

THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

VOL. III.

FEBRUARY, 1884.

No. 6.

MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM. ITS PRACTICAL BEARINGS.

By J. A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of the *Standard*, Chicago.

The Bible offers itself to the student under two chief aspects,—as a literature and as a revelation. I suppose I may assume that, as a revelation, the Bible is not a subject of criticism at all. That is to say, it is not the purpose—cannot be—of rightly guided biblical study to criticise, or subject to rationalistic tests of any kind whatever, *ascertained* revelation. There may be, and is often, a question as to what *is* revelation: as to what is the *meaning* of language, made the vehicle of the divine thought or message. But surely, it is no violent assumption to take it for granted that, once ascertained, the revelation is a subject, not for criticism, but for faith.

Another preliminary view which seems to require no argument is that what we have to preach and teach, in our efforts to bring others under the sway of Bible truth, is not the Bible as literature, but the Bible as revelation. The literary element may be a great help to us in teaching, or in seeking to illustrate and impress the revealed truth; but that which we aim at, as the ultimate, real purpose, is not to interest others in the Bible as literature, but to make them feel its power as truth; or, if the former of these may be to some extent proposed and sought, it must always be in subordination to, and in the service of, the latter.

I. Now, the first point which seems to offer itself for more extended consideration is this,—that we ought, in dealing practically with the work and results of biblical criticism, to frankly admit that such criticism, applied to the Bible as literature, is, in itself, entirely legitimate; and that it is in no wise inconsistent, when rightly conducted, with

due reverence for the Bible as revelation. Of course, we use the word "criticism" here, in that sense which has come to be conventionally an accepted one, in this connection. There is a process of this nature through which all ancient literatures need to pass, not so much—as in the case of that which is modern—to ascertain its worth and value, or to test its conformity to admitted rules of literary excellence, but with a view to settle a variety of questions, which must necessarily arise in connection with writings whose date lies perhaps thousands of years back of our own, and which are due to conditions radically unlike existing ones. When the gates of the Sanskrit, swinging wide, gave admission to that wonderful domain of ancient intellectual life, no one can be surprised that the favored explorers who entered there, felt that more was required of them than simply to discover and admire. Those who were not thus favored had, indeed, the right to expect of them that they would bring reports of researches on that field in which should appear the results of intelligent scrutiny, assignments of that old literature to its appropriate dates, exhibitions of it in due mutual relations, with real and valuable accessions to our knowledge of that dim old world, as found in what there remains of its thought, its worship, and its life. So with the Egyptian papyrus, or the Chaldæan tablet. The rich results of exploration and decipherment simply provide new work for the critic. Archæology without him would be scarcely better than a pathless jungle, in which any ordinary student must infallibly lose his way.

Now, we have long since ceased to feel any strong impression from the fact,—which nevertheless is a notable one,—that the Bible which lies on our tables, or in our pulpits, is a literature, in the earlier portions of it, belonging to a past as ancient, perhaps more ancient, than any of these others. While these books—for the Bible is more a library than a book—while these books were in course of preparation, Chaldæa, and Babylon, and Egypt, and Assyria, and Phœnicia, and Greece, and Rome, each played its great part on the scene of empire. The Hebrew writer was contemporaneous with the Aryan, the Chaldæan, and the Egyptian. The Hebrew nation had a literature long before the date of any that survives of the Greeks. The roots of this literature, in fact, lie far back in the world before the flood; the oldest, most truly primitive utterance anywhere to be heard in human speech.

Such, at least, as this the Bible presents itself to us. If there are those who are interested to examine into the evidences of this high antiquity, either for the whole, or for portions of the earlier books; if scholars, competent to the task, feel themselves called to a scrutiny of

this old literature, somewhat of the same nature as that applied to other literary monuments of the same general period; even if their conclusions are, in some instances, out of harmony with what has perhaps been long accepted without scrutiny,—it seems to be a line of inquiry to which the very antiquity of these books necessarily invites, and a form of service which, for those prepared for it, may be even a duty. Even where it may seem to us that the enthusiasm of the specialist carries him away, or that the critic fails to set forth upon his career of scrutiny from first principles sufficiently sound and safe, we ought, in any case, to admit without demur that the work itself, so undertaken, is equally legitimate and necessary. We ought not to demand that, in an age when archæological research is achieving such wonders in every part of that ancient world where the first human abodes were built, the book in our hands which is, even in an archæological point of view, so significant in all its relations, and so precious in itself, shall remain for purposes of learned inquiry with a jealous seal of pre-appropriation upon its every page. Whether we agree with him at all points or not, must we not grant, in a spirit of warm and high appreciation, that the reverent and careful biblical critic devotes himself to one of the noblest functions to which scholarship and genius can be called?

II. The second point upon which I dwell for a little time is, that the findings of the critics are themselves, even for us who are not critics, fairly and justly open to scrutiny. This sounds so much like a truism, that I hesitate to state it in this form; and still I can think of no other way in which to put succinctly what I have in mind. And besides, after what has just been said, this which I now urge cannot be omitted. It is another truism, perhaps, in some sense, to say that the conviction of another mind, however gifted or well informed, cannot be a conviction for us. Yet, in certain cases, we find occasion to affirm this to ourselves, if not openly.

To take an instance lying close at hand, where a certain critic denies the Messianic character of the Second Psalm, we may any of us have a right to feel astonished at finding him reasoning in this way: "This psalm is quoted in the New Testament, and applied to Messiah by the early Christian disciples in Jerusalem (Acts IV., 25); by Paul (XIII., 3); and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (I., 5). We may therefore presume that it was the current interpretation of the day. Yet internal evidence is against the exposition." It is certainly competent for any one of us in such a case as this to decide for himself whether to accept Dr. Davidson's ideas as to the "internal evidence" of the psalm,—what he understands it to say for itself as to its own

Messianic character or otherwise,—as against the usage of inspired men, witnesses appointed and endowed by Messiah himself. We may even go so far as to judge for ourselves what the psalm does really mean, and whether the king seated upon the holy hill of Zion is not far more likely to be, in the sublime phraseology used, the King of kings than either David or his son, whether a strain so lofty and so exulting can be fairly treated if belittled to the proportions of an earthly sovereignty and a material throne, though it should be that of a Solomon or a David.

Some use might be in point here of the fact, how seldom it is that critical judgments of this nature carry with them the suffrages of enlightened Christian opinion to such an extent as to give them justification or endorsement. They meet with much the same fortune as we observe, under like conditions, in general literature. The destructive critic, even when he is in the right, sets himself a hard task: much more when he is in the wrong. Even the poems of Ossian seem hard to discredit; for ever and again some cultured scholar comes forward, if not to justify Macpherson, nevertheless to treat the poems themselves as representative of what may belong to the literary annals of a primitive people. That Homer was a genuine personality, and that both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were his own matchless achievements in epic song, the world goes on believing, in spite of the German critic who first denied both the one and the other of these, and in spite of all who have laboriously followed in his steps. It required all the genius, all the learning, and all the immense fighting capacity of Richard Bentley to pull down the "Letters of Phalaris" from the high place where Temple and Boyle had set them; while even Bentley's learned and caustic criticism of the various editions of *Æsop* leaves the Phrygian fabulist just where he was before in the world's homage and faith. It seems a difficult matter to displace from among even the dramas of Shakspeare's plays manifestly not his; and, as to the Shakspearean authorship of these dramas as a whole, it is doubtful if a mathematical demonstration could really put Bacon in the place of the Stratford miracle, whom the world has wondered after so long. As for instances more germane to the present subject, doubtless there are those who are thoroughly convinced that the author of the Fourth Gospel and the author of the Apocalypse cannot have been one and the same person, and still, do we see any signs of this judgment of the matter prevailing as a final one? Ewald's recent testimony on this point shows that even the critical mind finds satisfactory evidence for at least the Johannean authorship of the Gospel named,—a point which so many have either doubted or denied. Is it not singular that a work of such striking lit-

erary merit as Renan's "*Vie de Jesus*" should be such a failure as to all the ends for which it seems to have been mainly written? And that the mythical theories of Strauss as to the same Man of Nazareth should be, as to any real effect in shaping opinion, very much as if they had never been invented? I suppose that Homer will be Homer so long as the Greek language survives, and Shakspeare will be Shakspeare till the last English book has perished out of the world; and we may feel equally certain that Moses will be Moses, and Isaiah will be Isaiah, and John will be the author of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, and the life of Jesus will be the centre of all history, the manifestation of God in the flesh, "very God of very God," till Bible history, and promise, and prophecy, have their final consummation in the millenium.

It is true enough that a man, whether the author of some critical theory, or of some new view in physical science, or of some invention in the application of mechanics, may be right, and still not succeed in mastering the general conviction of mankind. But the point is, that very confident theorists do fail in this way; that very brilliant performances in the way of attempts at revolutionizing opinion do often remain as brilliant performances merely; and that therefore no theorist can claim dominion over us just by right of genius or by right of learning, however super-abounding and miraculous. And this the more when, as is so often the case, the vital point in the whole issue, whatever that may be, is assumed or supposed, and then reasoned from as if already proved. There is no such magical incantation in the letters "Q. E. D." as will change theory and hypothesis into demonstration.

III. And then, while, let me next observe, we, as Christian workers and teachers, claim the right to judge for ourselves as to the findings of biblical critics, there are reasons why we should, at the same time, see in the modern biblical criticism, in its general character and tendency, what reveals in it, or in connection with it, a Providential purpose. We remember how Voltaire, in his old age, once said to an English visitor: "When critics are silent, it does not so much prove the age to be correct, as dull." So we may say that the worst possible attitude of the world toward the Bible is that of dull indifference. While it is painful to see valued men carried to dangerous extremes by their zeal as specialists; and perhaps the scepticism, even the infidelity of the age, encouraged and supported by the critical theories of scholars who probably are far enough from having any such purpose, still, even this is better, or rather is not so bad as that stupid unconcern which would treat the Bible, whether as literature or as revelation,

as something so slight as to be not even worth attacking. And meanwhile, the critical spirit of the time takes directions in which we may well rejoice. It reaches men fully equal in genius and scholarship to those whose self-appointed mission it seems to be to pull down, and who, upon the other hand, find a far higher mission in building-up. In the hands of such as these, what threatened mischief is turned to good: they catch the weapon as it flies, and use it in courageous and effective defense. The Bible does not suffer in the long run, even when men say the worst they can of it; and when the sincere, but mistaken critic sets some before unnoticed peculiarity in a strong light, so as to fix attention upon it, there is all the more an opportunity for one his equal in ability and his superior in soundness of view, to show what, and no more, the thing in question really imports. Besides, we may say with emphasis that the adversary never overreaches himself more fatally than when by instigating attack upon the Bible, or upon any part of it, he makes Bible-students, where otherwise Bible-study might never have been thought of as having attractions.

IV. It seems to belong to the line of remark here followed that I should say a few things upon what I may call the self-vindictory element in the Bible. We may thus encourage ourselves by taking note how the Bible itself meets and deals with the unfriendly or mistaken critic. It is with the Scripture somewhat as with that marvelous personality sketched for us in the gospels. Is it because so many wise and able and good men have borne testimony in his behalf that the Man of Sorrows has, more and more, age by age, revealed the form and feature of divinity; out of the depths of humiliation once, and now from the heights of infinite enthronement, manifesting God? Or, is it because that personality is its own best witness? And that other word of God, which in another sense was "in the beginning;" and which, in its own way, is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." Can you find any scar on the radiant face, so often smitten? Do you see any sign of weakness or wavering in the attitude in which it stands before the world, even in this time, when atheist and materialist and rationalist are all in arms against it? Save as seen in the calm, self-contained, loving, and sovereign reign of the Christ, I know of nothing in this world so sublime as the simple steadfastness of the Bible, rising like a rock out of the roaring sea of human hate and obloquy.

It may be in place for me to notice here two of the various ways in which the self-vindictory element in the Bible reveals itself. (1) The first is in the fact that what seemed at the outset a question touching what is most radical in our faith in the Bible as a whole, or in particular books, or in what seems to be vital matters of date, authorship,

authenticity, or even truthfulness, is so often found to be, after all, mainly or wholly a question of interpretation. I need not dwell upon this. There are many yet living who can recall the feeling of sensitive alarm with which the criticism by geologists of the Mosaic account of creation was at first viewed. Darwinism seemed at first so formidable in its attitude as to call for the marshalling of the whole phalanx of theological defense. As we have seen Moses, Isaiah, and John, called before these tribunals of modern criticism, we have perhaps listened with nervous anxiety for their answer. Somehow, it is seldom, indeed, that the apprehensions of those who hold by the faith of the Fathers are justified. The question at issue turns out to be a question of interpretation, or of the way in which to explain some peculiarity, or some other point of difficulty, which, just because it arises so naturally in the study of a literature such as this of the Bible, is so much the less to be fairly viewed as an impeachment of its genuineness or of its veracity. Who imagines, now, that "the divine legation of Moses" must depend upon the possibility of our believing that God made the world in six literal days? Who, save some reckless infidel, tests the inspiration of the whole Old Testament by the question whether in answer to the prayer of Joshua, God made the sun and moon to actually stand still in the heavens? Who thinks that the inspiration of the author of Genesis is impeached, even if it shall turn out that he used in his writing historical material in the form of ancient documents, or even tradition? Inquiry upon such matters is useful, as helping us know the Bible better; but at bottom they have so far been mostly, and I believe will ultimately be all found to be such in their nature, and the result of the inquiry such as to change what seemed like serious arraignment, into questions of exegesis, or points for critical study and elucidation.

(2) The only other form of this self-vindictory element in the Bible as literature, of which I shall speak, is in its character as a revelation. Not only does the Bible as literature illustrate the Bible as revelation, but the Bible as revelation supplies an important principle for estimating it as literature. Every divine work exhibits symmetry, a due order and law in the adjustment of its parts. God's buildings are all examples of a perfect divine architecture. It is admitted that we cannot, in a fair method of argument, assume the inspiration of the Bible, and then infer this or that as to the order, or authorship, or other peculiarity, of the several books. But this seems legitimate, to view the two great features of the Bible in their connection, and to mark how in mutual harmony and mutual alliance they are. Now, as a revelation, the Bible is a perfect system. Take the several books in their now

accepted order,—that order which they seem to have had in all the centuries in which their literary consecration can be certainly traced,—and revealed religion, in its two grand dispensations, with another, the millennial one, yet to come, grows from the dim and faint beginning of the first Edenic promise, age by age, along the line of patriarchal, Mosaic, and prophetic ministry, till the seed of the woman at last appears, and that is seen and heard which kings and prophets waited for. It is not a system mechanically constructed. The adjusting agent is not a *mechanism*, but a *principle*. We need not be surprised if critical study of the several parts raises questions, upon which equally honest inquirers may differ. But of this we may be certain: not only does “the firm *foundation* of God stand,” but the whole building stands, its own justification. There is no more danger that any essential dislocation of the structure will ever take place, than that the order of nature will be essentially disturbed, till it is time for the new heavens and new earth to appear, if even then.

V. From all this, now, I venture to draw a few inferences as to the practical bearings of modern biblical criticism, considered with reference to those of us who are not critics, but simply workers and teachers.

(1) The first is suggested by the fact to which attention has been drawn,—that it is the Bible as revelation which we are really to teach, and not the Bible as literature, any further than as this second aspect of it may be available for the high uses of the first. There would seem to be, therefore, no good reason why Christian work, in any of its spheres, should be in any way embarrassed, while debate upon critical questions goes forward among those whose studies, or whose special forms of service, give occasion for critical inquiry. In the pulpit or in the Bible-school, and in similar spheres of Christian labor, we shall find enough that is beyond debate, and this what is infinitely the essential matter in our Christianity, to fully occupy us, and to answer, better than doubtful disquisitions of any kind, the ends of our calling as Christians, and as Christian teachers.

(2) At the same time, secondly, the Christian intelligence of the age, whether in the ministry or elsewhere, must not ignore these debates among critics as something which it can afford to wholly disregard. While, as already noticed, such critical studies in the literature of the Bible are legitimate and useful, their ascertained results are of real value, and our practical Christianity cannot be thoroughly intelligent, unless more or less well-informed with regard to them. I would not, certainly, have such matters brought to the attention of immature minds, or of those whose religious convictions are in process of growth

and determination, any further than may be necessary to meet such casual suggestions of difficulty as may occur. But the point is, that a well-informed Christian should be well-informed upon those subjects of current investigation in which results of study and research and exploration are utilized in the interests of Christian truth. Especially should every Christian minister be thus well-informed, if for no other reason, because every teacher ought to know, so far as possible, all there is to know upon that which he teaches, whether he has occasion to teach it all, or not.

(3) What I would next infer from the general view taken in this paper, is, that it should be kept always in mind, that there will ever be, in such inquiries as are here under view, more or less that must be held, for the time being, in a state of suspense. While in one way there is a tendency with us to be suspicious of what is new, in the form of fact or theory, there is also, in another way, a tendency to favor what is new, if at the moment it impresses us agreeably, simply because it is new. That is to say, we get rather tired of the old view with its difficulties, large or small, and welcome a new one, even though it, also, has its difficulties, because, at least, these difficulties are themselves new, and because finding the enemy on another flank, we can bring fresh troops into the field. Or we may imagine that the new banner is the banner of a friend and join ranks where we ought to resist. I do not know that there will ever be a time when all the perplexities of biblical study shall be disposed of. I am not sure but it has been providentially so arranged, that there may always be things of this kind to stir human inertness, to move and rouse sluggish minds, always so apt to be sluggish where the things of religion are concerned. Let us settle it beforehand, that there are questions in biblical criticism which it is equally rash for the critic and for ourselves to settle categorically, and at once. Let us be sure not to forget that the holding of such questions in a certain attitude of suspense is not to impeach the truth of the Bible, nor the truth of such portions of it as are thus under examination. The truth is always the truth; and whether we reach it to-day or to-morrow, in this century or the next, it will still be truth when we do reach it at last.

(4) Finally, I cannot better conclude all, than in those words of Bacon's "Student's Prayer," with which the scholarly Farrar closes an able paper, upon a subject somewhat in kindred with this which we have here considered: "This [also we humbly and earnestly beg, that human things may not prejudice such as are divine: neither that from the unlocking of the gates of sense, and the kindling of a greater natural light, any thing of incredulity or intellectual might may arise in

our minds, towards divine mysteries; but rather that by our minds thoroughly cleansed and purged from fancy and vanities, and yet subject and perfectly given up to the divine oracles, there may be given unto faith such things as are faith's."

[Read before the Baptist Autumnal Conference, Boston, Nov. 14, 1888.]

THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS AND THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY REV. NEWELL WOOLSEY WELLS,
Brooklyn, E. D.

In a series of articles lately published in the *Independent*, Professor Francis Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, gave the testimony of the New Testament Scriptures concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch. The conclusion at which the Professor arrived was that no warrant is to be found in those Scriptures for regarding as the literary composition of Moses other than a few scattered texts in the first five books of the Bible, and that, therefore, the inference that our Lord and his apostles held to the generally accepted view of the authorship of the Pentateuch has no basis in fact.

Though not acquiescing in the conclusion of the Professor it is not our desire to canvas the ground so thoroughly gone over by him. Our purpose is rather to ascertain, if possible, what was the conviction of the early church as it found expression in the writings of the Fathers. Certain is it that no conviction, whatever its character, attains wide currency in a brief period of time unless it may have the forced development that ensues upon a supernatural revelation. Ideas, like seeds, in order to their dissemination require the processes of successive seasons. Growth is a factor that must be taken into account in every harvest. And if we shall succeed in showing that the Fathers, following close upon the footsteps of the Apostles, held to the Mosaic origin of the greater portion of the Pentateuch, we shall certainly feel ourselves warranted in ascribing a like conviction to the Apostles themselves.

Our method will be to trace the evidence back from the close of the third century toward the days of the Apostles, taking first the testimony of the later writers, then that of those immediately preceding them, and so on until we come to that of those whose lives overlapped the period known as Apostolic.

In beginning our study we remark this fact, that in but one volume of all the early writings of the church is there to be found an out-and-out denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and this is but a denial that the manual work of writing was performed by Moses in person. This denial may be found in the second "Clementine Homily," chap. xxxviii., and in the third Homily, chap. XLVII. The latter passage is interesting enough for quotation in full. "And Peter said: 'The Law of God was given by Moses, without writing, to seventy wise men, to be handed down, that the government might be carried on by succession. But after that Moses was taken up, it was written by some one, but not by Moses. For in the law itself it is written, "And Moses died; and they buried him," etc. But how could Moses write that Moses died?" It will thus be seen that the modern "higher critic" is but treading the path marked out for

him by the forger of the "Clementines." The scientific instinct seems to have had a more extended development than has generally been believed to be the case. The marvel is, the tardiness with which it has reached the present status.

We take up first such testimony as may be found in the "Apostolical Constitutions," written for the most part about the close of the third century. Among other sentences occur these which we quote as pertinent to the subject in hand. "As Sammel made constitutions for the people concerning a king and Moses did so concerning priests in Leviticus, so do we also," etc. (Bk. II., Sec. 34). Again, "We believe Moses when he says: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth'" (Bk. v., Sec. 7). Here, therefore, we find references to the book of Leviticus and the history of creation in Genesis as the literary compositions of Moses.

Archelaus, bishop of Carrha (A. D. 278) uses these words in his *Disputation with Manes*: "In Genesis, where Moses gives an account of the construction of the world, he makes no mention of the darkness either as made or not made" (22). Again: "When as yet there was no law embodied in writing God had compassion on the race of man and was pleased to give through Moses a written law to men" (28).

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who suffered martyrdom during the Valerian Persecution, A. D. 258, in his *Testimoniorum adversus Judæos* wrote as follows, ascribing to Moses words spoken by Jehovah: "That the dead rise again Moses intimates when he says in the bush, The 'Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.'" And again in his *Essay on Mortality* he quotes Deut. VIII., 2 and XIII., 3, as the warnings of the Holy Spirit through Moses.

Novatian, than whom none was ever more loyal to what he conceived to be the truth, and who readily sealed his attachment to the truth under the Emperor Valerian, in his treatise *Concerning the Trinity* (chap. XVII.) uses these words: "What if Moses delivers to us in the beginning of his sacred writings, this principle by which we learn that all things were created and founded by the Son of God Moses introduces God commanding that there should be light at the first."

Lactantius, who though a layman, was pronounced by Jerome the most learned man of his age, was born near the middle of the third century and died about 330 A. D. His references are far more frequently to the Greek and Latin classics than to the Hebrew Scriptures. Still he gives us his idea as to the authorship of certain portions of the Pentateuch. Thus, in his *Divine Institutes* (Bk. IV.) we find; "Moses, in Numbers, thus speaks: 'There shall arise a Star out of Jacob and a Scepter shall arise out of Israel,' words which, it will be remembered, occur in the prophecy of Balaam." Again: "In Deuteronomy he (Moses) thus left it written," whereupon follows a citation of the passages occurring in chap. XVIII., 17-19. Still again: "Moses spoke to this effect in Deuteronomy; 'And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night and shalt have none assurance of thy life.'" Concerning this passage fairness requires us to state that the meaning of the Father may have been simply that Moses spoke the words recorded in the Book of Deuteronomy. But even should this prove the case the face of the other citations will not be invalidated thereby.

Going still farther back in the patristic line, we come to Origen, born 185 A. D., died 253 A. D., one of the most eminent names in the early church. In his *De Principiis* (Bk. I., chap. I.), we meet with this sentence: "In the writings of Mo-

ses they find it said, 'Our God is a consuming fire'" (Deut. iv., 24). Again: "Concerning then the creation of the world what portion of Scripture can give us more information concerning it than the account which Moses has transmitted concerning its origin" (Bk. III., chap. 5). Still again: "This is pointed out by Moses when he describes the first creation of man in these words; 'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'" (Bk. III., chap. 6). "The divinity and inspiration both of the predictions of the prophets and of the law of Moses have been clearly revealed and confirmed." "In Deuteronomy the legislation is made known with greater clearness than in those books which were first written" (Bk. IV., chap. 1). And in his work *Against Celsus* (Bk. IV., chap. 4) we read of "the first book of Moses entitled Genesis," in which Moses wrote an account of the deluge and "the Mosaic cosmogony of the six days."

Hippolytus, whom Photens makes a disciple of Irenaeus, and who wrote in the early part of the third century, says, in his *Refutation of all Heresies* (Bk. V., chap. 15) "..... Moses confirms their doctrine when he says, 'Darkness and mist and tempest'"—alluding to chaos—"or when he states that three were born in Paradise, Adam, Eve and the Serpent; or when he speaks of three, Cain, Abel, Seth; and again of three, Shem, Ham, Japheth." "Moses has spoken of the six days in which God made heaven and earth" (Bk. VI., chap. 9). "In reference to this very law each of his books has been written as the inscriptions evince. The first book is Genesis..... The inscription of the second book is Exodus." Having dwelt in chaps. 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 upon the contents of the several books of the Pentateuch he alludes to them in chap. 14 as "the writings of Moses." In chap. 25 we read, "Moses asserts, 'The earth was invisible and unfashioned.'" Again, in Bk. VII., chap. 10, "..... that which has been stated by Moses, 'Let there be light and there was light.'" "Moses mentions this fiery God as having spoken from the bush" (Bk. VIII., chap. 2). "Moses mentions that the rod is changeably brandished for the plagues throughout Egypt" (Bk. VIII., chap. 7).

Among the prominent writings of the opening years of this century are those of Tertullian, who is known to the church as the most ancient of its Latin Fathers. He was born at Carthage in the year of our Lord 160 and died about 230 A. D. Among his polemic writings that have come to us, his treatises "*Against Marcion*" and "*Against the Jews*," are perhaps best known. In Bk. I., chap. 10 of the first mentioned work we find these words: "Although Moses..... seems to have been the first to introduce the knowledge of the God of the Universe in the temple of his writings, yet the birthday of that knowledge must not, on that account be reckoned from the Pentateuch; for the volume of Moses does not at all initiate the knowledge of the creation, but from the first gives out that it is to be traced from Paradise and Adam." In the fifth chapter of his tractate "*Against the Jews*," the words occur: "When the sacerdotal law was being drawn up through Moses in Leviticus." But it is characteristic of Tertullian that he rarely alludes to the books of the Bible by their individual names, but prefaces the majority of his allusions thereto with the phrase, "The Scripture saith." The above quotations however sufficiently indicate his conviction that the Pentateuch was Mosaic in its origin.

Theophilus of Antioch, writing in the last quarter of the second century, says *To Autolytus*, a well-informed heathen: "Moses, who lived many years before Solomon, or rather, the Word of God by him as an instrument says, 'In the begin-

ging God created the heaven and the earth' " (Bk. II., chap. 10). Having cited at length various portions of the opening chapters of Genesis, Theophilus writes: "All these things the Holy Spirit teaches us, who speaks through Moses and the rest of the prophets" (Chap. 30). "Moses, our prophet and servant of God, in giving an account of the genesis of the world, related in what manner the flood came upon the earth," etc. (Bk. III., chap. 18). "Moses showed that the flood lasted forty days and forty nights" (Bk. III., chap. 19).

Clement, known as "of Alexandria," though probably an Athenian by birth, a Platonist in his philosophy, makes very frequent allusion in his *Exhortation* to the heathen to "the commands of Moses," "the law of Moses," "the words of Moses," and "the precepts of Moses," but there are very few passages that can be cited as of interest to us in our present study. In his *Stromata*, however, we find many indications as to his conviction concerning the authorship of certain portions of the Pentateuch. He asks his readers to "mark the epochs by comparison with the age of Moses and with the high antiquity of the philosophy promulgated by him." In chap. 5 of the first Book he speaks of Plato as "aided in his legislation by the books of Moses." "The all-wise Moses indicated by employing repetition in describing the incorruptibility of body and of soul in the person of Rebecca," etc. (Gen. XXIV., 16). "As Moses says 'Melchizedek, King of Salem,'" etc. (Bk. IV., chap. 25). "We find in Moses, 'No man shall see me and live'" (Ex. XXXIII., 20). "The philosophers of the Greeks have taken without acknowledgment their principal dogmas from Moses and the prophets" (Bk. V., chap. 1). "Moses, describing allegorically the divine prudence calls it the tree of Life planted in Paradise" (chap. 2.). "Moses says that the body was formed of the ground." Deut. XXXII., 39, is quoted by Clement as occurring "in Moses" (Chap. 14).

In the Epistle of Barnabas which is known to have been in existence prior to Clement's time, although its exact date is uncertain, we read of the elevation of the serpent in the wilderness (Num. XXI.) as described "in Moses."

In chapter ninth of his *Legatio pro Christianis*, Athenagoras an Athenian philosopher wrote: "I think you cannot be ignorant. . . . of the writings of Moses, or of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the Spirit making use of them as the flute-player breathes into the flute," the standing illustration of "verbal inspiration" from his day until this present. Thereupon follows the quotation of Ex. XX., 2, 3, as among the writings of Moses.

Tatian, an Assyrian by birth, as is generally supposed, a sophist by profession, rarely alludes to the separate books of the Old Testament, but in his *Address to the Greeks* speaks of Moses as "the oldest of poets and historians" (chap. 31), and also says that "many of the sophists. . . . endeavored to adulterate whatever they learned from Moses" (Chap. 40).

Melito, bishop of Sardis, in a communication addressed to Onesimus, and quoted by Eusebius, makes this very interesting statement: "Having made myself accurately acquainted with the books of the Old Testament, I have set them down below and herewith send you. Their names are as follows, The five of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy;" etc. No clearer evidence could be given as to the general mind of the early church with regard to the authorship of the Pentateuch.

Irenaeus, whose life extended from about 130 A. D. to 202 A. D. writing *Against Heresies*, penned these words (Bk. I., chap. 18): "Moses. . . . says, 'In

the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." "Moses narrated the formation of the world" (Bk. II., chap. 2, sec. 5). "The Son of God is implanted everywhere throughout his (Moses') writings; at one time, indeed, speaking with Abraham, when about to eat with him, at another time with Noah, giving him the measurements (of the ark); at another inquiring after Adam; at another bringing down judgment on the Sodomites; and again when he becomes visible and directs Jacob on his journey and speaks with Moses from the bush. It would indeed be endless to recount the times in which the Son of God is exhibited by Moses" (Bk. IV., chap. 10, sec. 1).

This testimony of Irenaeus is rendered doubly interesting and important by the fact that an argument has been drawn by "higher critics" from a passage in Bk. III., chap. 21, sec. 2, in which it is asserted that, the Scriptures having been corrupted, Esdras was employed by God "to recast all the words of the former prophets, and to re-establish with the people the Mosaic legislation." The quotations which we have given go to prove conclusively that Irenaeus considered large portions, at least, of the Pentateuch, to have come from the mind and hand of Moses.

But by far the greatest mass of testimony comes to us from the writings of the Samaritan Platonist, Justin, Martyr, who was put to death in 165 A. D. We quote at length from him for the double reason of the frequency of his allusions to the Mosaic Scriptures, and the intimacy of his connexion with Apostolic times and events.

In his *First Apology*, written A. D. 148, we read that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. XIX.) is related by Moses (LIII.); that the prophet Moses was older than all writers and that the prophecy recorded in Gen. XLIX., 10, was predicted by him (LIV.). This passage, it will be remembered, occurs among the predictions of the dying Patriarch, Jacob. Again: "Through Moses the Spirit spake thus, 'In the beginning,' etc. (LIX.). Num. XXI. is alluded to as "in the writings of Moses" (LX.). ".....the writings of Moses.....thus it is written in them; 'And the angel of the Lord appeared,'" the passage quoted being Ex. III., 2. "And if," continues Justin, "you desire to learn what follows, you can do so from the same writings" (i. e., those of Moses). "They were the first of all men to busy themselves in the search after God; Abraham being the father of Isaac and Isaac of Jacob, as Moses wrote."

In the *Dialogue with Trypho* we read, "Moses affirms" followed by quotations from Ex. XXXII., 6, and Deut. XXXII., 15. "It was told you by Moses in the book of Genesis" (XX.). "Moses declares," Gen. XVIII., 1-XIX., 28 (LVI.) "Listen to the words expressly employed by Moses," Gen. XXI., 9-12. (LVI.) "It is again written by Moses" Gen. XXXI., 10-13, (LVIII.). "The word of God by Moses," Gen. I., 26, 28. "The words narrated by Moses," Gen. III., 22 (LXII.). ".....the prophecy announced by the patriarch Jacob and recorded by Moses," (LXIX.). "We have it recorded by Moses in the beginning of Genesis that the serpent beguiled Eve and was cursed" (LXXIX.). We are told (XC.) that the battle with Amalek is recorded "in the writings of Moses." "Moses says somewhere in Exodus, the following" (CXXVI.). "Moses says that God appeared unto Abraham" (CXXVI.). See Gen. XVIII., 2. "What Moses wrote"—Gen. XIX., 24—"took place," (CXXVII.). "I would now adduce some passages which I had not recounted before. They are recorded by the faithful servant Moses in parable." Whereupon follows Dent. XXXII., 43, *sqq.* (CXXX.).

In his *Hortatory Address to the Greeks* (xii.) Justin says: "The history of Moses is by far more ancient than all profane histories, which he wrote in the Hebrew character by the Divine inspiration." "What the first prophet Moses said about Paradise" (xxviii.). "Moses wrote that God spoke to him about the tabernacle in the following words"—Ex. xxv., 9, 40—(xxix.). "Moses first mentions the name of man and then after many other creations he makes mention of the formation of man" (xxx.). "Moses' history, speaking in the person of God, says, 'Let us make man,'" etc. (xxxiv.).

Our last citation is from Clement, bishop of Rome, the contemporary of some of the Apostles, who, in his First Epistle (xliii.), wrote these words: "The blessed Moses noted down in the sacred books all the instructions which were given him."

Here then we have a volume of evidence as to the general conviction of the early Christian church which, it seems to us, leaves the matter in no uncertainty whatever. In the light of it are we not warranted in interpreting the words of the apostles and of our Savior as expressive of their convictions as to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch? If any weight should ever attach to circumstantial evidence we know of no case in which it might more deservedly do so than in that before us. How to account for the prevalence of the conviction which we have found existing in the church of the second and third centuries without holding the presence of the same conviction in the church of the first century is a problem which, we believe, Professor Brown would find it difficult to solve. It is but a quibble to urge the closing verses of Deuteronomy as a proof of the impossibility of a Mosaic authorship. As well assert that Paul Janet did not write "Final Causes" because Professor Flint has written an introduction to that work. The question as to whether Moses employed documents in his work of composing or constructing the Pentateuch has no bearing upon our present study. The one question which has engaged our attention has been: What was the generally received opinion at and immediately after the time of our Savior as to the authorship of the Pentateuch? Certainly if the Christian fathers truly represent the Christian view, and if Josephus and Philo truly represent the Jewish view, our answer need not long be delayed.

THE REINS.

BY REV. J. G. LANSING,
West-Troy, N. Y.

The word *Reins* occurs fourteen times in the Old Testament, and once in the New. The Hebrew word is כְּלִיֹּת. The Greek word is νεφρός. In the Septuagint כְּלִיֹּת is rendered νεφρός. From the fourteen times in which the word *Reins* occurs in the Old Testament, it is in one instance to be excluded, viz., in Isa. xi., 5, where we read concerning the Messiah and his government, "And faithfulness shall be the girdle of his *reins*." The word here is not כְּלִיֹּת, but חֲלָצִים, a word which in every other instance is rendered, and is here also to be rendered, *loins*.

Lexicographers give the following definitions of the term. Gesenius defines כְּלִיֹּת, first, *the kidneys, reins*; second, by metonymy, used of the *inmost mind*, as the seat of the desires and affections. The Greek νεφρός is defined simply *the kid-*

neys, reins. Our English word is derived from the Latin *ren*. pl. *renes*, signifying *the kidneys*. "Hence," according to Webster, "the inward impulses; the affections and passions; so called because formerly supposed to have their seat in that part of the body."

Commentators and psychologists have varied but little from and added but little to the definition given by Gesenius, in their critical expositions of the term. A summary of the prevailing views is given in the following quotations. "The *reins* are the seat of the emotions, just as the heart is the seat of the thoughts and feelings." "The *reins* are the seat of the blessed feelings that God is the individual's possession." "The *reins* are the seat of the lower animal passions." "The *reins* denote the sensational and emotional part of man." "The *reins* are the seat of strong impulses, feelings, inclinations." "The *reins* constitute that inner organ which is regarded as the seat of the tenderest, inmost and deepest affections." "The *reins* are the central organs, not in a physical, but in a psychological sense."

Great indefiniteness in the mind attaches itself to these interpretations. This indefiniteness arises in great measure from the manner in which the terms *emotions, feelings, passions, affections*, etc. are used, whereby the *reins* are defined and described as being both physical and psychological in their nature, and as simultaneously performing the parts of almost all of the organs of the spiritual being. We are unable to explain to ourselves or to others with any reasonable degree of accuracy and satisfaction what these *reins* really are,—where they are located, and what are their functions, in the spiritual man.

Moreover, these interpretations appear untenable for the following reasons based upon the Scriptural usages of the term.

1st. The *reins* are spoken of as a specific organ, performing a specific part in man's spiritual constitution.

2d. The *reins* and their functions are treated as something distinct from the heart, mind, etc., and the functions commonly assigned them.

3d. Instances of the Scriptural usage of the term *reins*, will not admit of the interpretations given as being either sufficient, or accordant with the context.

Let then an analogical and an exegetical argument be pursued in determining what the *reins* are.

I. *The Analogical Argument.*—The word כִּלְיֹת is first employed in connection with the Levitical sacrifices where, as rendered, it signifies *the kidneys*. The same word, used not of the physical, but of the spiritual man, is rendered *reins*.

In determining then what the *reins* are, it would seem to be the most pertinent thing to ask,—What organ, with its functions, is there in man's spiritual constitution which corresponds to the kidneys and their functions in man's physical organism?

In answering this question note must first be taken as to what are the functions of the kidneys.

1st. The kidneys serve to separate and carry off from the blood certain effete substances. They free the blood of such impure matter as has become formed in the system by the decomposition of certain materials.

2d. The kidneys serve as a regulating valve by which the quantity of water in the system is kept to its proper amount, and by which also other soluble compounds existing in the system in a larger amount than is compatible with the normal constitution of the blood are eliminated. Did not the kidneys serve as

such an adjusting organ and power, continual and exceedingly injurious results would ensue.

3d. The kidneys serve as a most important, if not *the* most important, tributary factor in man, for the preservation of health and life, by reason of the vital relation which is thus seen to exist between them and the heart. If the kidneys fail to purify the blood of these injurious elements, diseased blood is infused into the heart, and by the heart sent throughout the system, causing the germination and spread of disease in various forms, and with speedy and fatal results, as in the case of uræmic poisoning.

4th. The kidneys thus serve not only to eliminate diseases from the system, but also to teach much about diseases when existing in the system, and for the purpose of their removal. By chemical and microscopical analyses of the secretions of the kidneys, the nature, locality and progress of diseases are detected and ascertained.

These are not simply facts about the kidneys, but the functions of the kidneys.

The question is then,—What specific and distinct organ, with its functions, is there in man as he is spiritually constituted, which corresponds to the kidneys and their functions in his physical organism? What specific organ in the spiritual constitution of man is that which acts to separate the bad from the good, and to free the spiritual life from impurities—sins? What is that specific organ in man as he is spiritually constituted, which acts as a regulator of the spiritual life,—to keep so much as is proper, and eliminate so much as is injurious to that life's well-being? What is that specific organ in the spiritual man which failing to act, or to properly and faithfully perform its part, disease—sin germinates and spreads throughout the spiritual life, speedily and fatally, through the unpurified and unchecked evil affections of the heart? What is that specific organ in the spiritual constitution of man which tells him of sin, which says, *this is sin*, which shows him how far sin has progressed, which does all this for the purpose that sin may be removed? The analogy is complete and unmistakable in furnishing us with the answer, in giving us to understand what the *reins* are, namely, *the conscience*.

In this connection, it is a noticeable fact that neither the word conscience nor any word that may be rendered conscience is to be found in the Old Testament Scriptures.

II. *The Exegetical Argument.*—It consists in briefly examining those passages of Scripture in which the word כִּיּוֹת occurs, as likewise proving that by the *reins* we are to understand the *conscience*.

Job xvi., 13. "His archers compass me round about; he cleaveth my *reins* asunder, and doth not spare; he poureth out my gall upon the ground." The facts are these: Job suffers severely at the hands of God and men. These sufferings of Job are on account of his sins. The truth of this,—which Job here withholds in an exaggeration of his innocence and a proclamation of his self-righteousness,—he yet expressly concedes in xiv., 4. So God delivers Job over to suffering as guilty,—to suffer on account of his sins. In part, this suffering consists in God's sending forth his arrows against Job, the terrible effect of which Job specifically describes as a cleaving of his *reins* without sparing. The facts and the description correspond precisely and exclusively to the working of conscience. The arrows of God sent against and into the guilty as guilty, whereby the guilty suffers inwardly and spiritually on account of his sins, can only be referred to the sin-smitten conscience.

Job XIX., 27. "Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my *reins* be consumed within me." As in connection with the former passage, so with this, and throughout, Job has been most wisely and forcibly maintaining a dual conception of God. In the first place he is God who delivers Job over to suffering as guilty; but in the second place he is God who also cannot leave Job unvindicated, even though such vindication should come only after death. In the preceding passage, God is regarded according to the former conception; in this passage, according to the latter conception. In the preceding passage Job suffers at the hand of God as guilty. In this passage, Job is suffering at the hand of God as guilty, yet appeals to God as the one who shall vindicate him against such guilt, and free him of such sufferings. Accordingly he says:—Even though my *reins*, my conscience be consumed, carry on a work of ruin within me, because guilty, yet I appeal and look and trust to God, knowing that my Redeemer, my Avenger liveth, who shall vindicate me, so that after death I shall see God, standing before him justified. It is like Paul crying out in the unrest and pain of conscience, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" and then in the very next breath exclaiming, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Ps. VII., 9; XXVI., 2; Jer. XI., 20; XVII., 10; XX., 12; Rev. II., 23. These are those passages wherein God is declared as being, or is appealed to as being the one who tries, searches, sees the *reins*, or the *reins* and heart together. In the case of Rev. II., 23, *νεφρός* is equivalent to *כְּלִיֹּת*, and the expression in which it occurs is applied to God as in the case of Ps. VII., 9, and others, whence it was probably taken. In these passages then, God is represented as seeing, searching, trying, putting to proof the *reins*, in order, as we learn from the context, to bring about one of three results.

- 1st. For the purpose of further removing sin; or
- 2d. For the purpose of confirming and establishing the godly; or
- 3d. For the purpose of punishing the wicked.

The passages thus standing before us in their contexts, the questions to be asked are,—Wherein is God operative in the individual so that the individual becomes convinced of sin, and is thus led to forsake it? Answer, the conscience. How and wherein is the individual assured, confirmed, established as to peace with God, as to faithfulness before God, as to hope in God? Answer, in a *good* conscience. How and wherein does God search and prove the wicked so that it is seen and known they will not have God, and are visited with just punishment? Through the conscience which has become hardened, seared. In all these passages those things which God is said to do, or which man would have God do, are things which can only be predicated of the conscience.

Ps. XVI., 7. "I will bless the Lord, who hath given me counsel; my *reins* also instruct me in the night seasons." What kind of instruction is this given by the *reins*? The word rendered here *instruct* is derived from *קָרַן* signifying *to correct, to admonish*. Thus Perowne and others render. The Psalmist is represented as anxiously listening to the voice of God, that he may thereby become corrected, admonished, warned as to that which is good, and that which is evil. By such admonition and warning the Psalmist would become conformed unto and settled in that which is good in God's sight. Of the office of what part of the spiritual man can this be predicated other than of the conscience?

Ps. LXXIII., 21. "Thus my heart was grieved, and I was pricked in my *reins*." The sense becomes evident when we consider the contents of the Psalm. The seeming prosperity of the ungodly had filled the Psalmist with doubts and anger, and had tempted him to fall away into an utter ignoring and disbelief of God. He had so far forth grievously strayed, seriously sinned. Then there was given to the Psalmist a solution of the problem, an explanation of the phenomenon of the apparent good fortune of the ungodly. In this passage and from the standpoint of the explanation received, the Psalmist speaks of a possible return of his temptation, and condemns it beforehand. He was pricked, pierced with pain in his *reins*, because of the temptation into which he had fallen, and the possibility of again falling into it. Manifestly the *reins* here constitute the conscience.

Ps. CXXXIX., 13. "For thou hast possessed my *reins*: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb." The Psalmist has been speaking (vs. 7-12) of the omnipresence of God. From that omnipresent God he cannot flee or hide. Why? Because God has formed and possessed his *reins*, whereby he has not only a *consciousness* of the existence of God, but a *conscience* continually producing painful or pleasing experiences with respect to the fact of God's omnipresence. And so throughout the Psalm, it is the power of conscience on the one hand, and it is the sense of sin and responsibility on the other hand, that are everywhere felt and acknowledged.

Prov. XXIII., 16. "Yea, my *reins* shall rejoice, when thy lips speak right things." The wise, pious and kingly father has just spoken of the necessity of withholding not correction from the child. And so if, by correction and chastisement, his own sons heart is made wise, the father's heart will rejoice; and if, by correction and chastisement, his own son's lips are made to speak right things, the father's *reins* will rejoice or exult. There will be an approval of conscience, and a rejoicing of heart on the part of the father if, in using correction and chastisement toward his son, his son is thereby led into the right. If correction and chastisement are withheld, and so the son goes astray, there will be sorrow of heart, and the regrets of a guilty conscience.

Jer. XII., 2. "Thou hast planted them; yea, they have taken root: they grow; yea, they bring forth fruit: thou art near in their mouth, but far from their *reins*." The prophet is speaking of the wicked, and their apparent prosperity and happiness in their treachery and wickedness. They seem, and indeed of God, to have been planted, to have taken root, to be growing and bringing forth fruit in prosperous wickedness. This condition of the wicked the prophet ascribes to God's being far from their *reins*, even though he is near in their mouth. What then are the *reins* in the which if God had been, the wicked would have been checked, stopped, turned from their wickedness? Can this be other than the conscience?

Lam. III., 13. "He hath caused the arrows of his quiver to enter into my *reins*." The explanation here is similar to that of Job XVI., 13. The prophet here speaks in his prophetic character; as one who stands between the people and their covenant God, to reveal the divine will to them; and as one who stands in their place, and presents their interests before the throne of grace. He is a representative man. He stands for the people; he speaks for the people; suffers for the people. The people are made to suffer at the hands of God for their sins against him. The arrows of God's quiver enter their *reins* causing them to suffer because of their sins. They are inwardly tormented, pierced with pain because of their great sins,

and God's great displeasure therefor. The description is such as can only be referred to the state and workings of a conscience painfully sensible of sin, and of the presence of an incensed Deity.

THE MESSIANIC ELEMENT IN THE PSALMS.

BY REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M. A.,

Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford.

There is much haziness in the minds of most persons as to the meaning of the words Messiah and Messianic. I have, therefore, first of all to state in what sense I here use these words. I would venture to define the word Messiah as meaning one who has received some direct commission from God determining his life's work, with the single limitation that the commission must be unique, and must have a religious character. Thus Cyrus will not be a Messiah, because 'his function was merely preparatory; he was to be instrumental in the removal of obstacles to the realization of [God's kingdom]' (*I. C. A.*, p. 166). An individual priest will not be a Messiah, because he has received no unique personal commission; even the High Priest Joshua is only represented as typical of Him who was to be pre-eminently the Messiah (*Zech. III.*, 8). David was a Messiah (compare *Ps. XVIII.*, 50), because he was God's vicegerent in the government of His people Israel; the laws which David was to carry out were not merely secular, but religious, and of Divine appointment. Each of David's successors was in like manner theoretically a Messiah. The people of Israel was theoretically a Messiah, because specially chosen to show forth an example of obedience to God's laws (*Ex. XIX.*, 5, 6), and to preach His religion to the Gentiles (*Isa. II.*, 3; *LV.*, 5). Above all, a descendant of David who should take up the ill-performed functions of his royal ancestors was to be, both in theory and in fact, the Messiah (*Isa. IX.*, 6, 7, &c.); and so, too, was the personal Servant of Jehovah (*Isa. LXI.*, 1), who was both to redeem His people from their sins, and to lead them in the performance of their commission.

Hence we may reckon five groups of Messianic psalms:—I. Psalms which refer to a contemporary Davidic king, setting him, either directly or by implication, in the light of his Messianic mission. II. Those entirely devoted to the future ideal Davidic sovereign. III. Those which relate to the future glories of the kingdom of God, but without expressly mentioning any Messiah. IV. Those which, though seemingly spoken by an individual, in reality describe the experiences of the Jewish nation in their unsteady performance of their Messianic commission. V. Those in which, with more or less consistency, the psalmist dramatically introduces the personal and ideally perfect 'Servant of Jehovah' (to adopt the phrase in *Isa. XLII.*, &c.) as the speaker.

On the first group there cannot be much difference of opinion. It contains Psalms *XX.*, *XXI.*, *XLV.*, *CI.*, *CXXXII.* The interest of the interpreter is more awakened by the second group, containing Psalms *II.*, *LXXII.*, *CX*: In *Ps. II.* we are presented first with a picture of the whole world subject to an Israelitish king, and vainly plotting to throw off the yoke; then with the divine decree assuring universal dominion to this particular king; then with an exhortation to the kings

of the earth to submit to Jehovah's Son.¹ It is, I know, commonly supposed that the psalm has a primary reference to circumstances in the life of David, but the ordinary Christian instinct seems to be much nearer the truth. Even granting for the moment that the chiefs of the Syrians and the Ammonites could be dignified in liturgical poetry with the title 'kings of the earth,' there is not the slightest indication in 2 Sam. VII. or elsewhere, that a prophet ever conveyed an offer to David of the sovereignty of the whole world. Even Jewish tradition, so zealous for the honor of the Davidic lyre, has not ascribed this psalm to David. Who, then, can the Son of Jehovah and Lord of the whole earth be but the future Messiah, whom the prophets describe in such extraordinary terms? Why should we expect the psalms always to have a contemporary political reference? If one psalmist (see below) takes for his theme the Messianic glories of Jerusalem, why may not another adopt for his the glories of the Messiah himself?

The same arguments apply to Ps. LXXII., which a Unitarian divine pronounces 'the most Messianic in the collection,' adding that it 'is applied by Bible readers in general, without hesitation or conscious difficulty, to the Messiah of Nazareth, as beautifully describing the spirit of His reign.'² The judgment of the plain reader is not to be lightly disregarded, and though Mr Higginson goes on to speak of 'its true historic marks, which assign it distinctly to the accession of Solomon,' other critics (e. g., Hupfeld) altogether deny these, and the Messianic interpretation has not yet been satisfactorily refuted. The psalm is not, indeed, a prediction (as King James's Bible makes it), but is at any rate a prayer for the advent of the Prince of peace and of the world, Ps. CX., again, is as a whole only obscure to those who will not admit directly Messianic psalms. How significantly the first of the two Divine oracles opens, with an invitation to sit on the throne, 'high and lifted up' (Isa. VI., 1), where the Lord Himself is seated! Can we help thinking of the 'El-gibbôr in Isaiah (IX., 6), and still more of the 'one like a son of man' who 'came with the clouds of heaven,' and was 'brought near before the Ancient of days' (Dan. VII., 13)? True, that 'son of man' is not said to be a priest, but he agrees with the personage in the psalm in that he is conceived of as in heaven, and as waging war and exercising sovereignty on earth from heaven. Neither in Daniel nor in the psalm is anything said about the Davidic origin of the high potentate, but his nature and functions are clearly those of the Davidic Messiah. The priestly character of the 'lord' in Ps. CX., 1, can be fully explained from Zech. III., 8; VI., 11-13, where a priestly element in the Messianic functions is distinctly recognized.

Over the third group I may pass lightly. It contains some late psalms, such as XCVI.-C., in which, the happiness of being under Jehovah's personal government is celebrated, and also Ps. LXXXVII., in which, chief among the Messianic privileges of Jerusalem, the conversion of the heathen is represented as their being 'born again in Zion' (compare Isa. XLIV., 5).

The fourth contains a number of psalms commonly regarded as Davidic, and as typically Messianic, and some which are merely supposed to describe the sufferings of a pious individual. In both subdivisions the language is often hyperbolic, which is explained in the case of the former by the typical character of the writer, and the overruling influence of the Spirit. A similar explanation might plausibly

¹ The Aramaic *bar*, not admitting the article, suited the unique position of the personage spoken of.

² Higginson, *Ecce Messias*, p. 30.

be offered for the seeming hyperboles of the latter subdivision, for every pious sufferer is in a true sense a type of Jesus Christ. But it is much simpler to suppose that these psalms really describe the experiences of the Jewish nation in the pursuit of its Messianic ideal: the supposed speaker is a personification. This is no arbitrary conjecture. The Jewish nation and its divinely appointed ideal were, in fact, to the later prophets and students of Scripture a familiar subject of meditation. I need hardly remind the reader of the 'Servant of Jehovah' in some parts of 2 Isaiah, but may be allowed to state my opinion that one principal object of the book of Jonah was to typify the spiritual career of Israel, and that the so-called Song of Solomon was admitted into the Canon on the ground that the Bride of the poem symbolized the chosen people. Can we wonder that some of the psalmists adopted a similar imaginative figure?

One of the most remarkable of these psalms is the eighteenth. It is probable enough that the psalmist in writing it had the life of David in his mind's eye; but it would be unreasonable to suppose that he merely wished to idealize a deceased king, or even the Davidic family. The world-wide empire claimed by the supposed speaker, and the analogy of cognate psalms, are totally opposed to such a hypothesis. But when we consider that the filial relation to God predicated of David as king in 2 Sam. vii. is also asserted of the Israelitish nation (Ex. 1v., 22; Hos. xi., 1; Ps. Lxxx., 15), and that in Isa. Lv., 3-5 the blessings promised to David are assured in perpetuity to the faithful Israel, it becomes difficult to deny that David may have been regarded as typical of the nation of Israel.—Another of these psalms is the eighty-ninth, which supplies further evidences of the typological use of David. The psalmist has been describing the ruin which has overtaken the Davidic family, but insensibly passes into a picture of the ruin of the state, and identifies 'the reproach of the heels of thine anointed' (v. 51) with 'the reproach of thy servants' (v. 50).—Ps. cii. may also perhaps be included in this group. The expression in vs. 3-9 are, some of them at least, far too strong for an individual, whereas in the mouth of the personified people they are not inappropriate. The words in v. 23 'he hath shortened my days' (virtually retracted in v. 28) remind us of Ps. Lxxxix., 45; and those in the parallel clause, 'he hath weakened my strength in the way,' are perhaps an allusion to the 'travail in the way' of the Israelites in the wilderness (Ex. xviii., 8). There are some reasons, however, for rather placing this psalm in the next group.

The remaining members of the fourth group are the so-called imprecatory psalms¹ (e. g., v., xxxv., xl., lv., lviii., lxix., cix.). As long as these are interpreted of an individual Israelite, they seem strangely inconsistent with the injunctions to benevolence with which the Old Testament is interspersed.² If, however, they are spoken in the name of the nation—'Jehovah's Son,' their intensity of feeling becomes intelligible. Certainly it was not 'obstinate virulence and morbid moroseness' which inspired them, for 'each of the psalms in which the strongest imprecatory passages are found contains also gentle undertones, breathings of beneficent love. Thus, 'When they were sick, I humbled my soul with fasting; I behaved myself as though it had been my friend or brother.' 'When I wept and chastened my soul with fasting, that was to my reproach.' 'They have re-

¹ Some of these psalms, however (xxiv., xl., lv., lxix.), belong more properly to the fourth group.

² Ex. xxiii., 4, 5; Lev. xix., 18; Prov. xx., 22, xxiv., 17, 18, 29, xxv., 21, 22, compare Job xxxi., 29, 30.

warded me evil for good, and hatred for my love!'¹ And, 'finally in the most awful of these psalms, the denunciations die away into a strain which, in the original, falls upon a modern ear with something of the cadence of pathetic rhyme (V'libbi khālāl b'q'rbī, "and my heart is pierced through within me").'²

Among the psalms not ascribed to David which belong to this group is the forty-first, from which a quotation is made in a Messianic sense in John xiii., 18. It is only the people of Israel which can at once confess its former sins (v. 4), and appeal to its present 'integrity' (v. 12).—The fifth and last group marks the highest level attained by the inspired poets. It contains Ps. xxii., xxxv., xl., lv., lxix., cii. I cannot think that the persistency of the traditional interpretation, at any rate as regards the two first of these psalms, is wholly due to theological prepossessions. In some of its details, the traditional Christian interpretation is no doubt critically untenable, but in essentials it seems to me truer than any of the current literary theories. Let me briefly refer to the twenty-second psalm, which presents such striking affinities with 2 Isaiah. In two respects it is distinguished from most others of the same group; it contains no imprecations and no confessions of sinfulness. It falls into two parts. The first and longer of these is a pathetic appeal to Jehovah from the lowest depth of affliction. The speaker has been God's servant from the beginning (vs. 9, 10), yet he is now conscious of being God-forsaken (v. 1). Not only are his physical sufferings extreme (vs. 14-17), but he is the butt of scoffers and a public laughing-stock (vs. 6, 7). Who his enemies are—whether heathen oppressors or unbelieving Israelites—is not here stated, but from a parallel passage (Ps. xlix., 8) it is clear that the hostility arises, partly, at least, from the sufferer's fellow-countrymen. Only after long wrestling with God does the psalmist attain the confidence that he has been heard of Him (v. 21). At this point the tone suddenly changes. The prayer becomes a joyous declaration of the answer which has been vouchsafed, and a promise of thank-offerings. 'But he does not end there. He treats his deliverance as a matter of national congratulation, and a cause of more than national blessings. He not only calls upon his fellow-countrymen to join him in his thanksgiving (v. 23), but breaks out into an announcement which draws the whole world within the sphere of his triumph (vs. 27, 28, 31).'³ I need not stay to point out how unsuitable is language of this description to any of the Israelites mentioned in the Old Testament, and how unnatural it is that the establishment of God's universal kingdom should be placed in sequence to the deliverance of an individual sufferer.⁴ The difficulties are strikingly analogous to those which meet us in 2 Isaiah.⁵ There, as here, some

¹ Bishop Alexander, *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, 1876, p. 53 (Ps. xxxv., 13, lxi., 10, 11, cix., 4, 5).

² *Ibid.*, p. 57. (It is not necessary to assume that the faithless friends in Ps. xxxv., iv., are mere figures of speech.)

³ Maitland, *The Arguments from Prophecy* (S. P. C. K.) pp. 95, 96.

⁴ Hupfeld, I know, denies that the anticipations expressed in vs. 27-31 stand in any relation to the deliverance of the speaker. But by this denial he destroys the unity of plan of the poem; it is certain, too, that the later O. T. writers often connect the conversion of the heathen with the sight of the wonderful deliverance of Israel. And the very connection which Hupfeld denies in Ps. xxii., he grants in the parallel passage in Ps. cii. (vs. 16-18).

⁵ It would be instructive to make out a list of the numerous parallels in these psalms to 2 Isaiah and the book of Job (for the author of Job, as we have seen, is not without flashes of Gospel light). Comp. for instance, Ps. xxii., 6, 'I am a worm,' with Isa. xli., 14; Job xxv., 6; *Ibid.* 'and no man,' with Isa. lli., 14, liii., 2; *Ibid.* 'despised of people,' with Isa. xlix., 7; vs. 16, 17, with Job's descriptions of his sickness: vs. 26, 28, with Isa. lv., 1, 21. Vs. 27-29 also find their best commentary in Isa. lli., 14, 15.

features of the description seem to compel us to explain them of an individual Israelite, while others remain unintelligible unless referred in some way to the people of Israel, with its Messianic, missionary functions. There, as here, the deliverance of the sufferer has a vital influence on the spiritual life, first of all of his own people, and then of all mankind. There, as here, the newly-acquired spiritual blessings are described under the figure of a feast. Is it so very bold to explain Ps. xxii. and the psalms like it as utterances of that ideal and yet most real personage, who in 2 Isaiah is the fruit, from one point of view, no doubt, of special revelation, but from another equally justified and perfectly consistent with the former, of an intense longing for the fulfilment of Israel's ideal? To assume that both the sacred poets and the poet-prophet are feeling their way (not, however, at random) to the presence of the Redeemer? That they have abandoned the hope of an earthly King of Israel, and are conscious, too, that even the noblest members of the nation are inadequate to the Messianic functions? And that hence they throw out in colossal outlines an indistinct because imaginatively expressed conception of One who shall perfectly fulfil these functions for and with his people?

[From Commentary on Isaiah.]

➤GENERAL NOTES.◀

The Place of Biblical Theology.—Biblical Theology belongs to the department of Exegetical Theology as a higher exegesis completing the exegetical process, and presenting the essential material and principles of the other departments of theology.

The boundaries between Exegetical and Historical Theology are not so sharply defined as those between either of them and Systematic Theology. All Historical Theology has to deal with *sources*, and in this respect must consider them in their variety and unity as well as development; and hence many theologians combine Exegetical Theology and Historical Theology under one head—Historical Theology. It is important, however, to draw the distinction, for this reason. The *sources* of Biblical Theology are in different relation from the sources of a history of doctrine, inasmuch as they constitute a body of divine revelation, and in this respect to be kept distinct from all other *sources*, even cotemporary and of the same nation. They have an absolute authority which no other sources can have. The stress is to be laid less upon their historical development than upon them as an organic body of revelation, and this stress upon their importance as *sources* not only for historical development, but also for dogmatic reconstruction and practical application, requires that the special study of them should be exalted to a separate discipline and a distinct branch of theology.

Now in the department of Exegetical Theology, Biblical Theology occupies the highest place, the latest and crowning achievement. It is a higher exegesis completing the Exegetical Process. All other branches of Exegetical Theology are presupposed by it. The Biblical Literature must first be studied as sacred literature. All questions of date of writing, integrity, construction, style, and authorship must be determined by the principles of the Higher Criticism. Biblical Canonics determines the extent and authority of the various writings that are to be

regarded as composing the sacred canon, and discriminates them from all other writings by the criticism of the believing spirit enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church, Biblical Textual Criticism ascertains the true text of the writings in the study of MSS. and versions and citations, and seeks to present it in its pure primitive forms. Biblical Hermeneutics lays down the rule of Biblical Interpretation, and Biblical Exegesis applies these rules to the various particular passages of the sacred Scriptures. Now Biblical Theology accepts all these rules and results thus determined and applied. It is not its office to go into the detailed examination of the verse and the section, but it must accept the results of a thorough exegesis and criticism in order to advance thereon and thereby to its own proper work of higher exegesis; namely, rising from the comparison of verse with verse, and paragraph with paragraph, where simple exegesis is employed, to the still more difficult and instructive comparison of writing with writing, author with author, period with period, until by generalization and synthesis the theology of the Bible is attained as an organic whole.

Biblical Theology is thus the culmination of Exegetical Theology, and must be in an important relation to all other branches of theology. For Historical Theology it presents the great principles of the various periods of history, the fundamental and controlling tendencies which, springing from human nature and operating in all the religions of the world, find their proper expression and satisfaction in the normal development of Divine Revelation, but which, breaking loose from these salutary bonds, become perverted and distorted into abnormal forms, producing false and heretical principles and radical errors. And so in the Biblical unity of these tendencies Biblical Theology presents the ideal unity for the church and the Christian in all times of the world's history. For Systematic Theology, Biblical Theology affords the holy material to be used in Biblical Apologetics, Dogmatics, and Ethics, the fundamental and controlling material out of which that systematic structure must be built which will express the intellectual and moral needs of the particular age, fortify the church for offence and defence in the struggle with the anti-Christian world, and give unity to its life, its efforts, and its dogmas in all ages. For Practical Theology it presents the various types of religious experience and of doctrinal and ethical ideas which must be skilfully applied to the corresponding differences of type which exist in all times, in all churches, in all lauds, and indeed in all religions and races of mankind. Biblical Theology is indeed the *Irenic* force which will do much to harmonize the antagonistic forces and various departments of theology, and bring about that *toleration within the church* which is the *greatest* requisite of our times.—From Briggs' *Biblical Study*.

Recent Literature in the Department of Old Testament Theology.—Of the learned works in this department recently issued, one of the most important is the *Old Testament Theology* of H. Schultz, 2 vols. 1869, a second edition of which appeared in one vol. in 1878. The religion of the Old Testament is regarded as the religion of revelation in its gradual progress, the religion of redemption coming into being, in distinction from redemption completed, as it is in Christianity. The special revelation which lies at the basis of both the Old and the New Testament religion is recognized as corresponding to the special connection of the two. Hence, while it is strongly affirmed on the one hand that the Old Testament religion is historically conditioned and prepared by the general prior development of mankind, and

especially by the religious development of the Semites, and also that it follows historical laws in its further advance, the firm position on the other hand is taken, that its origin and development are by no means to be explained as barely proceeding from historical relations, but from revelation in the special historical sense of the word. Still it must be confessed that Schultz's idea of revelation is burdened by an unbiblical restriction (cf. § 6, note 2).

H. Ewald, in his comprehensive work, *The Doctrine of the Bible concerning God, or Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1871-76, believing with the Christian Church in all ages, "that the books of the two Testaments as Holy Scripture constitute an inseparable unity in respect to their contents and aim," but keeping in view also the difference both between the two Testaments and the individual books, exhibits the unity of doctrine in the Old and the New Testaments. He regards revelation, on which all religion, and especially the religion of the Bible rests, as the illumination of the human spirit, in its search after God, with new religious thoughts and intuitions. On this view revelation is rather an achievement of the human mind than a thing received. It looks more like a psychological phenomenon than as an act of God. F. Hitzig, in his posthumous *Lectures on Biblical Theology and Messianic Prophecy in the Old Testament*, Karlsruhe, 1880, holds, in distinction from this, that there is no need of a special revelation. He conceives the God of Israel to be the product of human reflection resting upon the basis of a religion held by Arab nomads, and the religion of Israel as the creation of the Hebrew mind, "constituted from the beginning for the true religion."

What is usually styled the Graf hypothesis, according to which the priestly legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch is a post-exilic production, belonging to the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, would, if it were proved to be correct, be followed by sweeping results, because it would entirely revolutionize the received view of the historical progress of the religion of Israel. This hypothesis, advanced or suggested by Vatke and Reuss, was further elaborated by Graf in his work, *The Historical Books of the Old Testament*, Leipsic, 1866; and more recently J. Wellhausen's *History of Israel*, vol. I., Berlin, 1878, has won many adherents to the view that "the Mosaic law is not the point of departure for the history of ancient Israel, but for the history of Judaism—that is, of the sect which survived the people annihilated by the Assyrians and Chaldeans." The latest work in which the attempt is made to carry out this view is the *History of the Sacred Writings of the Old Testament*, by E. Reuss, Brunswick, 1881-82. In adopting this hypothesis, Bernhard Duhm, in his *Theology of the Prophets as the Foundation for the Internal History of the Development of the Israelitish Religion*, Bonn, 1875, undertook by an investigation of the contents of the prophetic books, to get a view of the origin of prophecy without the basis of the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch. The important contributions recently made to the history of religion, especially by Egyptology and Assyriology, promise to become fruitful for the understanding of the Old Testament. The *Studies for the History of Semitic Religions*, by W. W. Grafen Baudissen (vols. I. and II., Leipsic, 1876-78), come in this connection into consideration.—From Oehler's *Old Testament Theology*.

The Ancient Scripture.—No current questions have, in late years, more commanded attention than those which concern the literature and the interpretation of the Old Testament. The interest of these questions has almost pushed the physical scientists from their stools. Instead of Tyndall, and Darwin, and Hux-

ley, and Haeckel, and Virchow, we have now Robertson Smith, Delitzsch, Kuenen and Wellhausen. The date of an Old Testament book is now a more absorbing issue than that of the origin of species, while keener optics than those which lately were scrutinizing flint hatchets and old bones, are now searching the Messianic Psalms and the statutes of Leviticus. Naturally, one is led to ask what may be the significance of all this, and how it shall be interpreted.

In part, it must be said, the interest in Old Testament study now so manifest, is simply critical and archæological. We ought not to be surprised that there should be scholars who study our ancient Scripture not as theologians, but only as scholars. Their customary work has been largely in the line of other archæological literature. They have studied, with the zeal of explorers, both Egyptology and Assyriology. That old buried world which now after so many centuries is having a resurrection, absorbs them in the revelations made of the life, and thought, and worship of what are in a somewhat strict sense pre-historic times. During the ages in which that old world was the living world our ancient Scripture was written. Of this fact these explorers and scholars are constantly reminded. They turn from the tablet and the papyrus to the familiar pages of the printed Bible. As they read this page they are still archæologists and critics. They have not the doctrinal interest there which some of the rest of us have. That their conclusions on many points should be different from ours, is not surprising. Of two things we need to be aware, as we take note of the claimed results of their investigations: (1) that critics are apt to be over-critical; (2) that the studies in which these scholars habitually engage are such in their nature and the discipline they afford, as to justify the expectation that there must be value, of some kind, in the results.

Naturally, this form of the prevailing interest in Old Testament study prepares the way for another. Those who have been accustomed to regard the date and order of the books in our ancient Scripture as settled beyond all possibility of question, also the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the integrity of Isaiah's prophecy and the Messianic character of certain psalms, are surprised to find all these points treated as still open to dispute, while the confident tone of conclusions announced regarding them excites uneasiness. What does it mean? Are these conclusions sound? If so, what does it all import? Is faith in the Old Testament about to part from its moorings, and are we soon to be all afloat? Must even the inspiration of these ancient books be virtually given up? When such issues as these are present to the mind, whether really involved in the questions under debate or not, one feels that he must look into the matter. And doubtless he should; remembering, meanwhile, that the critics are apt to be over-critical, and that zeal for discovery often makes one on the outlook imagine that he sees land, while what he does see is a cloud in the horizon, or a fog-bank far away under the blue.

Once more, it would seem that very many of us are coming to be conscious that there is an interest and value in our ancient Scripture of which we had grown in a measure inappreciative. It is not very long ago that many, believing the Old Testament to belong to a dispensation wholly past, had almost come to regard it as no longer of interest for a Christian. Some, even, doubted if it were well for ministers to take texts from it for their sermons. The Christianity of the Puritans had a strong Old Testament cast; that of their children seemed in danger of reaching an opposite extreme even more mistaken. We find, now, that its rela-

tion to the New Testament, in its exhibition of a most interesting and momentous stage in the steady growth of Divine revelation and the kingdom of God on earth, as an ancient literature, some of it perhaps the oldest in the world, as running parallel with those other ancient literatures now coming to light, and yet in most wonderful contrast with them, as a repertory of primitive thought and faith, preserved by special Divine interposition from the corruption and darkness into which all in the world beside was plunged, as a memorial of ancient genius, plumed for fight by Divine inspiration and guided on its way by attending Divine ministries—we are now awakening to the fact that, as all this, our Old Testament is a most wonderful book, or, rather library of books. The infidel has done his worst in assailing it. Possibly we had consented in some measure to his disparagement. We now see that what he found in it as peculiar, and therefore open to attack, is peculiar just because it is old; and that what he did *not* find in it is a treasure of knowledge and faith worth more than all the wisdom of the world beside.—*Dr. J. A. Smith in Chicago "Standard."*

The respective "ages" of the Semitic and Indo-Germanic families.—This most fittingly leads us to the question of the respective "ages" of those two prominent families of languages. Not that to the one or to the other is to be assigned a longer, more ancient term of existence—for this notion of the direct parentage is, as we said, confined to bygone unscientific centuries, and to the Delitzsch-Fuerst school: if there be one. But it may fairly be asked—and this is by no means a barren speculation—which may have retained its ancient stamp with greater fidelity, and which thus reflects best the shape of its original? And there can be but one answer. The more simple, child-like, primitive of the two is, without any doubt, the Semitic. Abstraction and metaphysics, philosophy and speculation, as we find them in the Aryan, are not easily expressed in an idiom bereft of all real syntactic structure; bereft further of that infinite variety of little words, particles, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs, etc., which, ready for any emergency, like so many small living links, imperceptibly bind word to word, phrase to phrase, and period to period: which indeed are the very life and soul of what is called Construction. This want of exactness and precision, moreover, naturally inherent in idioms represented by words of dumb sounds, whose meaning must be determined according to circumstances by a certain limited number of shifting vowels, whose conjugations, though varied and flexible to an extraordinary degree, yet lack a proper distinction between the past and the future (cf. the Hebrew "perfect" and "aorist," which lend themselves to almost any tense between the past and future). There certainly is—who can doubt it?—notwithstanding all these shortcomings, a strength, a boldness, a picturesqueness, a delicacy of feeling and expression about those Semitic idioms which mark them, one and all, as the property of a poetically, not to say "prophetically" inspired race. But compare with this the suppleness of Aryan languages and that boundless supply of aid that enable them to produce the most telling combinations at the spur of the moment; their exquisitely consummate and refined syntactical development, that can change, and shift, and alter the position of word, and phrase, and sentence, and period, to almost any place, so as to give force to any part of their speech. With all these, and a thousand other faculties and capabilities, they might certainly at first sight almost lead one to the belief that they must have grown upon another stock—the Semitic—and outgrown it.

But discarding this unscientific notion, it cannot be denied that they are the "younger" of the two. The stage of Realism, as represented by the former, must naturally have preceded that of Idealism, of which the Aryan alone is the proper type and expression. The Semitic use of the materialistic, "sensual," term for physiological and psychological phenomena must be older than the formation and common usage of the Aryan abstract term. The name for the outward tangible impression which must have everywhere been identical originally with that of the sensation or idea connected with it, has remained identical in the Semitic from its earliest stage to its final development. It is, in fact, this unity of idea and expression, which, above all other symptoms, forces us irresistibly to place the Semitic into the front rank as regards "antiquity," such as we explained it; that is, of its having retained the closest likeness to some original form of human speech that preceded both the other family of language and itself.—*From Deutsch's Lit. Remains.*

➤CRITICAL NOTES.◀

"Time" in the Old Testament.—This "Note" is written for those who read the Old Testament in the English translation. The heading "Tense in Hebrew" would be more appropriate, but might be misleading. If the reader will open his Bible at Gen. XXIII., 11, he will read the words *I give thee* three times. In Abraham's reply (v. 13) occur the words *I will give thee*. If he will turn to Ruth, IV., 3, he will read, *Naomi . . . selleth a parcel of land*. Read also in Isa. IX., 6, *The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light*; and in Isa. XI., 9, *For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord*.

Now let it be noted that in the original the verbs which in these verses are rendered (1) *I give*, (2) *I will give*, (3) *selleth*, (4) *have seen*, (5) *shall be full* are in what is commonly called the *past* tense. It is undoubtedly true that the words "*I give*" in the first case and "*I will give*" in the second refer to the future, though immediate; in the third case we are confident that Naomi has not already sold her land, otherwise it would not still be for sale, at least by her; we shall all agree that the "light" referred to in Isa. IX., 6, is the Messianic time and still many hundred years in the future, although our translators have given us a literal rendering of the tense; the time in the future to which the words *shall be full* refer, is determined by the context. But in every case cited there is used in the Hebrew what is known as the *past* tense.

Now let the reader turn to Gen. II., 6. *But there went up a mist*; Ex. XV., 5, *the depths covered them*; XV., 1, *Then sang Moses*; Gen. VI., 4, *when the sons of God came in*; Isa. I., 21, *righteousness lodged in it*; Ps. I., 2, *and in his law doth he meditate*; Ex. I., 12, *But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew*. Let it be noted that in the case of every verb translated in these phrases the tense, in the original, is that which is usually called *future*. But how is this possible? The mist referred to *went up* before the creation of man. Moses *sang*, and the depths *covered* the hosts of Pharaoh thousands of years ago. In every case, except one, the thought is manifestly of the *past*. These cases bring fairly to our minds the question at issue, the use of the tense in Hebrew,—a question of interest not alone to the student of Hebrew, but to every one who would understand the Word of God.

There are two points worthy of notice: 1) The Hebrew has no "present" tense; 2) The so-called "past" and "future" tenses in Hebrew are fundamentally different from those in English, Latin or Greek. There is, what may be called, *order of time*; e. g., we say that a certain event is *past*, i. e., it took place at some date or time in the "past", and so another event is to take place at some date in the future. We take our stand in the present and, in reference to every event, ask ourselves as to its *order*. Has it yet taken place or is it yet to take place?—the standpoint of consideration being the present. Or, the standpoint of consideration may be fixed by the narrative. In this way we characterize it as past or future. This is *order of time*. But there is also what may be called *kind of time*; e. g., we may contemplate an action as *beginning, incipient, as finished, completed, or as continuing, going on*. A writer may "wish to lay stress upon the moment at which an action begins, or upon the period over which it extends, or upon the fact of its being finished and done." We must distinguish between this way of contemplating an action, and the former one. The former method marks differences in *date, or order*; but the latter in *kind or character*. As remarked above, the Hebrew has no "present" tense; its absence is partly supplied by using the participle, and the participle is used when the writer wishes to emphasize the duration, or uninterrupted continuance of an event. If an action, to be described, belongs to past time, but the writer wishes to characterize it as *beginning* in this past time, or as *incomplete*, he will use the so-called *future* tense, because *incipient and incomplete* action can be expressed only by this tense, whether the action is in the realm of the past, of the present or of the future. And *vice versa*, if an action belongs to the future, but the writer wishes to contemplate it as *finished, complete*, he must, of necessity, use the so-called *past* tense, because a finished or completed action can be indicated in no other way. It will thus be seen that the idea of the tense in English and Hebrew is entirely different. In the former language, tense indicates order or date; in the latter, *only* kind or character. But how, you will ask, is the order or date to be determined? One surely must know the date of an action, or he will all the time work in confusion. True; and there is a method of determining the order, although not by the tense. It will be found that in nearly every case this information may be obtained from the *context*.

The statement given in this Note is but a brief and general one; there is a multitude of details which come up in the close study of the subject. Space remains only for a rapid glance at the texts cited above, in view of what has been said.

Those cases in which the *so-called* past tense is used, while the English translation is in the present or future, may be explained as follows:—

1) Ephron really says to Abraham *I have given thee*, meaning thereby that he promises to give; and, although the giving is yet to take place, it is so certain, "being regarded as dependent upon an unalterable determination of the will," that it may be and is spoken of as having actually taken place.

2) The same explanation holds good of Abraham's reply which would read literally *I have given thee*, but is equivalent to *I will surely give thee*.

3) The literal rendering *Naomi has sold a parcel of land* is seen from the context to mean nothing; it assumes a new significance when we translate it *Naomi has resolved to sell (will surely sell)*, the fact of her *determination* to do so being indicated by the use of the *past* tense.

4) The prophet in Isa. ix., 6, writes as if the Messianic dispensation had already come. Inspired from above he announces as *taken place*, that which is

yet to take place. He represents it as an event *completed, finished*, and so it is in the divine will. The use of the past tense thus, in prophecy, is most frequent.

5) The last case (Isa. XI., 9) is similar. The context points to the future. At the time described in the preceding verses no one shall hurt or destroy, because, at that time, as the prophet looks ahead and sees, the earth *has been filled* with the knowledge of Jehovah.

The so-called *past* tense of the Hebrew marks an action or event as, in the estimation of the writer or speaker, *finished*. A better term for it, and one quite commonly used is *Perfect*, in the sense of complete.

Now look at those cases in which the so-called *future* tense was used in the Hebrew, while our English translation uses the present or past:—

1) *But there went up a mist* (Gen. II., 6) means that a mist went up *repeatedly*, from time to time; the idea would well be expressed by our phrase *used to go up*, the so-called future being used rather than the past, because the thought of *repetition* (incompleteness) was in his mind. The same explanation clears up the fourth and fifth cases cited: *when the sons of God were accustomed to go in* (Gen. VI., 4); *righteousness used to lodge in it* (Isa. I., 21).

2) If we substitute *then Moses began to sing* (Ex. XV., 1) for *then Moses sang*, we see the force of the tense, here denoting *incipiency*.

3) The Hebrew future, as we may recall, was said to indicate an action as unfinished, still going on. When an English speaker, in describing past events, desires to bring them vividly to the mind of his hearer, he uses the present (historical). By this means he places the event before the hearer as in the very act of taking place. To do this in Hebrew, the so-called future must be used. Keeping this in mind how much more significant is the expression *The depths cover them* (Ex. XV., 5), than would have been *The depths covered them*, the former portraying the event as directly before the eyes of the singers, the latter as a matter wholly in the past.

4) That man is *blessed who is accustomed to meditate* (Ps. I., 2), who keeps *meditating*, the so-called future being used as the tense which marks repetition, a form of incompleteness.

5) By rendering Ex. I., 12, *But the more they kept afflicting them, the more they kept multiplying and kept growing*, the verse takes on a new force, here again the future being used even of a past event because that event, though past, was contemplated as going on, incomplete. As the tense which marks completeness is termed by some the *Perfect*, so this one, marking incompleteness, is termed the *Imperfect*. These are but a few cases selected from many. Every chapter is full of verbal expressions, the close rendering of which is impossible in any language. There are shades of thought in nearly every verse which no translation can reproduce. They may be felt, but they cannot always be indicated. In prophecy and poetry is this especially the case.

It is proposed to take up in succeeding numbers of the STUDENT some of the Psalms, and, if possible, to point out some of these shades of thought. R.

The Sections in the Midrasch of Deuteronomy.*—The January STUDENT contained an interesting notice of *Der Midrasch Debarim Rabba*, by Prof. Charles R.

* Attention is called to the following correction in the notice, p. 174, line 5 from bottom: for "my son; וְלִי" that is:—"and rule over thy passion", read... my son וְלִי that is:—"וְלִי" and rule over thy passion."

Brown, of Newton Theological Institution. The term *Midrasch*, as our readers will recall, is applied to the Jewish interpretations of Scripture. Professor Brown's closing sentence in the notice was a suggestive one: "Historically the Midrasch is valuable, otherwise it is nearly worthless." By his kindness we are permitted to give below a tabular view of the sections included in the Midrasch of Deuteronomy:

Passages introducing Sections.	Halachoth, or Legal precepts.	Content of Sections.
1. I., 1.	May the Israelite transcribe the Law in every language?	The Profit of Instruction.
2. I., 10.	May the Israelite only who is placed over the whole people pronounce judgement?	The qualities demanded of judges and the duty of obeying them.
3. II., 3.	What is the reward of the Israelite who conscientiously reveres his parents?	The long duration of Esau's wicked kingdom (Rome) is a reward because Esau in a high degree obeyed this command.
4. II., 31.	How should an Israelite act upon a journey at the opening of the Sabbath if he has property with him?	Although Rome's power lasted long, its fall was sure. - So is Israel's exaltation.
5. III., 23.	May the Israelite pray aloud?	The great value of devotional prayer.
6. III., 24.	May the Israelite read the pattern (Schema) and then for the first time pray?	Although God is enthroned in the highest places, yet is he near every suppliant.
7. IV., 25.	May the Israelite permit the edges of his hair to grow?	The bad example of superiors is contagious among the people.
8. IV., 41.	What things were forbidden the first man?	The Abolition of Vengeance for blood-shed by the appointment of cities of refuge.
9. VI., 4.	Has the Israelite done his duty who has read the pattern (Schema) without particular attention to the pronunciation?	The confession of God's unity is a heritage from the sons of Jacob. With it they calmed their dying father.
10. VII., 12.	May the Israelite carry a jointed candlestick from place to place on the Sabbath?	God is true; reward and punishment are often delayed but they are certain.
11. IX., 1.	What blessing does one pronounce when he drinks water for his thirst? Answer: Blessed be he through whose word everything is done!	The miracles which God wrought by the Red Sea and in the wilderness by means of the spouting water give security that in passing over Jordan and in all further time God will protect the Israelites.
12. X., 1.	When an Israelite is married, who has to pay costs for writing the marriage contract?	The relation of God to Israel is like a marriage-covenant, the tables of the law are the marriage contract.
13. XI., 26.	May the Israelite read the curses in many divisions?	As man preserves the law the light of God which is in his power, so preserves God the soul, the light of man which is in His power.
14. XII., 20.	May the Israelite cover on a feast day the blood of a slain animal?	Benevolence is richly rewarded by God.

Passages introducing Sections.	Halaethoth, or Legal precepts.	Content of Sections.
15. XVI., 18.	May the relative of an accused person pronounce judgment?	Conscientious administration of justice on the part of judges is one of the props of the divine throne.
16. XVII., 14.	May an Israelitish king, having cause for suit, enter his case before the court?	Accusers are the ruin of a State. A State without them is powerful and victorious.
17. XX., 10.	What things have for their object the maintenance of peace?	The harmony of the world is a pattern for harmonious living.
18. XXII., 6.	Must a child born without foreskin be circumcised?	Obey the divine commands, small and great, without reference to greater or less reward; be conscientious, and especially be merciful to beasts.
19. XXIV., 9.	May one attacked with leprosy have himself examined by a priest who is his relative?	Envy and calumny entail misery and ruin.
20. XXVI., 1.	May the leader in prayer say amen! after every verse of the priest's blessing?	The house of God is a fountain of life, it brings thee fulness of blessing.
21. XXIX., 1.	May an Israelite, about to read from the law, read less than three verses?	The law is a precious possession, even angels have longed after it.
22. XXIX., 9.	If one has frequently omitted any prayers of the day, because of lack of time or because he was on a journey and forgot to pray, what must he do?	By the cases of Cain and Hezekiah may we recognize the efficacy of prayer.
23. XXX., 11.	What benediction must he pronounce who is about to read from the law?	For the advantage of men God gave the law, it is refreshment to the whole being.*

The Order of Melchisedec.—The supposition that there is a conflict between Ex. xx., 24, 25, 26, and Dent. xii., 5, 6., and in other places of the same book, can be easily prevented by supposing the instance first mentioned to be a general re-statement of the law of sacrifice, looking to spiritual results, such as had been in existence all through the patriarchal age, and which was certainly practiced by Samuel, David and Elijah. While the direction in Deuteronomy refers to the Levitical rites and sacrifices which had a primary relation to an earthly covenant, a temporal priesthood and a political privilege, but more remotely of course, involved the great sacrifice and rights of Christ and his church, the 20th chapter of Exodus is general, and designed for all nations and times. The Aaronic priesthood was not yet ordained, but sacrifices had been in order from the very beginning. These sacrifices had no reference to any political privilege whatever, while the Aaronic sacrifices were strictly national, as was the tabernacle and temple service, all of which was afterward ordained.

Of these primitive sacrifices all nations would partake, nor were any restrictions placed upon family in reference to the priest who should offer them. Of these priests, Melchisedec was a noted example, and became the type by which the

* עֲבֹדָה , the first word of Deut. vi., 4, is properly Imperative, but is used as a noun indicating the whole verse, which was regarded as a sort of confession of faith among the Jews. See OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT for Jan. 1884, p. 174.

order was to be designated in the process of that prophetic evolution which burst out in all its completeness when a risen Savior became the only priest humanity should ever again need.

This Melchisedec was a genuine כהן and a כהן לאל עליון. He belonged to the Canaanite race afterward proscribed by the law of Moses and forever debarred from all privileges of the Hebrew race and Aaronic priesthood. He has no genealogy, showing that this priesthood rises above the prerogative of a family, and belongs to the higher claims of a sanctified manhood. No wonder then, that the vision of the Psalmist, having been opened to the glory of the coming dispensation, should rise above the narrow limits of his own nationality and its priesthood, and fix itself upon Melchisedec as the true type of the priesthood of the Son of God.

We may safely infer that this priesthood and sacrifice were more or less practiced all through the history of the Israelites, until by a too superstitious reverence for the sacred places made memorable by them, the true spiritual culture was lost sight of and it became evil in God's sight, and the whole practice was interdicted by Divine order and regal authority.

C. V. ANTHONY.

♦♦♦

→ EDITORIAL NOTES ←

Semitic Study at Johns Hopkins University.—With the advent of Dr. Paul Haupt as professor of the Semitic Languages at Johns Hopkins University, a new interest in the study of these subjects could not fail to be aroused. From the *University Circular*, issued under the auspices of that institution, we learn that the classes are already formed in Assyrian, Sumero-Accadian, Arabic, Hebrew and Ethiopic. Nine students are enrolled, one of whom is sufficiently advanced in Assyriology to take up the reading of bi-lingual texts at sight. It is gratifying to note that there is such a demand for high-class instruction in this department, and that this demand can now be met in our own country by as competent an instructor as Germany can show. No small good will result to American scholarship from the enterprise and foresight of the Trustees of this University in securing the services of Prof. Haupt. It is the beginning, let us hope, of a movement to extend instruction in the Semitic languages into all the leading American colleges.

Another Testimony.—It gives us pleasure to publish the following letter, relating to a subject, in which, we believe, every student of the Bible ought to be interested:—

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—

I have read with pleasure the letter which Dr. Elliott publishes on page 124 of the December Number of THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT. He gives one of many instances which might be cited to show that in America Hebrew is beginning to receive a fair measure of attention. The plan of making Hebrew an elective study in our academical institutions is one which I most heartily recommend. Indeed, unless something of the kind is done, we can hardly expect to produce many first-class Hebraists. But let our students enjoy at least one term of thorough drill in the elements of the language before entering upon the study of

Theology, then ere their professional studies are completed they shall be able with zest to examine the niceties of syntax and exegesis; and better, they shall leave the Theological College with a love for the Hebrew Scriptures and an ability to read them with ease and profit. Dalhousie College, of this city, has recently made Hebrew an elective study, and so far as I know all fourth year men who have the ministry in view are enrolled in the Hebrew class.

Yours very respectfully,

3 Bland street, Halifax, N. S.

JOHN CURRIE.

Encouragement of Bible Study.—Certain prominent Canada papers have undertaken to popularize Bible study. Churches, Sunday Schools, and such other means as are ordinarily employed, will be supplemented by a method which not only covers in general the entire field, but also deals largely in detail. The particular kind of Bible study insisted upon is represented as being most profitable, and, with the incentive offered, most entertaining. The plan proposed furnishes employment of a high character for the long winter evenings, for both old and young. The profit to be gained from the study, under this plan, will be pecuniary as well as intellectual. Gold and silver watches, chains, locketts, rings, etc., are presented to the students of this school. An idea of the scope of the work may be obtained from the announcements made. In the work mapped out by one journal the student is expected to ascertain (1) how many times the word *Lord* occurs in the Bible? (2) how many times the word *Jehovah* is found in the Bible? (3) whether there are two chapters in the Bible exactly alike, and if so, where they are? Another journal instructs its students to ascertain (1) how many letters there are in the Bible? (2) how many words? (3) what verse in the Bible contains all the letters of the alphabet, counting I and J as one?

It would be no easy task to reckon the results, in respect either to amount or character, of Biblical knowledge acquired by these methods. To know that there are 3,586,483 letters in the Bible, 773,693 words, 31,373 verses, and 1,189 chapters; or to have learned that the words "Jehovah" and "Lord" occur a certain number of times—how valuable such knowledge must be. And in addition to the knowledge thus attained, sight must not be lost of "a pair of beautiful heavily plated gold bracelets," or "a solid gold gem ring," which falls to the lot of that arithmetical individual who succeeds first in making himself master of this practical information. How strange that respectable journals will lend themselves to such folly, or allow their pages to be used in advertising such nonsense. Yet the announcement informs us that this is done to encourage Bible study (!). We trust that entertainment of a more profitable character, and Biblical study of a different type may be provided for both the children and the adults of Canada. Let us have Bible study; let us encourage it; but let us be sure that it *is* Bible study.

What is Bible Study not.—It is often easier to say what a thing is *not*, than to say definitely what it is. That Bible study is study of the Bible, will be granted by all, but even this is not so satisfactory an explanation as one would wish.

Bible study, we are prepared to affirm (1) is *not* the counting of verses, words and letters; and it is but justice to our Canada friends to say that they are not alone in making this error, for the Jews at times, have paid much attention to the *letter* of the Word, and the work of counting points, letters, words and verses, in the case of the Hebrew Bible was done long ago. Nor (2) is Bible study the correct term to apply to those endeavors, so frequent in these days, to ascertain not

what the Bible teaches, but what it does *not* teach. Those who make these discoveries, do it more or less innocently. When the discovery has once been made, it is extremely difficult to persuade them that it is a sort of negative discovery, that is, a discovery of something which really does not exist in the place in which it is supposed to be found. Now it would seem that if the discovery of results which are *not* results, (and this is the character of a large number of the so-called results) is Bible study, some other name must be chosen for that work which produces genuine results. We cannot believe (3) that a correct definition of the term *Bible study*, would include that effort, made by many and closely connected with the last, which is prompted by a desire to prove that the Bible does *not* teach anything. It is possible to draw a line between (a) endeavoring to make the Bible teach everything and anything, and (b) trying to show that it teaches nothing. There are still other varieties of so-called Bible study which do not deserve the name, of which we may mention but two. However necessary and important the study of the word of Scripture may be, and by this we mean all investigation which deals with the forms, construction and meaning of words, or the historical setting of the thought,—in other words the *intellectual* part of the work, Bible-study (4) which stops with this, is not in a true sense study of the Bible. Nor (5) is the study of the spiritual part rightly to be reckoned as Bible study, when it is not based upon and closely connected with the intellectual study. One may say that all these are, in a sense, Bible study. True, but in what sense? A true definition would, probably, indicate a kind of study obtained from the union of the two last mentioned, neither of which, by itself, may justly lay any claim to the appellation.

The Study of the Messianic Element in the Old Testament.—The exact amount and character of the Messianic element is difficult to determine. One student finds it everywhere. Another, more careful and critical, discovers it but seldom. Yet it is true that Christians, for the most part, love the Old Testament and study it, that they may better appreciate and understand the Christ whom they believe to have come, and with whose coming these Old Testament Scriptures had, as they regard it, so much to do. It would not be strange then, if Christian interpretation of such passages differed greatly from the Jewish interpretation of the same. Nor need we be surprised if the interpretations proposed by Christians should, in many cases, even be distasteful to Jewish scholars. In various ways we have been informed that the discussion, merely, of such subjects, is regarded with disfavor by Jews. For the publication of articles of this character, in recent numbers, the *STUDENT* has been censured severely, both publicly and privately. But is this just? Will Christian scholars consent to do away with the study of those portions of their Scripture which present to them the most interesting field for investigation, and upon which they build in part the foundation of their belief, because, forsooth, the results of their study are different from those accepted by their Jewish brethren? Would Jewish scholars have them do this? Do they expect, ought they to expect such deference to be paid to their feelings? It is not only the privilege, but the duty of every man to teach that which he believes, and the publication of one's opinions cannot be made dependent upon either the wish or the feelings of another. We appreciate the fact that such discussions cannot interest the Jewish portion of our constituency. We greatly regret it; but we cannot, for this reason, consent, in accordance with a kind sug-

gestion to this effect, to omit henceforth the publication of such articles. Nor do we believe that the *highest* class of Jewish papers and Jewish scholars would desire this to be done.

Jewish theories of Messianic Interpretation.—The question often occurs to Christian students, in accordance with what theories do Jewish scholars interpret these so-called Messianic passages? While much that is regarded as Messianic by Christians, is not so regarded by Jews, there still remains a large amount of that which both will accept as referring to a coming Messiah. This element is recognized by both. A recent writer* enumerates four distinct theories advanced by Jewish theologians of different schools, in accordance with which these portions are interpreted. (1) A theory which may be called the *regal* theory. Those who accept this believe that a Messiah shall at some time appear as Israel's King. This Messiah will be Davidic, but not divine. He shall gather them together from all lands and lead them back to Palestine. As their king he shall take vengeance upon those who for so long a time have oppressed them. His reign shall be a prosperous, glorious and everlasting one. This King is not to suffer. Those predictions concerning a suffering Messiah refer, according to this view to the sufferings of some prophet, or to those of the nation as a unit. (2) A second theory is that of the *Two Messiahs*. A Messiah ben Joseph and a Messiah ben David shall appear at the same time. In the sufferings of the former all predictions of the one kind will find fulfilment, in the deliverance of Israel, wrought out by the latter, the second class of predictions are fulfilled. The former dies in the war with Gog and Magog. The latter reigns forever. (3) A third theory is that of a *Messianic Atonement*. Some believe that an atonement for human sin will have been made in Paradise by the Messiah before his appearance on earth. This atonement will be made by suffering of the most intense character. Others, we are told, suppose that the Messiah has already been born, but that he has not yet manifested himself, and that at the present time, and indeed, until the time of his manifestation he is engaged in making atonement for Israel's sins. (4) A fourth theory is denominated the *No-Person* theory, in accordance with which the Messiah is supposed to be an age of prosperity and, in no sense, personal.

→BOOK NOTICES.←

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

BIBLICAL STUDY.†

Upon opening a book on *Biblical Study*, by an author who occupies a prominent position in a leading theological seminary, who is the editor of a denominational Review, which may safely be regarded as the best Review in the country, and who has had many years' experience in the work of teaching the Bible, a reader

* Burnham's *Old Testament Interpretation*, pp. 184, 185.

† *Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods and History*. By Prof. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 8x5. Price \$2.50.

may be pardoned for expecting to find material of great value, and suggestions which shall prove helpful to him in his work as a student of the Bible. Does the book before us meet the reasonable expectations of its readers? Is its purpose a worthy one? Will it really serve as a help to those who desire to know better how to study the Bible? Is it a book to be studied, or will a hasty perusal suffice? Does it contain anything new? Does it pursue a correct method? Is its teaching true?

Since the publication of Professor Briggs' "critical" views in the *Presbyterian Review*, his friends, as well as his enemies, have been eager to learn still more definitely his views on various Biblical subjects. These critics may surely determine from this volume whether he may be trusted as a trainer of theological students. Those who differ from the author respecting "critical" questions will be the first to acknowledge the need of just such a book, and to recognize this volume as a most valuable aid to a correct understanding of the principles of Biblical study and the historical development of these principles.

After showing that, of all studies, Biblical study is the most important, extensive, profound, and attractive, the author sets himself to indicate the branches, methods and principles of the study, and to sketch their history. Biblical study is, really, *Exegetical Theology*, and this may be subdivided into (1) Biblical Literature, (2) Biblical Exegesis, and (3) Biblical Theology. Under the first division, we have chapters on (a) the *Languages of the Bible*, in which the characteristics of these languages are stated with very great force; (b) *The Bible and Criticism*—a favorite subject with the author, and one which crops out almost unconsciously at every turn, in which "Criticism" is defined, its principles stated, and illustrations given; (c) *The Text of the Bible*; (d) *The Higher Criticism*; (e) *The Literary study of the Bible*; this is essentially the treatment which appeared in the last volume of the O. T. STUDENT; (f) *Hebrew Poetry*. In the chapter on *Bible and Criticism*, we are told that "Biblical Criticism is confronted by traditional views of the Bible which decline re-investigation and revision." The question is, whether, as is claimed, these traditional views and dogmatic statements are really scriptural, and whether the criticism and even rejection of them will place the Bible in peril. At all events, will those who do not believe be influenced by such representations? Can they be prevented from testing the Bible by the principles of criticism? Is it not well for Christians and scholars also to use these tests and defend the Scriptures rather than leave that defence in the hands of dogmatic theologians and scholastics? The right of Biblical criticism is claimed in accordance with the principles of the Reformation and of Puritanism over against the Roman Catholic principle of the supremacy of tradition and dogma. "On this basis the Protestant symbols have been accepted and subscribed by honest and faithful men for their *face value*, for all that is fairly contained therein, and not for certain unknown and undiscovered consequences which may have a chance majority or the most authoritative teachers. Symbols of the faith are the expression of the faith of those who constructed them, and of those who subsequently adopted them, so far as they gave expression to Christian doctrines; but, with regard to those questions not covered by their statements, which they may have held in abeyance, or purposely omitted on account of disagreement, and in order to liberty, or because they were not suited for a national confession or a *child's* catechism, or because they had not yet arisen in the field of controversy—to bring these in by the plea of logical deduction, is to elaborate and enlarge the creed

against the judgment of those who framed it, is to usurp the constitutional methods of revision, is to dogmatize and obstruct those active, energetic scholars who having accepted them for their face value as a genuine expression of their faith, push forth into the unexplored fields of the Bible and theology, in order, by the inductive method and the generalization of facts, rather than by deductions from symbolic or scholastic statements, to win new triumphs for their Divine master."

The chapter on *Higher Criticism* is worthy of special study by those who desire to know, briefly, its rise and growth. That the acknowledged principles of modern criticism would have governed the reformers, if the questions had come up to any great extent, may be inferred from Luther's denial of the Apocalypse to John, and of Ecclesiastes to Solomon, and from the fact that he did not regard the epistle of James as an apostolic writing, and treated Jude as an extract from 2 Peter. Others of the reformers, likewise, had liberal views as to the authorship and even the canonicity of certain books. Many items of interest are brought out in this connection. The author, after explaining what, in his opinion, is the true method of dealing with the traditional theories treats successively the Rabbinical theories, the Hellenistic and Christian theories, the New Testament views of the Old Testament literature, the rise of the Higher Criticism, and the Higher Criticism in the 19th century.

The remaining chapters are (X.) on the Interpretation of Scripture, in which there is given an historical review of the various theories; (XI.) on Biblical Theology, in which are discussed the various types, the rise, the development, and the position and importance of this branch; (XII.) on the Scriptures as a means of grace.

A noteworthy feature of the book is the catalogue of literature, pp. 429-486. This contains a list of reference books for Biblical study. This list will doubtless be amended in some particulars in a second edition.

The question at once arises in the mind of the reader, Why is so much space given to the subject of criticism? Two answers may be given. No subject, connected with the Bible, is demanding to-day the same amount of attention. For fifty years or more, vigorous discussion has been going on; it grows more and more urgent with each year. In such a treatise, a large proportion of space must be given this question, because it is a living one. And besides, it is well known that Dr. Briggs is particularly interested in this question. His articles, referred to elsewhere, have placed him in a somewhat peculiar position. The book is intended, doubtless, as a defense of that position. It is quite hostile in its attitude towards traditional views. It would have the *right* of criticism acknowledged. It would accept as authoritative in reference to Scripture, everything that the Scriptures teach; but those questions not decided by the Scriptures, it would decide by the principles of Higher Criticism; should any question remain still undecided, *tradition* may be used. In theory, this position is certainly plausible. Is it not a practicable one?

Forty pages are given to Hebrew Poetry, seventy to the Interpretation of Scripture. We do not desire to criticize the lengthy treatment of the former subject. It is most excellent. No treatment, heretofore published, contains as much genuine information in the same space. Yet are not seventy pages too few, in proportion, for that extensive subject, Interpretation of Scripture? The writer does not say too much concerning the position of Biblical theology. That the importance of

this department is coming to be more highly appreciated is shown by the fact that in many seminaries, aside from the chair of Systematic Theology, there is also one of Biblical Theology.

The book, as a whole, indicates on the part of the author (1) a determination to convince his readers that the time has come for a scientific study of the Bible, and to inspire in their hearts a desire to engage in this study; (2) an extended and available knowledge of the facts and principles concerning which he writes; (3) a broad, liberal and intelligent spirit, a thorough knowledge of the demands of the times. The book will stir men up. It will challenge their attention. It will provoke study, and while not all the facts and conclusions which it announces will be established, it is probable that the position, in general, will, a decade hence, be accepted by many of those who to-day so strongly condemn it.

THE KINGDOM OF ALL-ISRAEL.*

This is an attempt to tell the story of the Hebrew Empire, a small kingdom it is true, but one whose "annals have always been regarded as a heritage of mankind, fraught with welfare to the whole world." The author accepts the traditional views of this history, and the work is therefore strictly orthodox. Regarding the Pentateuch as the chief source of Hebrew literature, the author has set himself to the task of finding "the living rills which run from it throughout the after-history in words, in quotations, and in ideas," and of tracing them back to the fountain-head.

There are eighteen chapters in the volume. It begins, of course, with *The Election of a King*. The writer here feels called upon to notice the nature of Hebrew historical writings and the doubts regarding their trustworthiness. In chapter V. we find discussed the *Law and legislation among the Hebrews*. Here a fact, which seems to have been overlooked, is noted, that "at no time during the five-centuries of the monarchy (1100-588 B. C.) is a word said of a body of laws enacted or codified by any of the kings." The inference is clear, says the author, that a law code evidently existed before a king filled the throne of Israel. It is the opinion of the writer, and he endeavors to substantiate that opinion, that when the Hebrews left Egypt they had a code of laws or customs with them, and that Ex. xxxi.-xxxiii. contain these precepts. The high civilization of this ancient code is enlarged upon. With a chapter on the "Anointing and Advancement of David," another on "David an Outlaw and an Exile," another on "The Death of Saul," and others on the "Literature and Worship of the People," "Reconstruction of All-Israel," "The Avenger of Blood," "The Close of David's Reign," we come to chapter XIII., "Deuteronomy—Antiquity of the Book—Internal Evidence." In proof of the antiquity of the book, there are urged four reasons: (1) The absence of any allusion to the relations sustained by Israel to Assyria in the time in which critics claim it to have been written. Vast changes had taken place in the condition of Israel, to which not the slightest reference is made. A forger could have written such a production and have failed to betray himself. (2) "There is no mention of Jerusalem in the book, or of the temple, as there ought to have been, if it was written when Hezekiah was attempting to put down

* *The Kingdom of All-Israel: Its History, Literature and Worship*. By JAMES SIME, M.A., F. R. S. E. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners street. 1883. 8vo, pp. 621. Price, \$4.00.

the high places, and make his capital the only seat of ritual worship." (3) It abounds in remembrances of Egypt, and of the wilderness out of which they had just come. There are fifty such allusions to Egypt. (4) Deuteronomy abounds in references to the events related in the three preceding books. These references are brief, made in passing, and imply that there is a close connection between Deuteronomy and the books which precede it. The chief difficulties connected with the traditional belief are taken up: (1) the expression Deut. i., 1, On this side Jordan; (2) Deut. ii., 12; (3) Ex. xii., 1-51 and Deut. xvi., 1-8; (4) boiling instead of roasting the passover; (5) the law of the central altar (Deut. xii., 1-32); (6) the law of the king (Deut. xvii., 14-20). These difficulties are seemingly settled for all time. Chapters xiv., xv., xvi., xvii., are given to the reign of Solomon. The last chapter is on the "Priests and Levites." An elaborate argument is brought forward to show that on the ground of this expression nothing can be proven concerning the priority of Deuteronomy in point of time, when compared with the three preceding books.

The volume is bright, airy, arrogant and dogmatic. The author repeatedly denounces others for offering conjectures. He has counted the occurrence of the words "probable," "likely," "perhaps," etc., in Bleek's *Introduction*, yet accuses him of confident assertion. The trouble with our author is that he does not use such words with sufficient frequency. In no book with which we are acquainted is there to be found so much baseless conjecture, and, at the same time, dogmatic assertion. The coloring given to the narrative is often purely fictitious. The style and character would answer well for an historical novel, but for ordinary history, it seems unsatisfactory. However, readers will gain a vivid idea of the events of these stirring times from the perusal of this volume.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY.*

If it can be shown that in the Old Testament Scriptures there exists a body of predictive prophecy, not to be explained away on the basis of human foresight or science, that a number of these predictions preceding by more than two centuries the appearance of Jesus, point to a Messiah and cannot, after careful examination, be fairly explained with reference to any other person, and on the other hand that in the Jesus of the New Testament (and in no other) claiming to be the Messiah, these facts of whose life as related in the Gospels are substantially correct, Messianic prophecy had a remarkably circumstantial and complete fulfillment,—the conclusion becomes almost irresistible that the two are one, that the Jesus of the New, is the predicted Messiah of the Old Covenant.

If this argument can be satisfactorily made out, it has a double office and usefulness, since it affords a strong proof of the Divine origin and authority both of the Old Testament Scriptures and of the Christian Religion as well. It indicates the essential connection between Judaism and Christianity, and links the latter to the grand course of historic development and the fulfillment of the Divine purpose. It exalts the dignity of the Messiah and throws new light upon his mission in the world.

Such is the general course of argument pursued by Dr. Gloag in the book before

* *The Messianic Prophecies. Being the Baird Lecture for 1879.* By PATON JAMES GLOAG, D. D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribner & Welford. 7½x5, Pp. xv.—368

us. Whether he satisfactorily makes out his case, his readers must judge for themselves. He certainly must be credited with great candor, breadth of view, ability to see both the strength and weakness of opposing arguments, and clearness in statement, contrasting very favorably in this regard with the writings of recent German thinkers upon these subjects. Seven lectures constitute the course, but each of these is enriched by a body of valuable notes which carry out into greater detail the exegetical or philosophical hints of the text. We cannot observe a point which has been untouched in the course of the argument. The principal Messianic passages and the more subordinate ones are taken up in turn, and subjected to a careful examination. One whole lecture is given up to a study of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. The book may be safely and warmly commended.

PROPHECY: ITS NATURE AND EVIDENCE.*

This book is one among the many scholarly arguments put forward in defence of the authority of Scripture by the practical English mind which seems to delight to run in the groove first marked out by Butler and Paley. "Evidences of Christianity" are numerous and weighty enough to convince the world if it were willing to be convinced. This volume deals with but one line of argument, which is presented in a thoroughly logical way. The gist of it is this. No small part of the Scriptures consists of prophecy. This prophecy is not merely lofty thought, didactic or spiritual, which the prophet pressed upon the men of his time. It contains predictions of such a minute, circumstantial and far-reaching character that the conclusion is well nigh irresistible that the writings which contain these predictions are divinely given and authoritative. A long chapter of the small volume is given to tracing the development of Messianic Prophecy from the origin of man to the coming of Christ. The whole argument is, of course, an old and familiar one, but it will be found stated here with a freshness, an adaptation to the present state of biblical scholarship, and a freedom from doctrinal prepossessions, which make it a useful addition to the literature of the subject. The title of the book is somewhat misleading. The Nature of Prophecy is but briefly considered, and the reader must not expect much beyond what has been briefly summarized in the preceding lines. The titles of the chapters are as follows: I., Introduction; II., The Prophet's Office and Mission; III., The Prophet's Training and Inspiration; IV., The Prophetic Word; V., Prophecy: its Fulfillment; VI., The Messiah the Soul of Prophecy; VII., The Word and the Facts; VIII., The Prophetic Spirit in the Christian Dispensation.

HEBREW TRADITION.†

This book is evidently a series of sermons upon the first chapters of Genesis, such as might have been delivered to a cultured Unitarian congregation in the vicinity of Boston. So far as affording any real help in the solution of the difficulties which are met in the study of these chapters it is of no service. With an airy

* *Prophecy: Its Nature and Evidence.* By the Rev. R. A. REDFORD, M. A., LL.B. London: *The Religious Tract Society.* New York: *Scribner and Welford* 7½x5. Pp. 301.

† *The Primeval World of Hebrew Tradition.* By FREDERIC HENRY HEDGE. Second edition. Boston: 1872. *Roberts Bros.* 7x4½ in. pp. 283.

assurance born of German rationalism the writer resolves Eden, the fall, the six days, and almost everything else in that most sober and literal of narratives into myth, allegory, and concludes as "the result of sober and reverent criticism" that the narrative of God's meeting and converse with Abraham is a Hebrew Idyl. The mistakes of theologians of the orthodox school figure largely in this book. It may be that to other eyes than the writer's, the baseless assumptions and vagaries of an irreverent criticism stand out quite as clearly. The book may serve its purpose in presenting, in a most fascinating style, theories of what the Hebrew traditions ought to teach according to the opinion of an idealistic philosopher. The last chapter, which develops the idea that the great teaching of the Hebrew race to the world was the importance of the inner life, exhibits the author at his best, who in the treatment of historical facts and statements seems to be lacking in the homely virtue of common-sense.

HEROES OF HEBREW HISTORY.*

The perennial beauty and freshness of this series of sketches is our excuse for bringing it to the attention of readers. They are not critical or deeply learned but designedly popular in matter and style. They were written for *Good Words*, and have been since published in book form, of which this volume is a new edition. Ministers who are anxious to obtain a model in homiletic treatment of Old Testament characters would do well to possess themselves of this volume. Bishop Wilberforce always wrote and spoke with great eloquence, but the union of beauty, strength and sweetness in these biographical discourses gives them a peculiar charm. He invests old and well-known scenes and characters with a new interest by the power of sympathy with both their surroundings and their thoughts and feelings.

The first sketch is that of Abraham, and the last deals with Elisha. It is specially instructive to notice how careful and extended knowledge of antiquities and acquaintance with the latest views concerning the subjects of his discourse are so intimately woven into the narrative, and the whole lighted up with a glow of genuine eloquence and spiritual fervor, that the reader is instructed while charmed and elevated and stimulated while carried along unwearily by the sustained vigor of the style. An abstract of the volume would be impossible.

→REVIEW NOTICES.←

The *Bibliotheca Sacra* in its January number contains two articles which come within the scope of our review. Professor Curtiss presents the first of a series of "Sketches of Pentateuch Criticism." Our sympathies are at once interested by the following sentences from his introduction: "Not all can pursue these studies.

* *Heroes of Hebrew History*. By the late SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, D. D. New Edition. London, 1879; Doldy, Ishister & Co.; New York: Scribner and Welford. 7x5. Pp. 368.

† *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. Editors: G. F. WRIGHT, JUDSON SMITH, W. G. BALLENTINE. Vol. XLI. Jan. 1884. Oberlin, Ohio: E. J. Goodrich. \$3.00 per year.

1. Sketches of Pentateuch Criticism, by Rev. S. Ives Curtiss, D. D.

4. Proposed Reconstruction of the Pentateuch: Deuteronomy and the Related Codes, by Prof. Edwin C. Bissell, D. D.

There is but one class of theologians who can, and they are the professors of Old Testament Theology in our various seminaries. In this work they need the sympathy and prayers of all their ministerial brethren. The position which they hold in this country is not only one of solemn responsibility to Christ, but also of positive peril to themselves, should the results of their investigation not seem to be in accord with the various standards received by different denominations."

Prof. Curtiss has for six years been collecting the material for an historical study of Old Testament Criticism. The first article deals with The Foreshadowings of a Critical Tendency among Heretics, Heathen, Jews and Christians, and introduces us to the First Period (1650-1800). The names and theories noted are the destructive critics, Hobbes, Peyrere and Spinoza, whose objections are all presented at length. The constructive critics will have their turn in the next article. One thing is remarkable—how familiar these objections are. They are the same which are insisted upon to-day by the critics. This series promises to be deeply interesting.

The series of articles upon the "Proposed Reconstruction of the Pentateuch," by Prof. Bissell, is closed in the same number by a comparison of Deuteronomy and the Related Codes. In such a comparison the critics claim to find support for their theory of the late origin of the code of the middle books of the Pentateuch. Prof. Bissell in his detailed comparison of the various laws, arrives at a precisely opposite conclusion, and shows that "if there are some laws in the middle books of such a nature that it would be impossible to determine, if taken simply by themselves, whether they chronologically preceded or followed Deuteronomy, the number is exceedingly small. A very large proportion of them, according to all fair rules of internal evidence, and tested by these only, appear as fixed, original sources." If the case has been made out, it will be of great value in settling the worth of the new ultra-critical hypothesis.

Since the time when Prof. Patton closed so emphatically the series of articles in the *Presbyterian Review** upon the Higher Criticism with his dogmatico-theological polemic, that Journal has failed to produce anything more upon the subject. In the January number appears—amusingly enough—a sharp review of Dr. Briggs' *Biblical Study*,—himself an editor, taken to task by a brother-editor, Dr. Chambers. While commending the book as fresh and vigorous, he charges it with "sheer assertions," novel, revolutionary and groundless principles, a theory of inspiration which would result in a "mutilated or vacillating Bible," and asserts that the difference, of which Dr. Briggs reminds his readers, between the old divines and the modern critics does not exist. Such a criticism in such a place, implies more than it reveals. We hope that the Presbyterian Church is not about to turn its back upon these great questions or settle them without a full and free discussion, merely by an appeal to creeds or to authority of any kind regardless of the protests of some of its leading scholars.

† *The Presbyterian Review*. Managing editors: CHARLES A. BRIGGS, FRANCIS L. PATTON. Associate editors: R. B. WELCH, J. EELLS, S. J. WILSON, T. H. SKINNER, T. W. CHAMBERS. Vol. V. Jan., 1884. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. \$3.00 per year.

Reviews: Briggs' *Biblical Study*, by TALBOT W. CHAMBERS.

→SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY.←

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- BARTLETT, S. C., Sources of History in the Pentateuch. New York: *A. D. F. Randolph & Co.*, 1 vol. 16mo.,.....\$1.25
- BAKER, REV. W. M., The Ten Theophanies or, The Appearance of Our Lord to Man before His Birth in Bethlehem. New York: *A. D. F. Randolph & Co.*, 350 pp. 12mo.,.....\$1.50
- OEILER, G. F., Old Testament Theology. Translated and Edited by Prof. Geo. E. Day. New York: *Funk & Wagnalls*, 8vo.,.....\$3.00

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- ROOS, FR., Die Geschichtlichkeit des Pentateuchs, insbesondere seiner Gesetzgebung. Eine Pruefung der Wellhausen'schen Hypothese. Stuttgart: *Steinkopf*. 8vo.,.....M.2.40
- DELTZSCH, FRIEDRICH, The Hebrew Language viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research. London: *Williams & Norgate*. '83. XII., pp. 73. 8vo.,.....4s.
- WRIGHT, G. H. B., The Book of Job. A new critically revised translation, with Essays on scansion, date, etc. London: *Williams & Norgate*. '83. VII. pp. 240. 8vo.,.....6s.
- LYON, D. G., Keilschrifttexte Sargon's, Koenigs von Assyrien (722-705 B. C.). Nach den Originalen neu hrsg., umschrieben, uebers. und erklart. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*. '83. XVI. 268 S. gr. 8.,.....M.24.—
- MORAUD, La Terre des Patriarches, ou le Sud de la Palestine. Lyon: *Vitte & Perrussel*. '83. XII. pp. 231.....fr.3.50
- DELTZSCH, FRANZ, Biblischer Commentar ueber die Psalmen. 4. Aufl. [Keil u. Delitzsch Bibl. Comm. ueb. d. A. T.] Leipzig: *Doerfling & Franke*. '83. XII. 904 S. gr. 8.,.....M.16.—
- WIEDEMANN, A., Aegyptische Geschichte. I. Abth.: Von den aeltesten Zeiten bis zum Tode Tadmeh' III. Gotha: *F. A. Perthes*. '84. XII. 372 S. gr. 8.,.....M.7.—
- BERTHEAU, E., Das Buch der Richter und Ruth erklart. 2. Aufl. [Kurzgef. exeg. Handbueh zum A. T., 6. Lfg.] Leipzig: *Hirzel*. 1883. (XXXII. 316 S. gr. 8.).....M.6.—
- Fac-simile of the Codex Alexandrinus Old Testament. Volume II., Hosea to 4 Maccabees. London: *Truebner & Co.* Imperial 4to in case,.....£9.
- MOSEH BEN YISHAK, The Sefer Hassaham: A Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon. Edited with Additions and Corrections by G. W. Collins, M. A. In seven Parts. Part I. London: *Truebner & Co.* 4to, pp. 56.....3s.
- KRUMMEL, L., Die Religion der alten Aegypter. Heidelberg, 1883. 8vo.....25c.
- FISCHER, B., Talmudische Chrestomathie, mit Anmerkgn., Scholien u. Glossen unter besond. Beruecksicht. der talmud. Discussion als Lesebueh zu der von ihm edirten Winer'schen Grammatik bearbeitet. Leipzig: *Barth*. '84. VIII. 268 S. gr. 8.,.....M.6.—
- HERZFELD, L., Einleitung in das Sprachgebiet der semitischen Urzeit. Hannover. '83. 8vo.,.....\$1.50
- BUSH, REV. R. W., A Popular Introduction to the Books of Joshua, Judges and Ruth. London. 12mo. cl.,.....\$.75

- REDFORD, A.A. LL. B., Studies in the Book of Jonah: A Defence and an Exposition. London: *Hodder*. 8vo. pp. 304.....\$2.00
- Genesis in Advance of Present Science. A critical Investigation of chapters I. to IX. London. 8vo, cloth.....\$4.20
- HARKNESS, M. E., Assyrian Life and History. With an introduction by R. S. Poole. London. 12mo,.....\$1.00
- RIANT, *Invention de la Sépulture des Patriarches Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob à Hébron le 25 Juin 1119. Gênes, '83. (Extr. des Archives de l'Orient latin.)* pp. 13, 8vo.
- BERKLEY, E., The Pharaohs and their People. Scenes of Old Egyptian Life and History. Imp. *Scribner & Welford*. 12mo,.....\$3.00
- LILLIE, ARTHUR, The Popular Life of Buddha, containing an answer to the "Hibbert Lectures" of 1881. London: *Kegan Paul*. 12mo.....\$2.40
- CONDER, C. R., Heh and Moab. Explorations in Syria in 1881 and 1882. Published for the Committee of Pal. Ex. Fund. London: *Bentley & Son*. 8vo, \$5.60
- GOSSE, P. H., Sacred Streams: The Ancient and Modern History of the Rivers of the Bible. 44 Engravings and Map. New ed., Revised. London: *Hodder & Stoughton*. Gr. 8vo, pp. XII. 435,.....\$1.50
- HUGHES AND JOHNSTONE, Analysis of the Books of Jeremiah, with Notes, critical, historical and geographical. London: *Simpkin*. 8vo, pp. 90.....\$1.00
- SAYCE, A. H., The Ancient Empires of the East: Herodotus, I, III. With Notes, Introductions and Appendices. London: *MacMillan*. 8vo, pp. 506.....\$4.00
- FLEMMING, J., Die grosse Steinplatten-Inschrift Nebnkadnezar's II. in transcribirtem babylonischen Grundtext nebst Uebersetzung und Commentar. Dissertation. Leipzig: *Fock*. 1883. 61 S. 8vo,.....M.1.50
- Assyriologische Bibliothek, hrsg. von Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 4. Bd. 3. n. 4. Lfg. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*. 1883. hoch 4to, each.....M.24.—
[I. 1—4. II., IV., 1—4.: M.156.—]
- FRAIDL, F., Die Exegese der siebenzig Wochen Daniel's in der alten und mittleren Zeit. Graz: *Leuschner & Lubensky*. 1883. 160 S. gr. 4to.M.6.—
- SPITZ, J., Rabban Jochanan ben Sakkai, Rector der Hochschule zu Jabneh. Beitrag zur Kenntniss der Mischnah und des Talmud. Dissertation. Leipzig. 1883. 48 S. 8vo.
- WILLIAMS, MONIER, Religious thought and life in India: an account of the religions of the Indian peoples, based on a life's study of their literature and on personal investigations in their own country. Part I.: Vedism, Brahmanism, and Hinduism. London: *Murray*. 1883. 532 pp. 8vo,.....18s.
- MASPERO, G., Etudes égyptiennes. T. 1. Fasc. 2. Etude sur quelques peintures et sur quelques textes relatifs aux funérailles; le Conte de Apôpi et de Soknouri. Paris: *Maïssonneuve et C.* 1883. pp. 81—216, 8vo.
- LEFORT, F., Sur la période chaldaique; comment les prêtres égyptiens ou chaldéens ont pu sans aucune science, découvrir la période de 6585 j. $\frac{1}{3}$ qui ramène les éclipses tant de lune que de soleil, les mêmes et dans le même ordre pendant un long intervalle de temps. Paris: *Imp. nationale*. 1883. 14 pp. 4to. Extr. du Journal des savants.
- OPPERT, J., Deux textes très anciens de la Chaldée. Paris: *Imp. nationale*. 1883. 11 pp. 8vo. Extr. des Comptes rendus de l'acad. des inscr. et belles-lettres.
- SAYCE, A. H., Fresh light from the ancient monuments: a sketch of the most striking confirmations of the Bible from recent discoveries in Egypt, Assyria,

- Babylonia, Palestine, and Asia Minor. With fac-similes from photographs. London: *Tract Society*. 1883. 8vo,.....3s.
- BELLETT, J. C., God's witness in prophecy and history: Bible studies on the historical fulfilments of Jacob's prophetic blessings on the twelve tribes, contained in Genesis XLIX. With a supplementary inquiry into the history of the lost tribes. London: *Masters*. 1883. 350 pp. 8vo,.....6s.
- ARNOLD, M., Isaiah of Jerusalem in the authorized English version, with an introduction, corrections, and notes. London: *Macmillan*. 1883. 140 pp. 8vo,.....4s. 6d.
- VAUX, L. DE, La Palestine. Ouvrage illustré par P. Chardin et C. Mauss. Paris: *Leroux*. 1883. VII. 527 pp. 8vo, avec 154 grav.
- WYLIE, J. A., Over the Holy Land. London: *Nisbet*. 1883. 398 pp. 8vo, ..7s. 6d.
- ARNOLD, T. K., First Hebrew Book: 7th ed. Revised. London: *Rivingtons*. 12mo, pp. 288.....\$2.00
- WEISS, J. H., Zur Geschichte der juedischen Tradition. III. Theil. Vom Abschluss der Mischna bis zur Vollendung des babylonischen Talmuds. Wien. Gr. 8vo. pp. 331.....\$2.20
- LINCKE, A. A., Skizze der altaegyptischen Literatur mit besonderer Beruecksichtigung der Culturgeschichte. Vortrag. Leipzig. Gr. 8vo, pp. 95,..... \$1.10
- SCIAEFER, B., Das Diluvium in der Bibel. Frankfurt a. M. Gr. 8vo, pp. 26, \$.25
- SACHAU, ED., Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien. Mit 2 Karten von H. Kiepert, 18 Abbildungen und 22 Lichtdruckbildern. Leipzig. pp. 488.....\$7.40
- STRACK, DR. H. L., and SIEGFRIED, C., Lehrbuch der neuhebraeischen Sprache und Literatur. [Grammatik von C. Siegfried: Abriss der Literatur von H. L. Strack.] XII. 132 S. 8vo. Karlsruhe: *Reuther*. 1884.....\$1.10
- WUENSCH, AUG., Eine Sammlung alter Midraschim, zum erstenmale ins Deutsche uebertragen. Leipzig: *Otto Schultze*.

RECENT ARTICLES.

- BISSELL, PROF. E. C., D.D., Proposed Reconstruction of the Pentateuch. IV. Deuteronomy and the Related Codes. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1884, pp. 67-94.
- CURTISS, S. I., D.D., Sketches of Pentateuch Criticism. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-23.
- CARPENTER, PROF. J. E., Through the Prophets to the Law. *Modern Review*, Jan. 1884, pp. 1-29.
- COOLLET, S. D., Outlines and Episodes of Brahmie History. *Ibid.*, pp. 126-158.
- DEUTSCH, I., Einige Notizen zu den Targumim der Megilloth. *Jued. Litrblatt*, '83, 48, pp. 190-191.
- WEST, DR. N., Daniel and the First Resurrection. Notes and Notices. *Presbyterian Review*, Jan. '84, pp. 134-153.
- FISCHER, G., Auferstehung und ewiges Leben im Alten Testamente. *Beveis des Glaubens*, Nov. '83, pp. 401-415.
- J. A. W., The Higher Criticism. *Central Presbyterian*, Jan. 2, '84, p. 3.
- FOX, G. H., M. D., The Dietary restrictions of the Mosaic Code. *The Pulpit Treasury*, Jan. '84, pp. 565-567.
- MUNNELL, THOS., The Genuineness of the Pentateuch.—W. Robt. Smith. *Christian Quarterly Review*, Jan. '84, pp. 65-73.
- KELLOGG, PROF. S. H., D. D., Prof. Max Mueller on the Origin and Growth of Religion. *Ibid.*, pp. 132-157.
- DROSTE, Hiob, XIX., 23-27. *Zeitsch. f. d. Alttest.-Wiss.*, 1884, Heft 1, pp. 107-112.

- MENANT, J., Le Panthéon Assyrio-Chaldéen: Les Beltis. *Revue de l'histoire des Religions*, '83. Juill.—Août., pp. 489-519.
- CORNILL, Die Composition des Buches Jesaja. *Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1884, Heft 1, pp. 83-105. By the same, Capitel LI. des Buches Jeremiah. *Ibid.*, pp. 105-107.
- MCCOSH, PRES. J., Is the Darwinian Theory of Evolution reconcilable with the Bible? If so, with what limitations? *Homiletic Monthly*, Jan. '84, pp. 229-235.
- SIEGFRIED, Die Aussprache des Hebraeischen bei Hieronymus. *Zeitsch. f. d. Alttest. Wiss.*, 1884, Heft 1, pp. 34-83.
- MOORHEAD, REV. W. G., The Book of Ecclesiastes, I., II. *Episc. Recorder*, Jan. 12 and 19, '84, p. 2.
- GRILL, Beitrage zur hebraeischen Wort und Namenerklaerung. *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wiss.*, 1884, Heft 1, pp. 134-149.
- SAYCE, A. H., The Names of the First Three Kings of Israel. *Modern Review*, Jan. 1884, pp. 158-169.
- SAYCE, A. H., The Date of Sargon. Letter. *The Academy*, Nov. 24, '83, p. 351b.
- VOLLERS, Das Dodekapropheten der Alexandriner (Schluss). *Ztschr. f. d. Alttest. Wiss.*, 1884, Heft 1, pp. 1-21.
- STADE, Miscellen: Jes. IV., 2-6; Jer. III., 6-16; Habakuk. *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wiss.*, 1884, Heft 1, pp. 149-159.
- DER, Gegenwaertige Zustand der Hoehle Machpelah. *Juedisches Literatur-Blatt*, 52, Jahr. XII., Dec. 27, 1883, pp. 203-206.
- TAYLOR, PROF. JOHN P., Archaeological Notes. *Andover Review*, Jan. '84, pp. 95-101.
- WHITENHOUSE, O. C., The Route of the Exodus: Exod. XIII., 17-XIV., 4. *The Expositor*, Dec. '83, pp. 448-457.
- COX, S., The Sluggard's Garden: Prov. XXIV., 30-34. *Ibid.*, pp. 401-416.
- WISE, I. M., The Clean and the Unclean Animals in the Law of Moses. *American Israelite*, Jan. 4, '84, p. 4.
- DELITZSCH, Ueber den Jahve-Namen. I. (Vier Briefe von Franz Dietrich. Schluss.) II. (Der Name יהוה bei Laö-tse von Victor von Strauss-Tornay.) *Zeitschr. f. d. alttest. Wiss.*, '84, Heft 1, pp. 21-34.
- WENDTKE, REV. C. A., Martin Luther and the German Bible. *Unitarian Review*, Jan. '84, pp. 23-43.
- WURSTER, Zur Charakteristik und Geschichte des Priestercodex und Heiligkeitsgesetzes. *Zeitschr. f. d. alttest. Wiss.*, '84, Heft 1, pp. 112-134.
- COX, S., Adam's Gospel: Gen. III., 14. 15. *The Expositor*, Jan. '84, pp. 56-66.
- YONGE, J. E., Jacob's Pillar: Gen. XXXIII., 18. *Ibid.*, pp. 66-71.
- PLUMPTRE, E. H., Ezekiel, an Ideal Biography. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-18.

REVIEWS.

- BRIGGS, C. A., D.D., Biblical Study. *Christian Union*, Jan. 3, '84, p. 16. The Same. *Andover Review*, Jan., '84, pp. 101-103, by G. F. Moore. The Same. *The New Englander*, Jan., '84, pp. 137, 138.
- LADD, PROF. G. T., The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. *Andover Review*, (By Harris), Jan., '84, pp. 46-61. The Same. *The Sunday School Times*, Jan. 5, '84, pp. 10, 11. The Same. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., '84, pp. 197-202.
- TRUMBULL, H. C., Kadesh Barnea. *N. Y. Observer*, Jan. 3, '84, p. 6. The Same. *The Independent*, Jan. 3, '84, p. 10, by S. C. Bartlett, D.D. The Same. *Christian Union*, Jan. 3, '84, p. 17. The Same. *Christian Intelligencer*, Jan. 9, '84.