

## ◀THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT▶

VOL. VI.

APRIL, 1887.

No. 8.

IN the statistics given in the January STUDENT touching the study of the Bible by pastors, it was stated that of those heard from not *one* had read the entire Old Testament in Hebrew. Since the publication of that statement, there have been received letters from several men,—one in Dakota, another in South Carolina, another in Michigan, and still another in Ireland,—who say that they have, with great profit to themselves, done this thing. A South Carolina pastor writes:—

“I respectfully submit my record as an instance of what a pastor *can* do if he is inclined. I have read the Old Testament in Hebrew *entirely* through. Many of the historical books, indeed most of them, I have read two or three times. Other books, such as the Minor Prophets, I have read *thoroughly*, comparing the Septuagint and Vulgate with the Hebrew. I read pen in hand, annotating, consulting commentaries, and writing out unknown words. I have tried to devote special attention to Biblical Theology and to Introduction. I have read most of the Apocrypha in Greek; the New Testament in Greek I have read fifteen or twenty times. I believe that a man who has done his duty in the college and seminary can gain a mastery of the Greek and Hebrew which will be more valuable to him than all the commentaries and works on theology put together. . . .”

A pastor's wife from Dakota thus writes concerning her husband's work:—

“We were both greatly surprised by the statement that, of one thousand ministers, not one had read the Old Testament through in the original; and while my husband's modesty on this point would perhaps prevent his writing the facts, I feel that you would be interested in knowing them. He completed the careful reading of both Old and New Testaments in the original languages in four years. The work was pursued under special difficulties, a large part of it while confined with his family in a sod shanty amid the rigors of a Minnesota winter. I know that he did the work conscientiously and faithfully, because his Hebrew Bible bears on every page the evidence of his labor. He often says that he would not exchange the benefits thus gained for his whole theological course. . . .”

ONE reason why American scholars, in some departments of science at least, must still sit at the feet of the Germans, is that

we have not yet learned the secret of independent research and original investigation. The Germans are no abler, nor are they more industrious. As regards industry, Americans are entitled to more credit than Germans. But the trouble is that, aside from our timidity, we are too often satisfied with second-hand work and second-hand authorities. Americans, for example, study commentaries on the Old Testament a great deal more than they study the Old Testament itself; they will read a dozen histories of New Testament times before thinking of Josephus or Philo or the Mishna. And yet true scholarship and truly scholarly methods of work consist in going back to the original sources of information and in drawing conclusions from the facts found there. How many students have ever made a really independent study of the Book of Genesis in the original, without placing themselves under the guidance of this or that commentary, or of this or that school of theology? Independent scholarship calls for just such a method. The object need not be to discover something in the book that no one else has found; nor does it imply the rejection of any help that the works of others may offer; it does, however, mean an independent study of the book from a healthy philological and theological stand-point. During the past years, there has been a great improvement in this regard, as can be seen from the fact that American scholarship, especially in the Old Testament department, is now being recognized and appreciated in Europe more than ever before. Americans are just as capable of doing first-rate work in the Old Testament field as are the men of any other nation. With clear ideas of the problems involved and correct methods of research, the scholarship and industry of America cannot but produce the best of results.

---

THE Assyrian and its contributions to biblical science have not, from the start, enjoyed the welcome elsewhere that has been so heartily accorded them by American scholars. It is quite possible that the material which this study offered to biblical apologetics, made the Bible-loving conservatives in America too ready to accept as fact what was mere theory or hypothesis. In continental circles, and especially in Germany, the opinion prevailed in many places that biblical science had caught a tartar in Assyriology. In apologetics, history and philology its contributions were either rejected or looked upon with suspicion; and the regular Old Testament men did not trust the conclusions which the Assyriologists offered. For instance, Stade, in his *Zeitschrift*, has repeatedly ridiculed the claims of this

study; in Cornill's *Ezechiel*, the attempts of Fried. Delitzsch to show the Babylonian influence on the language of that prophet, is simply discarded as unworthy of further consideration; years ago the historian Gutschmidt contended with Schrader as to the real or fictitious historical data offered by Assyriology; and a multitude of other instances of this kind could be cited. It seems, however, that the persistent and more cautious efforts of the Assyriologists are beginning to be recognized and their results accepted by Old Testament men. Professor Kautzsch, of Tuebingen, than whom there is not a more candid man among the scholars of Germany, in a recent review of Delitzsch's "Prolegomena," in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, is one of the first to offer this recognition. He says, however, that Assyriologists themselves will now acknowledge that the slow reception of their earlier efforts was not without good reason. But on the other hand, he says, it is "unjustifiable stubbornness" at the present time to reject a point simply because it is offered by Assyriology; and valuable contributions from this source to the departments of history, chronology and etymology are continually being received. On the one hand, then, the Assyriologist is becoming more careful, and is not claiming that for which he has no reasonable proof; and on the other, the theologian is becoming willing to accept what seem to be well-established results of research in this department.

---

It may be that the renewed interest in the biblical languages is yet to have a most important bearing upon one of the leading practical church questions of the day, namely, the union of the evangelical denominations in faith and co-operation. This study has drawn men's attention and application again to the source of all creeds and confessions, the one Word of truth. It would be too sanguine a hope to expect, even with the decided inclination of the Christianity of our day toward mutual forbearance and earnest working together, that the closest Bible-study should bring all to see eye to eye the one truth which all denominations wish to express. But a thorough and unprejudiced Bible-study will certainly do something toward this end. Men will see less of what separates them from others, and more of the great fundamental truths underlying all revelation. The thorough and general prosecution of biblical theology upon the basis of a sound study of the scriptural languages, cannot fail to benefit the church at large as well as the individual.

---

It must not be thought that the peculiar views of the most advanced German Old Testament students are anything new, or that

they do not hold any relation to the general theological discussions in Germany. On the contrary, the leading thesis of this school (it may not be theoretically acknowledged, but it is the practical outcome of their hypotheses,—namely, the exclusion of the divine factor from religion) stands in the closest relationship with the predominating new rationalistic school of German theologians. The leading thesis of Ritschl's school of theology is that all metaphysics must be excluded from the construction of the system of doctrines taught in the Bible, i. e., from dogmatic theology. This is done, because, as their great teacher Kant has taught them, in regard to objects not perceived by the senses, we cannot know "a thing in itself," but only its appearance and expressions. Accordingly, all that is transcendental is excluded from the domain of theological discussion. From this basis, the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Atonement, and other fundamentals of Christian doctrine are simply eliminated from dogmatics. It is evident that rationalism, in this new garb, notwithstanding its assumed agnostic modesty, aims at a divorcement of the supernatural from Christian doctrine, and establishes its system upon the foundation of practical morality. With this general trend of negative theology, the new school of Old Testament scholars go hand-in-hand in spirit and aim. The latter is but one phase of the former. Both begin and end in a denial of the divine element in revelation.

---

WE know of no better illustration of the fact that a reverent and, at the same time, strictly critical study of the Word of God brings to light new truths than Professor Briggs' new work on *Messianic Prophecy*. The author, it is true, is more willing than most American scholars to accept an historical readjustment of Old Testament books or portions of books. In his latest work, however, he does not go any farther than the general consensus of conservative specialists would warrant. As regards the Pentateuch, he does not even go so far, when one takes into consideration that, notwithstanding his acceptance of a documentary theory, he regards the statements of the Pentateuch as the correct expression of the Mosaic period. And yet, when he proceeds on the basis of this restatement of the historical order of the books of the Old Testament to develop their contents and their Messianic value, it is a constant surprise to see how luminous they become when set in an historical background from which they can be rationally developed.

## POPULAR USES OF THE MARGIN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT REVISION.

BY PROF. J. F. MCCURDY, PH. D.,

University College, Toronto.

Any one taking merely a hasty glance at the Revised Old Testament must be struck with the recasting which the margin has undergone. A very little reflection will bring him to the conclusion that it was worth while paying special attention to this portion of the work of revision. It may even be regarded as a great position of vantage won by the friends of accurate Bible-study that the marginal notes are now inseparably attached to the English text. Whatever may have been the advantages of circulating the Bible without note or comment, it can hardly be claimed for the world-encompassing issues of the Bible Societies, that they gave to ordinary readers a correct idea of the true state of the text of either Old or New Testament, or even an adequate reproduction of its meaning. But it has most certainly been of unspeakable benefit to the English-speaking world that the authorized version, in its complete form, did contain a liberal margin. Its use in private and in public has accustomed us to think of uncertainties, obscurities and ambiguities in connection with the text; and the way has thus been prepared for at least an unembarrassing reception of a more satisfactory popular critical apparatus. Thus all Bible-scholars, however much they may be disappointed with the execution of the task, or differ with statements here and there, yet owe a debt of gratitude to the Revisers for their manifest appreciation of the necessity of a good margin, and their scrupulous care in fixing its limits.

The advantage of having a margin of any kind is strikingly illustrated by the difference in the treatment accorded to the German and English revisions respectively. Though the work of revising Luther's Bible extended over a long series of years, and was the subject of earnest study on the part of several specialists in the history and language of the famous version, as well as on the part of the immediate Revisers, and although the changes introduced were almost ridiculously few, and unchecked currency was continued to hundreds of palpable errors endeared or supposed to be endeared to the minds and hearts of the great German race, the opposition even to the few trifling alterations was vehement and overwhelming. Why? Because, as we cannot help thinking, the people had been led to associate the idea of finality and immutability to a version which they had been accustomed to see devoid of explanations, alternative renderings, and everything that might suggest to the popular mind the idea of uncertainty or ambiguity in the original. And yet many readers of the English Bible, including some who would call themselves students, are, it is to be feared, in the habit of reading merely what is printed in the body of the text whether in the old or in the revised version. How great a mistake and loss this habit involves may be inferred from almost any page. When an alternative rendering is given, introduced by the word "or," it may be taken for granted that there was great doubt

in the minds of the majority of the Revisers as to the exact translation of the word or phrase in question. The matter at issue is often, to be sure, one merely of form or expression, but more frequently, perhaps, the decision is made between meanings entirely distinct from one another. Now, it must be remembered that no reading was introduced into the margin at all unless it had the support of a large number of the Revisers, and that a translation which was preferred by a majority of the body was in many cases placed in the margin instead of in the text, on account of the two-thirds rule as to the admissibility of changes in the text. So it appears that if the majority or even a large minority of that learned company represented, as they certainly often did, the opinions of the majority of competent outside scholars, the renderings which appear in the margin in many cases would seem properly due to the text. In other words, unless we read the margin carefully along with the text, we are often accepting and building upon words and ideas which are really not part of the Bible at all. This unfaithfulness to truth is certainly not so great a sin against the light as the habit which seems to be still prevalent of treating the old authorized version alone as the *ipsissima verba* of inspiration; but it is bad enough. Let us hope that the increasing use of the new revision, as it carries its own witness to these most important facts, may win over its readers to the true stand-point and to right practice.

A capital gain will certainly be made for true Bible-study in the incentive given by the marginal notes to the cultivation of Hebrew. The fact of the necessity for so many alternative renderings and explanatory statements would itself suggest the importance of testing the points thus raised by the only valid process of a resort to the original expressions. To take an obvious example, it is not easy to conceive how any but indolent or insensible readers can pass over Ps. XXVII. 4, or XC. 17, without a strong desire to know how it is that the divine attribute which is of supreme importance to the Psalmists, can be so doubtful to modern interpreters. In these, and in a multitude of other cases, the investigation thus incited cannot fail to be both delightful and profitable; and even if the student should ultimately decide for himself that, in these and parallel instances, what stands in the margin should be put into the text, or *vice versa*, no harm follows, but only the great gain not merely of invaluable knowledge, but of a practical training in the most valuable of all sorts of biblical criticism.

The other most important feature in the margin is also much more valuable for what it suggests than for the information it directly imparts. I mean the indication of variant readings in the original text. This is of two quite distinct kinds: references to variations in the Hebrew, or the so-called Massoretic text, whether in manuscripts or in printed editions; and the mention of divergent readings in ancient versions which are supposed to be based on recensions or copies of the original differing more or less widely from the Massoretic standard. The former class, the variations in the current traditional text, it is unnecessary to emphasize here, since they are of very slight importance, the existing manuscripts being all apparently derived from but one copy. But the references made to the readings of ancient versions, few as they are, eminently deserve attention from all students of the Bible. At the risk of seeming to utter commonplaces, I shall state a few general facts about these versions. The most important of them are the Septuagint, or Greek version, made in the third and perhaps partly in the second century, B. C., the Syriac Peshitta of the close of the second cen-

ury, A. D., and the Targums, misnamed "paraphrases," written in the West or Jewish Aramaic, of which the earliest cannot have been committed to writing before the fourth century, A. D. The Samaritan Pentateuch,—that is, the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch in Samaritan letters,—would be of the greatest value if it were accessible in its original form; but in its actual state, it is only occasionally of much importance as an independent witness to variant readings. The pre-eminent value of the Septuagint is due to its antiquity, the number of its ancient manuscripts, the fact that it seems to be the only translation from a recension of the text older than the archetype of our present standard Hebrew Bible, and to the extreme literalness of the rendering in many portions. The Peshitta, while in the main following a text very near the Massoretic, shows occasionally surprising agreement with divergent readings of the Septuagint, as well as evidence equally striking of some kind of association with the Targums beyond kinship of language.

While it would be beyond the scope of this article to discuss the question of the condition of the received Massoretic text or the chances of amending it in the light of its own manuscripts, or of the versions, it is necessary, at the same time, to remark that the whole matter of improving the Hebrew original, and thus getting a more perfect Bible, is one of extreme difficulty. The work of amending by means of a collation of manuscripts of the Massoretic text would yield results of very slight importance, on account of the fact that all copies have been propagated from the same source, and because the variations among them are few and trifling. But even these results would be difficult to attain on account of the seeming impossibility of classifying the manuscripts, the difference of opinion that prevails as to the use of traditional evidence, along with the absence of any authoritative school of textual treatment. Doctors of the Old Testament text work usually without intercommunication or mutual confidence; and those whose opinions all would defer to may be counted on the fingers of one hand. The work of emendation by means of the versions, while containing far greater possibilities, is at present and will be for a long time to come encumbered by many obstructions. Trained critics are few; a critical edition of the Septuagint is still wanting, and there is no prospect of any being soon placed in our hands; and where agreement between the manuscripts, or families of manuscripts, exists, the question as to a decision between the readings and those of the Massoretic text is often most perplexing, and not likely ever to be satisfactorily settled.

The above leading facts with regard to these vexed but important questions have been mentioned here because it is of the first importance that all readers of the Bible should know in a general way how the Book which they use has come to be what it is, and what it is that it has come to be, as far as the outward form is concerned, and also because it is well that they should not simply take the work of translation or revision on faith, but have some intelligent idea of how the Revisers have fulfilled their trust. As to the latter point it is proper to say here that the Revisers have done well in so far as they have made few changes in the *text* of the English translation based on emendations of the Hebrew, instead of the many that might have been made with much show of right. Probably the number might well have been increased; but it was better to err on the safe side, and they were bound not to go beyond the average scholarship of the time, else their work would have made no headway at all. The next revisers will work on larger and surer inductions, and will come before a much better instructed jury of

their peers; though they too, if they are to succeed in their task, must not go beyond their commission.

As to the *margin*, it must be admitted on all hands that much more numerous various readings might have been proposed there based on the testimony of the versions. It is well, however, to remember that the margin, as well as the text, was made for popular use; and there will be no dispute of the proposition that, if the margin were to be made a complete critical apparatus, it would be unmanageable, forbidding and unpopular. Personally, no doubt, nearly every scholar would prefer that the alternative renderings, or references to non-Massoretic texts, had been much more numerous. But only those who have gone over large portions of the Hebrew text, and noted strictly the divergences of the versions, can have any idea of the number of changes which might properly be proposed if completeness were to be sought.

What then is or should be the popular use of such an incomplete digest of variant textual readings? The use is great and various.

It must not be supposed that, because any effort to secure at present a complete text of the original Old Testament would be without result, it is therefore useless for us to have anything to do with the more or less diverging ancient translations. We must not forget what a version for the people should properly be, and what our revised version aims to be,—a record of the consensus of opinion of scholars on all points that are practically beyond dispute. It must, therefore, be conservative in its authoritative statements. But it may or should suggest a great deal that is new to the people, in order that they may come to the true conception of the scope and the end of study of the Bible-text. And we must not,—nay, we dare not,—rest content with an admittedly imperfect text, but ever press on towards the ideal of perfection, even though it may at present seem beyond practical reach. Moreover, it is from Bible-readers among the people that the ranks of competent scholars are to be recruited; and the greater the number of investigators, the more sure and rapid will the progress be in the elimination of doubtful and misleading, and the access of approved and consistent readings. Above all, it must be taken to heart that such work, largely technical, is not the only end at least of the popular study of the versions, which finds its account chiefly in the suggestion of fundamental and moving general ideas.

In the first place, if Bible-readers will but consider the matter well, there must be a change of sentiment with regard to what constitutes exactly the Old Testament. The very fact of the revision and the popular discussions with regard to textual variations must have awakened ordinary readers to a practical sense that the authorized version is not the real Bible; and that of itself is a great gain. But the references in the margin to the Septuagint and other versions must still further enlighten thoughtful inquirers. The questions must suggest themselves: What authority has the Septuagint, or any other ancient version? How far do these vary from the received Hebrew text? What are we really to regard as the actual form of the Old Testament? The process that leads to the answering of these inquiries may lead to temporary unsettlement of views and some dissatisfaction; but these will be followed by a greater degree of satisfaction and mental repose than could have been enjoyed before the questions were started, since there is nothing that can permanently satisfy but conclusions based on tested and attested facts. As to the main question, the essential results of the inquiry will be as follows:—The Old Testament is a body of sacred literature given to the



world in the Hebrew language; and of this literature our present Hebrew Bibles are by far the best extant representative. Yet this Hebrew text, as we now have it, is not a perfectly accurate copy in all its words or in all its sentences or paragraphs; for the Greek translation, made more than three centuries before the current Hebrew recension was authoritatively fixed, while agreeing marvelously with the latter in general, departs from it occasionally in all the above particulars. It was also based, in the main, on a good consistent text; and the departures from the Hebrew are not due to the supposed fact that the translators had our text before them and purposely changed it here and there, but to the actual fact that they had another current recension before them, which, as a rule, they rendered with scrupulous care and fidelity, and, in large portions, with extreme literalness. Other ancient versions are also deserving of attention; but they do not cause any shifting of our point of view or any new change of attitude; for they are representatives of editions which follow the original recension of our own Hebrew text. Thus, the best available Hebrew Bible would be a successful "harmony" of the original of the Septuagint and the archetype of the Hebrew Bible of our Massoretic tradition. In this way the Old Testament becomes better objectivized to us than before; our whole view of the history of its transmission is classified and made more real; and the practical problem of textual criticism is defined.

It will, then, be readily admitted that a thoughtful and conscientious use of these marginal references must lead Bible-readers to a clearer apprehension of the character and form of the original Old Testament. Now what is the next natural consequence and practical benefit? Why, this, that students must begin to take an altogether new and direct interest in the ancient versions. The great body of those who intelligently study their Bibles will not only recognize the importance of the work of scholars who spend much time upon the ancient versions, but they will begin to think that they may yet reap some part of the benefit for themselves. Above all, the reading of the Septuagint must become more common and profitable. Indeed, the whole tendency of modern Bible-study is to push the Septuagint to the front rank as a companion-book to the Hebrew Bible. The prejudices against the Septuagint, on account of its supposed dependence upon the Hebrew when agreeing, and its assumed inaccuracy when disagreeing with the latter, are rapidly giving way; and along with this advance in critical soundness of opinion, there has come, for the relief of this noble monument of ancient learning and piety, that mighty revolution in modern taste and judgment, chiefly brought about by the science of comparative philology, through which men have been led to revolt against the exclusive domination of classical standards of literary excellence and worth, and have been brought to see and feel that the thoughts enshrined in any form of human speech are of infinitely greater moment than the style or special linguistic garb in which they are embodied. Thus, no self-respecting scholar would now plead, in extenuation of neglect of the Septuagint, that the Greek style is barbarous and repulsive. The determining question must be, Are the ancient versions worth reading on their own account, as supplementing in various ways our conceptions and knowledge of the old Hebrew Bible? The answer must come in the affirmative; and the certain consequence, sooner or later, will be that the versions will be much studied and compared. Fortunately for the progress of this branch of biblical culture, the most important of all the versions is written in Greek; and thus, even one who has no knowledge of the

Aramaic dialects can get for himself the chief benefit of this comparative study. Indeed, there does not seem to be any good reason why educated Bible-readers should not read daily a chapter or two of the Septuagint, and thus not only verify for themselves the few references made in the revised margin, but gain an insight into the genius of Old Testament style and expression, and a sense of reality and positive progress in biblical study which will prove to be quite invaluable. Not the least among the fruits of such reading and comparison will be a surer hold upon and keener appreciation of the biblical Hebrew idiom itself. What all Hebrew scholars feel in reading the Greek New Testament, with its Hebraistic syntactical coloring, will be felt much more strongly in habitual converse with the great Greek version of the Old Testament. One may thus look forward with confidence to a time not very far distant when the use of the Septuagint, in and out of our theological schools, will be as much a matter of course as the study of the Hebrew Bible, or at least that the cultivation of the former will more than keep pace with the increasing deference to the latter. It will not then have been in vain that such a scholar as Lagarde has spent the best hours of a busy life in gathering and sifting materials for a worthy text of a work which, after the neglect and depreciation of many centuries, is destined to rule in no small measure the realm of Old Testament study and research.

Such are a few of the advantages which the margin in the Revised English Old Testament is likely to bring to those who use it aright and heed its suggestions. I have purposely avoided, in this article, going into details of practical application, contenting myself with an attempt to encourage direct and sustained interest in a few broad principles of popular intelligent treatment of the two main representatives of the ancient Old Testament, the surviving text of the Hebrew original and the greatest and most ancient of the versions. With such a plan in view, minute criticism of the marginal notes is necessarily excluded. Moreover, whatever be the failures and the defects of the margin, it will be acknowledged by all who desire and labor for increasing accuracy and certitude in Bible-learning, that, if the Revisers succeed in directing more earnest attention to these great *principia* of Old Testament knowledge, such an achievement alone will be an ample vindication of the Revision.

LETTER I.—TO A PASTOR WHO WISHES TO KNOW HOW HE  
MAY STUDY THE BOOK OF PSALMS TO HIS OWN BEST  
ADVANTAGE AND THAT OF HIS CONGREGATION.

BY PROF. REVERE F. WEIDNER, D. D.,  
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

I am glad to hear that you have again taken up the study of your Hebrew Bible. The plan you speak of in your last letter of joining the Hebrew Correspondence School, and thus reviewing carefully the fundamental principles of Hebrew Grammar, is an excellent one, and I am equally pleased with your proposed project of making a special study, at suitable times, of some of the Psalms for practical use in your church services.

I sympathize with you when you speak of your many pastoral duties and your seeming want of time, but you know very well that you have not yet learned to economize time. If you determine to make a special study of the Hebrew Old Testament, and are in good earnest, you can readily reserve one hour daily for such studies. Knowing your easy disposition, I can easily understand that you think there is no time for such work, for I am certain you fritter away two hours every morning without profiting yourself or anyone else. Instead of staying in bed until seven, it would be a good plan to rise at six; and instead of spending an hour over the daily paper, suppose you devote to it only ten minutes, and you will immediately be the gainer of more time than you need, and be as wise as before.

You wish to know whether it would be advisable to lecture on the Psalms, weekly, in regular order, until they are finished. For my own part I would not do so. On the contrary, why not arrange them into little books, which can readily be done, e. g., the Penitential Psalms (VI., XXXII., XXXVIII., LI., CII., CXXX., CXLIII.), the Pilgrim Psalms (CXX.—CXXXIV.); the Messianic Psalms (II., VIII., XVI., XXII., XL., XLV., LXXII., CX.), the Hallel (CXIII.—CXVIII.), the Hallelujah Psalms (CXLVI.—CL.), the Historical Psalms (LXXVIII., CV., CVI., CXXXV., CXXXVI.), etc., and then at special seasons or on special occasions lecture on such as are appropriate, e. g., on the Penitential Psalms before Communion, on the Messianic Psalms during the Lenten season, etc., arranging it so that in about six or eight years you can complete the whole Psalter.

You also ask my opinion about three commentaries on the Psalms which you already have in your library, and wish to know whether I can recommend anything better. As I happen to know your tastes, and since you inform me that you wish to lay a good foundation for exegetical work on the Old Testament, I shall express myself more plainly than I otherwise should. As to Spurgeon's voluminous work, of which you speak so highly as having given you such excellent hints in preparing your sermons, it does not here come into consideration. It is a book of devotion, to be placed on the same shelf with Neale<sup>1</sup> and Horne,<sup>2</sup>—the last com-

<sup>1</sup> Neale, J. M., and Littledale, R. F. *A Commentary on the Psalms* from primitive and mediæval writers; and from the various office-books and hymns of the Roman, Mozarabic, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, and Syriac Rites. 4 vols. Third edition. London, 1874. Price, \$16.00. A devotional commentary, containing a strange medley of allegorical interpretations.

<sup>2</sup> Horne, George. *A Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. New York, 1865. Price, \$2.50.

mentary you ought to take up before you preach your sermon,—I hope it will not be the first you take up to prepare one.

You made a good selection when you bought the Speaker's Commentary,<sup>1</sup> edited by Canon Cook. The Commentary on the Psalms, which has also been reprinted separately, is marked by many good qualities, although it contains the notes of three different expositors. You will find that it will always repay you to examine it after you have finished your critical study of a Psalm. This commentary naturally takes its place by the side of the works of Bonar,<sup>2</sup> Murphy,<sup>3</sup> Kay,<sup>4</sup> and Fausset.<sup>5</sup>

I am both surprised and gratified to learn that the third commentary on the Psalms in your library is the work of Jennings and Lowe;<sup>6</sup> for this book is not so well-known in this country, even by scholars, as it ought to be, and, in a certain sense, it supersedes the Commentary of Phillips.<sup>7</sup> As it is especially edited for Hebrew students, and contains full and valuable introductions to each Psalm, you will find it of great service to you.

No one, therefore, can find much fault with you, in your selection of commentaries on the Psalms; for you have chosen a fair representative of each of the three classes into which commentaries may be divided.

When you inquire whether it would be desirable to procure any additional commentaries, I am in doubt what to say, for it is far better to understand one commentary thoroughly, than to misunderstand a dozen. But as you frankly state that you wish to study the Psalter critically, to get into the depths of its teachings; in fact, that you wish to train yourself as a true exegete, I cannot but answer that you ought to procure at least one, if not two, more commentaries. If you decide on buying only one, I would, without any hesitation, recommend the work of Delitzsch,<sup>8</sup> who has no superior in critical acumen or in spiritual insight. But if you decide to buy two additional commentaries, I am somewhat at a loss what to recommend. I could not part with Perowne<sup>9</sup>, nor would I be willing to leave Moll's place vacant in Lange's series, and no true Hebraist can sleep contentedly if Hupfeld<sup>10</sup> has been mislaid.

<sup>1</sup> Known also as *The Bible Commentary*. 10 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$30.00.

<sup>2</sup> Bonar, Andrew A. *Christ and His Church in the Book of Psalms*. London, 1859. New York, 1861. Price, \$2.50.

<sup>3</sup> Murphy, J. G. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, with a new translation. Andover, 1875. Price, \$4.00.

<sup>4</sup> Kay, William. *The Psalms*, translated from the Hebrew, with notes, chiefly exegetical. London, 1871. Price, \$5.00.

<sup>5</sup> In Jamieson, Fausset and Brown's *Commentary*. 6 vols. Philadelphia, 1875. Price, \$15.00. Fausset's Commentary on the Psalms is also printed separately.

<sup>6</sup> Jennings, A. C., and Lowe, W. H. *The Psalms with Introductions and Critical Notes*. 2 vols. London, 1875-77. Price, \$5.00.

<sup>7</sup> Phillips, George. *The Psalms in Hebrew*, with a critical, exegetical and philological commentary. 2 vols. London, 1846. A second edition of this work has appeared, but I am not acquainted with it.

<sup>8</sup> Delitzsch, Franz. *Biblischer Commentar ueber die Psalmen*. Fourth revised edition. Leipzig, 1883. By all means use the latest German edition. The English translation in 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1871) is based on an earlier edition.

<sup>9</sup> Perowne, J. J. Stewart. *The Book of Psalms*. A new translation with introduction and notes, explanatory and critical. From third London edition. Andover, 1879. Price, \$7.50.

<sup>10</sup> Hupfeld, H. *Die Psalmen uebersetzt und ausgelegt*, von E. Riehm. Second edition. 4 vols. Gotha, 1867-72. Valuable on account of history of interpretation and philological notes, but not safe as a guide.

As to the best method of studying a Psalm, I would advise you not to examine any commentary until you are able to read the Psalm fluently in Hebrew, to translate it readily into English, and to analyze every word. Indeed, you ought not to consider that you have accomplished your task until you can take the Revised English Version in your hand and at sight translate it into the original Hebrew. This is done more easily than you imagine. You will now enjoy studying Delitzsch, which I would advise you to read first of all. Accustom yourself likewise to take notes, both grammatical and otherwise, and carefully rewrite or condense the most important hints given by other commentators, and so begin to prepare your own commentary. Such a commentary will be of more value to you than all the rest in your library, and will become fuller on each repeated study of a Psalm.

After such elaborate study of a Psalm, it will be a delight for you to present the doctrinal and practical truths therein contained to your congregation; and both you and they will be richly rewarded by your labors.

---

## THE INCONGRUOUS CLAUSE IN GEN. XIII. 10.

BY PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D.,

Union Theological Seminary, Hampden Sidney, Va.

### I. ZOAR.

"And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every-where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the land of Egypt, *as thou comest unto Zoar.*" The last clause seems, from its position, to qualify "the land of Egypt." But this construction deprives the statement of all meaning, inasmuch as Zoar was not in or near the land of Egypt. The clause is equally unintelligible, whether we place the pentapolis, of which Zoar was a member, at the southern or at the northern end of the Dead Sea.

Most commentators quietly ignore this difficulty. Others evade it by arbitrarily re-shaping the whole sentence. For instance, Bush<sup>1</sup> would connect the clause under consideration with the first part of the verse, thus, "And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every-where, as thou comest to Zoar (before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah), even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt." This view, besides implying that the author wrote such a clumsy description that every reader must recast the whole of it to get his meaning, simply exchanges one difficulty for another. If the plain was "well watered *every-where*," as the author has just stated, why should he specify any particular portion of it? Canon Tristram, adopting the theory that now has the strongest support, locates the cities of the plain north of the Dead Sea, and would identify Zi'ara with Zoar. Zi'ara is a bold headland projecting westward from the mountains of Moab, and overlooking the Jordan valley.<sup>2</sup> But why should a place 3000 feet above the plain, and surrounded by stony ground, be mentioned as the heart of this well watered valley? The clause seems to mean that Zoar was the richest spot of all this fertile region; but the fact is that Zi'ara is not nearly so well watered as the rest of the plain. Nor can

<sup>1</sup> "Notes on Genesis" *in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> "The Land of Moab." H. B. Tristram. P. 343.

it be argued that the clause "as thou comest to Zoar" was intended by the author to identify the plain of which he was speaking. For that would be to define the well known by the little known. The "circuit of the Jordan" is and always has been *the* landmark of Palestine; whereas Zoar has always been an insignificant place. In short, it would be absurd to identify "the plain" by reference to Zoar.

Dr. Selah Merrill's reconstruction of the verse is slightly different. He makes the last clause qualify the first, throwing all the middle portion of the verse into a parenthesis, thus, "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan (that it was well watered every-where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt) until thou comest to Zoar." That is, Lot saw all the plain of Jordan as far as Zoar, which, says Merrill, was both the limit of the plain and the limit of vision in that direction.<sup>1</sup> But that depends upon the location of Zoar. We have seen that Tristram finds it at Zi'ara, on a mountain spur 3000 feet above the level of the valley. Conder finds it at Shaghur, in the plain of Shittim.<sup>2</sup> Merrill himself finds it at Ektanu, making a precarious argument for this identification on the ground that *Ektanu* is the Hebrew word *qatan*, which means "little," as *tsoar* also does! Now, neither his own preferred site, Ektanu, nor Shaghur, nor Zi'ara, seems to be "the limit of vision in that direction." So that Merrill's re-arrangement is as valueless as Bush's. But even if this arbitrary shifting of clauses yielded a satisfactory meaning, the question remains, How came this awkward clause to stand last in the sentence, when it was intended to modify a statement that stands first? How came this marvelously clear writer to allow four dissevering clauses to interpose between two statements whose juxtaposition was indispensable to the understanding of one of them?

Moreover, let it be observed that Gen. XIX. 22 gives the origin of the name "Zoar," the place having been called Bela before that. Hence, if we retain Zoar in Gen. XIII. 10, we involve the author in an unexplained anachronism, since he mentions a city by a name that it did not then have. The name *might* be used by anticipation, it is true; but this is highly improbable. In Gen. XIV. 2, where Bela is mentioned, an explanatory parenthesis is added, identifying Bela with Zoar, as if in view of Gen. XIX. 22. In Gen. XIV. 8, after an interval of only six verses, the same explanation is carefully inserted. Now can we believe that *in the same period* Zoar would be mentioned for the first time (Gen. XIII. 10) without any mention of Bela and without any glance at Gen. XIX. 22?

## II. ZOR.

Such considerations as those above stated force us to the conclusion that "Zoar" is *not the true reading in this passage*. Accordingly, several careful students of biblical geography, including the Rev. Archibald Henderson<sup>3</sup> and Dr. H. Clay Trumbull,<sup>4</sup> have proposed to read "Zar" or "Zor." Mr. Henderson makes this mean the frontier fortress of Egypt. Dr. Trumbull makes it mean the border land of Eastern Lower Egypt, which was once protected by the Great

<sup>1</sup> "East of the Jordan." Selah Merrill. P. 233.

<sup>2</sup> "Heth and Moab." C. R. Conder. P. 150.

<sup>3</sup> "Palestine," in the series of Hand-books for Bible-classes.

<sup>4</sup> "Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for October, 1884." *Sunday School Times*, Nov. 22, 1884.

Wall extending across the isthmus from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. Either of these views is a vast advance on "Zoar;" but they also are open to serious objections. For example, "Zoar" is not the Hebrew equivalent of the Egyptian "Zor." "Zor" fails to account for the letter 'Ayin in "Zoar" (צוּר). Again, the fortified country of the isthmus was not the most fertile part of the land of Egypt, and would fail utterly to meet the high requirement of the words "well watered every-where, even as the garden of Jehovah" (Gen. ii. 10: "A river went out of Eden to water the garden"). Therefore, the true solution has not yet been reached, though we are undoubtedly moving in the right direction.<sup>1</sup>

### III. ZOAN.

The language "like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoar" clearly implies (1) that Zoar is not the same as the land of Egypt, (2) that Zoar is in the land of Egypt, and (3) that Zoar is a definite place, a well-known town, rather than a country. Neither of the views above given meets these conditions. Now, let us retain the clauses in their true order, and read as follows: "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every-where (before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah), even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoan." There! How slight the change! How great the gain! "Zoar" is obviously a not unnatural error of transcription for "Zoan." See how easily one of those words can be mistaken for the other in English. The difference between them in Hebrew is even smaller, as we may see by placing them side by side,—צוּן = Zoan, צוּר = Zoar. It is just the difference between the two final letters ן and ר, which are not strikingly dissimilar in appearance, especially in the old writing that preceded the square character now in use. How natural, then, that a copyist, under the influence of his greater familiarity with Zoar and the apparent connection with the Jordan valley, should have written צוּר for צוּן. He knew where Zoar was. Probably he did not know so much about Zoan. Geography never was a strong point with the ancients. And so, whether unwittingly or of set purpose, he made the change that disjointed the description and baffled the commentators.

Having shown the *a priori* probability that Zoan is the true reading, let us proceed to the proof. This is no merely conjectural emendation. The Syriac version reads, "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan,

<sup>1</sup> Every careful reader of Dr. Trumbull's able and conclusive monograph on Kadesh Barnea must recognize the importance of the great wall of Egypt as a geographical factor. But Dr. Trumbull seems disposed to overestimate its value. Having used it as a key to unlock the mystery of Kadesh Barnea and the route of the Exodus, he would now use it to solve also the geographical problem of Gen. xiii. 10, and even Deut. xxxiv. 3. The proof that he is overworking the wall as a landmark may be found in his treatment of this last passage, Deut. xxxiv. 1-3. Here, too, instead of "Zoar" he would read "Zor," though of course the necessity for a change does not exist here, as it did in Gen. xiii. 10; and he would have Moses looking all the way from Nebo to Egypt, and that too after his eye had completed the circuit of Israel's territory. According to the text, the comprehensive view ends with "the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, at Zoar," this town being the feature of the panorama that lay immediately before and nearest to the spectator. If "Zor" be substituted, see what a line and what a boundary we get! Dr. Trumbull admits that "Zoar" is not an exact transliteration of "Zor" (much less is Zoan); and yet such is his infatuation with the wall-country (Zor) that he would have us believe that both "Zoar" in Deut. xxxiv. 3, and "Zoan" in Ps. lxxviii. 12, 43, should be read "Zor"! Less radical and violent, as well as otherwise more probable and satisfactory, is the view presented below in III., which I shall proceed at once to discuss.

that it was well watered every-where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoan." "Now, the richest part of the land of Egypt was "as thou comest unto Zoan." The adjacent delta-land, "well watered every-where," was of the most exuberant fertility. Mos'oudy, the Arab historian of the tenth century, says: "The place was formerly a district which had not its equal in Egypt for fine air, fertility and wealth. Gardens, plantations of palms and other trees, vines, and cultivated fields met the eye in every direction."<sup>1</sup> This opinion is fully borne out by the Letter of Panbesa,<sup>2</sup> which describes "the field of Zoan" as it was in the time of Moses. "Nothing can compare with it in the Theban land and soil," says this ancient document. "It is pleasant to live in. Its fields are full of good things, and life passes in constant plenty and abundance. Its canals are rich in fish, its lakes swarm with birds, its meadows are green with vegetables, there is no end of the lentiles; melons with a taste like honey grow in the irrigated fields. Its barns are full of wheat and durra, and reach as high as heaven. Onions and sesame are in the enclosures, and the apple-tree blooms. The vine, the almond-tree and the fig-tree grow in the gardens. Plenty and abundance are perpetual in it. He rejoices who has settled there."

Assuming the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, who was so likely to make this ideal country around Zoan the standard of fertility as the man who had lived there forty years and witnessed its succession of luxuriant crops? In his narrative, Abraham and Lot had recently left this land of rivers and canals and lakes, and therefore the comparison was all the more natural. The abundant waters of the plain of Jordan, "utilized as they then were by irrigation far and wide, must have made every part of it, as seen by Abraham and Lot, a very garden of Jehovah, recalling the traditions of their own eastern Paradise, or the glorious beauty of the scene they had recently left behind them at Zoan, where the beautiful Nile, led every-where through the thirsty soil, repaid the care by a fertility and luxuriance that had passed into a proverb."<sup>3</sup>

By the change of a single letter, then, we relieve the confusion of the clauses, diminish the topographical difficulty, acquit the author of anachronistic mention of Zoar and of the folly of identifying a celebrated plain by an obscure town, gain a distinct advance in the thought instead of an interrupting check upon it, and add greatly to the force of the description by naming as the standard of comparison in point of fertility "the field of Zoan," the kernel of the land of Egypt, the richest part of the richest country in the world.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in "The Story of Tanis." By Amelia B. Edwards, *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Oct., 1886.

<sup>2</sup> "Records of the Past" (vol. VI.), and Brughseh's "Hi tory of E ypt" (vol. II., pp. 100-102).

<sup>3</sup> "Hours with the Bible." C. Geikie. Vol. I., pp. 370-3



## THE WORD ELOHIM IN GENESIS I.

BY PROF. R. V. FOSTER, D. D.,  
Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

In the December OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, page 116, Dr. Beecher says: "The fact that Elohim usually and Adonay always have their verbs and adjectives in the singular is discouraging to those who seek here a polytheistic meaning." Reference is also made in the same connection to current theories of the plural Elohim.

That the word Elohim was used as a plural of excellence can never be demonstrated, nor can it ever be proved that it hints even remotely at the doctrine of the trinity. Both hypotheses are extremely improbable conjectures. The word Elohim is a Hebrew word, but it, or its equivalent, existed outside of the sphere of revelation before it existed within that sphere. Outside of this sphere it was an ordinary plural, denoting several or many gods, because the outside peoples were polytheistic and had use for just such a term to express what they regarded as the prominent divine element inhering in more than one god. When the word was brought within the sphere of the religion of Israel, its plural form was brought with it, and in this form it was applied to the one true God, but it was not applied to him as a suggestion either of majesty or trinity. So remote and metaphysical a hint of the transcendent excellence, or the triune personality of God, would have been of no practical value to anyone, except, perhaps, to those already informed of these things by a supernatural revelation. The idea of majesty or trinity is not the idea that would naturally be attached to the plural term. When it was brought within the sphere of revelation and used in its plural form to designate the one true God, it was done because there was no other generally understood name by which to call him. Elohim really has no singular form. El (or Eloah) denotes, not one god, but one among many gods, in so far as it designates an individual at all. Had the writer of Gen. i. said, "In the beginning El created the heaven and the earth," the statement would have been as polytheistic as it is in the present case, perhaps even more so. It would have meant that one among the many gods did it; and the ancient Hebrew might have asked, "Which one of them did it, Ra, or Osiris, or Baal, or Chemosh?" and so on through the list. And he actually did ask it, even though no term of the singular number was here used. The doctrine that there is only one God was lost and found again. At the time when Genesis is generally supposed to have been written, it was in process of being found. The new revelations had to coin new words and adapt old ones, as well as it might, just as Christianity had to do in the case of the Greek language. In order that the recipients of the new revelations might eventually no longer doubt that there is only one God, expedients had to be resorted to. The use of no one term, whether of the singular or plural form, would settle the question. One of these expedients, we may suppose, was a syntactical one—the use of the singular verb, or of the definite article, with Elohim; perhaps another was the invention, or at any rate the adoption, of a new memorial name by which the true God should ever afterward be distinguished; perhaps another was a course of experimental

tests—Jehovah permitting himself, so to speak, to be brought into collision with the so-called gods of the nations, in order that the Hebrews might have sensible proof of his superiority and, finally, of the nothingness of the other gods. The biblical revelation, of course, always insists on a rigid monotheism; and the very fact that it does this so strenuously, even in its earliest stages, seems to imply that monotheism was not the prevailing belief at that time. Here and there a pre-Mosaic saint, like Abraham, may have been a monotheist. But it is a noticeable fact that in his appearances to Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and the Israelites, Jehovah was accustomed to introduce himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, “the God of thy fathers,” “the God which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt,” thus enabling those to whom he appeared to identify him, instead of mistaking him for some other god. The term Elohim was originally polytheistic, a simple ordinary plural, and not a metaphysical one. But when the Hebrew language came to be used as the vehicle of revelation, a new meaning was gradually given this word just as new meanings were given many others. But if a polytheistic Egyptian, or Canaanite, familiar with the Hebrew language, had read the first verse of Genesis, he would probably have understood it in a polytheistic sense, unless the singular verb with which Elohim is construed had been suggestive to him of something more than bad syntax. It seems to me, therefore, that so far as the use of the plural Elohim in Gen. i., and other passages, is concerned, we can infer nothing whatever concerning the polytheistic or monotheistic nature of the religion of Israel. The fact appears to be that the *religion* was monotheistic, while the *people* were polytheistic, at least for a long while. “Jehovah, he is God; there is none else beside him,” was a truth which they did not learn in a day.

Nor do I think that the plural expression “we will make,” in verse 26, hints at any degree of polytheism within the sphere of revelation; nor does it contain a suggestion of the trinity or of majesty. As in the case of Elohim, so remote and vague a suggestion of the trinity could not have been distinguished at that early day from polytheism—the very error against which it was so earnestly desired to protect Israel. It may suggest the trinity to us, but it could not have done so to the first readers of the passage, and this latter is the main point. And as for the royal “we,” aside from the fact that such a use of the pronoun is extremely rare in the Old Testament, and perhaps altogether unknown to the writer of Genesis, the pronoun “I,” when God speaks, is vastly more royal than “we.” How would it do to substitute “we” for “I” in this passage: “Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?” and in other similar ones? It would not do at all. The expression under consideration is a quotation. If the author had been using the indirect style of discourse, he might have written, “And God said that he would make man,” using the singular instead of the plural verb. But he puts words into the mouth of God, still using the word Elohim in the singular sense, as he had done in the preceding instances. Elohim, with him, is still one, and the only one. I conceive that he quotes him here as saying “*We will make,*” because in the revelation-vision (whether poetical or real) Elohim was represented to him as addressing the intelligent and holy beings whom he had already created. Doubtless these had witnessed with great joy and expressions of praise the creative acts just described, and now Elohim by way of loving concession, as a father to his children, says to them: “We will now make man in the same image and likeness as you and I are. He also shall be one of the sons of God.”

Nor does this view at all require that we should go to the extreme of ancient Jewish vagaries in regard to angelic co-operation with God in the work of creation, though it postulates the generally admitted fact that the existence of angelic beings was recognized in the earliest ages even where there had been no direct supernatural revelation on the subject.

This exegesis may be wrong; but it is respectfully submitted. It is not polytheistic, and it violates no known facts in the case, nor does it involve a metaphysical and unhistorical presupposition of the doctrine of the trinity, or of the so-called *pluralis majestatis*.

---

## THE CAPHTORIM.

WHO WERE THESE PEOPLE AND WHERE WAS THEIR ORIGINAL HOME?

BY REV. A. HALLEN,

The Caphtorim are mentioned in the Old Testament in Deut. II. 23, and Gen. x. 4. Caphtor is found in Deut. II. 23; Jer. XLVII. 4, and Amos IX. 7. According to Deut. II. 23, the Caphtorim came forth from Caphtor, destroyed the Avvim, who dwelt along the southern sea-coast of Palestine, and occupied their country. The usual name for this people in the Old Testament is Philistines. In harmony with this it is said in Amos IX. 7, that Jehovah brought the Philistines up from Caphtor, as he brought Israel from Egypt; and Jeremiah calls the Philistines the "remnant of the isle (or sea-coast) of Caphtor."

Four different countries have been regarded as the Caphtor of the Bible:

1) Cappadocia. This view is supported by the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version and the Targums. The only reason that led these ancient versions to render Caphtor Cappadocia was probably the similarity in sound between the two names. But even this support fails when we learn that the ancient name of Cappadocia was Catpatuk.

2) Cyprus. Against this identification speaks the fact that Cyprus, in the Old Testament, is called Chittim, which by no means resembles Caphtor.

3) Crete. Many considerations favor this view. In Zeph. II. 5, and Ezek. XXV. 16, the Philistines are identified with the Cherethim; and in 1 Sam. XXX. 14, the land of the Philistines, or at least a part of it, is called "the South of the Cherethim." Cherethim is probably the Hebrew word for Cretans, and the Septuagint renders it *Κρηται* in Ezek. XXV. 16, and Zeph. II. 5. Caphtor is called an island by Jeremiah. Greek and Roman writers also favor this supposition. Stephanus relates that Gaza, the chief city of the Philistines, was called Minoa, after the Cretan sea-king Minos, who came there with his brothers Acakos and Rhadamantos, and named the place after himself. Tacitus, mistaking the Jews for the Philistines, states that they left Crete and settled on the extreme border of Lybia.

On the other hand, there are some strong objections to this identification. In Gen. x. 13, 14, the Caphtorim are classed as belonging to Egypt, and Crete is too far removed from that country to be counted as belonging to it. The Philistines are said, verse 14, to have come forth from the territory of the Casluhim, which is generally admitted to be Casiotis, or the country between the Delta of the

Nile and Palestine. It also seems improbable that the Caphtorim should come by water from distant Crete and be able to destroy the powerful Avvim and take their country, or that the Phœnicians would allow another sea-faring people to settle in their immediate vicinity.

4) The Delta of the Nile.

We regard this solution of the problem as the true one. The genealogical table in the tenth chapter of Genesis, which really is geographical and ethnographical, places the Caphtorim among the descendants of Mizraim, and we must therefore seek for their home somewhere in Egypt. The same table further states that the Philistines came from the territory of the Casluhim, which, as already has been said, belonged to Egypt. This, however, seems to contradict the fact that they came from Caphtor. Some scholars have therefore thought that the relative clause in verse 14 has been misplaced and that the passage should read "Caphtorim, whence went forth the Philistines." That such a mistake has been made is possible, but hardly probable, as the parallel passage in 1 Chron. i. 12, has the same reading as Gen. x. 13, 14. A more acceptable explanation may be given. When the Philistines left the Delta they passed through Casiotis, and perhaps stayed there for a while, and when they entered Palestine they actually came forth from the land of the Casluhim. The comparative ease with which a strong people might enter the country of the Avvim in this way and expel or destroy its inhabitants must also be taken into consideration.

Ebers has shown in his "Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's" that the Delta was called by the Egyptians "kaft" or "kaft-ur" (great kaft). As it was a sea-coast, or almost an island, it was also called by its Phœnician settlers "Ai-kaft," Ai (𐤀) meaning *sea-coast* or *island* and kaft *curved* or *bent*, from a Hebrew root *kaphath* which also is found in Egyptian. Ai-kaft then means *the curved sea-coast*, which is a fitting name for the land about the mouths of the Nile. This name is similar to the Greek *Αιγυπτος*, which the Greeks probably derived from it through the Phœnicians.

But whence came the inhabitants of the Delta? They were not Egyptians. These latter first settled in Upper Egypt and then pushed gradually northward. The Delta was occupied by Phœnicians. This sea-faring people very early became acquainted with the unoccupied coast of Lower Egypt, and began to settle there. They founded the maritime towns of Tanis and Herakleopolis-parva. As they increased in number they moved southward, came in contact with the Egyptians and gradually adopted their culture. They preserved their independence, and their kings reigned as cotemporary dynasties (the ninth and tenth) during the reign of the sixth, seventh and eighth dynasties. In the time of the 12th dynasty, Semitic families were seeking admittance also in Upper Egypt, as is seen from monuments belonging to that time. That there was close intercourse between Phœnicia and Egypt is proved by the fact that the Phœnicians very early got their alphabet from the Egyptian hieratical characters. It was then simplified, and became the basis of the Hebrew and Greek alphabets. This derivation of the Phœnician alphabet from the complicated hieratical characters could hardly have taken place if the two peoples had not lived together in Egypt. Monuments in Phœnicia and Egypt testify of intercourse between the two countries. Phœnicia itself was called "kaft" or "kafatha," as the table of Kanopus shows, where in the Greek translation "kaft" is rendered *φοινίκης*. The name of the colony had been transferred to the mother country.

During the thirteenth dynasty there was a great influx of Semites who finally overpowered the legitimate kings and reigned under the name of Hyksos in Lower Egypt for 500 years, or from about 2150 till about 1650 B. C. During this time the Israelites came down to Egypt and were well received by the kindred rulers of the country. The legitimate kings, who had withdrawn to Upper Egypt, at last succeeded in expelling the intruders, and most of them returned to Asia. A part of the Caphtorim probably left Egypt at the same time, passed through the territory of the Casluhim, occupied the southern coast of Palestine, and became almost neighbors to their Phœnician ancestors. At the time of the exodus the Philistines were already settled in their country and were very powerful, as is seen from Exod. XIII. 17. According to Gen. XX. 21, 26, the Philistines dwelt in Gerar as early as the time of Abraham and Isaac. This would imply that already at that time some Philistines had settled there, coming either from Caphtor or Phœnicia. The inhabitants of that region may, however, be called Philistines, not because they really were so, but because they inhabited a country which afterwards was called Philistia.

The Phœnicians had colonies not only in Egypt, but also in Asia Minor, the islands of the Ægean Sea, Crete, Italy and Africa. There were probably settlers in Crete both from Phœnicia and Lower Egypt, and these kept up intercourse with their former homes. When the Hyksos were expelled a part of the Caphtorim may have removed to Crete, and when later they were pressed by the Greeks they may have joined their brethren who had already found a home in Palestine. Thus the previously mentioned identification of the Philistines with the Cretans may be explained.

The Phœnicians, and therefore the settlers in the Delta, and the Philistines were, as has already been suggested, Semites. This is proved by their language and religion. The Phœnician language, as found on monuments and coins, is closely allied to the Hebrew, and so is the remnant of the Philistine tongue that is preserved in the names of kings and cities mentioned in the Old Testament. It is also evident that the Hebrews found no difficulty in understanding their Philistine neighbors. Both the Phœnicians and the Philistines worshiped the old Semitic gods, Baal and Astarte. We feel, therefore, safe in affirming that they were Semitic peoples. In the Bible division of mankind, however, they are placed among the Hamites. But that division is not altogether based on real race distinctions. The ancients did not possess our means and ability of tracing the affinities of the different nations, but divided them more according to their civilization and usages than according to their origin. The Phœnicians and Philistines therefore were classed as belonging to a family entirely different from the Hebrews. A true classification would, no doubt, designate at least a part of the Hamites, and perhaps all of them, as a branch of the Semites which had attained to a civilization different from that of their other Semitic brethren.

## THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,  
Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

- APRIL 10. JOSEPH EXALTED. Gen. XLI. 33-48.  
APRIL 17. JOSEPH MAKES HIMSELF KNOWN. Gen. XLV. 1-15.  
APRIL 24. JOSEPH AND HIS FATHER. Gen. XLVII. 1-12.  
MAY 1. ISRAEL IN EGYPT. Exod. I. 6-14.  
MAY 8. THE CHILD MOSES. Exod. II. 1-10.

The one common subject of these five lessons is Israel in Egypt. If the account of the descent of the Israelite people into Egypt, and their residence there, is to be regarded as historical, it must be understood consistently with itself, and with the other known facts in the case. This is a self-evident principle of interpretation, but one which is not in all particulars followed in our received traditional understanding of this part of the Bible. For fifteen centuries preceding the one in which we live, the interpretation of the Old Testament has descended to us through a succession of men who paid little attention to the geography of the countries where the events occurred, who were entirely without the helps which recent investigations have brought to light, and who were actuated by a disposition to make the Bible stories as wonderful as possible. Most of us received the stories, with this interpretation put upon them, when we were little children; we bring our imperfect childish conception of the matter into our present understanding of it. In the circumstances, none of us should be surprised if, on reviewing the evidence, we find that we have been accustomed to suppose that the Bible teaches some things which it clearly does not teach, concerning these events. These considerations are especially important just now, because many who deny the credibility of the facts stated in the Bible, really base their denials quite as much on what the Bible is commonly supposed to mean, as on what the Bible says.

In Gen. XLVI., Exod. I., VI., is a list of "all the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt" (Gen. XLVI. 26). The question of the ages of these persons is of some importance in itself, and of more importance for the light it throws on other matters. Jacob was 130 years old when he came to Egypt, Gen. XLVII. 9. Joseph was then thirty-nine (Gen. XLI. 46, 53; XLV. 11). It follows that Jacob was ninety-one years old when Joseph was born, and ninety-seven years old when he returned to Canaan. If we suppose the interval between Jacob's service for his wives and that for his cattle, Gen. XXXI. 41, etc., to have been twenty years, Reuben, Joseph's oldest brother, may have been twenty-six years older than himself, that is, may have been about sixty-five years old at the descent to Egypt. Evidently, the older sons of Jacob were old enough to have children and grandchildren of their own. On the other hand, within the thirty-three years after Jacob's return, there had occurred the marriage of Judah, the births of the three sons of that marriage, the successive marriages and deaths of the two elder sons, then an interval of some years, and after that the births of Pharez and Zerah, Gen. XXXVIII. It follows that the latter must have been very little boys, at the time of the going down into Egypt, and that Hezron and Hamul, Gen. XLVI. 12,

were born some years later. Further, Benjamin was born after Jacob returned to Canaan, Gen. xxxv. 18. Hence his ten sons, Gen. XLVI. 21, if they were all born before the descent into Egypt, must have been young boys at that time, and probably from more mothers than one. Again, Joseph was twenty-eight years old at the time of the dreams of the chief butler and chief baker, Gen. xli. 46, 1. He had then been for a considerable time in prison, and had previously for a long time been Potiphar's overseer, Gen. xxxix. 5, 6, and had before that had time to make the reputation that led to his appointment. From these instances it appears that Jacob's sons and grandsons were old enough to marry, to have families, to do a man's work in the world, when they were not much more than twenty years of age. This confirms the position heretofore taken in these notes, that the extreme ages reached by the patriarchs indicate, not that human life then had a longer average than in subsequent times, but rather that the stock whence Israel sprang was apt occasionally to produce men of extraordinary vigor and length of life.

Were the seventy "souls," a few of them not yet born, with the addition of the wives of Jacob's sons, all the persons who came into Egypt with Jacob? This, I believe, is commonly asserted; but is it what the writer of the list intended us to understand? Are we to understand that among all Jacob's grandchildren there was but one girl? See Gen. XLVI. 17, 7. In view of the early marriages of Benjamin and Joseph and Er, are we to hold that, previous to the descent into Egypt, none of Jacob's sons possessed grandchildren? Further, who are Jacob's daughters, mentioned in Gen. xxxvii. 35; XLVI. 7, and in the latter place expressly distinguished from his sons' daughters? Further still, does this author mean that, when they went to Egypt, they abandoned their numerous servants and retainers?

When Abraham pursued the four kings, he could equip 318 men from among those of his home-born dependants who were available for a sudden emergency, Gen. xiv. 14. Several times afterward, the clan of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is represented as increasing, and never as diminishing, e. g., Gen. xxvi. 16, etc. It is represented that Jacob brought a large re-enforcement from Padan-aram, xxx. 43; xxxi. 16; xxxii. 10; xxxvi. 7, etc. Two only of his ten adult sons had a force sufficient for the capture of Shechem, xxxiv. 25. When the family came into Egypt, they came with their cattle and their goods, XLVI. 6. What became of their servants and retainers? Nothing is said concerning them; the traditional interpretation therefore concludes that the author of Genesis held that there were no servants or retainers of Jacob who came into Egypt—nobody at all except the sixty-seven persons who are named, and the wives of Jacob's sons. Is this a just conclusion?

When we speak of Jacob's sons buying corn in Egypt, I am afraid that the average picture in the minds of Christian people is that of just ten men, leading or riding just ten donkeys, buying so much corn as the ten donkeys could carry, and carrying home their purchase with them. I am afraid that I should be accused of caviling, if I should ask how long it would take the ten heavily loaded donkeys to go from the capital of Egypt to Beer-sheba, or how much corn would be left, after furnishing subsistence for the caravan by the way. If any of us have this idea of the matter, then certainly we need to modify it. Let us modify it not by conjecturally throwing in a few extra donkeys, but by looking at the facts. Unless the clans of Isaac and Jacob had unaccountably dwindled within

a few years, the purchase must have been of a grain-supply for some thousands of people. Egypt at that time possessed systems of transportation both by land and water. The grain business was a monopoly, conducted by Joseph for the king; but the grain was stored in cities in various parts of Egypt, *xli.* 48. In the circumstances, we must think of the ten men riding their asses, their purchase-money with them, making the most respectable show they were able, going to the headquarters for grain-sales, where Joseph was, and transacting their business; the grain itself would naturally be delivered from the most convenient store-city, and by the most convenient transportation, to some place where Jacob's men would meet it with a caravan sufficient for transporting it home.

If we altogether understood the principles on which the genealogies found in the Bible are written, we should doubtless be able to explain just how the seventy "ancestral heads" mentioned in the list are to be distinguished from all other persons; that would carry with it the explanation of the fact that the writers of the Old and New Testaments habitually think of these seventy as properly constituting the Israel that went into Egypt. But if they thought of this fact as historical, they certainly did not understand it as conflicting with the other fact that seems to be so clearly implied in the narrative, namely, that Jacob took to Egypt the whole body of his servants and retainers. It seems to follow that these dependants, since they were mainly of the same race with himself, and were all included in the covenant of circumcision, became gradually blended, while in Egypt, with the blood-kindred of Jacob, so that all alike were reckoned Israelites. As Esau had already become the head and "father" of a strong people, made up largely of the kindred of his wives and their tribesmen, so each of the immediate descendants of Jacob became the ancestral head of a tribe, or a family, not made up exclusively of his lineal descendants, but including others who, for various reasons, came to be identified with that particular division of Israel.

The cases of Simeon, Judah and Joseph, *Gen. xli.* 10, 12, 27, and parallel passages, show that Canaanite or Egyptian blood might be admitted into the Israelite lines of descent. To what extent the Israel that went into Egypt may have there received additions through intermarriages with other peoples, or by adoptions from other peoples, no one is qualified to say; but the circumstances were such as afforded peculiar facilities for growth of this sort.

The duration of the sojourn is described in the Bible in the following forms: Exactly 430 years, *Exod. xii.* 40, 41; 430 years, "in Egypt and in the land of Canaan," *Sept. ibid.*; 430 years, beginning with the date when the covenant was made with Abraham, *Gal. iii.* 17; 400 years, *Gen. xv.* 13, *Acts vii.* 6; the fourth generation, *Gen. xv.* 16. In the tribe of Levi, the names of Levi, Kohath, Amram, Aaron span the time of the sojourn; in some of the other tribes, the generations are more numerous. In the *Sunday School Times* of Jan. 29, 1887, Prof. W. H. Green says that, according to *1 Chron. vii.* 23-27, Joshua is tenth in descent from Jacob. Supposing this to be correct (the list in Chronicles is of uncertain interpretation), and supposing the sojourn in Egypt to have been the 215 years that the Septuagint and St. Paul make it to be, there is room for the entire succession, without supposing any father to have been less than 22 years old at the birth of his eldest son. Certainly all the biblical evidence fits this view of the case, and does not so well fit any other. There has been a disposition among interpreters to stretch the time as much as possible, in order to give time



enough for Israel to multiply to the 600,000 fighting men of the times of the Exodus; but what has been said above as to the number who went into Egypt, and the possibility of increase by absorption, shows that no stretching of this sort is necessary.

The tradition handed down through Syncellus is that the Pharaoh of Joseph was the last of the Shepherd Kings, the last king of the seventeenth dynasty. Between the accession of this king and that of Menepthah, who is commonly regarded as the Pharaoh of the Exodus, the numbers given in Rawlinson make it to have been a period of about 360 years, but with some gaps to be filled, and some doubtful passages to be adjusted. But it is hardly possible that this Pharaoh was one of the Shepherd Kings, Gen. XLVI. 34. A period of 215 years before the Exodus would begin somewhere in the middle years of the famous Thotmes III., perhaps just before he entered upon the expeditions in which he devastated Palestine and Syria. This cast of the dates seems to me much more likely than the other. So great a conqueror as Thotmes needed a man of Joseph's ability at home, to look after his affairs, and keep him from bankrupting his kingdom.

On any theory of the chronology, while Israel was safe and increasing in Egypt, Canaan, the land of their sojournings, was being crossed and recrossed by the armies that carried on the wars of the various Pharaohs. Rameses I., the founder of the nineteenth dynasty, reigned but one year, or a little more. He was succeeded by Seti, who reigned thirty years or more, but who, after twelve years, associated with himself his son, afterward the distinguished Rameses II., at that time a young boy. If common opinion is correct, the foster-mother of Moses was a daughter of either Rameses I. or of Seti. As Rameses II. reigned sixty-seven years, and Moses was eighty years old at some time during the early part of the reign of his successor, Moses and Rameses must have been nearly of an age; as boys, we may fancy that they played and studied together. The policy for oppressing the Israelites began pretty promptly upon the accession of this dynasty. Perhaps the flight of Moses from Egypt occurred not very long after Rameses II. became sole king. In view of these facts, if the Sunday-school publishers of the month do not make a somewhat conspicuous use of the hideous recently unrolled mummy of this Rameses, they will prove themselves unaccountably neglectful of their opportunities.

Josephus (*Ant.*, II., x, xi) tells some wonderful stories concerning the childhood and early manhood of Moses, which he did not obtain from the Scriptures. Probably they come from some work of the Jewish imagination, written in the centuries just before Christ; but the writer knew enough of Egyptian history, as we have now learned it from the monuments, to make some correct points, at least, in the setting in which he has placed his stories; there were Ethiopian wars, for example, at the time assigned to them by the story in Josephus.

## OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

---

The May number of *THE STUDENT* will contain a "book-study" of Hosea by Prof. Francis B. Denio, of the Bangor Theological Seminary.

---

A professorship of the Semitic languages has recently been established in the University of Rio de Janeiro, and a professor appointed by command of Dom Pedro, Emperor of Brazil.

---

Prof. D. Kauffman, of Buda-Pesth, and Dr. A. Berliner, of Berlin, will both publish, in the near future, monographs in reply to the attack made on Judah Halevi's poetry and on the late Leopold Zunz by Professor de Lagarde.

---

The *Knox College* (Toronto) *Monthly* for February contains five contributed articles. The subjects of three of these articles are, "The Moabite Stone," "The Study of the Dead Languages," "The Value of Hebrew to Ministers and Students." The time, it would seem, has come when college-papers shall discuss Old Testament and Semitic topics. This indicates at least two things,—that there is an increased and increasing interest in such subjects; and that the influence of someone is being felt by those connected with the college. Knox College is to be congratulated upon having in its faculty the Rev. J. F. McCurdy, Ph. D.

---

Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. have in press *Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt*, the Stone Lectures for 1887, delivered at Princeton by Rev. Alfred H. Kellogg, D. D. The author has for several years made a special study of Egyptology in its bearings on the Old Testament. The first two lectures deal with the Egyptian and Hebrew chronologies. Lecture III. takes up Joseph in Egypt; IV. Abraham and Moses; V. discusses the place of the Exodus in Egypt's history; VI. "The Pharaoh of the Exodus." Besides numerous notes, references, etc., there is also added a chronological chart which shows at a glance the two chronologies. In an appendix the author will discuss the question whether the name "Hebrews occurs on the monuments."

---

The Chautauqua Hebrew work will be conducted this year as before, except that it will not be under the name of the American Institute of Hebrew. The same advantages will be offered at this school as at the schools of the Institute. It will open July 10th, and continue four weeks. Its corps of instructors will include Prof. Wm. G. Ballantine, D. D., of Oberlin, O., Prof. David G. Lyon, Ph. D., of Cambridge, Mass., Prof. Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., of New Haven, Conn., Prof. D. A. McClenahan, M. A., of Allegheny, Pa., and Prof. R. D. Wilson, Ph. D., of Allegheny, Pa. Instruction will be given not only in Hebrew, but also in the cognates. The classes in Assyrian, under the instruction of America's pioneer Assyriologist, will be particularly attractive.

The American Institute of Hebrew will conduct four Summer Schools of Hebrew during the coming summer. These will be held at Philadelphia (June 16—July 15), at Newton Centre, Mass. (June 30—July 29), at the University of Virginia (July 28—Aug. 26), at Evanston, Ill. (Aug. 4—Sept. 2). Two important items in connection with this announcement are, (1) the change of the location of the Chicago School from Morgan Park, where it has been held for five years, to Evanston, the seat of the North-Western University, with which is connected the Garrett Biblical Institute; and (2) the fact that in the Schools of 1887 *no tuition-fee will be charged*. Arrangements of such a nature have been completed that for about *twenty dollars*, exclusive of traveling expenses, one can spend a month in a most pleasant and profitable work.

---

One of the most necessary yet one of the most difficult things to be done by conscientious students of the Old Testament is the separation of the purely literary questions of the Old Testament from the superstructure of false hypotheses that has been erected on these literary discussions. The question, for example, as to the literary analysis of Genesis, or even of the whole Pentateuch, is one that should be decided independently, without taking into account the further problems of the authorship of the Pentateuch and its position in the development of Old Testament religion. Unfortunately this is not always kept in mind, and accordingly some accept the errors of the one department on account of the truths in the other, and others reject the truths in the one on account of the errors in the other. The great trouble with our analysts is that they cannot acknowledge a limit to their knowledge, and think that, having settled with a comparative unanimity a division of the Pentateuch into documents, they must, at all hazards, build up a general scheme of religious development on the basis of their literary analysis.

---

Rev. F. A. Klein, the discoverer of the Mesa-stone, who is now in Germany, but who for the past twenty-six years has been a Protestant missionary in Palestine (five in Nazareth, and twenty-one in Jerusalem), says that the present population of the Holy Land is divided into three parts,—the city people, the village or country people, and the Bedawins. The first are called *madani*, pl. *madanife*; the second *fellah*, pl. *fellahin*; the third, *bedawi*, or inhabitants of the desert. The last named often call themselves simply *el-arab*, the Arabs *par excellence*. These three classes are sharply distinguished from each other by their language, their clothing, the shape and arrangement of their houses, and their general customs and manner of living. The *fellahin* are considered the lowest in the land, and the word *fellah* is often used in derision. The inhabitants of the cities imitate the ways of western civilization, and pity the poor peasants. The latter, in turn, are the object of the supreme contempt of the Bedawins. Rev. Klein gives a most graphic and instructive description of the manners and customs of the *fellahin* in the *Journal of the German Palestine Society*, vol. III.

---

In one department of Old Testament study, the older generations of scholars were far in advance of the present. We refer to the study of the post-biblical Hebrew, as this appears in the Mishna, Talmuds, Midrashim and Targums. This

bears the same relation to the biblical Hebrew that the modern Greek does to the ancient. Indeed, its relative importance for the study of biblical Hebrew is much greater. In the days of the Buxtorfs, Christian scholars were thoroughly at home in this field. At the present date, those who can find their bearings in it are few and far between. At the head of these few stands the venerable Prof. Franz Delitzsch, of Leipzig, whose work in this department, however, falls mostly in his younger days. The most energetic Christian scholar in this field now is Lic. Dr. Aug. Wünsche, who has translated into German a collection of old Midrashim, and has published them in thirty-four pamphlets in the *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, and who has just issued the first half of a translation of the Haggadic portions of the Babylonian Talmud. Professor Strack, of Berlin, is also thoroughly at home in this field, and in connection with Professor Siegfried, of Jena, has published a short grammar of post-biblical Hebrew. The *Instituta Judaica*, established within the past few years at nine German universities, are devoting much time and attention to the literature.

The current number of *Hebraica* is one of the most interesting and instructive that has as yet been published. The opening article is by Rev. Philip A. Nordell, "On the Synonyms 'Adhah (עֲדָה) and Qahal (קָהָל).'" These synonyms are treated in a scholarly manner in the light of all the Old Testament texts in which they occur, and the author comes to the conclusion that "the 'adhath Israel was the technical name of the whole body of circumcised males above twenty years of age, who either represented all the people, or were represented by the heads of their respective families," and that "the qahal was, in general, the name of any theocratic gathering of the people, and was composed of those who freely responded to a summons proceeding directly or indirectly from Israel's divine king." Richard J. H. Gottheil, Ph. D., follows with a *critique* of Kottek's "Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum." Perhaps the most interesting to Hebrew scholars is the article by Dr. Chas. A. Briggs on "The Strophical Organization of Hebrew Trimeters." The subject is treated at great length, and the article will undoubtedly cause much discussion among scholars. Robert F. Harper, Ph. D., gives eight pages of corrections (photo-engraved) to the Cyls. A and B of the Esarhaddon inscriptions as published in I. and III. Rawlinson. The Rev. F. J. X. O'Connor, S. J., gives a photo-engraved page showing the variations between the Nebuchadnezzar inscription in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, and an unpublished inscription of the same king in the British Museum. In addition, a list of the various inscriptions of this king is added. "The Jewish Grammarians of the Middle Ages" are treated by Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph. D.; and notes on Mabbul (מַבּוּל), N'philim (נְפִילִים), etc., are given by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D. D.

## → BOOK NOTICES. ←

### ORIENT.\*

In the first of a series of five lectures published in this book, Dr. Cook discusses Palestine, Egypt and the future of Islara. The lectures contain some most admirable word-painting. "God in history in Palestine," "Palestine a bridge between Egypt and Assyria," "Possible future of Syria," "The future of Mohammedanism" are a few of the points taken up. Other lectures follow on "Advanced thought in India," "Keshub Chunder Sen and Hindu theism," "Woman's work for women in India," "Japan, the self-reformed Hermit nation," "Australia, the Pacific Ocean, and International Reform."

### CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY.†

Of this volume, sixty-eight pages are given to the Old Testament, forty-five pages to the New Testament, eighty-six pages to Historic Theology, sixty-three pages to Systematic Theology, fifty-four pages to Practical Theology. It is in the first department that we are particularly interested.

The first chapter treats of "Semitic Studies" in general, in which reference is made to the development of this work in America. The second treats of "Old Testament Introduction," in which a brief survey of Wellhausen's theory of the Pentateuch is presented, together with notices of recent books by Green, Bissell and Vos, in support of the Mosaic authorship, and of recent works by conservative German scholars. The leading German scholars are classified as follows: (1) Supporters of the post-exilic codification of the Priest's Code (the Wellhausen or Grafian hypothesis) are Budde, of Bonn; Stade, of Giessen; Duhm and H. Schultz, of Göttingen; Giesebrecht, of Greifswald; Kneucker, of Heidelberg; Siegfried, of Jena; Delitzsch, Guthe and König, of Leipzig; Cornill, of Marburg; Kayser (d. 1885), Nowack and Reuss, of Strassburg; Kautzsch, of Tübingen; Smend, of Basel; Vuilleumeir, of Lausanne; Steiner, of Zürich. (2) Supporters of the Priest's Code as an older document are: Dillmann and Strack, of Berlin; Köhler, of Erlangen; Bredenkamp, of Greifswald; Klostermann (?), of Kiel; Mühlau and Volck, of Dorpat. (3) Critics who mediate between the two schools are: Kamphausen, of Bonn; Ryssel (?), of Leipzig; Baudissin, of Marburg. Only *one* Old Testament professor in Germany, Bachmann, defends the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But, as Prof. Curtiss remarks, "this is not a question to be settled by votes." The third chapter is given to "Hermeneutics," and the fourth to "Old Testament Theology," in which general

\* ORIENT. With Preludes on Current Events. By Joseph Cook. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 8vo, pp. 340. Price, \$1.50.

† CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. By Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. IV. Pp. 338. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell. Price, \$1.50.

questions relating to this study are discussed. The spirit of this presentation and its execution, are all that could be desired in view of the small amount of space at the disposal of the author. There are not a few who would be pleased to have Dr. Curtiss publish in full his lectures on Old Testament Theology. It is a matter for congratulation that the publication of the "Current Discussions" is to be continued.

---

#### CHEYNE'S JOB AND SOLOMON.\*

---

When we recall the fact that Dr. Cheyne has published, within a very few years, commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and other Minor Prophets, we cannot but express surprise at the appearance of this new volume from his pen.

The writer seeks to apply to the Books of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Ecclesiastes, the same principles of criticism which have recently played so important a part in Pentateuch-study. Many suppose that the literary criticism is confined to the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and perhaps a few other books like Zechariah. These portions, it is true, have received most attention; but now the critic's work will cover all parts of Sacred Writ.

The work is introduced by a discussion "How is Old Testament Criticism Related to Christianity?" It is the author's belief that the day of "negative criticism is past," as well as "the day of a cheap ridicule of all critical analysis."

In fifteen chapters (pp. 115) on Job, six are given to the general interpretation of the various parts of the book, and in the remaining there are discussed (1) the traditional basis and purpose of Job, the growth of the book; (2) the date and place of composition; (3) argument from mythology; "one of the peculiarities of our poet is his willingness to appropriate mythic forms of expression from heathenism;" (4) argument from the doctrine of angels; (5) argument from parallel passages; (6) the disputed passages, especially the speeches of Elihu; (7) is Job a Hebraeo-Arabic poem? (8) the book from a religious point of view; (9) the book from a general and western point of view.

From this brief synopsis, it will be seen that the great questions of the book are considered. It need not be added that the discussion is at once scholarly and judicious. It is true, however, that Dr. Cheyne has taken such advanced ground that very few on this side of the ocean will be ready to follow him. There are no longer very many who feel compelled to acknowledge a veritable Job, or rather to understand the events and colloquies as having literally taken place. A large number will agree with the author in assigning the speeches of Elihu to a different writer. The assignment of the book to a late period will also be accepted by many. But the average Bible-student and conservative scholarship will be slow to grant any considerable degree of willingness on the part of the author of Job "to appropriate mythic forms of expression from heathendom." Dr. Cheyne's explanation of this willingness, granting that it exists, is certainly satisfactory: "It was not due to a feeble grasp of his own religion; it was rather due

---

\* JOB AND SOLOMON; or, The Wisdom of the Old Testament. By the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M. A., D. D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation at Oxford. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1 Paternoster Square. 1887. 8vo, pp. 309. Price, \$1.25.

partly to the poet's craving for imaginative ornament, partly to his sympathy with his less developed readers, and a sense that some of these forms were admirably adapted to give reality to the conception of the 'living God.'"

Dr. Cheyne is certainly an adept in the work of comparing parallel passages; and he with great truth remarks that "a great point has been gained in one's critical and exegetical training when he has learned so to compare parallel passages as to distinguish true from apparent resemblances, and to estimate the degree of probability of imitation."

We cannot go into the details of his work on Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Ecclesiastes; it will suffice to say that every-where there is evidence of the same calm and judicious weighing of opinions, and of the same advanced critical positions. The book is not one in which the ordinary Bible-student will be greatly interested; but the special student will find it rich in suggestion, and a model of critical research. We can only regret that it was not possible for the author to give us the philological notes which, according to his original design, were to have been included.

## CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

### AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- La Sainte Bible.* Texte de la Vulgate, traduction française en regard avec commentaries. Introduction générale. T. 2. VIII. Géographie et archéologie bibliques; par M. l'abbé Trochon. Paris: lib. Lethilleux. 1887. 704 p. 14 plans et gravure 3, 8.
- The Patriarchal Times.* By T. Whitelaw. London: Nisbet. 1887. 8vo, pp. 306. ....6s.
- Chrysostom: a Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation.* By F. H. Chase. London: Bell & Son. 1887. 8vo, pp. 208. ....6s.
- The Pharaohs of the Bondage and the Exodus.* Lectures by Charles S. Robinson, D. D., LL. D. New York: The Century Co. 12mo, pp. 199. ....\$0.50
- Die hebraeische Sprache als Sprache der Bibel.* By K. Furrer. Zurich: Schulthess. 1887. 8vo, pp. 26. ....M.0.80
- Der Prophet Jesaja, erläutert.* 2 Lfg. By C. J. Bredekamp. Erlangen: Deichert. 1887. 8vo, pp. 85-223. ....M.2.
- Untersuchungen ueber die Textgestalt und die Echtheit d. Buches Micha.* Ein krit. Commentar zu Micha. Leipzig: Hirzel. 1887. 8vo, pp. viii, 284. ....M.8.
- Beitraege zur jued. Alterthumskunde.* 1. Thl. Abhandlungen. Midrasch Tadsche, nach Handschriften edirt (in hebr. Sprache). By A. Epstein. Wien: Lippe. 1887. 8vo, pp. vi, 185. ....M.4.
- Seven, the Sacred Number; its use in Scripture and its application to Biblical Criticism.* By R. Samuel. London: Kegan Paul. 1887. 8vo, pp. 482. ....10s.6d.
- La Sainte Bible, ou l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament.* Version d'Ostervald révisée. Nancy: Impr. Berger, Levrault et Cie. 1887. 8vo, pp. vii, 1167.

### ARTICLES.

- Significance in Oriental Names.* By William Wright, D. D., in S. S. Times, March 5, '87.
- Caravan Traffic in the Ancient World.* By Canon George Rawlinson, lb., March 19, '87.
- Old Testament Criticism for Readers of the English Bible.* By Prof. Howard Osgood, lb.
- The Coat of Many Colors.* By Prof. Isaac H. Hall, lb.
- The Name and Position of Pottphar.* By Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, lb.
- History of the Pentateuchal Composition Controversy.* By Prof. Dr. Eduard König, lb., March 26, '87.

- Old Testament Typography.* By Rev. J. F. Riggs in New York Observer, March 17, '87.
- The Synthetic Pentateuch.* IV. The Book of Numbers. By J. B. Thomas, D. D., in National Baptist, March 17, '87.
- Interpretation of Some Difficult Texts.* By Howard Osgood, D. D., in Homiletic Review, March, '87.
- Critical Theology, Kuenen on the Hexateuch.* Unitarian Review, March, '87.
- The New Testament in the Old.* By Prof. John De Witt in Herald and Presbyterian, March 9, '87.
- Ezekiel and the Critics.* Jewish Messenger, March 11, '87.
- Der Baum des Lebens.* By G. Zetlow in Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben., I., '87.
- Jesaja XV. en XVI.* By Dr. H. Oort in Theol. Tijdschr., I., '87.
- Apokalyptische Studien.* [Die Apokalypse des Esra in syrischer Sprache.] By L. E. Iselin in Theol. Ztschr. aus d. Schweiz, I., '87.
- Das Neue Testament u. die moderne alttestamentliche, besonders pentateuchliche Kritik.* By R. Kübel in Bewels des Glaubens, Jan., '87.
- The Hittite Hieroglyphics Deciphered.* In Episcopal Record, March 17, '87.
- The Relation of the Old Testament to the New.* By Prof. R. V. Foster in Cumberland Presbyterian, March 17, '87.
- The Route of the Exodus.* By C. R. Gillett in Independent, March 24, '87.
- The Prophet Amos.* I. Jehovah, God of Israel. By Rev. Prof. A. B. Davidson, D. D., in Expositor, March, '87.
- The Work of Bible Revision in Germany.* 2. Critical Part. By Prof. H. L. Strack, lb.
- Gold, Bedolach, and Shoham Stone.* A Study of Gen. II. 10-14. By Principal Sir J. W. Dawson, LL. D., F. R. S., lb.
- Abraham et Isaac en Egypte et à Gherar.* By R. Chatelanat in Revue de theol. et de philos., I., '87.
- The Bahr-Jusuf and the Prophecy of Jacob.* By F. Cope Whitehouse in PSBA., VIII., '85-'86, pp. 6-25; pp. 57, 58.
- The Meters of David.* By C. J. Ball, lb.

### REVIEWS.

- Prophet Jesaja* (by C. J. Bredekamp). In Theol. Litblt., 1886, 48; by Zlummer in Bewels des Glaubens, Jan., '87.
- The Jewish and the Christian Messiah* (by V. H. Stanton). In Theol. Lit., by E. Schürer.