

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VIII.

DECEMBER, 1888.

No. 4.

WHAT a blessing to any preacher are those hearers who are well-informed concerning biblical facts and truths! They are not only his most appreciative listeners. They are not only his most capable critics. They are not only those who derive the greatest benefit from his preaching if he is a faithful student and expounder of the Scriptures. They are much more. They constitute a bulwark for him in the large, free treatment of biblical truth. Their ideas of the Bible are drawn from a study of it, not brought to it and forced upon it. Hence, on the one hand, they are open to new light, ready for larger views, tolerant on behalf of any one who is seeking to unfold the Word. But on the other hand, they guard the pulpit from falling into a type of teaching which is extra-biblical. Here is perhaps the great danger of the modern preacher. So diverse are the interests and so wide is the range of subjects which fall under his view that he is tempted to depart from "the ministry of the *Word*." Happy the pastor who is buttressed and shielded from either danger by the strong, stimulating assistance of a body of Bible students among his people.

WHY should not every pastor aim to build up such a body of hearers? Why is not that effort just as important and as helpful to the kingdom of God as any other department of his labors? Why should he not put forth special energy in this direction? Much can be done from the pulpit by expository preaching. Vastly more can he accomplish as teacher of a Bible class in giving his personal attention to the training of his people in right methods of study. Why should he not rather give up some other lines of work for his flock,

in order to secure for them this supreme achievement—that they may know how to search, to appropriate, to be mighty in, the Scriptures?

IN three articles published in successive numbers, the question of the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament will be presented. Of the many questions which demand the attention of the biblical student, this one is, perhaps, most vital. One's interpretation of a multitude of passages, one's views upon a great number of subordinate topics will largely be determined by the view which he holds in reference to the relation of the two Testaments. Nor is it an easy matter to come to a decision upon this question. It cannot be denied that difficulties lie in the way of accepting any one of the three principal theories. Nothing will be gained, however, by shirking responsibility. The theories deserve consideration. The difficulties must be faced. What Professor Toy, of Harvard, does in this number for one of these theories, Professor Stevens, of Yale University, will do in the January STUDENT, for a second, and President Alvah Hovey, of Newton Theological Institution, will do in the February STUDENT for the third. To most of us the view presented by Dr. Toy will seem to take away from the New Testament all authority, and even all claim to be regarded as a book of ordinary accuracy; it will seem impossible to entertain such a theory of the New Testament and at the same time acknowledge, in any sense, its divine origin. Still this is not the proper line of argument. We cannot say: This view must be false because it is inconsistent with a given theory. We must examine one by one the facts which he claims to exist, and decide whether he is right or wrong in his claim. This method of procedure, and this method alone, will satisfy a thoughtful man. It is, of course, supposable that a large number of the STUDENT'S constituency have investigated this question, and made decision upon it. It is true, on the other hand, that many are just now considering it afresh, if not for the first time. To both classes its discussion by men of such ability, representing, as they do, three different schools of opinion cannot but be helpful.

IN speaking of the doubt which exists in reference to the authorship of the Book of Job, Prof. Davidson* remarks: "There are some minds that cannot put up with uncertainty, and are under the necessity

* THE BOOK OF JOB; Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; p. 68.

of deluding themselves into quietude by fixing on some known name. There are others to whom it is a comfort to think that in this omniscient age a few things still remain mysterious. Uncertainty is to them more suggestive than exact knowledge. No literature has so many great anonymous works as that of Israel. The religious life of this people was at certain periods very intense, and at these periods the spiritual energy of the nation expressed itself almost impersonally, through men who forgot themselves and were speedily forgotten in name by others." Is not this fact, in itself, strong evidence that Israel's literature is something different from ordinary literature. It is broader than the work of any one man could possibly be. It is human, to be sure; but how much more than human!

THE history of the world is the history of redemption. The proto-evangelium, as one has said, is its magna charta. The authors of the Old Testament recognize this, and thus are peerless among the writers of antiquity. We find no such insight elsewhere, and rightly call it of divine inspiration. These inspired men saw also that the specific human organ of redemption for the world was Israel,—as a people, and finally as represented in the Messiah. This thought is the spinal cord of the Old Testament, binding the various writings together in organic unity, and needs to be kept in view in any adequate treatment of Old Testament History. The prominence given to it still renders many of the older works, such as Jonathan Edwards' History of Redemption, valuable; and they should still find a place on our book-shelves, and not be entirely pushed aside by the more scientific and exact treatises of to-day, many of which fail to emphasize sufficiently this underlying thought of the Old Testament.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AS INTERPRETER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY CRAWFORD H. TOY,

Cambridge, Mass.

The method of determining the exegetical value of the New Testament would seem to be simple enough. Here is an ancient book from which citations are made in another ancient book. Are the citations correctly made and used? To answer this question in any given case, all that is necessary is to fix the text and meaning of the two passages, by scientific principles of interpretation, and compare them.

There are, to be sure, one or two complications, which, however, need not seriously embarrass the solution of the question. In the first place we are not absolutely certain that we have the complete original text of either Old Testament or New Testament. Our present Hebrew text, as is well known, depends upon MSS. of which scarcely one is older than the tenth century of our era. This Massoretic text may sometimes be controlled by the Greek, Aramaic and Latin versions, though there are many cases in which these offer little or no help, and our dependence has to be on the traditional Hebrew form. We know that this Hebrew text has been jealously guarded probably from about the beginning of our era; but what may have been its fortunes before this time, when for hundreds of years there was no authentic collection of the ancient Hebrew literature, when books were copied by unknown men under unknown circumstances, when we have good reason to believe that scribes took large liberties with their manuscripts, adding to or taking from the material, and combining two or more books in one manuscript, when the unintentional errors of one scribe might often be perpetuated by his successors, when there was no critical public to watch over the destinies of books,—what, under these conditions, may have been the fortunes of the Hebrew text, who can tell?

The history of the New Testament text is in general similar to that just described. The large number of errors in the received text has recently been brought to light by the Canterbury revision. The texts now generally accepted, those of Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort, rest almost entirely on two or three manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries, controlled in a measure by the Syriac and Latin versions. Yet in not a few cases the different testimonies are so discordant that an absolute decision is impossible, and the history of the New Testament writings between the date of their composition and the appearance of the earliest version is involved in the same obscurity which shrouds the early history of the Hebrew text. We are to a certain extent at the mercy of the scribes whose methods of copying we do not know.

Yet for the body of Old Testament and New Testament writings we may be reasonably sure that we have in substance the thought of the original authors. There may be uncertainty about particular words, sentences, or paragraphs; but

the probability is not great that a succession of scribes extending through several centuries could have quite transformed the body of their texts. For purposes of historical investigation, the best modern editions of Old Testament and New Testament texts may be accepted as substantially correct; for the former Hahn, and Baer and Delitzsch, and for the latter Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort. These do not claim absolute verbal accuracy, but they may fairly be regarded as containing no very important errors in text or words. And so far as the broader criticism is concerned, the investigation of the integrity or composition of the various books, this must of course follow its own principles in general dependence on the best attainable text.

Another complication is found in the fact that the New Testament writers quote not from the Hebrew but from some version, more generally the Septuagint. In such cases, it becomes necessary to compare the version with the Hebrew and determine, if possible, the original form of the text. If the translation of the version be perfectly correct, then our question is the same as if the quotation were made immediately from the correct Hebrew. If the translation be not correct, then the quotation is not, strictly speaking, from the Old Testament but from another book; the question would then be first, whether the New Testament writer has correctly understood the version from which he cites, and then, whether the version gives the substantial sense of the original or whether it departs therefrom in an important degree. If the New Testament author has only, for example, the Septuagint before him, we cannot hold him responsible, as an interpreter, for the errors of his version; we must recognize and commend his exegetical qualities if his employment of his text is accurate. But if this text be not that of the Hebrew Old Testament, he is in so far an expounder not of the Old Testament, but of the version. In the case of each quotation, therefore, it will be necessary to decide whether it is the Hebrew or the Greek or some other version that is cited.

Still another introductory question arises in connection with certain of the quotations: What is the meaning of the expression that occurs so frequently in the Gospels in connection with various incidents in the life of Jesus:—"That it might be fulfilled"? Similar phrases occur in the epistles of Paul and in the epistle to the Hebrews. Are we to understand that the New Testament writer intends to declare in such cases that there is the fulfillment of a prediction? And if so, does he mean that this remote fulfillment was had in view by the Old Testament writer? or only that, without the prescience of the latter, God had brought it about that certain declarations should be illustrated and fulfilled in the life of Jesus or in the history of the early Christian church? So far as the mere wording of the expression goes, either of these views of its meaning might be maintained. In each case we have to decide as best we may the import of the expression in question, from the tone of the New Testament writer and the general direction of his narrative.

Putting such passages aside, we may examine the citations in which the main point is the correctness of the use of the Old Testament made by New Testament writers.

Let us take for example the passage Matthew 8:17 quoted from Isa. 53:4. The Hebrew reads: "Our sicknesses he bore and our pains he carried them," which is rendered with sufficient exactness in the Gospel: "Himself took our weak-

nesses and bore our diseases." The prophet means to represent the servant of Yahweh, of whom he is speaking, as suffering vicariously for the nation, enduring sorrows produced by the national sin, and through this suffering eventually conquering peace and purity for his people. The picture is clear enough; a righteous person involved in suffering through no fault of his own, but by virtue of his close relations to a sinful community, suffering of mind and of body inflicted on him by his enemies. In the Gospel the sense given to these words is certainly different from this. "They brought to Jesus," says the evangelist, "many possessed with demons, and he cast out the spirits with a word and healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled that was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying," etc. Here Jesus is represented as taking into his own body and bearing the diseases which he expelled from the bodies of others, a conception strange in itself and foreign to the thought of the prophet. The meaning of the evangelist has been supposed to be that Jesus by his suffering procured pardon and peace for men, but in the passage in Matthew there is no word of spiritual experience or faith on the part of those who were treated; it was simply a bodily cure effected in them, and Jesus is said thereby, in accordance with the prediction of the prophet Isaiah, to have borne men's diseases; the natural understanding of this seems to be that he assumed the diseases which he healed. It may be added that the natural signification of the phrase, "that it might be fulfilled," is that these healing acts of Jesus were definitely predicted by the prophet in the passage cited.

In Matthew 21:5 there is a curious misapprehension of the Hebrew expression quoted from Zech. 9:9. The evangelist relates that two disciples were directed to go to a village and to bring an ass and a colt which they should find there; this they are said to have done; they "brought the ass and the colt and put on them their garments, and he sat thereon." The evangelist adds that all this was done that the word of the prophet might be fulfilled: "Behold thy king comes to thee meek and riding on an ass and a colt the foal of an ass." The words "ass" and "colt" are understood in the New Testament use of the expression to mean two different animals, the ass being represented as the mother of the colt, whereas in the Old Testament passage, the two words mean one animal, being simply used in a sort of poetic parallelism, "an ass, that is, a colt of the ass species," both words being masculine in the Hebrew.

A quotation which deals in an extraordinary manner with the Hebrew text is that in Matthew 27:9,10 from Zech. 11:13 (the ascription to Jeremiah in Matthew is doubtless a mere clerical error). The stress of the citation is made to turn in the Gospel on a word which in all probability does not properly belong in the Hebrew at all and gives it a sense quite foreign to the meaning of the prophet. The passage in Zechariah reads: "And Yahweh said to me, Throw it to the potter—a goodly price at which I am priced by them! And I took the thirty pieces of silver and threw them into the house of Yahweh to the potter." The evangelist declares this to be a prediction of the purchase of the potter's field with the thirty pieces of silver which Judas returned to the priests. The word "potter" in the Hebrew is suspicious; one does not know what a potter should be doing in the temple and why the prophet should throw the money to him. The change of one Hebrew consonant gives us "treasury" instead of "potter" (אוצר for אופר), which is a natural sense in the connection; and it is curious that in the Gospel

(v. 6), the priests say that it is not lawful to put this money into the treasury, which was in general the obvious place for money. "Potter" is not found in the Septuagint text, which misread the Hebrew in another way; the reading in the Gospel comes from some corrupt text of the time. But this is not the only departure from the Hebrew in Matthew. There it is the first person, "I took and threw;" here it is the third person plural, "They took and gave;" in the Greek the form of the verb admits of either rendering and it was perhaps from a Greek version that the evangelist took that form which best agreed with the transaction to which he referred. Further, the Hebrew text says only that the money was thrown to the potter; in the Gospel it is represented as saying that "they" gave it for the potter's field, another variation for which it is hard to account, for in the prophet nothing is said of a field or a purchase. These combined changes give a sense which we may fairly say does not belong to the prophetic passage. In Zechariah the prophet in the symbolic procedure which he is describing receives from the people the price of his religious care over them, a price ridiculously small, which he takes and not without contempt throws into the treasury of the temple. The emphasis is not on the place into which he puts the money—this was of course the treasury—but on the smallness of the price at which the people of Israel estimated the instruction of Yahweh's prophet and in the fact that they were so willing to give up his services. What he means to say is simply that Israel cared little for the instruction and guidance of their God since they so readily dissolved the connection between themselves and His appointed minister. There is a general parallelism between the two transactions in question, in so far as the betrayal of Jesus to the priests might have been regarded by the evangelist as a betrayal by the people of God's minister and therefore an abandonment of God himself. The parallelism is not faithful in the details, for it is the traitor Judas whose price is estimated by the priests at thirty pieces of silver; or, if it be Judas himself who puts the price of his God at thirty pieces, he cannot fairly be taken as the representative of the people. And further, as is pointed out above, the stress in the two passages is by no means the same; in the prophet it is on the smallness of the price; in the Gospel it is on the purchase of the potter's field.

John 19:37 is another example of an interpretation based on a wrong translation. The original passage, Zech. 12:10, reads: "They shall look to me in respect to [or in behalf of] him whom they have pierced [that is, slain]." The prophet, speaking in the name of Yahweh, is describing the situation in Judah in his own day and predicting a happier future. We gather from his words that the feeling between the city of Jerusalem and the surrounding rural districts was an unfriendly one, and he predicts a coming reconciliation between the two parties. "And the chieftains of Judah shall say in their heart, the inhabitants of Jerusalem are my strength in Yahweh of hosts their God. In that day I will make the chieftains of Judah like a pan of fire in the midst of wood, and like a torch of fire among sheaves, and they shall devour on the right hand and on the left all the people round about, and Jerusalem [that is, the population of Jerusalem] shall yet dwell in its own place, in Jerusalem. And Yahweh will save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem may not be magnified above Judah." After declaring that Yahweh will endue the house of David with mighty strength and will seek to destroy all

the nations that come up against Jerusalem, the prophecy continues: "And I will pour out on the house of David and on the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplication [that is, they shall have a kindly and prayerful disposition], and they shall look to me in behalf of him whom they pierced [slew], and shall mourn for him. In that day the mourning shall be great in Jerusalem." Here is a strife between the two parties which came to blows. Some of the inhabitants of the country districts, a region evidently looked down upon by the haughty inhabitants of the capital, had been slain, and Yahweh, says the prophet, will so change the disposition of the proud Jerusalemites that their souls shall become kindly, they shall mourn over their brother slain and shall turn their eyes to God in respect to him, asking pardon for their sin in slaying him. The Hebrew text represents the people as looking to God, and the person who is pierced [that is, slain] is distinguished from God. The evangelist renders: "They shall look on him whom they pierced." The substitution of "him" for "me" is supported by a few manuscripts and Jewish commentators, but the mass of manuscripts and all the versions sustain the present Hebrew text, that is, the person who is pierced is not, as the evangelist represents it, the same as he on whom they look. Further, the rendering, "whom they pierced," is inadmissible; the 'eth separates the relative from the preceding pronoun.

Another mistranslation in the New Testament which is found also in the Septuagint and Latin vulgate is the rendering "shall be blest" instead of "shall bless themselves" in Acts 3:25; Gal. 3:8; from Gen. 12:3; 22:18; 26:4: "All the families of the earth shall bless themselves in thee." The signification of the expression, "to bless one person in another," is given in Gen. 48:20, where Jacob calls for the sons of Joseph and blesses them, saying: "In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh;" that is, the prosperity of the sons of Joseph was to be so great that other nations should take them as types and standards of happiness, and should be able to think of no greater blessing for men than that they should be like these. An equally clear explanation occurs in Ps. 72:17: "His name shall endure forever; His name shall remain as long as the sun, and all nations shall bless themselves in him, shall call him happy." Here it is plain that the Psalmist is speaking of the happy fortunes of the king, and the expression "call him happy" is parallel and equivalent to "shall bless themselves in him." The same form of the Hebrew verb (*h'ythp'āl*) is found in Gen. 22:18 and 26:4, and a similar form (*n'ythāl*) in Gen. 12:3 and 18:18. Israel, like Ephraim and Manasseh and the king in Ps. 72, is to be so wonderfully blest by God that the other nations shall think no lot superior, and when they would invoke prosperity on friends shall choose Yahweh's people as the norm and standard of happiness. The promise on the face of it refers simply to the national prosperity, and says nothing of a moral or religious influence of Israel on the other nations. It is true that such an influence did afterwards exist, but it is not referred to in these Old Testament passages, nor is there any hint in text or context that the thought of such influence was in the mind of the writer. The New Testament passages in Acts and Galatians see here a prediction of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah of Israel and the Saviour of the world, a meaning which, if the above exposition be correct, is not found in the passages quoted.

The same remark may be made on Paul's argument in Gal. 3:16, based on the word "seed" as being singular and not plural. The promise, says he, was to

Abraham and his seed, not the plural "seeds," as if many were intended, but the promise refers to one person, "thy seed," which he says is Christ. It is well known that the Hebrew word used in Genesis is a collective noun identical in meaning with our "posterity," and cannot in itself, by virtue of its form, point to an individual. If such a reference to an individual is intended, it must be made clear by the context. But in the Old Testament passages cited, there is no such explanatory mention of an individual; on the contrary, the context shows that it is the nation Israel that is meant, nor is there in all the Old Testament a passage suggesting any other signification for the expression in question. No one versed in Old Testament Hebrew would ever think of making such an argument based on the singular form of the word *zera*. How, then, did the Apostle Paul come to employ such a method of reasoning? The explanation is that in the later Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic of Paul's time, the singular number of the word was employed for an individual, and a plural made from it to express "posterity;" and Paul, familiar with this current usage and unfamiliar with Old Testament Hebrew, transfers it to the Old Testament passage. In the same way in the *Midrash rabba*, on Ruth 4:14, the term "seed" is interpreted of the Messiah. Paul conceived that the form of the word necessarily involved the reference to an individual; he says that inasmuch as it is singular and not plural, it cannot mean the nation, but must mean the Messiah.

In Paul's argument in the fourth chapter of Romans there is lack of precision in the statement in v. 3 sqq., that Abraham's faith, the basis of his justification, was something wholly different from works. The idea in Gen. 15:6 is that God reckoned Abraham's trust in him as a righteous thing, as a righteous act, and it is therefore to be considered a righteous work. We cannot but share in the apostle's indignation against the religious formalism of his time, which undertook to substitute a set of ritual proceedings for inward righteousness, and in so far as an act of faith is a spiritual work, we must grant the propriety of the argument which sets it far above and in a different category from merely formal and outward acts of obedience. But in so far as the apostle may wish to take Abraham's act out of the category of human activities, that he may annihilate all human righteousness in order to substitute for it the righteousness of Christ as the ground of salvation, we must doubt whether he finds basis for this view in the Old Testament. In general, Paul's sharp antithesis of faith and works is not an Old Testament idea. The passage in Hab. 2:3,4, which is translated in Romans 1:17; Gal. 3:11: "The just shall live by faith," is more properly rendered, "The just shall live by his constancy." It is fidelity to God's commands, according to the Old Testament view, which is the condition and surety of man's deliverance and blessing. The rule of salvation in the law, says the apostle, is "He who is obedient shall live," and he shows the impossibility of salvation under the law by pointing out the impossibility of complete obedience. The argument would be sound if the Old Testament insisted on absolute perfection of obedience; but it uses the word "perfect" of man, as in Job's case, for example, in a restricted sense. What was demanded was a controlling spirit of obedience, and occasional errors were forgiven if the man repented, or in certain cases sacrifices were appointed. Or, in the later times we find in certain Psalms, as in the 18th and 44th, confident assertions of personal perfectness: "I have kept the ways of Yahweh; I was perfect with him; therefore he has recompensed me according to my

righteousness." "We have not forgotten thee nor dealt falsely in thy covenant." The Old Testament knows no other condition of the enjoyment of the divine favor than faithful obedience. The man's record is based on his voluntary activity, which, when sincere, is of course always accompanied by trust in God. But the apostle, instead of conceiving of the Old Testament ideal as obedience permeated with and inspired by trust, makes a sharp contrast between the trust and the obedience, a procedure which he thinks necessary in order to break down the current Jewish theory of salvation by an obedience which constantly ran the risk of becoming mere formalism. What the narration of Abraham's life in Genesis means to declare is that Abraham was justified by his obedience, that is, by his works, though this obedience was as a matter of course grounded on confidence in the truth of the divine promise; and in Gen. 15:6 his trust in the divine promise, his voluntary act, was reckoned as an act of righteousness: so that, in so far as his faith was ground of salvation, his righteousness was equally the ground of salvation.

One of the hardest passages in Paul's writings to comprehend is his definition of the righteousness which is of faith, in Rom. 10:6-8, taken in free translation with explanatory insertions from the Septuagint of Deut. 30:12-14. The difficulty lies in the fact that the passage in Deuteronomy refers without any doubt to obedience to the law: "This commandment which I command thee this day," says Moses, "is not too hard nor far off, nor in heaven nor beneath the sea, but nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." Yet the apostle cites this passage as the utterance of the righteousness which is of faith, "because," says he, "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." And that he intends to refer it to the Messiah is evident from his explanatory additions: "Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven (that is to bring Christ down)? or, Who shall descend into the abyss (that is to bring Christ up from the dead)?" We do not know how to explain his use of the passage except by supposing that he took it as a completely isolated expression, without reference to the context, and attached to it his own meaning, interpreting the "word" in a sense entirely different from that which the connection demands.

A similar example of the apostle's habit of using Old Testament passages without regard to the Hebrew or to the context, occurs in Rom. 14:10-12, where he seeks to guard his brethren against hasty judgments of one another, by reminding them of the final divine judgment: "But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God." The fact of a final judgment he wishes to establish or impress by a Scripture quotation, and he cites Isa. 45:23, which he renders: "As I live, saith the Lord, to me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God." But the prophet is simply announcing the acceptance of the worship of Yahweh by all the nations. It is Yahweh himself who speaks: "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is not another; by myself I have sworn, the word has gone forth from my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that to me every knee shall bow; every tongue shall swear; truly in Yahweh, shall one say to me, is righteousness." "Men," says the prophet, "shall swear by him;" that is shall accept him as the holiest, as the true God. There is no word of a judg-

ment, least of all, of a judgment after death. The apostle changes "swear by" or "swear to" into "confess to," a meaning the Hebrew will not bear. A similar meaning, however, belongs to an Aramaic word (Pael of קים) used in the Targum of Jonathan as the rendering of the Hebrew expression for "swear," and as the apostle's vernacular was an Aramaic dialect, he may have got his translation "confess" from some current Aramaic version. That he quotes the Old Testament passage as proof of a final judgment is evident from his concluding words: "so then each one of us shall give account of himself to God."

Much stranger is the use which Paul makes of Isa. 28:11,12, in his discussion of the Charismata in 1 Cor. 14:20 seq., where he makes a comparison between prophesying and speaking with tongues in respect to their utility. He wishes to show that prophesying is a higher and more edifying gift, meant to promote the well-being of believers, while the glossolaly was a sign for unbelievers and therefore less to be desired by the Corinthian Christians. His proof of this last fact is derived from the passage in Isaiah, which he renders, following neither Hebrew nor Septuagint: "By people of strange tongues and by the lips of strangers will I speak to this people, and not even thus will they hear me, says the Lord." The prophetic "strange tongue" is simply a foreign language; that is, a foreign nation with which the careless, disobedient population of Jerusalem is threatened as a punishment for their godlessness. All of them, says Isaiah, including priest and prophet, have erred through strong drink, and come to God's messenger babbling out their drunken objections to his message. Let them babble, but "with stammerings of lip and with another tongue will he speak to his people, because he said to them, This is the rest, give you rest to the weary, and this is the repose—but they will not hear." The people of Israel would not listen to the prophet's message of peace, the only true repose of trust in Yahweh, and now God would teach them a stern lesson with the whip of a foreign people speaking with stammering of lips more serious than the babbling of the Jerusalem debauchees. Contrast this with the Corinthian glossolaly, a spiritual gift exercised by believers in the interest of religion, though, as the apostle points out, not always wisely and well.

Another instructive citation is that in Eph. 4:8 from Ps. 68:19(18). The passage in the Psalm describes the God of Israel as a conquering king leading his captives taken in war and ascending the throne where he receives gifts from subject nations. "Thou didst receive gifts among men" (Hebrew and Greek). In the epistle this is interpreted of Christ as a victorious monarch who ascended into heaven after having descended into Hades; but instead of receiving gifts from men, he is there said to have given gifts to men. The same change from "received" to "gave" is found in the Peshitto-Syriac and the Targum, and we may therefore suppose that the text of the epistle came from some similar Aramaic reading. The Hebrew reading is evidently the correct one, and the alteration of the text came perhaps from the feeling in later times that it was not appropriate to the Divine Majesty to receive gifts.

The influence of the Septuagint is seen in Eph. 4:26, a citation from Ps. 4:5(4). The Hebrew reads: "Stand in awe and sin not," a warning to certain men to cherish such awe of the holy and powerful God of Israel as should deter them from falling into sins that would excite his anger. The Septuagint, followed by the epistle, translates: "Be angry and sin not," whence in the epistle the rule

of moderation of anger, an admirable moral precept, but not contained in the Psalm.

The epistle to the Hebrews contains a large number of citations from the Old Testament, the majority of which it may fairly be said do not follow the rules of what we regard as correct exegesis. One of these citations appears to be from a Septuagint passage which is not found in the Hebrew at all, namely, 1:6: "And let all the angels of God worship him." This might conceivably come from the Greek of Psalm 96:7 (Heb. 97:7): "Worship him, all ye his angels," in which "angels" is an incorrect rendering of the Hebrew *elohim*; the Psalm is really a summons to heathen deities to worship Yahweh: "Shame on all the worshipers of graven images, they that make boast in idols; worship him all ye gods." But the citation in Hebrews follows word for word the Greek of Deut. 32:43. The cited words are an expansion from Old Testament material such as that of Ps. 97:7. The Song of Moses in which they occur ends with a description of the divine vengeance on the enemies of Israel, and the honor which is therefore to be ascribed to him. This is interpreted in the epistle in a Messianic sense, and the hymn is represented as bringing the first begotten [the Messiah] into the world, that is, as introducing him to Israel and inducting him into his office as the saviour of his people.

The way in which an erroneous Greek punctuation may lead to a complete misunderstanding of the meaning of the Hebrew is well illustrated in the citation from Isa. 8:17,18 in Hebrews 2:13. The burden of the prophet's preaching had been the necessity of trust in Yahweh against the power of the hostile kings of Syria and Israel. He was commanded to give to his children symbolical names which should be signs of God's dealing with the nation, Shearyashub, "a remnant shall return," and Mahershalahashbaz, "haste-spoil-hurry-prey," so that they and he might be omens and guides to the depressed and unbelieving people. And so he says: "I will hope in him. Behold, I and the children whom Yahweh has given me are signs and omens in Israel." The Greek rendered this with general correctness except that it wrongly divided the second sentence: "Behold, I and the children whom God has given me; and they shall be signs and wonders in the house of Israel." The author of the epistle takes the first half out of connection: "Behold, I and the children whom God has given me," and interprets it to mean the oneness of Jesus with his disciples, and hence the necessity of an incarnation. A simple grammatical Messianic interpretation would have understood it as declaring that the Messiah and his people were signs of God's presence in the church and of the divine method of dealing with men; the conjunction of the Messiah and men who believed on him could prove only a oneness of aim between them, not an identity of nature.

One object of the epistle to the Hebrews is to comfort the suffering Christians of the time with the hope of coming happiness, and it seeks to find Scripture demonstration of the Messianic Sabbath rest, the bodily and spiritual peace which the followers of Christ should enjoy when he should come at the end of the present age to establish his everlasting kingdom. This argument (Heb. 3:7-4:11) is drawn from Ps. 95:7-11: "O that ye would hear his voice to-day! Harden not your heart as at Meribah * * * Forty years I loathed that generation and said, They are a people that err in their hearts and they know not my ways. So that I sware in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest." Here is no promise, but the state-

ment of a fact in the far past; the people had been disobedient in the wilderness and God declared that as a punishment they should not enter Canaan. The epistle holds that the last words of the Psalm passage contain a promise which had not yet been fulfilled, since it was given after God had instituted the weekly Sabbath (Gen. 2:2) and also after Joshua had led the people into the rest of Canaan, and hence that there remained a rest for the people of God, which could only be the Messianic Sabbatism.

A similar mode of argumentation is adopted in Heb. 8:8-12, where the author discusses the "new covenant" of Jer. 31:31-34. The epistle understands this to mean the abolition of the Levitical system of daily sacrifice in favor of the Christian scheme of the sacrifice of himself which Christ made once for all. But the prophet's antithesis of new and old is something different. He thinks not of abolishing the national system of sacrifices, but only of the introduction of a spirit of obedience. His contrast is between the present ignorant rebellious life of the nation, and a reconstruction in which the people would give an intelligent and glad assent to the commands of their God. A fulfillment of this prediction in Christianity might be sought in its pure and lofty spirit of obedience, in the new heart which, as Jeremiah and Ezekiel say, God would give to men, a heart to apprehend the righteousness and goodness of his services; of the sacrificial system there is not a word in either of these prophets, in this connection.

In Heb. 10:5-7 an argument in the same direction is made from the word "body" which occurs in the Septuagint rendering of Ps. 40:7-9 (6-8): "Sacrifice and offering thou hast not desired, but a body thou hast prepared me; * * * then I said, Lo, I come * * * to do thy will, O my God, is my delight." The interpretation of this in the epistle is as follows: The Messiah speaks: "The old Levitical sacrifice thou dost not desire, and therefore thou hast prepared my body as a sacrifice, and I come to do thy will by the offering of myself, once for all." The contrast thus ascribed in the epistle to the Psalmist between two sorts of sacrifice is not that of the Psalmist himself, who, on the contrary, puts obedience over against sacrifice: "Thou dost not desire the ordinary sacrifice, which is a mere outward thing; what will please thee is to do thy will, and in this I delight." The rendering "body" is impossible.

An example of an undesirable though not very important mistranslation occurs in Heb. 11:21: "Jacob worshiped [leaning on] the top of his staff." The Hebrew has: "Jacob bowed himself on the head of the bed." The Hebrew words for bed and staff have the same consonants. The Catholic-English translation of 1582 renders, as is well known, "Jacob worshiped the top of his rod," and explains the rod as a figure of the scepter and kingdom of Christ.

It appears from these examples that in certain cases the New Testament use of Old Testament passages is not correct. Sometimes the text is inaccurate, sometimes the exegesis. The number of these cases is considerable, and the conclusion is that a New Testament interpretation cannot be accepted without examination, but must always be tested by hermeneutical principles.

THE SEPTUAGINT.*

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.,

Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

INTRODUCTORY.

For the problems of lower or textual criticism the versions of the Old Testament have a greater relative value than those of the New. While in the critical apparatus of the New Testament the ancient versions occupy only a secondary and subordinate rank over against the manuscripts as the primary authorities, the condition of affairs in the Old Testament department is almost the exact opposite of this. The reason of this is, that the versions antedate by many centuries the oldest existing Hebrew manuscripts. Of the latter there are indeed a very great number in existence, but none that were written before the tenth or eleventh century. The oldest Hebrew manuscript known is probably the Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus, written in the year 916, with the Babylonian system of punctuation. The text of the prophets from this codex was published in 1876 by Professor Hermann L. Strack. Wellhausen, who is a fair judge in these matters, says in his fourth edition of Bleek's Introduction to the Old Testament, § 275, that the manuscripts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries belong to the very oldest. To this must yet be added, that, according to the view of Lagarde, the most prominent scholar in Old Testament text-critical work, and maintained with a considerable show of argument as early as 1863 in his Remarks on the Greek Translation of the Proverbs, pp. 1 and 2, "our Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament all go back to a single copy, the very corrections of whose mistakes in writing have been copied by them, and whose errors, which accidentally found their way into it, have been reproduced." Accordingly we would practically have but the equivalent of one single Hebrew manuscript, which served as an archetype for all the rest. The date assigned to this archetype is the reign of the Emperor Adrian, 117 to 138 A. D. (Lagarde, *Symmicta*, 50 sqq.). This view was expressed previously in 1853 by Justus Olshausen, and is adopted with great confidence by Cornill in his revision of the text of Ezekiel (1886, p. 6 sqq.). If this hypothesis should prove to be correct, then internal reasons would come to the aid of external reasons in diminishing materially the value of the traditional Massoretic text for the purposes of lower criticism. However, this hypothesis has not been able to win for itself anything like a consensus of scholars. Wellhausen, indeed, (§ 294), calls it a "plausible" theory, but ridicules the date assigned by Lagarde, while more conservative scholars reject the whole as a castle built in the air, and ascribe the wonderful agreement of the Hebrew manuscripts to the scrupulous care of the Jewish scholars.

* The writer would state that this and some other articles on the versions of the Old Testament, which may be expected to follow, are not intended to bring forward any new data or discoveries, but, for the benefit of students and readers in general, to give merely a bird's-eye view of the status of investigation with regard to these versions.

The versions, however, all represent an earlier date of the Old Testament text. The Septuagint, restored to its original readings, would antedate by twelve hundred years at least the earliest Hebrew manuscript extant and bring us almost as near to some of the Old Testament autographs as the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus do to the original copies of the New Testament books. The further fact, that in a number of books the Septuagint text varies from the Massoretic to so marked a degree that the conclusion is almost unavoidable that the translators had before them a recension of the Hebrew text differing from the present Massoretic, opens the way to critical possibilities that are of peculiar interest and importance.

For a further reason the study of the Septuagint is now timely. For the first time in the history of Old Testament research scholars are trying systematically and with trustworthy scientific methods to work out the problems of textual criticism. While in the New Testament field this was the first of the great problems that reached a practical settlement, and in the texts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort we have the application of an agreement of methods satisfactory to about all the specialists, and thereby also practically one resultant text of the New Testament, in the Old Testament department this problem is only now beginning to be thoroughly discussed, and the burning question is yet in regard to the methods and principles that must control this investigation. The great work done in the Old Testament line in the past decade and century has been in the line of higher criticism. But in the further prosecution of this work, scholars are constantly hampered by the fact that the problems of lower criticism have not yet been settled. New Testament scholarship in this regard followed the more logical order of research, but its task was easier.

Now there is a general consensus among all scholars, both the more critical and the conservative, that in the text-critical work of the Old Testament the Septuagint has a most important work to do. The differences arise when the degree and manner in which this version should be allowed to influence or modify the current Massoretic text are under discussion.

ORIGIN OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

Concerning the origin of the Septuagint as a whole we have absolutely no external historical testimony whatever. All we possess is testimony of a debatable character concerning the translation made of the Pentateuch. There exists a letter, beyond all doubt spurious, which claims to have been written by Aristeas (or Aristæas, as Josephus calls him), a man high in authority at the court of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (283-247 B. C.), addressed to his brother Philocrates. This letter states that Demetrius Phalereus, the chief librarian at Alexandria, proposes to King Ptolemy to enrich his library by having a translation of the Jewish law-book made for it. The king agrees to this, and sends an embassy consisting of his chief of guards, Andrew, and Aristeas, the author of the letter, to Jerusalem with rich presents to the high priest Eleazar, asking him to send old and worthy and wise men, six out of each tribe, to Alexandria, where they were to translate the law-book for the royal library. Eleazar sends the seventy-two men, who take with them a precious manuscript of the Pentateuch written in golden letters. After having been royally entertained by the king, Demetrius conducts them to the island of Pharos, where they could work undisturbed. When they had come to an agreement on a section, Demetrius wrote down the

version. The whole work was completed in seventy-two days. A copy of the translation was given to the Jewish community at Alexandria, who officially and solemnly adopted it. The letter of Aristeas is very long and goes minutely into details in describing the visit to Jerusalem and the colloquy held with King Ptolemy. It was first printed in 1601, and the best edition is found in Merx, *Archiv.*, 1868.

What is the value of this Aristeas letter? Its character is such that, without a dissenting voice, scholars are agreed that it is apocryphal and valueless as direct historical testimony. The majority agree that it contains a kernel of historical truth, but what the extent of this truth is, does not seem so clear. Wellhausen, in Bleek (§ 279) and in his article on the Septuagint, in Vol. XXI. of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, regards it as settled by the letter that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch was done at Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy II. All the rest of the letter he regards as literary decoration and ornamentation. Schürer, in his *Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, Second Part, § 33, an authority, at least equal if not better than Wellhausen, regards this as merely a possibility, but by no means certain. For the details of the discussion we refer to the authors mentioned. So much, however, is certain, that the Aristeas account at an early day found acceptance among the Jews. Philo, (*De vita Moyses*, II., § 5-7) knows of it in detail, and Josephus (*Antiq.*, XII., 2) reproduces it almost in full as an historical fact.

A second direct testimony is from Aristobulus, of Alexandria, the oldest Jewish philosopher, who wrote a work on the Interpretation of the Sacred Laws, which he dedicated to King Ptolemy Philometer (180-145 B. C.), of which an extract has been preserved by the church historian Eusebius (*Præparatio Evangelica*, XIII., 12, 1-2). Here Aristobulus maintains that Plato already was acquainted with the law-book of the Jews, and that the chief contents of the book had been translated into Greek even before the days of Demetrius Phalereus. From this it would seem that the author knew of a tradition about the Greek version of the Pentateuch differing to a degree from that given by Aristeas. But whether this vague statement confirms the accounts of Aristeas or makes it historically still more unreliable, it would be difficult to say. The individual view in the matter depends upon the amount of probability to be given to the Aristeas letter.

Concerning the translation of the other books in the Septuagint we have absolutely no historical record whatever. The name of a "Version of the Seventy," an abbreviation for seventy-two, was gradually transferred from the Pentateuch to the whole work.

But if we have no direct testimony as to the *terminus a quo* we are more fortunate in having some of reasonable reliance for the *terminus ad quem* of the version. In the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, the translator, who in 132 B. C. went to Egypt, remarks that in his day there existed Greek versions, not only of the law, but also of the prophets and the other books (*ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων*). There can be little or no doubt that he here refers to the Septuagint version, which, at that date, must have been completed. This is corroborated by the further fact that the most ancient relics of Jewish literature, preserved in extracts by Alexander Polyhistor, and recorded by Eusebius in his *Præp. Evang.*, IX., all show acquaintance with the Septuagint (cf. for details, Schürer, l. c., § 33).

It is then almost entirely internal evidence to which we must appeal for information concerning the origin of this historic version. It will appear later on that diversities in the manner of translation in the various parts are so great, that the idea of one man or one set of men having made this version is entirely excluded. Beyond a doubt a beginning was made with the law, which, as also is seen from internal reasons, originated in Alexandria, and was known to Demetrius, who wrote under Ptolemy IV. (222-205 B. C.). Whether the translation of the law is to be attributed to the Jewish influence or to the literary ambition of the Ptolemies, is a much discussed question, for which only a possibly, scarcely a probably, correct answer can be given. That the other books were translated under Jewish auspices is highly probable, as they could not possess literary importance sufficiently to tempt a Greek translator. The work of translating the whole Hebrew codex into Greek may have occupied a generation or two, or even a whole century. External and internal evidences will scarcely admit of going further than has been done in the above remarks.

THE CHARACTER OF THE TRANSLATION.

The first thing that strikes the student when comparing the Septuagint text with the Hebrew is the differences of agreement and disagreement existing between the Greek and the original texts in the different books. Some agree almost word for word; as is the case especially with the Pentateuch and in a smaller measure with several of the hagiographa, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Chronicles. Others, again, vary exceedingly, the worst in this regard being, in the view of most scholars, the Book of Isaiah. Unfortunately special investigations of all the books have not yet been made, so as to allow a judgment on the whole. Lagarde has examined the Book of Proverbs; Bickell, that of Job; Hollenberg, that of Joshua; Wellhausen, the text of Samuel; and within the past few years exhaustive investigations of the text of Ezekiel and of Micah have been made, though from different stand-points and diverging results on the merits of the Septuagint, the former by Cornill, the latter by Ryssel. The differences between the Greek and Hebrew are often many and of much greater importance than the great bulk of various readings in the New Testament manuscripts. In a large number of instances the Greek contains matter not found in the Hebrew, as, e. g., in the Books of Ezra and Daniel, and to a lesser degree in such Books as Job and Proverbs. In other cases matter found in the Hebrew is omitted or abridged in the Greek. In many cases the Greek is an incorrect translation of the present Hebrew text, the cause of the false rendition being still traceable to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. This is particularly the case in the more difficult poetical and prophetic books. The writer recently compared word for word the Greek text of the Proverbs with the original. Not only were there many omissions found, but on the average only about one sentence in three was what could be regarded as a good translation, although in many instances the source of the poor rendering could yet be discovered. No better and more thankworthy work could be found for a student seeking to understand the character of the vexed problem of the relation between the Septuagint and the Massoretic text than working through the prolegomena and critical apparatus to Cornill's Ezekiel. This does not mean that it is necessary to adopt Cornill's conclusions. There are yet worlds to conquer in the Septuagint investigations.

The language of the Septuagint is most remarkable. It is almost incorrect to say that it is Greek. Plato and Aristotle would have been able to understand but little of the non-historical portions. The Greek is entirely under the spell of the Hebrew. The Septuagint has a language of its own. Naturally the difficulties are not in the grammatical line; they are almost entirely in the lexical. A Greek word which in one of its uses corresponds to a Hebrew word in one of its uses, is at once made the equivalent of the latter in all its figurative applications; and even more than this, also in its employment for clauses, phrases, and peculiar idioms. Because, e. g., the Greek *δίδωμι* in its basal sense is the equivalent of the Hebrew *nāthān*, it is at once compelled to do service in every sense and every connection in which the latter can be employed. And when it comes to the use of Old Testament words of peculiar theological or ethical importance, such as *δόξα*, *εὐφροσύνη*, and others, they are used in senses of which the classical Greek lexicon knows absolutely nothing. It is for this reason that even so good a Greek dictionary as "Liddell and Scott" is useless for Septuagint work. A Septuagint lexicon is a great desideratum, which, however, can scarcely be filled until the Septuagint text itself has been better settled. As yet a good Hebrew dictionary and an accurate knowledge of Greek are indispensable requisites for close Septuagint work.

But the very awkwardness in the language, which robs it of nearly all its value as a piece of literature, is of the greatest advantage for the very work for which Christian scholarship desires to use the Septuagint, namely, to determine the character of the Hebrew text of which the Septuagint is a translation. As matters now stand it is as a rule no difficult matter to re-translate the Greek and thus reconstruct the Hebrew original. Its very faults make it a valuable aid for text-critical work. Were the translation less slavish and less barbarized with Hebraisms, this could not be the case.

HISTORY OF THE TRANSLATION.

The so-called translation of the Seventy rapidly won its way into official recognition among the Hellenistic Jews. The oldest writers of whom we have any knowledge that they used the LXX. are Demetrius and Eupolemus. After them we find Philo using the translation, at least of the Pentateuch, as equally authoritative with the original. The same is done, though not to the same degree, by Josephus. The majority of the New Testament writers make use of the Septuagint translation, especially Mark and Paul. Indeed the whole lexical material of the New Testament is based upon the *usus loquendi* of the LXX. In this regard the method pursued by Cremer in his *New Testament Lexicon* is more correct than that of Trench in his *Synonyms*, who develops the New Testament words out of the classical Greek in a rather one-sided manner. The use and honor of the LXX. in the Christian Church, as well as the perception that it was not in every particular a true version, led to the preparation of the three well-known later Greek versions, namely, the intensely literal one of Aquila, that of Theodotion, in which he tries to compromise between the Hebrew text and the current LXX. version, and that of Symmachus, the Ebionite, which adheres to the Hebrew original but translates into readable Greek. Fragments of these versions are preserved in the Hexapla. In the ordinary Septuagint editions Theodotion's translation of Daniel has been substituted for the old version. No one of the existing MSS. contains the old *κοινή* or original text of the LXX., although schol-

ars are substantially agreed that we have a near approach to it in B, or the Vaticanus. Cornill's investigations have made this more probable than it was before. But we have the testimony of patristic literature that at a relatively early date the discrepancies between the old LXX. and the *veritas Hebraica*, as Jerome and others call it, led to a revision of the text. Of these revisions there were three. The first and most important was made by Origen (185-254 A. D.) in his Hexapla. He made the common text the basis of his investigations, and corrected the text chiefly after the Greek translations made later from the Hebrew, especially Theodotion's. He designated the *plus* and *minus* of the edition by critical marks. The value of this edition is reduced to a minimum by the fact that Origen seems not to have been consistent in his methods, as is seen chiefly from the Syriac Hexapla. The Origen text was published by Eusebius and Pamphilus of Cæsarea, and became the official text of Palestine. The revision of Hesychius was accepted by the church of Egypt and that of Lucianus by the churches of Constantinople and Antioch. The patristic citations on these points are found in full in Wellhausen's Bleek (§§ 282, 283).

In this way the old LXX. text in its original character was lost and supplanted by revisions made avowedly to conform the Greek to the accepted Hebrew text of the day. The great work then to be done by Septuagint scholars is to discover again, if possible, the original *κοινή* text and thus learn what the real Septuagint was. It is a work of extraordinary difficulty to investigate the manuscripts of the version and, if possible, classify them in such a manner as to lead to the solution of this problem. A beginning, and a good one, has been made by Lagarde, who has begun the publication of what he considers the Lucianus recensions, and further work in this line has been done by Cornill's classification.

THE VALUE OF THE VERSION.

A partial answer to this has already been given in the above, and a full answer, in so far as this can be given at all at this stage of inquiry, will flow naturally from what has been stated. While the exegetical value, especially for individual passages, cannot be estimated at too high a rate, the chief advantage to the Bible student must and always will lie in the text-critical help afforded by the LXX. Until the original text of the LXX. has been re-discovered in so far as this can ever be done, and thus the critical status of the version *as such* been determined, the use of the Greek for the Hebrew text or interpretation must be decided in each individual instance on the merits of the case in question. No general rule for the use of the LXX. in this regard can yet be given. Such a rule would infallibly lead to a misuse, as it has where rash attempts at generalization have been made. The writer has treated of this phase of the general problem in detail in the *New York Independent*, September 27, 1888, and begs to be permitted to refer to that article.

EDITIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

The editions of the Septuagint are many. The best known and most used is the so-called Sixtina, of 1587. This is the traditional text. Fortunately it is also a comparatively good one, being based in general upon the best MS. of the LXX. extant, namely, the Vaticanus. Tischendorf has also published an edition, which was, however, only a slight improvement on the Sixtina. This was still the case when in Nestle's edition of Tischendorf some variant readings of the other uncials

were appended. The magnificent fac-simile reproduction of the Vaticanus, published in Rome 1868-1881, prepared the way for a really good edition of the text. This Professor Swete has begun to publish, issuing the first volume at Cambridge, containing Genesis to IV. Kings.* Here the genuine Vaticanus text, which deviates considerably from the Sixtina, is reproduced, together with such readings from the other leading MSS. as to give the reader the best critical material on hand for the study of the Septuagint version. No other edition should now be used for Septuagint work.

WEBER ON THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE TALMUD.†

BY PROF. GEORGE B. STEVENS, PH. D.,

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

IV. THE FINAL COMPLETION.

a. THE RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE WORLD.

Through the opposition of the nations of the world to the Messiah, the Messianic Kingdom is brought to an end, and the judgment and separation of the godless nations from the earth which is renewed as the dwelling-place for the people of God, begin. The resurrection is not general, but is for Israel alone. Maimonides says: "The resurrection of the dead is a fundamental article of Moses, our teacher,—peace to him!—but it comes only to the righteous." Resurrection is the prerogative of those who participate in the Kingdom of God; the godless are already dead in life. It is accomplished only in the Holy Land. Those who have not studied the law cannot rise again. Such is the general representation in the talmudic literature. Some, however, maintain a resurrection for the heathen, but say that they do not remain in life, but sink back into death again. Generally the resurrection is contemplated distinctively as a reward of righteousness, i. e. observance of the law.

The heathen and the disobedient (who have despised their circumcision and renounced the Covenant) in Israel go direct at death to Gehinnom and receive their just punishment (cf. Luke 16:23). "Gehinnom, which is for Israel a Purgatory, is for the heathen the place of punishment; it is not in its original purpose designed for Israel." Those who in Israel despise the sign of the Covenant, e. g. the Samaritans, are reckoned as heathen and are destined for Gehinnom. There are unpardonable sins which consign even Israelites forever to Gehinnom.

Those who fall into Gehinnom suffer pain and torment and at length complete annihilation. Their pain is caused by the darkness, fire and brimstone of the place. If one applies himself incessantly to prayer, his fire may be somewhat cooled. The tears of the righteous falling into the place, cool its fires. The reason why brimstone is so nauseating is that it is designed for the punishment of Hell. The smell of it is a premonition of its use. Are these sufferings everlasting or do they terminate in absolute annihilation? Both views are found; the latter is the

* Cf. a notice of this work in *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT*, October, 1888.

† Concluded from the November number.

more common one. It is probable that they may be reconciled on the supposition that, for the worst of men, punishment was everlasting, but for less degrees of guilt, a cessation of being might make an end of suffering.

The idea of judgment has two forms,—as applied to the individual at his death and as a general and final assize at the end of the Messianic age. This age is a time of possible salvation for the heathen, and their final condemnation cannot occur until they shall have made their great resistance to the Messiah at the end of the Messianic period. At that time the measure of their iniquity will be full and they shall be assembled before God for final judgment. This will be the last act in the drama of human history in time; thereafter eternity ensues. The Rabbins graphically picture this scene. God opens the book of the law and calls upon those who have obeyed it to come and receive their reward. Hereupon all nations rush forward in confusion. The Almighty rebukes them for their disorder and commands them to come one by one. The Romans come first and are asked: "With what have you been occupied?" They answer: "Lord of the worlds, we have built streets and baths and heaped up silver and gold, all that Israel might busy itself with the law." They are told in answer that they have done all this but for their own glory, ease and power, and are challenged to show that they have kept the law." They cannot, and they depart with heavy hearts. Thus the various nations are passed in review. After this an effort is made by the nations to excuse themselves, which may be summarized thus: "We had no law." Answer: "What means, 'God came from Sinai, from Mount Paran and from Teman,' etc. (Deut. 33:2; Hab. 3:3), if not that He offered the law to all nations? But only Israel received it." "But if thou hadst threatened us, as thou didst Israel, we would have obeyed." Answer: "You did not even keep the seven commandments of Noah which I gave you at the first." "But Israel has not kept thy law." Answer: "I call heaven and earth to witness that they have, and prove it by the very testimony of heathen: Abraham's faithfulness by Nimrod; Jacob's honesty by Laban; Joseph's purity by Potiphar's wife, etc." "Lord of the worlds, give us now a law and we will obey." Answer: "Do you not know that he who prepares his food on the preparation day has something to eat on the Sabbath; but he who omits it must go hungry? But I will grant it. In my law is an easy commandment, that to keep the feast of booths. Go and celebrate this." Then they all go and build booths upon their roofs. Then God sends forth a heat, hot and burning as in August, that all, stamping on the ground leave the booths. Thus their disobedience is finally confirmed.

The judgment occurs in the valley of Jehoshaphat. "Thus will the heathen world be assigned by God's judgment to destruction by the fire of Gehenna; and after the earth is in the exclusive possession of Israel and is freed from the godless heathen world, can it be renewed and become the sphere of the eternal life."

b. THE NEW HEAVEN, THE NEW EARTH AND THE NEW HUMANITY.

The heavens and the earth will at length pass away. The creation will not be destroyed, but renewed. The new creation comes out of the old. This production of the higher from the lower is illustrated by the derivation of Abraham from Terah, Hezekiah from Ahaz, etc. The world is to go through a process of purification. But the old world is the mother of the new, which is built out of the material of the old and has its form for its type. The creation of the new heaven and the new earth is determined upon from the beginning, is *ideally exist-*

ent; it is now *materially* accomplished only so far as the old creation contains the form and basis upon which the new world is to be reared. The new creation is thoroughly light and pure; the future world is all day (cf. Rev. 22:5). The principle of darkness, the power of sin and destruction reigns no more. Corresponding to this light is the moral purity of the new world, for it is no more the dwelling of sinful men. There is also physical purity in so far as the new earth is delivered from all defilement. The new earth, moreover, will be complete and harmonious. Its perfection consists in the complete fulfillment of its purpose. Ten marks of the new creation are enumerated, among which are,—light, the water of life (cf. Rev. 22:1), health, and the yielding of fruits every month (cf. Rev. 22:2). The new creation is harmonious in all its parts. In the animal world there is no conflict, and between men and animals there is peace. Wild beasts will be cured of their blood-thirstiness; the lamb will have no need to fear mankind and “all animals will be satisfied with a vegetable diet.”

Upon the new earth dwells a new humanity. The renewal of man, that is, the restoration of his normal condition, is designated as a “healing,” so far as it relates to the material side of man. The blind will see, the deaf hear, the lame walk, etc. (cf. Is. 35:5 sq.). The moral renewal of the world takes place through the eradication of the purpose or principle of evil (*jezer hara*) from the human heart and the giving of a new heart. It is this *jezer hara* which creates idol-worship. In the future world God will root this out and give man a new heart. The Holy One said to Israel: “In this world you rend yourselves away from my commandments through the *jezer hara*; but in the future world I will pluck this out of you by the root; for it is written: “And I will put my spirit into your heart (Ezek. 36:27).”

C. THE COMING AGE (OLÂM HABBÂ).

Three good gifts have been given to Israel which the nations covet,—the law, the land of Israel, and the future world. The coming age belongs exclusively to Israel. Every Israelite, as such, looks forward to it with expectation, unless he has forfeited his right to it by apostasy. Infants participate in the future life, even those of wicked parents, provided they are circumcised. That all Israel is to assemble in the Holy Land in this period is evident from the fact that those who fell in the desert are to participate in the coming glory. But the heathen are excluded. Of Israel and heathenism, Jacob and Esau stand as the respective types. A commentary on Gen. 25:31 narrates in detail a conversation between Jacob and Esau before their birth, in which Jacob explains to his brother the different principles and employments of this world (age) and the future world. Esau chooses (apparently at Jacob's instigation) this present world, and Jacob takes for his part the blessings of the *Olâm habbâ*.

Respecting the modes of life in the future world there are two opinions,—the more spiritual view, according to which there is to be no sensuous life of eating and drinking, begetting and trading; no anger or hate, but the righteous will sit with crowns on their heads enjoying God's presence; and a more materialistic view, according to which relations continue very much the same as in this life, except that sin is eliminated. In this view much emphasis is laid upon the feasting which awaits the righteous and a noticeable peculiarity is that the flesh of the Leviathan and Behemoth is indicated as the special delicacy which shall distinguish the festal occasion. These two varying conceptions of the coming age may

be explained upon the supposition that the ideas of *this* world and the *next*—the *earthly* and the *heavenly*—are not clearly separated; hence the emphasis of those elements which belong to the one or to the other.

Notwithstanding these variations, it is agreed that existence in the coming age will be blessed and glorious because it will be a life in full communion with God. The Sabbath, as the symbol of peace and rest, is designated as a foretaste of this future world. To happy rest is joined external glory. The righteous wear the crowns which they once received from angels at Sinai and which were taken away when they fell into sin. This blessedness and glory is the same in its nature for all, but differs in degree: "Each righteous man has his own Eden in the Garden of Eden." There are two opinions concerning the class with which God is best pleased. According to one, it is those who have studied most the law and commandments; according to the other, it is the scribes who have in faithfulness taught the young.

All this happiness culminates in the completed communion of life between God and the righteous. The upper Jerusalem will come down upon the new earth; for there is a Jerusalem in the coming age different from that of this age. It is built of sapphire and its central point is still a sanctuary. Aaron is the priest, and receives the thank-offerings (all other offerings having ceased). The righteous behold God and praise him, and He in his own person teaches them the law. The relation between God and His people is the closest possible. "It is more intimate than that between God and the angels; for the elders of Israel constitute the council in the coming age, therefore are nearest to Him."

The Talmud's most beautiful picture of the future is found in this story: Joshua Ben Levi is sick and in a trance. When he comes to himself, his father asks him: What hast thou seen? He answers: I have seen a changed world; those who here were above are there beneath; those who here were beneath are there above. Then answered his father: Thou hast seen a pure world (that is, one in which reality and appearance correspond).

OLD TESTAMENT WORD-STUDIES: 4. MORAL EVIL.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL, D. D.,

New London, Conn.

All moral evil, while springing indeed from an underlying unity, exhibits itself in many different aspects. Hebrew is peculiarly rich in words denoting these various forms of opposition to moral good. The Old Testament does not conceive of moral evil as an essential element in human nature, but as the result of man's free volition in yielding to the solicitations of an evil principle of unexplained origin which already existed in the world, Gen. 3; Deut. 30:15. Sin, according to the Old Testament, is not merely transgression of natural law entailing physical suffering, as the heathen held, but opposition to divine holiness springing from a selfish disregard of Jehovah's will as supreme law.

¹āvĕn *vanity*.

¹āvĕn is most frequently translated *ἀνομία* in the LXX., and *iniquitas* in the

Vulgate. From the latter it has passed into the A. V. where *iniquity* is the prevailing rendering. These renderings indicate that the point of view from which moral evil is regarded in this word is that of transgression of law,—that which is opposed to equity in the relations of man to man, or of man to God. This interpretation is, however, incorrect. The primary thought is found in an unused verb meaning to breathe heavily, to puff, pant, as the result of strenuous exertion. The same verb naturally gives us the substantive 'ōn, strength, the putting forth of power accompanied by deep breathings or pantings. The derivative 'āvēn, assuming a moral significance, presents the idea of nothingness, emptiness, vanity—that which, having no real existence, has also no real worth. The works of idolaters, i. e. their idols, are vanity, 'āvēn, and nought, Isa. 41:29; 66:3. The oracles of the teraphim are 'āvēn, empty words, Zech. 10:2. Unjust and oppressive judicial decisions are also 'āvēn, Isa. 10:1. The frequent association of the word with idols and idolatry indicated that the oft-recurring phrase “workers of iniquity” is merely a synonym for idolaters. To “regard iniquity” in the heart, Ps. 66:18, is, not to cultivate a tendency to wrong doing in general, but to cherish a secret inclination toward idolatry, which is treason against Jehovah. He will not answer the prayer that springs from such a heart. A stubborn disregard of Jehovah's command is 'āvēn, and is as bad as idolatry, 1 Sam. 15:23. From this conception of abstract evil as a vain and empty thing, the word passes into a designation of the concrete accompaniments or consequences of evil; the wicked “bring forth iniquity,” Job 15:35, but God returns it upon them, Ps. 94:23; cf. Job 4:8. It is only a short transition from this thought of the penal consequences of evil to that of pain, sorrow, affliction, the emptiness and desolation of life, caused by the removal of the objects in which the heart had found its joy, Ps. 90:10; Job 5:6.

'āshām guilt.

The verb 'āshām or 'āshēm, to incur an obligation or debt, either pecuniary or moral, gives the substantive 'āshām, a debt, trespass, hence guilt, and also the necessity of making restitution for damage that has been done, not willfully, but through ignorance or neglect, Gen. 26:10; Lev. 5:7. Fools make sport of guilt and of the necessity of atoning for it, Prov. 14:9, but God smites those who persist in such conduct, Ps. 68:21(22). This word assumes a technical sense in the levitical law, designating the guilt-offering which, like the sin-offering, was expiatory in its nature. The use of this word in Isa. 53:10, where the innocent servant is said to make his soul an 'āshām for sin, has occasioned considerable controversy. Wellhausen, in the interest of the Grafian hypothesis, asserts that it has not the technical sense of guilt-offering, but only the primary meaning of guilt. This meaning, however, is entirely contrary to the spirit of the whole chapter which conspicuously represents the sufferings of the servant as a ransom, λύτρον, paid to Jehovah for the sinners whose guilt the servant expiates by his voluntary sufferings and death.

B'liyyā'āl worthlessness.

This word, commonly transferred into the English form Belial, occurs twenty-seven times in the Old Testament. It seems to be one of the rare instances in which Hebrew tolerates a compound word, being composed of b'li, nothing, and yā'āl, worth. It designates a person or thing whose leading characteristic is

worthlessness. With *ben* it forms an idiomatic phrase, a son of Belial, which the R. V., either in the text or margin, generally renders "base fellow." It characterizes conduct that is mean and despicable, Ps. 41:9; 101:3; thoughts that are base and degrading, Deut. 15:9. In 2 Sam. 22:5; Ps. 18:5, the writer's thought in connecting Belial with "floods" is quite obscure. The A. V. renders it "floods of ungodly men," and the R. V. "floods of ungodliness." The context suggests the idea of mortal terror, and therefore the rendering of De Witt, "the floods of destruction" would seem more appropriate. In the form *Belīap* this word occurs in the New Testament, 2 Cor. 6:15, where, having lost its abstract meaning, it becomes a name of Satan, the prince of the realm of darkness.

Hāvvāh destructive wickedness.

The root-meaning is a gaping mouth, hence a yawning abyss. Usually this word stands for destruction, Ps. 57:11(12); Prov. 19:13. From this meaning it glides into that of wickedness, Pss. 5:9(10), 55:11(12), this being conceived of as destructive and corrupting. Though the word occurs only sixteen times in Hebrew, the LXX. gives it no less than ten different renderings. For a full discussion of the word, see Delitzsch on Ps. 5:10; also Hupfeld.

Hāttā'th sin.

This is the prevailing Hebrew term for sin, and is properly rendered in the LXX. *ἀμαρτία*, and in the Vulg. *peccatum*. From Jud. 20:16 we learn that primarily it denoted the missing of a target or mark. From an ethical point of view it represented a failure to attain the divine standard for human conduct. This might occur through ignorance, Num. 15:28, or through the immaturity of youth, Ps. 25:7. But usually it exhibited a deliberate deviation from the holy will of God. Indeed, *hāttā'th* seldom or never refers to mere errors, but to gross sins that are apparent to all beholders, as were those of the Sodomites, Gen. 18:20, cf. 1 Sam. 2:17; 15:23. In the Mosaic law it became the standing designation of the sin-offering. During the monarchy, when Israel apostatized from Jehovah, *hāttā'th* came to denote the national sin of idolatry, 1 Kgs. 15:26; Jer. 17:1. In Deut. 9:21 the golden calf is termed Israel's *sin*.

'āvēl, 'āv'lāh unfairness.

Occurs only twenty times, and in the majority of instances is rendered *ἀδικία* in the LXX. The verb *'āvāl*, to turn around, to be perverse, occurs only twice, Ps. 71:4 and Isa. 26:10, both times in Piel, and meaning to act in a rascally manner. The substantive itself designates that form of moral evil which exhibits itself in unfair transactions, whether in the perversion of justice, Lev. 19:15,35, or in business dealings, Ezek. 28:18. *'āv'lāh*, the feminine form, presents the same general meaning, and differs from the masculine, if at all, in being a little more emphatic. It suggests a perversity of conduct that amounts to actual villainy, Ps. 89:22(23); Mic. 3:10; Hab. 2:12.

'āvōn iniquity.

The A. V., except in a very few instances, renders this word by iniquity. In the LXX. and Vulg. it is rendered by *ἀδικία*, *injustitia*, 73 times, *ἀμαρτία*, *peccatum*, 63 times, and *ἀνομία*, *iniquitas*, 61 times. These renderings give us a partial clue to the radical meaning of the word, which seems to have been a turning or bend-

ing away from righteousness and law. This is confirmed by the verb 'āvāh, to turn, twist, pervert, from which 'āvōn seems to be derived, meaning crookedness, perversity, and in an ethical sense, depravity. It conceives of sin as a departure from the normal path of obedience to God's holy will. But this departure involves at once penal consequences, and the thought of these is also included in the word. Cain, having heard the divine sentence pronounced upon him, exclaims, "My 'āvōn," i. e. sin and punishment, "is greater than I can bear," Gen. 4:13. The frequent phrase "he shall bear his iniquity," spoken in reference to the transgressor of law, points to the same fact, as does also the declaration in Isa. 53:6 that Jehovah made the iniquity of us all to fall on his innocent servant. Cf. 1 Sam. 28:10; Ezek. 14:10. In some instances the additional idea of guilt is presented. "The 'āvōn of the Amorites is not yet full," Gen. 15:16, and the 'āvōn of the fathers is visited upon the children to the third and fourth generations, Exod. 20:5. From the ideas of guilt and penalty there is but a step to that of the physical overthrow and ruin which follow as the inevitable consequences of sin and depravity, Gen. 19:15; Prov. 5:22.

'āmāl toil, misery.

From the common meaning of wearisome labor or toil this word passes here and there into a designation of evil, more especially physical, conceived of as a grievous bondage, Deut. 26:7; Ps. 107:12, that has no end, Eccl. 4:8, for man is born to it, Job 5:7, the pride of his short life being only 'āmāl and sorrow, 'āvēn, Ps. 90:10. The frequency with which 'āmāl and 'āvēn are conjoined is surprising, Job 4:8; 5:6; 15:35; Ps. 7:4; 10:7; 55:10(11); Isa. 10:1; 59:4; Hab. 1:3; no less surprising is the confusion in the renderings of these words in the common English version.

Pěshā' transgression, felony.

The verb pāshā' means to break off, *dirumpere*; in respect to a sovereign, to sever allegiance by rebellion, as when Israel rebelled against the house of David, 1 Kgs. 12:11, or Edom against Judah, 2 Kgs. 8:20. Chiefly it designated Israel's rebelling against Jehovah's sovereignty, Isa. 1:2; 1 Kgs. 8:50, or, in other words, Israel's breaking of the covenant in their apostasy from Jehovah's service to that of idols. The substantive pěshā' preserves the meaning of the verb, denoting originally a breach of covenant, or revolt from political supremacy, Prov. 28:2. When this revolt was directed against God it usually assumed the form of transgression of his law, bold, wanton disregard of the moral boundaries which he had assigned to his people, Micah 1:5. Pěshā' is sometimes joined with ḥāttā'th for the sake of emphasis, but when the two are contrasted, Ps. 25:7, the former is the stronger, denoting a willful and outrageous opposition to God, springing from a perversion of the will, while the latter denotes rather sins of infirmity springing from ignorance or from a consciousness clouded by passion.

Rā' wicked, evil.

Rā' is used both as an adjective and as a substantive, and occurs far more frequently than any other word in the present group. It is the opposite of tōbh, good, with which it is very often contrasted, e. g., "Speak not to Jacob either good or bad," Gen. 31:24. The renderings of this word are exceedingly various,

and this arises from the remarkable diversity of its applications. It describes anything and everything that is bad, ill-favored, grievous, mischievous, wicked, in short, every form of evil, whether physical or moral. It springs from a root the general meaning of which is to be restless, to be in motion, to break down, to destroy. From an ethical stand-point it looks upon evil as a hurtful and destructive force, ceaselessly opposed to everything that is good whether in human relations or divine.

Rāshā' wicked.

Like the preceding, this word also is in very frequent use. In a physical sense it denoted that which is loose, slack, unstable, and hence metaphorically, that which is lax, dissolute in an ethical sense. As a substantive it occurs almost wholly in the plural form, r'shā'im, ungodly or wicked men. These are regarded as morally lax, loose, controlled by no principles of truth or righteousness. Having cut themselves loose from God, they have lost all stability of character, and have become "like chaff which the wind driveth away," Ps. 1:4, or like a troubled sea, that cannot rest, Isa. 57:20. From every point of view the r'shā'im are diametrically opposed to the tsāddîqîm, the righteous, the solid, firm, stable in character and disposition.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

Prof. E. P. Barrows, whose death at a ripe age was recently announced, left in manuscript a Hebrew Grammar, the fruit of years of Hebrew study, a Commentary on the Book of Proverbs, and an Autobiography.

Again an appreciation of the importance of Old Testament work has been shown; this time by the trustees of Madison University. Professor S. Burnham, well-known to readers of *THE STUDENT*, will henceforth be assisted in his work by Rev. Nathaniel Smith.

Dr. Richard J. H. Gottheil, of Columbia College, announces the following Semitic Courses for the year: (1) Elementary Course (Harper's "Introductory Method" and "Elements of Hebrew"); (2) Advanced Hebrew (1 Samuel 1-20); (3) Rabbinical Hebrew (five courses); (4) Syriac (two courses); (5) Arabic (two courses); (6) Assyrian; (7) Semitic Palæography.

The latest advices from the Philadelphia Babylonian Exploring Expedition, are to the effect that the damage occasioned by the shipwreck upon the Isle of Samos is extremely slight, the loss of time being the only important matter. While Professor Peters has been in Constantinople, vigorously pushing the important work of securing privileges from the Turkish government, with large hopes of success, the rest of the party has reached Aintab; and ere this the whole company is *en route* for the scene of permanent activity.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh, announce for early publication a valuable work, entitled "The Text of Jeremiah; or, a Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the Variations of the Septuagint retranslated into the Original and explained," by Prof. J. C. Workman, M. A., of Victoria University, Coburg, Ontario. Besides discussing the relation between the texts, this book reveals important matter for the correction and the reconstruction of the present Massoretic text. Prof. Workman has been residing for the past four years in Leipzig, and during the greater portion of that time has been specially engaged at this investigation.

An interesting extension of the correspondence system appears in the recently published announcement by missionaries in Tokio, Japan, of courses in Greek and Hebrew, for the aid not only of missionaries but also of native preachers. Three courses in Greek are proposed: (1) elementary, comprising grammar, analysis, exercises; (2) *intermediate*, consisting of grammatical and critical notes on portions of the Greek Testament; (3) *advanced*, consisting of extracts with notes from various Christian Greek writers. The Hebrew will be taken up through the Correspondence School of the American Institute of Hebrew. This will be supplemented by a Summer School of Hebrew in 1889. It is a well-known fact that of all men, missionaries excel in their zeal for Bible study. This is but one example of this interest.

→BOOK † NOTICES.←

PALESTINE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.*

The historical movement of the present day has, in the study of Christ and the Gospels, produced a new branch of learning. It seeks to create from all available sources of literature and archæology a trustworthy and living picture of the times in which Jesus lived and the scenes among which he walked. This study is as yet in its infancy. Two works in this department, both by German scholars, have been hitherto available for English readers, and those only in part. Hausrath and Schürer have each written a history of the New Testament times and it is but just now that so much as half of the latter work could be had in English. And even now the high price of these volumes, as well as the scholastic and learned character of the contents, has put them beyond the reach of the mass of Bible students. This is to be regretted, since the labors of these scholars are of the greatest value in Scripture study. Passages in the Gospels and episodes in the life of Jesus are often vividly illuminated and take on an entirely new meaning in the light of the habits, customs, and history of the people of the times.

But now in this book of Edmond Stapfer, an opportunity is given to secure at a moderate price much of the best and latest results of investigation into the Palestine of Christ's day,—a book written in a style marked by French vivacity and attractiveness. It is a book for the people, and it is to be hoped that many people will purchase it. There are deficiencies in it—inaccuracies of statement, as well as lax theological views. But for all that it is the best popular presentation of the subject and will well repay careful and constant reading. It will serve, also, as an excellent introduction to the larger and more exhaustive works already mentioned, and the student once fairly embarked upon this fascinating subject will hardly be satisfied until he has studied the fuller treatise of Schürer.

A glance at the table of contents will give one an idea of the scope of the work. The material is classified in two books: I. Social Life, embracing the geography of the Gospels, a brief history of the times, the Sanhedrim, population, the home life, dwellings and clothing, public life, country life, literature and science; II. the Religious Life, covering an account of the Pharisees and Sadducees, their doctrines and practices, the synagogue, the Sabbath, the Bible, fasts etc., prayer, the temple, the feasts, the Essenes, Jesus, his life and teaching. A wonderful amount of light is thrown upon the New Testament. References more or less helpful are made to more than four hundred passages in the Gospels, so that the book becomes a kind of commentary upon the whole Gospel narrative.

There can be no doubt that a careful study of such a book would result in a clearer understanding of the New Testament. It would give the death-blow to many of those allegorizing, "spiritual" interpretations of the words of Jesus which are the chiefest hindrance to real Bible knowledge. It would also be likely to produce in the mind a truer knowledge of Jesus as a man among the people of

* PALESTINE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST. By Edmond Stapfer, D.D., Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris. Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Pp. xii, 528.

his time and thus of our time. We need the human Jesus as well as the divine Christ. The Gospels give us both, and we must not lose sight of the man in the God.

But the danger here is that this study will too highly exalt the human element in Jesus and minimize the divine. Dr. Stapfer has either unintentionally made that impression, or else has purposely sought to create it, in the last chapter of his volume. Perhaps it was unavoidable in the brief space at his command. He indeed promises us a fuller treatment of Christ's life and teaching. The reader of this book must note this aspect of it and make the necessary allowance and correction. Evidently the author belongs to the liberal school of theologians and treats the Gospel narratives with a freedom which will not commend itself to many.

All of Dr. Stapfer's statements of fact are not to be relied upon, especially in his references to the present condition of Palestine. It seems as though his information on these points has been obtained from untrustworthy sources. There is also some rhetorical exaggeration indulged in throughout the book, which, while lending interest to its perusal, is liable to leave a false impression upon the reader. Apart from these defects the work is one heartily to be commended. It has an index fairly complete and a table of references to biblical passages quoted, as well as an excellent bibliography. The type is large and clear; the outward appearance attractive, and the amount of information given within, marvelous.

HUMPHREY'S SACRED HISTORY.*

A book, dealing with the field which is covered in this volume, must subject itself to searching tests. Students have a right to expect many things from one who attempts a history of what is confessedly the most difficult period of biblical history. The ideal historian of these times ought to be possessed of at least six characteristics; 1) a passion for facts and a strict adherence to them, 2) skill in exegesis and interpretation, 3) wide acquaintance with the new learning—archæological and critical, 4) a faculty of historical grouping, which can produce an intelligible, reasonable, finished picture, 5) ability to see the universal bearings of the particular, local, temporary, 6) a devout spirit. A formidable list of qualities, surely,—yet without any one of them a writer on these subjects is inadequately furnished. Dr. Humphrey's book is characterized by, 1) traditional exegesis, 2) want of acquaintance with the new learning, or at least an ignoring of it, 3) a theological setting in which the facts appear, 4) the quality of dogmatic generalization and inference, 5) a strict Calvinistic orthodoxy, 6) failure to unify the impressions of the history, 7) a devout, earnest spirit. It is difficult to see how the volume is anything more than an abbreviated summary of Kurtz's *Old Covenant*. The editors, with the commendable partiality of filial regard, say that the book "will bring a surprising number of fresh suggestions of kindling and enriching thought to all careful students of the Bible and advanced readers of Sacred History;" and "that it will clear away the mists from the vision of many serious and candid doubters." While the many defects which belong to the very idea and structure of this work will forbid our acquiescence in this judgment, still it may be said that it reveals the workings of the keen, spiritual, vigorous mind of a scholar, moving along the old lines and hampered by preconceptions of what his subject contains.

* SACRED HISTORY FROM THE CREATION TO THE GIVING OF THE LAW. By Edward P. Humphrey, D. D., LL. D., some time Professor in the Danville Theological Seminary. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1888. Pp. xlii, 540.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL OF HEBREW.

Thirty-seven persons became members of the Correspondence School during October. They are as follows: Rev. J. W. D. Anderson, Elk City, Kans.; Rev. S. W. Anderson, Nashville, Tenn.; Mr. W. F. Bacher, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. R. D. Bambrick, Sydney Mines, Cape Breton, N. S.; Rev. W. F. Campbell, Patten, Maine; Mr. S. S. Conger, Summit, N. J.; Rev. P. K. Dayfoot, Strathroy, Ont.; Mr. J. Q. Dealey, Providence, R. I.; Miss C. P. Dwight, Elmira, N. Y.; Mr. G. W. Ehler, Detroit, Mich.; Mr. W. D. Fuller, Colorado Springs, Col.; Rev. H. S. Gekeler, Upper Sandusky, O.; Rev. M. W. Gilbert, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. A. P. Greenleaf, Battle Creek, Mich.; Rev. N. J. Gulick, East Albany, N. Y.; Rev. J. J. Hall, Berlin, Vt.; Prof. G. W. Hayes, Petersburg, Va.; Rev. L. Helnmiller, Geneva, N. Y.; Mr. W. M. Junkin, Christiansburgh, Va.; Rev. Wm. Karback, New Orleans, La.; Rev. E. H. Koyl, Beamsville, Ont.; Rev. E. R. Leyburn, Port Gibson, Miss.; Rev. G. F. Mainwaring, Paradise, N. S. Rev. John McCalman, New Bedford, Mass.; Rev. A. D. McHenry, Columbiana, O.; Rev. G. B. Merritt, Fall River, Mass.; Rev. J. R. Moses, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. E. A. Potts, Lynchburg, Va.; Rev. P. O. Powell, Middle Grove, Mo.; Miss Cassie Quinlan, Stella, Neb.; Rev. W. E. Renshaw, Richmond, Utah; Rev. G. S. Rollins, Wilmington, N. C.; Mr. W. O. Sayies, New York City; Rev. L. A. Thirkeld, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. J. M. C. Thompson, Princeton, N. J.; Mr. G. E. Young, Xenia, Ohio.

Many of those who have recently taken up the Correspondence Work have been induced to do so through the kind offices of the friends of the School. In September and October, a letter was sent to the members of the School and some others, requesting them to furnish the names of those of their acquaintance who would be likely to be interested in this work. Many responded, and the result has been a larger addition to our numbers than has occurred in the same length of time for several years. For this assistance the hearty thanks of the principal and instructors are due, not only to those who find in the published lists of new students the names of persons whose names they sent in, but also to those who as yet see no result from their efforts to aid us. It may not be out of place also to remind others that it is not yet too late to send us lists of names.

Perfect examination papers were received during October from Rev. E. H. Barnett, D. D., Atlanta, Ga., three; Dr. E. S. Maxson, Syracuse, N. Y., two; and Rev. G. A. Carstensen, Erie, Pa.; Mr. John A. Ingham, Hackettstown,

N. J., and Rev. R. M. Kirby, Potsdam, N. Y., each one.

Courses were completed by Rev. E. H. Barnett, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. H. C. Ross, Ingersoll, Ont., and Rev. David Robb, Leith, Scotland; and all continue at once with the next course. Mr. Robb says, "I think the lessons most admirable, only regret that I did not have them twenty years ago."

The following students who discontinued Correspondence study during the summer, resumed sending papers in the course of the month covered by this report: Rev. L. C. H. Adams, Monroe, N. Y.; Rev. W. P. Aylsworth, Fairfield, Neb.; Rev. F. W. Bartlett, Willamstown, Mass.; Rev. J. A. Bowler, Lancaster, N. H.; Prof. G. W. Caviness, So. Lancaster, Mass.; Miss E. S. Colton, Farmington, Conn.; Rev. P. D. Cowan, Wellesley, Mass.; Rev. J. R. de W. Cowie, Waterford, N. B.; Rev. S. O. Curtice, Port Chester, N. Y.; Rev. C. A. Evald, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. J. C. Flanders, Manchester Centre, Vt.; Rev. A. J. Fristoe, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. L. M. Gates, Georgetown, N. Y.; Rev. F. B. Groul, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. John Howland, Guadaluajara, Mexico; Eld. O. A. Johnson, Helena, Mont.; Mrs. W. C. Mickey, Princeton, N. J.; Mr. T. E. Moffat, New Wilmington, Pa.; Rev. J. W. Presby, Mystic, Conn.; Rev. J. H. Ralston, Worcester, Mass.; Rev. A. R. Rich, Grove City, Pa.; Rev. H. H. Sangree, Currytown, N. Y.; Rev. W. H. Schwiering, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa; Rev. W. A. Schruff, Chillicothe, O.; Rev. A. L. Urban, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. T. M. Westrup, Monterey, Mexico.

The November STUDENT was issued so early that it was impossible to publish in it the October reports. Hence the Correspondence School page was omitted. It is intended, however, that this department shall appear regularly hereafter.

If the number of examination papers received in the present month is any criterion, the amount of work done in the Correspondence School during the coming winter will be greater than ever before.

The next number of the STUDENT will contain a list of all members of the School who have sent in forty or more examination papers during the year ending Nov. 30th. At the head of this list will, of course, stand the names of those who have sent the largest number and who are hence entitled to the prizes offered this year. Many have already signified their intention to make a determined effort to secure one of those offered for the year beginning Dec. 1st.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- The Peerless Prophet; or, The Life and Times of John the Baptist.* By Archibald McCullagh, D. D. New York: Randolph. \$1.00
- Jeremiah: his life and times.* By Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D. D. London. S.2.6
- The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament.* By E. Schrader, Vol. II. S.10.6
- The Pulpit Commentary: II. Samuel.* By Rev. R. P. Smith, D. D. London. S.15
- The Bible of our Lord and His Apostles.* The Septuagint considered in relation to the Gospel. By J. G. Carleton. London. S.2.6
- The Expositors' Bible: II. Samuel.* By W. G. Blaikie, D. D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. \$1.50
- Christ in the Bible: I. Genesis and Exodus.* By Rev. A. B. Simpson. New York: Word, Work & World Pub. Co. \$2.00
- Die Offenbarung, betrachtet vom Standpunkte der Weltanschauung u. d. Gottesbegriffs der Kabbala.* By F. Kolb. Leipzig: Fock. M.6
- Biblical Eschatology.* By Alvah Hovey, D. D. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1888.
- De l'histoire de la Vulgate en France, leçon d'ouverture faite à la Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris, le 4 novembre 1888.* By S. Berger. Paris: libr. Fischbacher, 1888.
- Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, etc.,* hrsg. v. O. Zöckler. 3 Aufl. 1 Bd. 1 Abtlg. *Grundlegung u. der Schrifttheologie.* 1 Hälfte. Nördlingen, Beck, 1889. M.7
- Das Zeitalter des Propheten Joel.* Inaug. Diss. By G. Kessner. Leipzig: Druck v. Grimme & Trömel, 1888.
- Introduction to the Books of the Old and New Testament.* By O. S. Stearns, D. D. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co. \$1.00
- Studien zur Geschichte d. alten Aegypten.* III. *Tyrus u. Sidon.* J. Krall. Wien, 1888. M.1.50
- Die Psalmen. Uebersetzt u. ausgelegt.* By H. Hupfeld. Für die 3. Aufl. bearb. v. W. Nowack. 2. Bd. Götting. F. A. Perthes, 1888. M.14
- Das Buch Ezechiel u. die 12 kleinen Propheten, ausgelegt.* By C. v. Orelli. [Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heil. Schriften A. u. N. Ts, A. T., 5 Abth.] Nördlingen, Beck, 1888. M.6.50
- Ezechiel, Capitulum 20 interpret.* By M. Friedmann. (in hebr. Sprache.) Wien: (Lippe), 1888. M.0.80
- Kennst du das Land? Bilder aus dem gelobten Lande zur Erklarg. der heil. Schrift.* By L. Schneller. Jerusalem: Buchhandlg. d. syr. Waisenhauses, 1888. M.5
- La bibbia, la natura e la scienza.* Vol. II. By Alf. Travaglini. (Pentateuco: Genesi), fasc. 1 e 2. Vasto: tip. edit. Isonia di C. Masciangelo, 1888.
- The Sabbatical Rest of God and Man: A Study of Heb. 4:3,9.* By Rev. John Hughes, M. A. London: Nisbet. S.7.6
- The Hallowing of Criticism: Nine Sermons on Elijah, etc.* By Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D. D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. S.5
- Inspiration and the Bible: An Enquiry.* By Robert F. Horton. London.
- Biblische Real- u. Verbal Handkonkordanz. Neue, sorgfältig rev. Ausg.* By G. Büchner, 1 Lfg. Basel: Riehm, 1888. M.0.50

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- Die Anhänge des Richterbuches.* By K. Budde in Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissensch. VIII. 2. 1888.
- Saul's Königswahl u. Verwerfung.* By K. Budde. Ibid.
- Ezegetische u. Kritische Bemerkungen.* 1 Sam. 20:36-38; 21:4-6; 1 Sam. 23:6. By J. Ley. Ibid.
- Die Reden des Buches Jeremia gegen die Helden* 25, 46-51. By F. Schwatley. Ibid.
- Noch einmal Ps. 45:7.* By J. C. Matthes. Ibid.
- Ueber die Wichtigkeit der samaritanischen Litteratur für die semitische Sprachwissenschaft, Exegese u. Dogmengeschichte, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Schriften Markab's.* By M. Heidenheim. (Handschr. Nr. 522 der königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin) in Verhandlungen der 39. Vers. deutscher Philol. u. Schulmänner in Zürich, 1888.
- The Interpretation of the Book of Job.* By Prof. J. F. Fening in Andover Review, Nov., '88.
- The "I" of the Psalter.* In the Independent, Nov. 8, '88.
- Kell's Archaeology (Rev.).* Ibid.
- Humphrey's Sacred History (Rev.).* Ibid., Nov. 1
- [Ist Kadytis hei Heradol] Jerusalem oder Gaza? Eine archäologisch-biblische Studie.* By Wandel in Schulbit. f. d. Prov. Brandenburg, '88.
- Das Verwandschaftswort QJ.* By M. Krenkel in Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissensch. VIII. 2 ('88), pp. 280-284.
- Die Wortstellung im hebraischen Nominalsatze.* By C. Albrecht. Ibid.
- Beträge zur hebraischen Wort- u. Namenerklärung.* 2. מן sodalis. By J. Grill. Ibid.
- Die Tafelinschrift Hab. 2.* By C. Bredenkamp in in Theol. Stud. u. Krit., '89.
- The Palace of Artazerzes-Mnemon and the Book of Esther.* By Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D., in Sunday School Times, Nov. 17, '88.
- Teachings of the Qabbala (Rev.).* Ibid.
- Oriental Modes of Covenanting.* By Dr. Cunningham Geikie. Ibid., Nov. 10.
- Dod's Book of Genesis.* By C. L. Diven in the New Englander, Oct., '88.
- Jewish Genealogies.* By J. B. Scouler, D. D., in Evangelical Repository, Oct., '88.
- The Two Isaiahs; the real and the imaginary.* By Principal Geo. C. M. Douglas, D. D., in the Presbyterian Review, Oct., '88.
- Reviews:—1. Forbes' "Studies on the Book of Psalms" (Briggs); 2. Bredenkamp's "Isaiah" (F. Brown); Driver's "Isaiah" (Briggs); Stapfer's "Palestine" (C. W. Hodge). Ibid.*
- The Study of the Hebrew Language in College.* By Prof. C. E. Crandall, A. M., in the Sabbath Recorder, Nov. 8, '88.
- Studies in Practical Exegesis, Psalm XXXII.* By Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D. D., in the Expositor, Nov., '88.
- Kittell's Geschichte der Hebraeer.* By Horst in Theol. Litzg., Nov. 3, '88.
- Wreschner's Samaritanische Traditionen.* By Siegfried. Ibid.
- Sayer's Religion of the Ancient Babylonians (Rev.)* By John Phelps Taylor in And. Rev., Nov., '88.
- The Resurrection in the Pentateuch.* By Howard Osgood, D. D., in the Baptist Quarterly Rev., Oct., '88.
- La critique et la foi [Cette etude est la preface d'un ouvrage sur Les Sources de Pentateuque].* By A. Westphal in Revue chretienne, 1888, 10.

