first use of זֶבַח and not the second, where it is. The combination would favor the reference of both commands to the Passover-offering; but really the first זֶבַח is unqualified and is general, and refers to all peace-offerings. The unleavened bread of the seventh command is not the unleavened bread of the *Mazzoth* feast but the unleavened bread of the *Mincha* (מִנְחָה) which accompanies the זֶבַח in accordance with Lev. II., 11. "No *Mincha* which ye bring to Jehovah shall be offered leavened (חָמֵץ); and again Lev. VII., 12, sq.: "Ye shall bring with the זבח of the thank-offering perforated cakes unleavened (מצות) mingled with oil and wafers unleavened, anointed with oil," &c. The זֶבַח is the peace-offering for which the fuller expression is זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים. For the verb שחט, slaughter for sacrifice, the larger book of the Covenant has זָבַח offer as a sacrifice, a verb cognate to the noun זֶבַח (XXIII., 18).

The פסח of the eighth command is the Passover feast which is here incidentally referred to under the offering peculiar to the feast. The Passover sacrifice was indeed a special kind of זֶבַח. The command here corresponds with that of the Elohistic narrative, Ex. XII., 10. only the phraseology is entirely different. Thus the Elohist gives us לֹא תוֹתִירוּ מִמֶּנּוּ עַד בֹּקֶר. "Ye shall not leave any of it over until morning" where our Jehovistic code has: לֹא יָלִין לְבֹקֶר זֶבַח חַג הַפָּסַח. "The peace-offering of the feast of the passover shall not abide till morning." The term: זֶבַח חַג הַפָּסַח indeed corresponds with the phrase peculiar to the Jehovistic narrative, Ex. XII., 27. זֶבַח פֶּסַח. The larger book of the Covenant (XXIII., 18) has: לֹא יָלִין חֵלֶב־חַגִּי עַד בֹּקֶר differing from both especially in the phrase "fat of my feast" which would not confine it to the Passover זֶבַח.

Ninth Command, Verse 26a.

"The first of the first fruits of thy land thou shalt bring to the house of Jehovah, thy God." This is the law of first fruits. Our phrase is רֵאשִׁית בִּכּוּרֵי אַדְמָתְךָ. The greater book of the Covenant has exactly the same expression (XXIII., 19); but the Deuteronomic code (XXVI., 2) מֵרֵאשִׁית כָּל־פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה. Here there was to be selection of the first and choicest, and these were to be brought to the house of Jehovah, that is not the temple or tabernacle necessarily, but before these were erected, any place of an altar of Jehovah, in accordance with the greater book of the Covenant (XX., 24) where the name of Jehovah was recorded, or in accordance with the Deuteronomic code (XII., 13) in the place chosen by Jehovah in one of the tribes.

Tenth Command, Verse 26b.

"Thou shalt not seethe a kid (which is still) with its mother's milk."

This last command is most difficult of all. The older Protestant interpreters, Luther, Calvin, Piscator, *et al.*, thought of a limitation of the age of an animal for purposes of sacrifice. This is most suited to the context, for we have had three laws of offerings prior to it. But the Rabbinical interpretation that it is a dietary law against eating a kid in the milk of its mother has been followed by most moderns, even the A. V. The Deuteronomic code (XIV., 21) is thought to favor the latter view from the fact that it is there preceded by the command not to eat anything that dies of itself. But on the other hand, it is followed by the law of tithes and first fruits, and it may rather go with these laws

there, as it is associated with the law of first fruits here We do not hesitate to follow the former interpretation and class this law with the three preceding as laws of offerings. בשל is used for cooking the portions of the animal victim that was eaten by the offerers in the communion meal of the זבח Ex. XXIX., 31. This then would forbid the sacrifice of suckling animals. It is true that in the larger book of the Covenant (Ex. XXII., 29) first born of animals were to be given to Jehovah on the eighth day, notwithstanding the law in Ex. XXIII., 19, corresponding exactly with ours. It is also true that in the priest code (Lev. XXII., 27) we have the more explicit statement "From the eighth day and upward it shall be accepted for an *qorban* (קָרְבָּן) an offering by fire unto Jehovah (אִשֶּׁה)," but notwithstanding the consensus of Rabbinical interpretation we are not sure that this amounts to any more than that as the male child was circumcised on the eighth day, so the animal on the eighth day was taken from its mother to the divine presence. It may then have been kept in the flocks and herds of the altar for subsequent use at the proper age. Indeed the וְהָלְאָה = "and upward," favors our view. But even if the ordinary view is taken as to the age of animals suitable for offerings, we have still to bear in mind that the various codes differ not infrequently in their prescriptions. The only mention of the sacrifice of a suckling animal, that we have observed, is in the case of Samuel (1. Sam. VII., 9). This may have been exceptional in those disorderly times. The offerings are generally of animals a year old or more, in the specifications of age that are not infrequently made.

Thus in this little book of the Covenant we have a decalogue. Three of the commands, I., II. and IV. correspond with the commands of the tables. The others are commands respecting sacred days and offerings. They may be divided into three groups (a) I.–II., the two laws of worship in general, (b) III.–VI., the laws of holy days, and (c) VI.–X., the laws of offerings. It is therefore a decalogue of worship as compared with the decalogue of the tables which is a decalogue of Holy conduct. They may well have been each in its way at the root of the Covenant of Jehovah with Israel. The one was written by Jehovah himself upon two tables as the tables of the Covenant, the other was written by Moses in a writing as a book of the Covenant.

NOTES FROM ABROAD.

BY REV. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D.

An aspirant for the position of *Privat-Docent* in the theological faculty of the University of Leipzig presents, in Latin, a dissertation on some appropriate theme, and also propounds certain theses which he offers publicly to defend. The *disputatio* is in Latin. The candidate occupies the *cathedra*, and invites first the professors, then the *Privat-Docents*, and then the public at large to discuss with him the theses he has propounded. The discussion usually lasts some hours. I have already noticed by anticipation Dr. Wm. Lotz's *Habilitationsschrift*, *Quaestionum de Historia Sabbati*, which shall receive a fuller notice later. Two of the twelve theses which he offered to defend are: "The root of the verb יָדַע, meaning *know*, is ידע, and not ורע. The word אִשָּׁה is derived from another root than אִישׁ." With regard to the latter of these—the י in אִישׁ seems to me not radical, but merely a device to indicate the length of the vowel. If this is so, אִשָּׁה may very well be from the same root as אִישׁ. Compare אֵשׁ, *fire*, where the lengthening takes another form, and its derivative אִשֶּׁה, *that which is consumed by fire, offering*.

Among books in the press or in preparation are:

1. A new and more correct edition of Onkelos' Targum by Berliner, under the patronage and with the assistance of the Berlin *Akademie der Wissenschaften*;

2. A new edition of Delitzsch's commentary on the Psalms;

3. A new edition of Bertheau's commentary on Judges and Ruth, in the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch* series;

4. In the same series a commentary on Proverbs by Nowack, professor at Strassburg. Prof. Nowack, a young man, not much over thirty, is already favorably known as the author of a very serviceable commentary on Hosea;

5. Dillmann's commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua, will, contrary to what I stated last month, form but one volume in the same series;

6. Prof. C. H. H. Wright's commentary on *Koheleth*, containing also an answer to Robertson Smith, is completed, even to the indices.

7. The second half of the ninth edition of Gesenius' *Woerterbuch*, which was originally promised for last year, is printed as far as the letter ה. Dr. Ryssel of Leipzig is correcting the proofs. It may appear during the summer;

8. Dr. Paul Haupt of Goettingen, the Assyriologist, will publish during the spring or summer the cuneiform text of the Izdubar or Namrudu Legends. His views with reference to these legends, or this myth rather, are, I believe, the same as those of Prof. Frdr. Delitzsch, and substantially as follows: These legends together constitute a sun epos. The different episodes describe the sun's cycle. The names of the signs of the zodiac are derived from this same nature myth. This myth, or mythological epos, together with the signs of the zodiac, was received by the Semitic Babylonians from the pre-Semitic Akkadian inhabitants of Babylonia. Through the Babylonians and Phoenicians it was widely spread. The Herakles myth of the Greeks is thus borrowed from the Akkadians. Also, in

agreement with Rabbi Goldziher (*Der Mythos bei den Hebraeern*), Delitzsch (*Haupt*) recognizes in the Nimrod and Samson of the Bible this same nature myth;

9. I regret to say that Haupt's Assyrian grammar, like his recent pamphlet on the Akkadian language, is to be disfigured by a prefatory tirade against Dr. Hommel of Munich. There is some talk of the publication of this grammar in English.

In the second number of the *Zeitschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Theologie* for 1883 is a sharp, although appreciative, review of Reuss' *Die Geschichte d. heiligen Schrift d. Alten Testamentes* by A. Hilgenfeld, the editor of the magazine. Eduard Reuss is professor at Strassburg. He may be regarded as the Nestor of the Wellhausen school of Old Testament criticism. That which is distinctively characteristic of that school, the post-exilic origin of the Law (Torah), was set forth by Reuss in his lectures, almost, if not quite, before Wellhausen was born, but not until last year did he publish his views in book form. He maintains that from the whole "heroic age" (to the end of Saul's reign) we have no document, excepting Deborah's song, not even the Decalogue. The oldest part of the Pentateuchal legislation is, according to him, Ex. XX.–XXIII., called in Ex. XXIV., 7, the "Book of the Covenant." This is the *Landrecht* of King Jehoshaphat (917–892). It will be seen that Reuss is not sufficiently careful to distinguish facts from theories, and that he is extremely radical. He has, however, a reverence of tone that is in pleasant contrast with Wellhausen's irreverent flippancy, and the book is very valuable as a book of reference, its literary summaries being especially full. The point in Hilgenfeld's review to which I wished to call attention is this; referring to the essential agreement between the Samaritan and Jewish Pentateuchs admitted by Reuss he says: "As the Pentateuch of the Samaritans is in essential agreement with that of the Jews, I can the less believe that the *Torah* did not receive its present final form until after the time of Ezra." That is after a period of about 100 years of bitter enmity (according to the tradition), the Samaritans are supposed by Reuss and his school to have adopted the *Torah* of their foes, but still to have retained their hatred of them. The Wellhausen criticism has been internal in its character. Internal criticism is proverbially unreliable when without all external corroboration, and it is extremely desirable that the critics of that school should give some satisfactory explanation of the relation of the Jewish to the Samaritan canon, of the origin and date of which latter we really have no certain information at present. It seems to me, also, that there is in connection with the LXX. a similar external difficulty not yet satisfactorily accounted for, in assigning to the time of the Maccabees large numbers of Psalms, and portions of prophetic books.

In a recent number of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, A. Kamphausen of Bonn, reviews in the most favorable manner, Introductory hints to English readers of the Old Testament, by Rev. John A. Cross, M. A., London: Longman, Green & Co., 1882. He finds it both orthodox and liberal, with opinions of its own, but affording materials for independent opinions.

In the January number of Luthardt's *Zeitschrift* is a review by O. Zoeckler, of the Old Testament literature of 1882, in which he finds that the anti-Wellhausenists have the advantage both in number and ability.

I take the liberty of answering here a question addressed to me with reference to Stade's *Zeitschrift fuer alt. testamentliche Wissenschaft*. It is assisted by the

Deutsche morgenlaendische Gesellschaft, and is ideally a valuable enterprise, but it seems to me that it has, up to the present time, been very one-sided. The editor is Stade, professor at Giessen. He is an ultra-follower of Wellhausen. His Hebrew grammar, of which only one volume has ever appeared, is an advance on Olshausen's ideas, and his history, the first volume of which appeared last year, is an advance on Wellhausen's.

The Old Testament and Semitic courses at the University of Leipzig for the summer (April 16 to August 15) semester of 1883 are as follows:

Prof. Franz Delitzsch, Biblical Theology of the Old Testament; Genesis; The relation of the prophets to the law (English society); The Hebrew-Aramaic collection of proverbs, Millin de rabbanan (Jewish mission). Prof. Baur, Minor Pre-exilic prophets. Prof. Hoelemann, Psalms. Dr. Ryssel, Isaiah. Dr. Guthe, Old Testament Introduction; Legislation of Deuteronomy. Dr. Koenig, Hebrew Antiquities; Grammar. Dr. Lotz, Judges; Assyriology as auxiliary Theological Science; Assyrian. Prof. Fleischer, Arabic (Koran and Hamâsa). Prof. Krehl, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic (Roediger's, Arnold's, and Dillmann's chrestomathies respectively). Prof. Frdr. Delitzsch absent. Also there will be lectures on the Geography of Babylonia, Arabia, &c.

At the University of Berlin:

Prof. Dillmann, Biblical Theology of the Old Testament; Job. Prof. Kleinert, Psalms. Prof. Strack, Old Testament Introduction; Genesis; Kimchi's Hebrew Grammar. Prof. Schrader, Assyrian-Babylonian History; Selected Assyrian Inscriptions; Sumerian-Akkadian; Ethiopic. Prof. Sachau, Arabic (Mo'-allakât; Legends of the Koran); Syriac (Kalila and Dimna). Prof. Dieterici, Arabic (Arabic Poets; Thier and Mensch); Prof. Barth, Aramaic chaps. of Daniel and Ezra; the Syriac Apocrypha, and Syriac Syntax. Dr. Jahn, Arabic Grammar comparatively considered; Arabic exercises. Prof. Mueller, Geography and Ethnography of Asia. Prof. Bastian, General Ethnology.

The most important Old Testament and Semitic scholars in other German Universities are as follows, the order being determined by the relative number of theological students in the universities mentioned:

Halle; Schlottmann, Riehm, Wellhausen. Tuebingen; Kautsch, editor of Gesenius' Grammar. Breslau; Praetorius, best known for his Himyaritic studies. Goettingen; Bertheau, de Lagarde, Haupt. Dorpat (Russia); Volck and Muehlau, editors of *Gesenius' Woerterbuch*. Munich; Hommel, Assyriologist and Arabist, and Pezold, Assyriologist. Marburg; Count Baudissin, best known for studies in comparative religion. Strassburg; Reuss, Kayser, both of the Wellhausen school, Nowack, Noeldeke, one of the greatest of Semitic scholars, Erting, known for his work on inscriptions. Basel (Switzerland); Smend, commentator on Ezekiel. Rustock; Philippi. Giessen; Stade. Heidelberg; Merx, commentator on Joel, Weil, Arabist. Graz (Austria); Floigl, eccentric theories of Biblical chronology.

GENERAL NOTES.

The Relationship of Christianity to Judaism.—Christianity, in fact, so far from being the result or synthesis of all previous religions, or of many previous religions, was in immediate and intimate historical connection with only two religious developments of thought—one Semitic and the other Aryan—the Hebrew and the Hellenistic, the Jewish and the Grecian. Its primary and fundamental relationship was with the former. It assumed the religion of Israel as its basis. It professed to be the fulfillment of the law and the prophets, to have done away with whatever was imperfect in them, to have retained whatever they included of permanent value, and to be the full corn in the ear of every seed of truth sown, and of every blade of promise developed in them. The more thoroughly we investigate this claim the more we shall become impressed with its justice. There is not a prominent doctrine of the Bible of which such propositions as these may not be laid down,—namely, that it was evolved from simple facts or statements of a rudimentary or germinal kind; that the course of its development was gradual, closely associated with the history of events, and through a succession of stages, in each of which the doctrine was extended and enriched; that this course was throughout one of progress, constantly unfolding into greater clearness and comprehensiveness; that the evolution was imperfect before the New Testament era; and that the New Testament fulfillment actually gave to the doctrine developed the self-consistency of completeness, so that it thereafter only required to be apprehended and applied. These affirmations may almost be regarded as laws of the important science of Biblical theology, because they hold true of all Biblical doctrines. Judaism and Christianity are connected by all the truths of both, and by all the threads or strands of the history of these truths. Judaism brought nothing to maturity; but the whole religion of Israel was a prophecy of Christianity. This can only be fully established and exhibited by the entire science of Biblical theology. But the most cursory survey of the authoritative records of the Jewish and Christian religions is sufficient to show us that the connection of Judaism and Christianity was very peculiar and very wonderful.

The latest portions of the Old Testament appeared generations before the birth of Christ,—its earliest portions belong to an unknown antiquity,—its intervening portions were written at intervals, through many centuries, by a multitude of authors, of every condition in life from prince to peasant, in every form of composition, and on a vast variety of subjects; yet the collective result is a system of marvellous unity, self-consistency, and comprehensiveness. It is at the same time a system which is not self-centred and self-contained, but one of which all the parts contribute, each in its place, to raise, sustain, and guide faith in the coming of a mysterious and mighty Saviour,—a perfect prophet, perfect priest, and perfect king, such as Christ alone of all men can be supposed to have been. This broad general fact—this vast and strange correlation or correspondence—cannot be in the least affected by any questions of "the higher criticism" as to the authorship, time of origination, and mode of composition, of the various

books of the Old Testament: by the questions, for example, which have been raised as to whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch; whether its first book has been made up of a number of older documents; whether its legislation consists of various deposits or strata; whether the book of Deuteronomy is the work of Jeremiah; whether there was an earlier or a later Isaiah; whether the book of Zechariah is the work of several writers; whether Daniel was composed by the prophet whose name it bears or by a later author. Answer all these questions in the way which the boldest and most rationalistic criticism of Germany or Holland ventures to suggest,—accept on every properly critical question the conclusion of the most advanced critical schools,—and what will follow? Merely this, that those who do so will have, in various respects, to alter their views as to the manner and method in which the ideal of the Messiah's person, work, and kingdom was, point by point, line by line, evolved and elaborated. There will not, however, be a single Messianic word or sentence, not a single Messianic line or feature, the fewer in the Old Testament Scriptures. The whole religion of Israel will just as much as before be pervaded by a Messianic ideal; and that Messianic ideal, however differently it may be supposed to have been developed, will be absolutely the same as before,—an ideal which can only be pretended to have been realized in Christ, and which may reasonably be maintained to have been completely fulfilled, and far more fulfilled in Him.

Such is the connection between Judaism and Christianity. It is a relationship which is not only remarkable, but unique. Comparative theology cannot show a second instance of it in the religious history of humanity. Brahmanism was, indeed, a development of the Vedic religion; but no person has ever regarded it as a fulfillment of the Vedic religion. Buddhism was an offshoot of Brahmanism; but instead of being the completion of Brahmanism, it was an essentially antagonistic religion. The religion of Israel and the Christian religion are the only two faiths in the world which have been historically related as prophecy to fulfillment, hope to substance.—*Robert Flint in "The Faiths of the World."*

PREPOSITIONS OF THE VERBS MEANING TO BELIEVE OR TRUST.

By Prof. F. B. Denio,

Congregational Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

The various prepositions used after the Hebrew verbs signifying *to trust* arouse inquiry regarding their influence on the verbs and prepositions of the Greek Testament. Were the non-classical uses of πιστεύειν and εἰς or ἐπί communicated through the Septuagint from the Hebrew Bible? An investigation developed the following facts:

There are four verbs which are the important Hebrew verbs translated *believe*, *trust* or *rely*: these are נִשְׁעַן, הֶאֱמִין, חָסָה and בָּטַח.

נִשְׁעַן literally means *to lean*. From this rises the tropical meaning *to rely*. This verb is used in the tropical sense fourteen times with a preposition. In twelve instances, the preposition is עַל and therefore corresponds to the literal meaning of

the verb; once it is אֶל and once, בְּ. These prepositions are all translated by *ἐπί*, which is followed either by the Dat. or Acc. cases, apparently with indifference as to which case is used. None of these instances are in the Pentateuch. The object of the preposition is impersonal four times. The remaining objects are of course personal, seven out of the ten times the object is God. The verb is more often translated by *πεποιθέναι*, and never by *πιστεύειν*.

חָסָה means *to seek refuge*, hence its almost invariable translation *trust*. It is used thirty-six times, and is followed once by תַּחַת and elsewhere invariably by בְּ. תַּחַת is translated by *ὑπό*. בְּ is thus translated twice, by *ἀπό* once, by *διά* once, by *ἐν* thrice and by *ἐπί* twenty-four times. Elsewhere the Greek verb is not followed by a preposition. If one were to say that the Sept. translators did their work independently of the meaning of the Hebrew prepositions, these facts would make it difficult to disprove his statement. חָסָה is translated by *πεποιθέναι* ten times and by *ἐλπίζειν* twenty times, never by *πιστεύειν*. Nineteen of the twenty cases in which *ἐλπίζειν* is used, occur in the Psalms. In fact, *ἐλπίζειν* is a favorite verb of the Sept. translator of the Psalms.

בָּטַח is used nearly always in the Qăl. There are but five exceptions, and these are Hîph'îl verbs. It is used 102 times with a preposition. In twelve passages the preposition is אֶל, in sixty-nine it is בְּ, and in twenty-one עַל. The lexicographers disagree about the original meaning of בָּטַח, but they concur in giving the tropical meaning as *to trust*. It may be by *casting cares* upon one (Ges., *Thesaurus*), or *adhering* to one (Fuerst, *Concordance*) or *hanging cares* upon one (Fuerst, *Lexicon*), or *being secure* in a person (Ges., *Woerterbuch*, Ed. VIII.). In fifty out of the 102 passages mentioned above, בָּטַח is translated by *πεποιθέναι*, and in forty-three by *ἐλπίζειν*. בָּטַח is used only once in the Pentateuch. This is the case with חָסָה. It is found in the Psalms forty-four times, in Jeremiah sixteen, in Isaiah fifteen, in Proverbs seven, in 2 Kings seven, and in no other book is it found more than twice. When it is followed by אֶל, God is generally the object, which is the case when בָּטַח בְּ occurs in the Psalms. When עַל is used, the object is commonly impersonal, as is the case when בָּטַח בְּ is outside of the Psalms. In the Psalms בָּטַח is more often translated by *ἐλπίζειν*. It is elsewhere commonly translated by *πεποιθέναι*, never by *πιστεύειν*. אֶל and עַל are always translated by *ἐπί*, and בְּ is so translated fifty-six out of the sixty-nine times it is used. In these instances, *ἐπί* is followed by the dative a few more times than it is followed by the accusative. The results obtained by the examination of these three verbs, are not such as we started out to obtain. One thing we may be sure of, we have found the origin of the non-classical uses of *ἐλπίζειν*, *πεποιθέναι*, and of *ἐπί* after these verbs.

If we may trust Trommius' Concordance of the Sept., *πιστεύειν* is used once to translate שָׁמַע, in Jer. xxv., 8, and elsewhere it is used only as the translation of הֶאֱמִין. This verb means *to regard as firm, or to hold fast upon*, hence *to believe* or *trust*. It may be followed by לְ with the person or thing which is believed: thus

הֶאֱמִין לְ means *credidit* with the dative. הֶאֱמִין may also be followed by בְּ with the person or thing upon which one holds fast in faith or trust. הֶאֱמִין בֵּאלֹהִים means *fidem habuit Deo*, he had faith in God. Both constructions are followed by God as the object. These constructions are found thirty-six times. No other preposition is used. לְ is used fourteen times, and the expression is always translated by *πιστεύειν* with the dative. בְּ is used twenty-two times, and this expression is also translated by *πιστεύειν* (simple or compounded) and the dative. The Greek construction is perfectly classical thus far. הֶאֱמִין בְּ is translated seven times by *πιστεύειν* (simple or compounded) *ἐν*. This is non-classical and is apparently the original of the same construction in Mark 1., 15. Πιστεύω is never followed by *εἰς* in the Sept., unless in a variant; and from the examination given none have appeared. In some texts *εἰς* follows *ἐλπίζειν* in 2 Kings, XVIII., 24. The writer has failed to find any light in the Sept. as to the origin of the New Testament use of *πιστεύειν εἰς* or *ἐπί*. It may be added that Wahl's Clavis of the Apocrypha adds nothing new from that quarter. It is believed that these facts are of value to the student of the New Testament, and should be noted in connection with the discussion of *ἐλπίζειν*, *πείθειν* and *πιστεύειν* in Cremer's Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the New Testament.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Criticism and the Canon.—Has Biblical Science the right to re-examine the historic foundations of Christianity and re-test the Canon of Scripture? Without a doubt. But in this process of re-examining and re-testing, has it also the right to reject entirely the traditional testimony of the Church to the Sacred Books? To *this* question the arrogant spirit of the extreme modern Criticism gives an affirmative answer. Happily there are those who deny this right. *Van Oosterzee* says, "As concerns the Canon of the *Old* Testament Scriptures, the Christian Church received from the Jews, *yet not without critical investigation*. Melito of Sardis and Origen made accurate investigations amongst the Palestinian Jews as to what writings belonged to the Canon, although, along with these, a certain value was attached to the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. To the question (then raised) whether it was wise, generally speaking, *to rely on the Jewish Tradition, an affirmative answer seemed justified*, for this Tradition itself was the fruit of a critical examination made at the time of the close of the Old Testament Canon, and assuredly not without earnestness and conscientiousness. As to particular details, the accuracy of this critical judgment of antiquity is, perhaps, not to be defended against every possible objection. But well may it, with grateful appreciation of the help of a thorough Isagogics, regard the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as a whole, as authentic sources of our knowledge of *Divine Revelation given by Moses and Prophets*. The position which Christian Theologians, in the spirit of the Reformation have, therefore, to occupy in relation to the tradition which gave to the Church its Canon, is already defined, in principle, by what has been said. It is not that of *blind dogmatism* which, at once,

begins to submit, unreservedly, to the authority of tradition; and just as little is it that *lofty criticism* which attaches to the utterances of tradition no essential importance, but that of a truly independent, impartial, and patiently conducted, investigation." To the same purpose are the profound observations of *Martensen*: "As Holy Scripture is the Canon for the *Church* only, it is manifest that a necessary reciprocity must continually subsist between it and ecclesiastical tradition. By the transmission of the Church, Scripture has been handed down to us, and the Church it was that collected the Books of the Canon, as they are in living use, at the present day. We cannot, indeed, look upon our traditional Canon as a work of inspiration, yet we cannot but recognize the fact that the ancient Church had a special call to this work, and that this collection of books,—which has obtained unanimous recognition in the most contrasted quarters in the Church, and thus has received ecumenical ratification, has been determined under the guidance of the Spirit who was to lead the Church, according to her Lord's promise, into all truth. To deny that the early Church performed this task, is to deny that the Scriptures, given by God, have the power to claim for themselves admission and recognition in the Church."

What is worthy of note is, that, notwithstanding doubts expressed here and there, by a few individuals, the uniform result of all critical sifting of the Canon leaves it practically untouched. It was the result of the Jewish search, the result of the early Christian search, by men who knew the use of language, the result of the Reformation search, the "*Quinque libri Mosis*" being a part of the Word of God, and the result of the Westminster search, as is shown by the writings of their divines. Whatever liberty is accorded to the later criticism, it does not yet appear that this foundation of the past, laid by such giant intellects, ceaseless toil, and careful investigation can be essentially affected. While asserting, therefore, the right of Biblical Science to a free, untrammeled and reverential criticism of the historic grounds of the Canon, we may approve the remarks cited above. There is an inseparable relation between the Canon and a true tradition. It will not do in determining the Canonicity of a given book to employ a single rule; viz., the Testimony of the Spirit and subjective application of saving truth, nor to rest solely upon tradition. Does the book claim for itself authority? Is the claim well supported by the composition itself? Has the book generally been so regarded? Has it the sanction of Christ or of one of the New Testament writers? All these questions must be answered. Criticism which has to do chiefly with the second, has no right to announce as infallible, a decision which has been reached without an impartial consideration of all sides of the question.

The order, Prophets, Law, Psalms; instead of Law, Psalms, Prophets.—There are those who would have us believe that the traditional arrangement of the literature and history of the Old Testament must be entirely changed; not modified merely, but wholly reconstructed. Supposing the Pentateuch to bave been written by Moses, they are perplexed to find his legislation "followed by a period of about five centuries of comparative barbarism, during which a highly organized nation has fallen into a loose federation of clans, an elaborate ritual with a jealously exclusive official clergy has been superseded by a crude and uncouth cultus presided

over by an irregular and personal priesthood, and the trained strength of a disciplined army coextensive with a victorious nation has disappeared, leaving the oppressed Israelites dependent upon flashes of individual and undisciplined valor for even temporary relief from their sufferings." But their perplexity rests not at this point. It is equally difficult for them to comprehend the sudden change from the "wild and barbaric virtues and vices of the period of the judges to the marvelous spiritual depth and maturity of the Psalms," it being impossible, as they view the matter, for the hero "who stood with one foot in the period of Gideon and Jephthah (to say nothing of his own doings and beliefs) to have composed those portions of the Old Testament which stand nearer than any other to the feelings and aspirations of Christianity." And then, after two or three centuries, during which not even the "faintest after-vibrations of David's harp are to be heard, they are startled by the apparition of the prophets—true sons of the earth, in the freshness and verve of their appeal, speaking like men whom a sudden sense of what should be has startled and horrified by its own contrast with what is, and who turn in all the passion of new-born conviction to force the truth upon a heedless or astonished world." Nor, finally, are they willing that Israel should be without a history during the five hundred years from Malachi to Christ. To be relieved of these difficulties a new scheme is suggested. Instead of "Law, Psalms, Prophets," they propose "Prophets, Law, Psalms." According to this reconstruction the arrangement of Hebrew literature will be briefly as follows:

1. *The Prophetic Narrators*, by whom were written those portions of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, which may be described as most graphic, pathetic and picturesque; c. g., Gen. II. 5—IV. 26; VI. 1–8, etc; the legislation of these Narrators is to be found in Ex. XXI.—XXIII. 19, known as the *Book of the Covenant;* about the end of the.....*9th cent.*
2. *Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah* (I.–XXXIX.).....*8th cent.*
3. *Deuteronomist*, in whose writings is to be found a marked advance upon the legislation of the Narrators. This includes among other fragments, Gen. XV., XXVI. 2–5; Exodus XIII., 3–16 XX. 2–17; all of Deut. except a part of chaps. XXII. and XXXIV., and some portions of Joshua. This code was introduced by King Josiah in the revival which followed the idolatrous reign of Manasseh and Ammon.....*7th cent.*
4. *Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Second Isaiah* (XL.–LXVI.).....*6th cent.*
5. *Book of Origins, or Priestly Code*, partly narrative, chiefly legislative, marked by two characteristics, love of system, and devotion to ceremonial observances. This includes, together with large portions of Gen., Ex., Numbers and Deut., all of *Leviticus*..*5th cent.*
6. *Psalms;* a few perhaps go back to the 7th, but the most of them must be assigned to the.....*5th–2d cent.*

And now we may well ask upon what ground this reconstruction is based. The answer is, *internal evidence*. There is no external evidence *for* it, while it may be said emphatically that there is external evidence *against* it. This point is touched by Dr. Peters in the "Notes from Abroad" of the present number. He says truly that "internal criticism is proverbially unreliable when without all external corroboration." Two important items, therefore, viz., the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch militate against any theory assigning so late a date to the Pentateuch, and to some of the Psalms. Another serious question is found in the attitude of the New Testament writers. We cannot deny that the traditional view is attended with difficulties which in some cases seem inexplicable; but we believe that this proposed reconstruction involves far greater difficulties. If, however, we were prepared to rule out the supernatural, to deny the existence of

prophecy, to count as of no weight the words of the Savior, there is so much in this theory of the plausible, that we might be tempted to adopt it.

What Kind of a Knowledge of Hebrew does a Christian Minister need?—That some knowledge of Hebrew is needed by a Christian minister and, indeed, by every Christian minister, is taken for granted. The question is, how much and of what kind? It is not the need of a philologist, or of a linguist, or of a specialist in any part of this great field, to which we call attention, but the need of the busy, care-bearing, overburdened pastor. His great work is that of *teaching, interpretation.* That which he interprets is written in languages other than his own,—two-thirds of it in Hebrew. He cannot teach what he does not know. He cannot *know*, in any true sense of that word, the contents of the Scriptures of the Old Testament without a knowledge of the language in which those Scriptures were written. The day is past when any correct or legitimate study of the Old Testament can be made without the Hebrew grammar, the Hebrew lexicon, and the aid furnished by ancient history. The employment of these aids is the employment of the so-called *historico-grammatical* method, and so long as any other method of study or interpretation is used, the true meaning of the text will remain hidden. In this connection it is remarked by Dr. Curtiss, in *Current Discussions in Theology* (just published): "There was a time when, under the stress of some great controversy it was sufficient for a minister to wipe the dust from his long-neglected Hebrew Bible, and with much labor assure himself from the 'original' that the meaning which he had been taught to associate with the verse was the correct one. Such casual study of the text is almost worse than useless, because it fosters the belief that one has reached the true sense of the passage. The knowledge of Hebrew which our ministers require is something more than the senseless and painful enunciation of words which convey no meaning to the eye, and the ability, with the help of good King James, to ride over the vasty deep. A knowledge by which one is repelled, and which is forgotten as soon as possible, is not a knowledge worth having." But now, to be brief, what knowledge *is* needed? *First*, an accurate knowledge of the fundamental principles of the grammar, and this means, simply, the ability (1) to recognize the position of each word as it occurs in the text, (2) to analyze it into the different elements of which it is compounded, and (3) to give in English its exact equivalent. *Second*, a thoroughly mastered vocabulary of 800 or 1000 of the most frequently recurring words in the language. *Third*, a living acquaintance with the most common constructions and idioms of the language.

This amount and kind of knowledge, as all, we think, will confess, *is needed.* But is this sufficient? Shall a man stop when he has gone thus far? Yes; if his conscience will permit him to do so. No man, however, who is in any sense a student, or who in any sense realizes the work to which he is called, will be satisfied with this. And in the case of men who are not thus satisfied, time for the deeper and broader study *will find itself.* In our opinion, therefore, every minister needs that knowledge of Hebrew, having which he will be able to carry on Old Testament study by the only true method, the historico-grammatical, and that too, without the feeling that the work is a *drudgery.* More than this may be desired; this, at least, is needed.

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.*]

THE YALKUT ON ZECHARIAH.*

A compilation from the Talmud and Midrash, in illustration of the Bible, called "Yalkut Shim'oni" was made in the eleventh century. Part I., taking up about two-thirds of the book, was devoted to the Pentateuch; Part II. included the remainder of the Old Testament. The word Yalkut means *bag, purse.* Of this Yalkut twelve editions have been printed, the last in 1876—7. As an illustration of the matter contained in the book the following on Zech. xi. 8 is given:

And I cut off the three shepherds in one month.

Did they then actually die in one month? For did not Miriam die in Nisan, and Aaron in Av, and Moses in Adar? But the fact is the good gifts, which had been given to Israel by their means, ceased in one month.

R. Yose, son of R. Yehudah, said, Three good Guides were given to Israel and three good gifts were given by their means:

These are they:—The Manna, the Well, and the Pillar of Cloud.

The Well—for the merit of Miriam;

The Pillar of Cloud—for the merit of Aaron;

And the Manna—for the merit of Moses.

Miriam died:—then the Well departed; as it is said, "*And Miriam died there*" (Num. xx., 1), and it is written (immediately) afterwards, "*And there was no water for the Congregation*" (Num. xx., 2). But it came back again through the merit of Moses and Aaron.

Aaron died:—then the Pillar of Cloud departed. As it is said, "*And all the Congregation saw that Aaron had expired*" (Num. xx., 29). R. Abbuhu said, Do not interpret וַיִּרְאוּ, "*and they saw*" but וַיִּרְאוּ, "*and they feared.*" But both of them (i. e. the Well and the Pillar of Cloud) came back through the merit of Moses.

Moses died:—(then) all three departed; and thus we may interpret that Scripture which says, "*And I cut off the three Shepherds in one month.*"

In the Time to come they will all three come back, as it is said:—

"*They shall not hunger*" (Is. xlix., 10).—This means the Manna.

"*And they shall not thirst*" (Is. xlix., 10).—This means the Well.

"*Neither shall the glare nor the sun smite them*" (Is. xlix., 10).—This means the Pillar of Cloud.

"*But by fountains of waters He shall lead them*" (Is. xlix., 10). It is not said "*a fountain*" but "*fountains.*"

In the Time to Come there will go forth for Israel twelve fountains corresponding to the twelve Tribes.

Two interesting appendices are added, the first of which is on *Messiah Ben Joseph.* Here the writer endeavors to show that the Jewish belief in a Messiah Ben Joseph is not of late date, as is assumed by most scholars, but has its germ even in the Book of Genesis, and that it "runs through the whole Jewish history, disappearing at times, but always breaking out again with increased vividness." The second appendix treats of a remarkable tradition which existed in very early

* Translated with Notes and Appendices by EDWARD G. KING, B. D., Hebrew Lecturer at Sidney Sussex College and Vicar of Madingley. London: G. Bell & Sons. 8vo, pp. 122.

times respecting the *exaltation* and *enlargement* of Jerusalem. There is not a doubt that much light is to be shed upon the Old Testament, and particularly upon the New, by such investigations as the one before us. Work in this line has but commenced. There is no field from which greater treasures may be obtained, than from that of the old Jewish writings. Nor has any field been more neglected.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS.*

This book belongs to the same class as C. H. M's Notes. It is, however, far worse. According to this author, "Genesis reveals to us all that can spring out of Adam and his sons. Here we may read how Adam behaved, and what races and peoples sprang out of him. In spirit we may learn how old Adam behaves, what the old man is in each of us, and all the immense variety which can grow out of him." The writer adopts in every case a triple interpretation. Besides the literal, of which it would seem that little is made, there are the inward or moral, the outward or allegoric, and the dispensational or anagogic senses. It is needless to urge that such methods make the Bible a riddle, render it impossible to assign any certain meaning to any certain passage, and destroy absolutely its worth and usefulness. The mysteries which are supposed by such interpreters to be found in numbers, names of persons and places, etc., are many; they are not more strange, however, than the fact, sad as it may be, that there are, in these days, those who can write, and those who will believe such absurdities as are contained on every page of this volume.

OUTLINES OF ANCIENT HISTORY.†

The author of this manual is correct in saying that manuals of history are too often mere crowded inventories of events, and so not only fail of awakening an intelligent interest in what should be the most engaging of studies, but repel and dishearten the student. In no department of study is it so difficult to find a good text-book, as in the department of history. It is also true that first-rate teachers in this department are as rare as first-rate text-books. This book has three features which deserve mention: (1) The fact that so much of the space, at the command of the author, has been given to the account of the arts, sciences, literature and religion of the various nations. Is it not true that "the character and work of a Moses, a Solon, or a Lycurgus have been far more potent elements in the formation of the complex product we call civilization, and therefore more worthy of a place in our thoughts as students of a growing humanity, than the petty wars and intrigues of kings and emperors, whose only claim upon our atten-

* The Types of Genesis, briefly considered, as revealing the development of Human Nature, by Andrew Jukes. Fourth edition. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 8vo, pp. 421. Price $2.00.

† Outlines of Ancient History, from the earliest times to the fall of the Western Roman Empire, A. D. 476, embracing the Egyptians, Chaldæans, Assyrians, Babylonians, Hebrews, Phœnicians, Medes, Persians, Greeks and Romans; designed for private reading and as a manual of instruction, by P. V. N. Myers, A. M., President of Farmer's College, Ohio. New York: Harper and Brothers. 8vo, pp. 480. Price $1,75.

tion is that the accidents of history have made them titled personages?" (2) The fact that in the arrangement of matter the ethnographical has been allowed to exert a greater influence than the chronological method. It is only in this way that one can get clear and succinct ideas of history. (3) The division of the text into paragraphs, under each of which is placed as much matter as the scope of the book allows to be given. The wisdom of omitting all foot-notes and references to larger works may well be questioned. Of 471 pp., 12 are given to a general introduction, 31 to Egypt, 11 to Chaldæa, 17 to Assyria, 12 to Babylonia, 13 to the Hebrew Nation, 7 to the Phœnicians, 17 to the Persians, 112 to Greece, 232 to Rome. That part of Ancient History in which *we* are most interested, is, as shown above, treated very briefly. If it is true, as the author himself says, that "of all the elements of the rich legacy bequeathed to the modern by the ancient world, by far the most important, in their influence upon the course of events, were those transmitted to us through the ancient Hebrews"—why should not more space have been employed in the narration of these elements? The fact is that in historical manuals, and in historical study too little space and time are given to the consideration of the history of the Chosen People.

LECTURES ON HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH.*

It is strange that ministers do not more often undertake the work of exposition. Expository preaching should certainly come in for a fair share of attention. The example of the worthy divine, who prepared these lectures solely for his people, and with no thought of their publication, might well be imitated. The writer gives evidence of having been a careful and conscientious student, but the lectures are especially valuable for the rich practical suggestions in which they abound. In the main the exegesis is good, careful study having been bestowed upon that part of the work which must always serve as the basis for the rest. In the interpretation of symbols he is careful. Had the author himself prepared his work for the printer, he would doubtless have modified some portions of it. We cannot understand why the book should have been printed on such miserable paper. The additional expense of a few dollars would have made the volume much more attractive.

SCIENCE OF THE DAY AND GENESIS.†

This treatise claims to consider all points of contrast between science and the Bible history of creation. That scientists are for the most part skeptics, the author denies. Scientific leaders are Bible believers. The trouble is that in the majority of cases men who do not understand science interpret the Bible, while

* Expository and Practical Lectures on Haggai and Zechariah, by Rev. John Van Eaton, D. D., late pastor of the United Presbyterian Congregation of New York, N. Y. Edited by Rev. W. J. Robinson, D. D. Pittsburgh: United Presbyterian Board of Publication. 12mo, pp. 366. Price $1.00.

† Science of the Day and Genesis, by E. Nisbet, D. D. New York: W. B. Smith & Co., 27 Bond street. 12mo, pp. 149. Price $1.00.

students of science are either ignorant of, or hostile to the Bible. In thirteen chapters there are discussed (1) Whence the Earth? (2) The Aim of the Bible, (3) The Antiquity of the Bible, (4) "Day" in Genesis I., (5) The Creation of the Sun, Moon, Stars, (6) Death among animals, (7) Darwinism, (8)—(11) Antiquity of Man, (12) Unity of Origin of the Human Species, (13) Final destiny of the Earth.

The style is brisk, clear, perhaps over-confident. The matter is to a large extent quotation, but quotation from authorities, and well-arranged.

SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

ENOCH, Book of; tr. from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library by the late Richard Lawrence, Archbishop of Cashel; the text now corrected by his latest notes; with an introd. by the author of "Evolution of Christianity." London: *Kegan Paul & Co.* 8vo, 240 pp. ..... 5s.

BERGEL, J., Mythologie der alten Hebraeer. II. Leipzig: *Friedrich.* gr. 8, VIII., 80 S. ..... M. 1.50

BERGMANN, F., Eine Kette von Liedern (bisher das Hohelied Salomo's betitelt) u. der Greis Salomo (bisher der Prediger Salomo benannt), aus dem Urtext uebersetzt u. erklaert. Strassburg: *Treuttel und Wuertz.* 8vo, VIII., 111 S. ..... M. 3.50

DELITZSCH, FRANZ, Kritische studien over de vijf bocken van Mozes. Uit het Hoogduitsch vertaald door F. W. Stutterheim. Culemborg: *Blom en Olivierse.* 8vo, XII.; 162 pp. ..... f. 1.50

GRAETZ, H., Kritischer Commentar zu den Psalmen, nebst Text u. Uebersetzung. 2. Bd. Breslau: *Schottlaender.* VII., 385–701 S. ..... M. 10.—; geb. 11.50

KRUMMEL, L., Die Religion der Alten Aegypter. Sammlung v. Vortraegen, hrsg. v. W. Frommel u. F. Pfaff. 9. Bd. 6 Hft. Heidelberg: *C. Winter.* 8vo, 29 S. ..... M.—.60

LOTZ, W., Quaestiones de historia sabbati. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.* gr. 8, IV., 108 S. ..... M. 6.—

PRESSEL, W., Geschichte u. Geographie der Urzeit von der Erschaffung der Welt bis auf Mose. Noerdlingen: *Beck.* 8vo, VI., 338 S. ..... M. 3.50

WUENSCHE, A., Die Raethselweisheit bei den Hebraeern, mit Hinblick auf andere alte Voelker dargestellt. Leipzig: *O. Schulze.* gr. 8, 65 S. ..... M. 1.50

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

PETERS, REV. G. N. H., The Theocratic Kingdom. New York: *Funk and Wagnalls.* 3 vols., 8vo, 700 pp., each $3.00

OEHLER, Old Testament Theology. By Geo. E. Day, D. D. New York: *Funk and Wagnalls.* 8vo, 534 pp. $2.50

WISE, DR. I. M., Moses, the Man and Statesman. Cincinnati: *Bloch & Co.* 8vo, paper, 28 pp. ..... $ .25

THAYER, ANDREW W., The Hebrews and the Red Sea. Andover: *W. F. Draper.* 16mo, 140 pp.....$ .80

WASHBURN, W. W., A. M., The Gospel according to Moses; or, Import of Jewish Sacrifices. New York: *Walden and Stowe.* 16mo, 90 pp.....$ .50

NEWTON, HEBER, D. D., Right and Wrong Uses of the Bible. New York: *R. Worthington.* 12mo, 300 pp.....$ .75

GREEN, W. H., D. D., A Grammar of the Hebrew language. New revised Ed. New York: *John Wiley and Sons.* 8vo.....$2.50

RECENT ARTICLES.

REID, RICHARD, Land Tenure in Bible Times. I. Patriarchal. *The Catholic Presbyterian*, Apr. 1883, pp. 260–'71.

STEBBINS, REV. R. P., The Hebrew Prophets. *The Unitarian Review*, Apr. 1883, pp. 289–300.

LANSING, REV. GULIAN, D. D., Quotations of the Pentateuch. *The Evangelical Repository*, Apr. 1883, pp. 328–'42.

CARPENTER, PROF. J. ESTLIN, The Book of Deuteronomy. *The Modern Review*, Apr. 1883, pp. 252–'81.

BISSELL, PROF. EDWIN C., The Proposed Reconstruction of the Pentateuch. II. *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, Apr. 1883, pp. 225–'45.

GINSBURG, REV. C. D., LL. D., The Sanhedrin in the Time of the Apostles. *The Sunday School Times*, Mar. 31, Apr. 7, 1883, pp. 195, 211.

HIGHER CRITICISM, The, VI. *The Presbyterian Banner*, Mar. 21, p. 4.

DORMAN, REV. L. M., The Bible and the Koran. *The Sunday School Times*, Apr. 14, 1883, p. 228.

SCHODDE, G. H., PH.D., Ezra's Relation to the Law. *The Independent*, Apr. 5, 1883, p. 424.

RAMESES II. *The Independent*, Apr. 5, 1883, pp. 432, 433.

METZ, Ueber die angebliche Abstammung der Kaffern u. Fellatah's von den Juden. *Jued. Lit.-Blatt*, XII., 10, 11, S. 39, 40, 41, 42.

KAUTSCH, E., Nachtraegliches zur Siloahinschrift. *Ztschr. d. Deutschen Palaestina-Vereins* V., 3, 1883, S. 205–'18.

GUTHE, H., Ausgrabungen bei Jerusalem. *Ztschr. d. Deutschen Palaestina-Vereins* T., 3, 1883, S. 161–204.

KESSLER, Propheten u. Koenigsthum im Alten Testament. *Ev. Kirch. Ztg.* 1883, 3, Sp. 49–58; 4, Sp. 73–83.

GRIMM, W., Luther's Uebersetzung der alttestamentlichen Apokryphen. *Stud. u. Krit*, 1883, 2, S. 375–400.

VUELLEUMIER, H., La critique du Pentateuque dans sa phase actuelle. *Revue de theol. et de philos.*, Jan. 1883, pp. 67–87.

CHAPINS, P., De l'autorite de l'Ecriture. *Revue de theol. et de philos.*, Nov. 1882, p. 525–542.

LEWIS, TAYLER, LL. D., A Glimpse of Old Testament Eschatology. *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, Mar. 1883, pp. 231–'44.

FRADENBURG, J. N., PH. D., The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. II. *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, Mar. 1883, pp. 279–301.

REVIEWS.

SAADIAH, Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah. By E. Nestle: *Lit. Centralblt*, 13.

SCHOLZ, A., Commentar zum Buche des Propheten Hoseas. By E. K.: *Theol. Litblt.*, 11.

SCHRADER, E., Die Keilinschriften u. das alte Testament. By F. Hommel: *Lit. Centralblt*, 11.

ELLICOTT, C. J., An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. I. By T. K. Cheyne: *The Academy*, Jan. 27, 1883.

DEANE, J. W., The Book of Wisdom. By M. Vernes: *Revue critique*, 9.

REUSS, E., Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments. By M. Vernes: *Revue critique*, 4.

STADE, B., Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. By R. Smend: *Stud. u. Krit.*, 2, 1883.

LUNCZ, A. M., Jerusalem. By H. L. Strack: *Theol. Litblt.*, 8.

LENORMANT, FRANCOIS, The Beginnings of History. By R. M.: *The Modern Review*, Apr. 1883, pp. 404–'7; and *The Baptist Quarterly Review*, Apr. 1883, pp. 244–56.

BOUTON, J. W., Bible Myths and their Parallels in other Religions. By T. R. Slicer: *The Unitarian Review*, Apr. 1883, pp. 377–'9.

EBERS u. GUTHE, Palaestina in Bild u. Wort. By E. Schuerer: *Theol. Litztg.*, 1883, 7. Sp. 146. 147.

ROOS, PROF. FR., Ueber die richtigen Grundsaetze fuer die biblische Kritik. By E. Schuerer: *Theol. Litztg.*, 1883. 7, Sp. 147, 148.

FILLION, C., Atlas archeologique de la Bible. By H. Lesetre: *Bulletin critique*, 6.

KAULEN, F., Assyrien u. Babylonien. By Schrader: *Deu'sche Litztg*, 17 Maerz, 1883.

KOENIG, F. E., Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments. By A. L.: *Beweis des Glaubens*, Maerz, 1883, and *Theol. Litblt.*, 9.

LEDRAIN, E., Histoire d'Israel. By J. Halevy: *Revue critique*, 11.