

## THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

VOL. IV.

SEPTEMBER, 1884.

NO. I.

### A RECENT THEORY OF THE GARDEN OF EDEN.\*

BY PROF. FRANCIS BROWN,

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

It is not the purpose of this article to give, even in outline, an account of the various hypotheses in regard to the position of Eden and its garden which have found champions at different periods in the history of exegetical studies.† But since a degree of new life has been awakened in the discussion since the beginning of the present decade, it seems worth the while to review one of its most striking phases with the purpose of determining, if possible, the net result.

The immediate and most effective cause of revived interest in a debate which had been long-continued and somewhat fruitless was the appearance, soon after the middle of 1881, of the monograph, *Wo Lag das Paradies*, by the brilliant Assyriologist of Leipzig. His views had been propounded some three or four years earlier in a paper read before the Leipzig *Verein fuer Erdkunde*, but were now published in a much more extended form, and fortified by great learning and ingenious argument. The essential mark of his theory was the location of Eden in Northern Babylonia, and the identification of the various features of the Biblical account (Gen. II., 8-14), with the aid of Babylonian topography and the products of Babylonian soil. This striking hypothesis, so vigorously presented, called forth a wide expression of opinion. Most of the notices which appeared in English and American publications were of a favorable nature,—some, indeed, with considerable reservations,—but, unfortunately for their scientific value, there was in several prominent cases a lack of discrimination, and an indication of prepossession, which diminished their real importance.

\* Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo Lag das Paradies*, Leipzig, 1881. Cf. S. I. Curtiss, in *Symposium on the Antediluvian Narratives*,—Lenormant, Delitzsch, Haupt, Dillmann;—*Bib. Sacra*, July, 1883.

† This field has often been surveyed: *vid.* Winer, *Real-Woerterbuch*; Schenkel, *Bibel-Lexicon*; Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*; Dillmann, *Genesis*; Friedr. Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, etc.

There were two influences, especially, which seemed to incline the reviewers to over-haste in accepting the new hypothesis; (1), an excessive confidence, based, indeed, on very remarkable and well-established data, in the power of Assyriology to solve all historical problems upon which it could be brought to bear; (2), the supposed confirmation of the literal, historic accuracy of Gen. II. which the new opinion afforded.\*

The scholars of the Continent of Europe were far less complaisant. The new theory was everywhere discussed, and almost everywhere condemned. Assyriologists and Non-Assyriologists joined hands in assailing it. Only a few voices were heard in its favor, and those less in the way of careful defense, than in allusions and expressions of personal opinion.† In spite, however, of the strong objections brought against his theory, Professor Delitzsch is understood to maintain his ground, and this adds a further zest to the examination upon which we are about to enter. But before beginning it, it is important to distinguish three possible forms of fundamental inquiry: (1). Where was the Garden of Eden, *i. e.*, as a matter of fact and of history? (2). Where did the author of Gen. II., 8-14 think it was? (3). What has been the history of belief in regard to it, among ancient peoples? It is not meant that these questions do not have an intimate connection, and a direct bearing upon each other, but only that for purposes of scientific study a distinction must be made between them. In the present case it is the second form of the inquiry which is adopted,—that form which underlies Professor Delitzsch's work, in spite of his title, which points rather to (1)—and any light upon (1) or (3) which may be gained will be incidental and undesigned.

We are now ready to look at Delitzsch's hypothesis, which it will be convenient to state in the form of successive propositions:

\* The former was illustrated by A. H. Sayce, *Academy*, Nov. 5, 1881; the latter by C. H. H. Wright, *Nineteenth Century*, Oct., 1882.—C. H. Toy, *Proceedings of Am. Oriental Soc.*, Oct., 1881, was much more cautious, and perceived the weak points of the hypothesis; my own notice in the *Presbyterian Review*, Jan., 1882, may be referred to, since its attitude is considerably modified in the following pages.—It should be said that (2), above, received no direct countenance from Professor Delitzsch himself.

† Among the more important criticisms were: In Germany, Th. Noeldeke, *Z. D. M. G.*, xxxvi., (1882) pp. 173-184; Fr. Philippi, *Theol. Lit.-Zeit.*, Apr. 8, 1882, Col. 147 sq.; J. Oppert, *Goettingische Gel. Anzeiger*, June 28, July 5, 1882, pp. 801-831.—France, J. Halevy, *Revue Critique*, Dec. 12-19, 1882, pp. 457-463, 477-485; Fr. Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, II., i., 1882, pp. 529-539.—Holland, C. P. Tiele, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Mar. 1882, pp. 258, sq.—Similarly, A. Dillmann, *Genesis*, 1882, pp. 57 sq., *Herkunft der Urgeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebraeer*, in *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.*, Apr. 27, 1882, transl. in *Bib. Sacra*, July, 1883; cf. K. Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, 1883, pp. 82, 270; E. Schrader, *KAT*, 1883, pp. 26 sq., 40 sq.—F. Hommel, however, *Augsb. Allgem. Zeitung*, 1881, Bell. 229-231, devotes ten columns to a hearty endorsement of Delitzsch's position, without, at all points, helping the cause by perfectly judicious argument.

I. *The writer conceived of the territory where the garden was as in existence in his own time, supposed himself to know its locality, and desired to communicate to his readers such knowledge as he had.* *Par. pp. 2, 3, 44.* The first statement and the last are undoubtedly true, witness the various details of the description,\*—mostly unimportant for his narrative, and of use only as means of identification. It might be that the second statement was true only in a limited sense, *i. e.*, the degree of precision attaching to his conceptions of the locality is a matter for special consideration.

II. *Various details indicate that Eden was conceived as having a southern, tropical climate* (pp. 7 sq.); (1), that God walks in the garden "in the cool of the day," (2), that fig-trees were available for girdles. To which may be added the fertility of the soil.—None of these, however, gives material for a definite conclusion as to locality. With the addition of irrigation, they would suit Arabia (Halevy) as well as Babylonia. Unfavorable to Babylonia,† if not conclusive against it,‡ is the use of fig-leaves, since the fig is rare in Babylonia.

III. *The analogy of other early narratives of Genesis, and favorable local conditions, point to Babylonia as the site of Eden* (pp. 45 sq.); *e. g.*, (1), the ark was doubtless built in the lowlands, and Babylonia is suitably near Eastern Armenia, where the ark rested; (2), the Land of Shinar was in Babylonia; (3), the names Tigris and Euphrates point to the same region; (4), the well-watered garden, and (5), the position of it "eastward" (*i. e.*, from Palestine.)§—No one could call these points conclusive. Granting (1) and (2), they prove nothing certainly to the point; (3) is adverse to Babylonia, since it is not in Babylonia that these rivers take their rise (see below); (4) and (5) suit Babylonia. Four of these particulars, then, may have

\* It is not in conflict with this to say that the author is describing the region as it was in the earliest times. Vv. 8, 9 refer to the past; probably also  $\text{אֲדָמָה}$ , v. 10 (So Del., Dillm., *Gen. 4, ad loc.*,—otherwise *Gen. 2—Phillips, loc. cit.*, etc. In that case  $\text{פְּרִי הָרִיבִּי}$ , also, would be historical Impfs.

† So Schrader, *KAT*, p. 38, Dillm. *Genesis*, on III., 7.

‡ Not conclusive—because it is not certain that there *never* were more fig-trees there than at present, or than in Herodotus's time. (Herod. I., 193). See also Ritter, *Erdbkunde*, VII, 2, p. 541. (".....selbst noch Bagdad.....bringt keine guten Feigen."....."Das wahre Feigenland beginnt erst mit dem mittlern und obern Tigris-und Euphratlande, mit Mesopotamien..... vorzueglich ist es aber auch hier nicht die Flaechen, sondern das Huegelland, oder vielmehr noch der eigentliche Klippenboden, in welchem der Feigenbaum sich wohlgefuehlt." The paper of Solms, cited by Dillm. *Genesis*, p. 72, I have not been able to see.) And because, in any case, Delitzsch might be willing to modify his view so far as to suppose the Hebrew writer to transfer the tree of Palestine to the Garden of God.

§ This is the most likely interpretation of  $\text{מִן הָרִיבִּי}$ , if it is genuine. See Dillm., who, however, cites Lagarde, *Genesis, graece*, (1868) Pref., p. 23 f., according to which the word was once lacking in Heb. and Syr. text.

weight in connection with positive evidence; one will have to be overcome by such evidence.

IV. *It is highly probable that the Babylonians had a legend of a Paradise, and of a Fall of Man, whose natural location would be Babylonia*; this is indicated by (1), the evidence of Babylonian accounts of Creation, Ten Patriarchs, and Flood, more or less distinctly parallel with the Hebrew accounts (pp. 84 sq.);\* (2), a belief that Babylonia was the home of the first men (p. 92); (3), the "tree of life," constantly represented on Assyrian and Babylonian tablets, and probably, also, the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (p. 91); (4), the significant names *Kar* = (or *Gin* =) *Dunias*, for the district immediately about Babylon, and *Tintir*, for the city itself (pp. 64 sq., 136 sq.); (5), the Cherubim, believed to be known in Babylonia (pp. 92, 93, 150 sq.); (6), the consciousness of guilt among the Babylonians, and their attributing of suffering (in particular, the flood) to guilt, with the contrast between the excellence of the original creation, in which they believed, and the actual state of the world as they must have observed it (pp. 86, 145); (7), the activity of the dragon, or serpent, *Tiamat*, enemy of the gods, whom Merodach overcomes (pp. 87 sq., 147 sq.). —(1) affords a presumption, but nothing more, and the Flood-story is the only one of the three whose details can be satisfactorily compared with the corresponding Hebrew narrative; (2) is supported by the Babylonian localization of the Flood, and by the fact that Berossus makes Aloros, the first of the antediluvian kings, a Babylonian; (3) is admitted in its former statement, but the latter cannot be independently proved, since the only reason for holding to a Babylonian "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" is the peculiar form of the tree represented on the cylinder referred to below,—under (7)†; (4) the names "Enclosure of the god Duniash," and "Grove of Life" can give only general hints, no proof; (5) is possibly true, although the exact relation between the winged bulls (*Sedu* = *Kirubu*?) of Babylonia and Assyria, and the Hebrew conception of *כרובים* is still in dispute. But it was not the only office of the *כרובים* to guard the entrance to the lost Paradise, and their existence in Babylonia would not prove that they had this office there; (6) is a good argument, as far as it goes, but points less to a Paradise, i. e., a topographically defined garden of innocence and peace, than to the facts of consciousness; (7) is the most important of all, and must be carefully examined.

\* See, however,—somewhat too skeptically adverse to any close connection between the Babylonian and the Hebrew stories,—Dillmann, *Urgeschichtliche Sagen der Hebraeer*.

† Dillm., *Gen.* p. 49, maintains that this tree is peculiar to the Hebrew narrative; so K. Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, p. 79. There is certainly no positive evidence as yet to the contrary.

This is clear, that, while the Babylonians, like the Hebrews, and other peoples, attached no necessarily bad idea to the notion of a serpent, but rather the contrary,\* yet the representation of Tiamat (Chaos), who is commonly a dragon, when personified at all, is also sometimes a serpent, called by that name (*Par.* p. 89), and even so figured.† Delitzsch compares (p. 89), not without reason, Rev., XII., 7-9, XX., 2 sq., and the *שר על-הרתהו* of the Kabbala. On the same page we have also a mention of the mutilated tablets which seem to connect Mero-dach's battle against Tiamat with the exhortations to men to fulfil their duties toward the gods. No certain conclusion, however, can at present be drawn from this. But Delitzsch lays the chief stress (p. 90), upon the famous little cylinder which bears a rude tree, with fruit hanging at each side, and two sitting figures, with long garments; the one at the right has horns on the head, the other a cap or turban, while behind him (her?) a serpent appears standing on its tail. The right hand of one figure and the left of the other are extended toward the tree, which rises between them.‡ That this naturally reminds the beholder of Gen. III. (so Baudissin, p. 291) can hardly be denied; that there is really a connection is not thereby demonstrated. Nothing proves the different sex of the sitting figures;¶ their long robes are not primitive, neither is their head-gear; their outstretched hands have the palm turned upward, and the fruit hangs below them. There is no sufficient reason from the form of the tree to distinguish it from the familiar "tree of life,"—(see above). If we were sure of the existence of the legend in Babylonia, these difficulties might be overcome, and supposed to depend partly on the rudeness or carelessness of the engraving, and partly on the transference of later habits (*e. g.*, the robes) to primitive times, partly perhaps (as in the case of the head-gear), on some unknown symbolism. But, with our present light, this interesting and striking scene can hardly be admitted as a definite proof of a Babylonian story of the Fall.§

And it must be clearly kept in mind that such a story would not

\* See *Del. Par.*, pp. 87, 88, 146 sq., and cf. Num. xxi., 5-9; 2 Kgs. xviii., 14; also Dillm. on *Genesis*, iii., 1.

† See W. H. Ward, *The Serpent Tempter in Oriental Mythology*, *Bib. Sacra*, Apr., 1881, p. 22A. Dr. Ward discovered the cylinder, here depicted, in the possession of the late Dr. S. Wells Williams; it was first published, after his impression, by A. H. Sayce, in *Geo. Smith's Chaldean Genesis*, 2d ed. (1880), p. 90.

‡ See, further, W. H. Ward, *l. c.*; A. H. Sayce, *l. c.*, p. 88; W. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, I., p. 258 sq.

¶ That the difference in head-gear does so (Del.), is surely very doubtful. The distinction between bearded and beardless (Ward, *l. c.*) would be better, but I am not able to convince myself that there is this difference between these two faces.

§ See criticisms of it by Tiele, and Budde, *l. c.*; cf. Menant, *Empreintes de cylindres Assyro-Chaldeens*, p. 48; Halevy, *l. c.*

necessarily bring with it a "garden of Eden," and that such a garden is the very thing of which we are in search. It might very well be that the *fact* of the Fall, and the manner of it, quite outweighed for the Babylonian priests, who would probably transmit the legend, the *place* of the Fall, and that the garden, with its river, dividing into four, might be entirely strange to them.

V. *Eden* (עֵדֵן) (1) denoting a land distinct from other districts of similar name (עֵדֵן 2 Kgs. XIX., 12 = Is. XXXVII., 12, Ezek. XXVII., 23, Am. I., 5) (p. 3 sq.), (2) not an invented name (land of *delight*) (p. 5 sq.), (3) nor yet to be connected with *Gin Dunias* (or *Kardunias* = *Babylonia*), (p. 65 sq.), (4) may be explained by reference to *Akkadian edin*, *Assyr. edinu* = *Assyr. seru*, "*field*," "*plain*," "*desert*,"—originally "*lowland*," "*depression*," (p. 79 sq.), a name applicable to *Babylonia*.—(1) is at once admitted; (2) is, from the absence of אֶרֶץ, in Gen. II., 8, and the apparent wish of the writer to define the locality, probably correct, at least to this extent, that whatever the meaning he attached to the word, he connected it with some particular part of the earth's surface; (3) is most likely, notwithstanding Sir Henry Rawlinson's high authority,—not so much on the ground proposed by Delitzsch, that *Kardunias* ("enclosure—garden?—of the God Duniash") would not explain אֶרֶץ עֵדֵן, since the "land" of Eden might result from a misapprehension,—but because *Gin-dun-i-sa* is a very late form (*Asurbanipal*, B. C. 668—), and still more because *Kardunias* itself is not traceable earlier than the *Cossaeon* dominion (B. C. 1500+)—see below; (4) gives a very plausible etymology, but there are several missing links in the argument which destroy its stringency: *a.* it is not proved that *edinu* was ever applied to *Babylonia*, or any part of it, as a proper name; *b.* it is not proved that *edin* = *seru* in the sense "*depression*," "*lowland*," and not rather simply in the sense "*plain*;" in that case the comparison of *Zor*, "*depression*," an Arab. name of *Babylonia* (*Wetzstein*, in *Delitzsch Jes.* 3. *Ausg.* p. 701) is much less significant.\* On the other hand, it is not clear that the name might not have been applied to some level country, and the fact that it is elsewhere employed in the phrase *sabe edini*, "*warriors of the steppe*" would not hinder the derivation of עֵדֵן from *edin* (against *Halevy*, *l. c.*). But מִקְרָא, "*eastward*," "*to or in the East*" is too general to point definitely to *Babylonia*, and it may well be questioned whether, if *Babylonia* had been in mind, the writer would not have used some better known designation, and, in any case, have omitted the phrase "*in the East*," which, by its very generality seems to imply a greater degree of igno-

\* Against Delitzsch's comparison זֶרַח = זֶרַח (Dan. III., 1), see *Halevy*, *l. c.*, p. 80.

rance (on the part of the writer or the readers,—one or both) than would have been possible in regard to Babylonia. That Babylonia was not north or west or south of them, the Hebrews surely knew. It needs no argument to show that there is a wide difference between using the term "East" with more or less definite application to a particular region, (*e. g.* ארץ קדם, Gen. XXV., 6, cf. XXIX., 1, Job I., 3, see *Par.* p. 46), and adding the same word, as a more particular definition to a proper name already expressed.\*

VI. *The Pishon and Gihon were canals, or natural water-courses artificially enlarged,* (pp. 47 sq., 67 sq.); (1) the Pishon = the Pallakopas, which left the Euphrates to the west a little below Babylon, flowed into and through the "Chaldæan lakes," past the ancient city of Ur (= Ur Kasdim, Gen. XI., 28, 31), and finally into the Persian Gulf; (2) the name Pishon (פִּישׁוֹן) might be connected with Assyr. *pisanu*, "water-holder," (p. 77); (3) the Gihon = the *Shatt-en-Nil* (a comparatively modern name, ancient *Arahtu*) branching eastward from the Euphrates, at Babylon, flowing S.E., and returning after a hundred miles or so to the Euphrates again. The beds of these ancient streams are still traceable, for a considerable part of their extent; (4) the name Gihon (גִּיחוֹן) is explained by bilingual lists of Babylonian "canals" or streams, by the equivalents *Ka*-(or *Gu*)-*ga-an-de* = *Arahtu* (p. 75) on the supposition that *de* has here its meaning "flowing," "irrigation,"—and is therefore a non-essential element, and that the stream *Ka*-(*Gu*)-*ga-an-na* which appears on another fragment, is the same with *Gugande*.—That these were once important streams is doubtless true, although we know too little of their course to speak with much certainty† of their value to the Babylonians, and the name Gihon is identified with some plausibility. That of Pishon = *pisanu* is guess-work.—But it must be reckoned an objection,—not perhaps insuperable—that while the rivers are enumerated presumably from a geographical standpoint, as first, second, etc., in the order Pishon, Gihon, Tigris, Euphrates, the proposed identifications would give Tigris,

\* This argument falls the moment one adopts another interpretation for ארץ קדם,—as "in the eastern part" of Eden, or rejects the word altogether,—see above.

† E. g. Arrian (*Anab. Alex.* vii., 21) says that the Euphrates, swollen by snows, would often flood the surrounding country, if the surplus water were not drawn off through the Pallakopas into lakes and swamps. Is there any evidence that the Pallakopas reached the Persian Gulf? Halévy (*l. c.*) maintains that it did not. The Greek of Arrian is as follows: [The Euphrates] ὑπερβάλλει ἐς τὴν χώραν, εἰ μὴ τις ἀναστομώσας αὐτὸν κατὰ τὸν Παλλακόπαν ἐς τὰ ἔλη τε ἐκτρέψει καὶ τὰς λίμνας, αἱ δὲ ἀρχόμεναι ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς διώρυχος, ἐς τε ἐπὶ τὴν ξυνοχὴ τῆς Ἀράβων γῆ, καὶ ἔνθεν μὲν ἐς τένας ἐπὶ πολὺ, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἐς θάλασσαν κατὰ πολλὰ τε καὶ ἀφανῆ στόματα ἐκδίδωσι.—But when the snow is gone, and the Euphrates has grown small, καὶ οὐδὲν μείον τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸν Παλλακόπαν ἐκδίδοι ἐς τὰς λίμνας.—Further: ἐπὶ τε τὸν Παλλακόπαν ἐπλενε (i. e. Alexander), καὶ κατ' αὐτὸν καταπλεῖ ἐς τὰς λίμνας, ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀράβων γῆν.

Gihon, Euphrates, Pishon; or Pishon, Euphrates, Gihon, Tigris.

VII. *The land Havilah, around which Pishon flows, is the eastern or northeastern part of the Syrian desert, west of the Euphrates and northwest of the Persian Gulf;* (pp. 57 sq.), favored by (1) the position of Havilah, Gen. X., 29, as last but one of the Joktanides, (2) Gen. XXV., 18, where it is the limit of the Ishmaelitish territory, see also 1 Sam. XV., 7; (3) the products attributed to Havilah, ch. II., 11, 12. —(1) and (2) are good reasons, especially (2);\* (3) is disputed, but it is certain that Merodachbaladan, who ruled the shore of the Persian Gulf, is said to have sent as tribute, "gold, the dust of his land," that Pliny (Nat. Hist. XII., § 35, [XIX]) speaks of bdellium (*Par.* pp. 16, 60) as a product of Babylonia, and that the *santu*-stone belonged to the (Babylonian?) province Meluhha. There is no difficulty, then, in supposing either that gold, which was found in lower Babylonia, was also found in Havilah, across the Euphrates, or that Merodachbaladan actually ruled in Havilah, and that the gold he sent came from that region. Similarly it may be said of bdellium, that Havilah might be reckoned to Babylonia, as producing it, or that it is at all events not unlikely, that two closely adjoining territories had similar products. True, we do not *know* that כרלח (Gen. II., 12) is the *bdellium*, but our ignorance on this point cannot overcome the positive evidence as to the location of Havilah. In regard to שיהם, if, as seems natural, it is to be identified with the *sandu*, or *santu* (-tu = fem. ending) there is however the awkward circumstance that the *santu* is mentioned expressly as a product of Meluhha, which is identified with Akkad = Northern Babylonia,—while Havilah would lie nearer to Southern Babylonia,—so that a similarity of product is in this case less easily inferred. Two or three other considerations must be added: (a) Havilah has here (Gen. II., 11) the article (החווילה), which makes the identification with חווילה of Gen. X., 29, XXV., 18, 1 Sam. XV., 7 less certain; (b) there is no evidence that Babylonians or Hebrews looked upon the region bordering the Persian Gulf and west of the Euphrates, as the land of gold and precious stones *par excellence*;† (c) while סוכב (Gen. II., 11, cf. 13) need not mean "encircling"‡ it is very doubtful whether it can mean "in leichtem Bogen durchfliessen" (*Del. Par.* p. 10), which would probably be necessary if the Pallakopas were the Pishon, and Havilah the territory here supposed; (d) this difficulty is greatly increased by the expression כל-ארץ החווילה, which is very emphatic and inclusive, so that, although the location of Havilah affords the most definite, posi-

\* Cf. also Dillm., *Genesis*\*, p. 58.

† *Matt.* II., 1, 11, which Delitzsch adduces, furnishes no proof.

‡ See Dillm., *ad loc.*



tive argument in behalf of Delitzsch's hypothesis that we have yet found, it is hampered by rather serious difficulties.

VIII. *Cush is not Ethiopia, but the land of Kassu in Babylonia, cf. Nimrod, son of Cush, Gen. x., 8 sq. (pp. 51 sq., 127 sq.);* (1) several of the descendants of Cush, in Gen. x., are not demonstrably the heads of African tribes, some of them certainly Asiatic; (2) the presence of Cushites in Babylonia is likely, from the mention of Nimrod; (3) the *Kassi*, Greek *Κίσσοι, Κοσσαίοι*, whose ancient home was in the mountains on the border of Media and Elam, had in early times a permanent settlement in Babylonia; (4) the name *Kaldu* applied by Asurnasirpal (9th cent. B. C.) to Babylonia,—being doubtless the Assyrian pronunciation of Babylonian *Kasdu* (Heb. כִּשְׁדִים) is probably the same name, *Kassu*, with the ending *-du (-da)* "border," "territory." —We have here a very difficult problem, not as yet susceptible of perfect solution.\* As to (1), it may be agreed that, whether or not there is sufficient evidence of ethnological relationship between Asiatic tribes and the African Cush,† certain Asiatic tribes were, for some reason or other, associated with Cush; this would, however, be entirely compatible with the view that both Asiatic and African Cush are here included under the one name; (2) points on the face of it, to some, as yet obscure, connection of Nimrod with the Cushites elsewhere mentioned in the Bible, which nowhere else alludes to a Babylonian branch of Cush; (3) calls for several remarks: (a) Assyrian *Kusu*, (Bab. *Kusu*) is always applied to Ethiopia. Even if *Meluhha* denoted both Ethiopia and a Babylonian district, it would not, without evidence, follow that *Kusu* could be so employed. But any proof that the Hebrews located Eden in Babylonia would increase the unlikelihood of their using Cush in a non-Babylonian sense; (b) to meet this objection it is suggested‡ that כּוּשׁ, Gen. II., 13, x., 8, results from a misunderstanding of the narrator or editor, and that *Kas* (כּש) was the original form,—i. e. the Gihon skirted the land Kash, and Nimrod was a Kassite;¶ a possibility, especially in view of the probably late date of the *matres lectionis*, but possibility is not proof. In the present case there are grave objections to its reality. It is shown by Delitzsch (cf. Kossaeer, p. 62) that there were Kassites in Babylonia as early as 1525 B. C., when the Kassite dynasty began; there is no evidence of their being there earlier. De-

\* Friedr. Delitzsch's recent work, *Die Sprache der Kossaeer*, Leipzig, 1884, makes some important contributions to the discussion,—see below.

† C. H. Toy, *Proceedings of Am. Oriental Soc.*, May, 1882, denies such relationship.

‡ Schrad. *KAT*, p. 87; favored by Delitzsch, *Kossaeer*, p. 61, N. 1, and see particularly Paul Haupt, *Andover Review*, July, 1884, p. 89. Hommel, also, *Allg. Zeit.* 1881, *Bell.* 229, p. 8364, maintains that Cush here refers to the Kassites.

¶ Haupt even calls his article, just cited, *The Language of Nimrod, the Kassite*.

litzsch distinctly abandons the idea that Hammurabi, a more ancient king of Babylon, was a Kassite (cf. Kossaeer, pp. 64, sq.). Was Nimrod not conceived of as earlier than this,—a time when Babylon, and all the famous old cities of its neighborhood were long established,—when Assyria had already its own, independent kings? And if the Babylonians so conceived of him, must not the Hebrews also, undoubtedly dependent on Babylonian accounts for events like those of Gen. x., 8 sq., have been well-informed? At all events, as far as at present appears, if Nimrod was a Kassite, we must give up the favorite hypothesis that Nimrod was the same with Izdubar. That name, whatever it means, has no Kassite marks, and all the evidences of Akkadian literary advancement, and Assyro-Babylonian dependence upon the Akkadians for poem and legend, stand in the way of a sudden transference to the wild, mountain-bred Kassite of any part of that stock of tradition or myth which the bi-lingual and uni-lingual tablets have preserved to us.\* But if it is hard to suppose that Nimrod was, or was believed to have been, a Kassite, the argument is greatly weakened for the original reading נִשְׁ in Gen. II., 13, as well; (c) there is little real evidence that Babylonia, and particularly the district south and southeast of Babylon was called *Kas*. Asurnasirpal, in his great inscription (I R. 23, Col. III. l. 17), in describing a Babylonian campaign, says that Sdadu, of the land of Zuhi, . . . trusted in the numerous forces of the land of the Kassite,† but its location is not further defined. Whether *Kasda* (II R. 53. 9a) refers to the land of the *Kassite* depends upon (4); under this head it is to be noticed that Asurnasirpal names the land *Kaldu*, in the same account (I R. 24. Col. III. 24) and the difference in form would, in the absence of other indications, point to a difference of meaning rather than to identity. Moreover, if Ur Kasdim was in Babylonia, then there are two fresh objections to Delitzsch's *Kas* = *Kasda* = כַּשְׁדִּים, for, in the first place, there is every probability that the Hebrew emigration (Abraham) from Ur took place before the 16th cent., B. C., while there is no ground to doubt that כַּשְׁדִּים belongs to the earliest form of the story, and further, since Ur = *Mugheir* is west of the Euphrates, *Kasda* would also be there, and not the Gihon, but the Pishon would flow through it.—Add, *mutatis mutandis*, what was said under VII. (c) and (d), and it will appear that there is at present

\* Delitzsch thinks that he has proved that there is no linguistic relationship between Akkadians and Kassites (Kossaeer, pp. 40, 41). Certainly Haupt, (*loc. cit.* pp. 80—91, cf. Theoph. G. Pinches, *Journal R. A. Soc.*, Apr. 1884, p. 302), has not proved the contrary. His suggestion that Nimrod (נִמְרוֹד) is derived from the name of a Kossaeian god *Maraddas*, (= Adar), god of the chase (?) is as yet hypothesis.

† *ana ummanati mat Kassite rapati ittakalma.*

considerably less evidence in favor of Delitzsch's Cush, than for his Havilah.\*

IX. *The river of Gen. II., 10, which divided into the four, was the Euphrates, at the part where, above Babylon, it approaches the Tigris, with its system of watercourses flowing toward the Tigris, and including the Tigris as the eastern limit* (pp. 66 sq.); the "isthmus" between the two rivers was so intersected by these watercourses, as to make the impression of one great stream, in various channels.—This is perhaps the most ingenious and the weakest point of the argument. For, granting that Arrian (*Anab. Alex. VII. 7*, cited by Del. p. 67) is right in saying that the direction of the current of these watercourses was from the Euphrates toward the Tigris, and not the reverse,† and that they still retained the general direction of the Euphrates sufficiently to be thought part of the river, and that the Tigris really was regarded as, at this part, nothing more than the left border of the Euphrates, yet no Babylonian, or Hebrew familiar with Babylonia could suppose that the Euphrates with its canal-system, + the Tigris, was one river, nor could it occur to him to so represent it. The brief part of their course in which their waters were thus intermingled could not induce a writer to forget or ignore their wide separation above, nor,—whatever might be possible in the case of the Pishon and Gihon,—to suppose that the Tigris and Euphrates proper began where that many-channeled river ceased. Whether the Asshur before, (or east of), which the Tigris is said to flow is the city or the empire is here immaterial. But that any writer, with even a vague knowledge of the geography of the region could in one breath speak of the Tigris as a "head," i. e. new stream-beginning, starting from a river of Babylonia, and in the next, of the same Tigris as flowing past Asshur, is utterly incredible. Quite as incredible is it that the Hebrews, who, as all agree, knew something of the middle Euphrates, should utterly ignore that, and speak or write as if the Euphrates began its existence a few miles from Babylon.

Of all the propositions, then, in which I have endeavored to

\* When, therefore, he says, (*Kossaeer*, p. 61)... "Ists verwunderlich, dass das hebraeische Volk, dessen Gesichtskreis, was Babylonien und Assyrien betrifft, nicht ueber das 16. Jahrhundert zurueckreicht, wie ja die alte Reichshauptstadt Assur den Hebraeern unbekannt ist, Ists verwunderlich dass das hebraeische Volk die babylonische Staatenbildung ueberhaupt auf ׀׀, dass es Nimrod, den Jaeger und Staedtegruender, zu einem Kuschiten oder besser Kossaeer macht? und gewinnt nicht die in meinem Werk ueber die Lage des Paradieses vorgetragene Ansicht, es moechte das ׀׀ der Paradieserzaehlung von Babylonien zu verstehen sein und der Name Kasdim selbst mit diesem Volk *Kassu* im Zusammenhang stehen, mehr und mehr an Gewicht"—I must observe that in the preliminary sentence he draws too large a conclusion from his premises, and confess that his questions seem to call for answers the reverse of those which, by their form, they appear to look for.

† As Xenophon, *Anab. I. 7, 15*, says of the canals he saw.

formulate this brilliant, and at first sight attractive hypothesis, the only one which has any probative power is that relating to Havilah; that, however, is hampered by some difficulties of its own, and certainly cannot, in the presence of so much hypothetical and hostile evidence, bear the whole weight of the theory. The necessary conclusion is that Professor Delitzsch has not satisfactorily answered the question, Where did the conception of the Hebrew writer of Gen. II., 8-14 place Eden and its garden?

---

### THE BLESSING OF Jael.

BY PROF. EDWARD L. CURTIS,  
Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago.

“Blessed above women be Jael  
The wife of Heber the Kenite.  
Above women in the tent blessed.  
Water he asked, milk she gave.  
In a dish of the nobles she offered him curds.  
Her hand she outstretched to the tent pin,  
And her right hand to the hammer of the workmen  
And hammered Sisera, and smote his head,  
And beat and struck through his temples.  
Between her feet he bowed, he fell he lay,  
Between her feet he bowed, he fell;  
Where he bowed there he fell down slaughtered.”

Judges v., 24-27.

That the death of Sisera by the hand of Jael should hold a leading place in the song of Deborah is most natural. A fulfillment of the previous prophecy,<sup>1</sup> it was a grand vindication of the divine commission of the prophetess. Its praise also was to the just humiliation of the men of Israel who had hesitated when bidden to go forward, and to whose leader Deborah had been forced to say: “The journey that thou takest shall not be for thine honor.” Woman had been stronger than man, and to woman belonged the praise.

But, from a moral standpoint, what of the blessing of Jael? At first glance it appears like the commendation of a base assassination, especially when one reads the prose narration.<sup>2</sup> Let us consider it somewhat carefully:

Is the blessing with or without divine sanction? If we take the latter view, that these words are simply Deborah's, that the inspiration of the Book of Judges guarantees nothing more than a correct

<sup>1</sup> Judg. iv., 9. <sup>2</sup> Judg. iv., 18-21.

record of this song, with no endorsement of its contents, all difficulty vanishes. We have here then simply Deborah's sentiments, which we are at liberty to accept or reject. This view advanced by some<sup>1</sup> is untenable.

1. Because Deborah was a prophetess, and her words must be received of inspiration equal to those of any prophet. She was God's mouth-piece.

2. Because this blessing evidently depends upon a "thus saith the Lord." It is correlate to the curse of Meroz, equally an utterance of the Angel of Jehovah.

For these reasons also it cannot be regarded as the mere assertion of the fact<sup>2</sup> that Deborah was thus esteemed, nor yet as only an expression of gratitude.<sup>3</sup> It embraces these and much more. It contains a direct divine element.

Regarding this blessing of God many<sup>4</sup> have supposed that a special divine impulse or revelation was given Jael; that in good faith she received Sisera and pledged him protection, but afterwards, while she saw him sleeping, God moved her to break her word and slay him. The Lawgiver can override the law. The command of the former would annul obligation to the latter. This supposition acquits Jael of wrong, and prepares the way for the blessing. But does it not introduce another still greater difficulty? If without such a special revelation and command it would have been wrong for Jael to have slain Sisera, how was God's will communicated to her? How would she know that the impulse given her was not Satanic? Presumably it would be if it contradicted her moral nature, if it led to a violation of the moral law. And not even a miracle, Scripture teaches,<sup>5</sup> would be sufficient to remove that presumption. Moreover can God be thought of as commanding one to violate the moral law, to do an act which without a special interposing order would be a base, treacherous murder. The numerous manifestations of God, his frequent communications at that time with his agents, might suggest that Jael received a divine communication, but to consider her act otherwise morally wrong and to use this as a ground of its justification, is impossible. Right and wrong are as fixed and eternal as God, for they are of God, and for him to make moral wrong right is to deny himself. He does what he wills with his creatures, but not capriciously against his will.

To treat Jael, however, with historic fairness, any motives or cir-

<sup>1</sup> Poole (in loco) in *Synopsis*, Dr. Hussey in *Moral Difficulties connected with the Bible*.

<sup>2</sup> Canon Farrar in *Smith's Bible Dict.* under Jael.

<sup>3</sup> Hengstenberg, *Kingdom of God under O. T.* Vol. II., p. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Augustine, Scott, Henry, Gill, Wordsworth.

<sup>5</sup> Deut. xiii., 1-5 and Gal. i., 8. See also Mozley's *Ideas of Early Ages*, p. 34.

cumstances which can be reasonably presented in her favor must be alleged.<sup>1</sup> Of course the outrageous conjecture of the Rabbis that Sisera offered her violence is not worthy of a consideration. But it may be assumed that Jael was a true believer in Jehovah. Her act upon this occasion and the history of her people, whether we look backward or forward, justify this assumption. Her ancestor Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, accepted the true faith.<sup>2</sup> His descendants seem to have retained it. They probably accompanied Israel into the promised land.<sup>3</sup> They were befriended by Saul and David.<sup>4</sup> Jehonadab, centuries later in the midst of a general apostasy, is conspicuous as a worshipper of Jehovah.<sup>5</sup> And how gracious a divine benediction rested upon his children, the Rechabites.<sup>6</sup> A child of Abraham,<sup>7</sup> the cruel wrongs of captive Israel may have stirred Jael no less than Deborah. Her husband having wandered from the bulk of his people had settled near Kadesh and was allowed by Jabin to dwell in peace. No strict alliance appears to have existed between them, else why was not Heber summoned to join Sisera's host? With the cunning shrewdness of his race he seems to have held a neutral position. Or the peace may have been imposed by the conqueror upon the conquered—a peace to be broken when an opportunity should be given. The house of Heber may have had wrongs as deep as those of the house of Israel.<sup>8</sup>

Now we can understand why Jael slew Sisera. As a worshipper of Jehovah she felt herself obliged to. Had she been a man as a true believer she would have cut him down with the sword, as Samuel slew Agag,<sup>9</sup> because he was an enemy of Jehovah, an outlaw, under the ban of the Almighty. As a nearest kinsman must avenge his fallen brother, so every child of Israel in a crisis like this was called upon to avenge the Lord's people. It was but fulfilling the old command to exterminate the Canaanite.<sup>10</sup> Cursed was Meroz,<sup>11</sup> the city of Israel, because her people came not to the assistance of Jehovah. Blessed was Jael, the alien, the Kenite, because she did. The brave loyalty of the foreigner is conspicuous against the cowardly faithlessness of the home-born. There was a double reason also why Jael should slay Sisera. He was the leader, a host in himself, a man doubtless of tremendous energy and possibly of wickedness, especially doomed for destruction like the Canaanite leaders of the days of Joshua<sup>12</sup> To let him escape

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to understand why Kitto (*Biblical Encyclopædia*, Jael) should impugn Jael's motives and regard the transaction as one of base, treacherous, crafty prudence. What circumstances he can he makes against her, and allows no room for justification. The mere record of the unqualified blessing in the Divine Word shows that the deed is of a higher quality.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xviii., 11, 12. <sup>3</sup> Num. xxiv., 21, 22; Judg. i., 16. <sup>4</sup> 1 Sam. xv., 6; xxvii., 10; xxx., 9.

<sup>5</sup> A fair inference from 2 Kgs. x., 15, 23. <sup>6</sup> Jer. xxxv., 18, 19. <sup>7</sup> The Kenites were Midianites.

<sup>8</sup> See Thomson, *The Land and The Book*. Vol. II., 147. <sup>9</sup> 1 Sam. xv., 23.

<sup>10</sup> Deut. xx., 16. <sup>11</sup> Judg. v., 23. <sup>12</sup> Joshua x., 23-27.

was to lose half the victory. Jael could not slay him openly with the sword. She was a woman, and she took a woman's method. She detained him, and then lest perchance he might up and away before she could deliver him into safe hands, she slew him. Or she may have wished to keep her word and pledge, which evidently were given to the intent that she would not betray him into the hand of another. Sisera had no thought that he needed protection against her arm. If she betrayed him, she lied to him; if she protected him, she must lie to his pursuers. Placed in this dilemma, it was kindness, if Sisera must die, no less than fierceness and righteousness for her to slay him.

Jael's loyalty to Jehovah is her justification, and obtained for her the divine blessing. But her deed must not be judged according to Christian morals, nor regarded absolutely righteous. The blessing does not demand that. Great allowance must be given her. Not being an Israelite, not being of the chosen people, uninstructed doubtless, her ideas of right and wrong could only have been very crude and imperfect. She was a Bedouin, and among the Bedouins "artifice, treachery and assassination were lawful in avenging blood."<sup>1</sup> She lived also in a rough feudal time, "when there was no king in Israel, and every man did that which was right in his own eyes." The true religious spirit of that age also was: Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.<sup>2</sup> The Psalmist hated his enemies with perfect hatred.<sup>3</sup> And unquestionably in such a spirit he who had forfeited life was held to have forfeited truth. Thou shalt not bear false witness against *thy neighbor*. That it was wrong to deceive an enemy like Sisera, that a lawful avenger of blood should not by any means entice and entrap his foe, never, probably during the days of the Judges, entered the mind of a pious Israelite. The blessing of Jael, viewed from a mere historic standpoint, shows that to Deborah the murder of Sisera was commendable, and Deborah represents the highest piety and morality of the period. How the midwives in Egypt, how Rahab and Ehud lied, and yet God prospered them.<sup>4</sup> We must not judge them and Jael by the light of our day, God did not, but of their day which was that of dim obscure early dawn. Under their circumstances, may we not believe, if influenced by a true and living faith they could not have done otherwise. The stress then was upon faithful obedience to God, upon a recognition of Jehovah. The idea that faithlessness to a fellow being might

<sup>1</sup> Michaelis, Bk. 3, Art. 4. Eng. Trans. London, 1814. Vol. ii., p. 205. See also *The Land and The Book*, Vol. ii., p. 147.

<sup>2</sup> Not personal enemies of the chosen people, but political, idolatrous enemies.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. cxxxix., 22.

<sup>4</sup> Exod. i., 15-21. Josh. ii., 4, 5. Judg. iii., 20.

be equally faithlessness to God, or that a wrong against man might be equally a wrong against God, was not then fully realized. The frequent deceptions of the patriarchs show this, and in bold relief is it presented in the story of the old prophet<sup>1</sup>. Moreover to teach his people perfect righteousness, perfect justice, God was obliged, or else by a miracle change their human nature, to lead them by allowing imperfect justice and imperfect righteousness. Their hearts, as Christ said<sup>2</sup> were too hard to admit of other treatment. Sound reason now dictates the same principle. We do not exact of the street Arab, reared in ignorance and vice, the same high Christian feelings, the same delicate distinction between right and wrong that we do of one from a refined and cultured Christian home. Upon the newly converted savage we do not impose the highest laws of Christian conduct. And even in our day how much further have we advanced in morality than the Judges?<sup>3</sup> Much of the detective system, against which we hear no protest, even from religious bodies, is carried on by the same means, call it treachery if you will, by which Jael ensnared and slew Sisera. And who will condemn the detective, who thus acting, was the means of bringing the murderous clan of the Molly Maguires to justice? It is true that he did not assassinate as Ehud and Jael did, but Ehud and Jael lived when the private avenger and not the government was the executor. Ehud and Jael lived also when individual life was not so sacred and independent as it is now. That idea in its modern form was unknown to the ancients.<sup>4</sup> The son belonged to the father, the father to the state. No one had absolute proprietorship to himself, and to have spared, for example, Achan's children might have been to have violated the children of Israel's sense of complete and atoning justice. To give them also a true conception of the iniquity of the Canaanite, of the difference between the service of Jehovah and that of other Gods, it was necessary that they should be commanded to wage war to the knife. They were threatened with similar treatment in case of apostasy. It was terrible surgery, reminding one of the boiling oil once poured into gun-shot wounds, but it was the only surgery available at that time to rid the world of evil and preserve a true faith. Cromwell applied a little of a similar kind; the Indian mutiny made men desire more; and how recently the complete annihilation of the Bashi Bazouks, authors of the Bulgarian massacres, would not have been unwelcome to many Christians. Ancient war-

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kgs. xiii., 11-32.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xix., 8.

<sup>3</sup> See Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, Book 3, Chap. 15.

<sup>4</sup> The Mosaic Code, however, more than any other ancient one was conducive to its development. For its later development on the spiritual side, see Ezek. xviii.



fare was accompanied with extermination, and it no more violated the moral sense of the ancient worshipper of Jehovah that innocent women and children should be slaughtered<sup>1</sup> than the making Germans of the people of Alsace and Lorraine does that of the Christian. They were innocent of the Franco-Prussian war; why should they be compelled to lose their nationality?

The safety of Israel, also, demanded the extermination of the Canaanites. Had they been left in the land they would have been their ruin. Indeed it was only as by fire that at last a remnant of Israel was saved from being engulfed and destroyed by the surrounding polytheism. It was necessary also that Israel's hand should do this work. They would only have been nurslings, a poor puny race of men, had Jehovah by famine, or pestilence, or earthquake, swept all their enemies from before them. Self-reliance, self-maintenance, as well as faith in the Almighty, were as essential then as now to the development of an earnest national and individual character. Without a fierce truculent energy how could they have ever held their ground, "wedged in, as they were, among the iron charioted millions of Amalek, Midian, Philistia, Assyria and Egypt?" Did not the Judge of all the earth do right then, when he said "Thou shalt shew no mercy unto them?" Mistaken is the notion that in a theocracy God must set up the laws of heaven. When Jehovah assumed the leadership of his people, it was as a perfect leader from an earthly and not from a heavenly standpoint, a perfect ruler for men and not for angels, for centuries before Christ and not centuries after. The Mosaic code for its purpose was perfect. It was a miracle, and, considered historically and politically, is a perpetual witness of the divine guidance of the Jewish lawgiver. The law was *divine*, but for a *human* race.

The position of Israel also was unique. They were the first and last earthly theocracy. As Sinai, the mount of God, towers with its granite cliffs sublimely stern in the Arabian desert, so Israel, the chosen of God, stands apart and separate from all other nations. They were instruments of divine judgments against the Canaanites, their enemies, because Jehovah's. They were directly under the command of God; and of all nations to them alone was such a command directly given. This is the key to their career. Take the direct divine element out of their history, treat it from a purely rationalistic stand-point, and it is a complete enigma. This divine element vindicates Israel's military ethics. Thus conscious of doing God's will by the sword, they were kept from being defiled by their bloody work, kept from being a mere robber horde like Attila and his hosts, a scourge of God and nothing more.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ps. cxxxvii., 9.

There should then be no difficulty in the bloody and deceitful deeds approved in the Old Testament. Critics are at fault when they judge them by the enlightened conscience and feelings of Christianity. Such a conscience, such feelings did not then exist, could not then exist, for the light of revelation had not been sufficient in intensity and duration to produce them. This is hard to realize. It is hard to go back 3000 years, to divest oneself of all that fineness of moral feeling which Christianity has given and to judge fairly from the standpoint of the Pentateuch. Yet even in the Old Testament is seen a progression in ethics. The Book of Job, as it presents the firm assurance of a future life, an intimate relation with God, and a new glimpse of God, and almost a new revelation of God's dealings with men, so also, as though based upon this doctrinal advancement, gives, in its description of the ideal upright man,<sup>1</sup> teachings which are far in advance of those presented in the older books.

A still greater advance was made when Christ fulfilled the law, when he said a new commandment I give unto you; yet the same *principle* underlies all—whole hearted service and love to God. And this service is none the less real in an age of little light than in the full noon-day blaze. None the less real in the bloody judge of Israel, in the witch-hanging puritan of New England, than in the Christian philanthropist of the nineteenth century. And wherever this service is found, as it was in Jael, the divine benediction rests upon it. But from a divine blessing or sanction one must not conclude that an act may not contain elements of wrong and unrighteousness, any more than that the lives of God's chosen ones, Abraham, Job, David and Peter, for example, were sinless. And however dark may now appear Old Testament teachings contrasted with Christian, can even the present Christian conception of practical morality be regarded as perfect? May not a deed which to-day we are prone to justify and regard worthy of divine approval appear in the fuller and purer light of the hereafter not less stained and spotted than now appear the deeds of Israel's heroes. They tested acts by the law thundered from Sinai. We test them by Christ's sermon on the Mount. The angels, by the light which proceeds from the throne of the Lamb. Each successive test is more refining than the previous, reveals dross unseen by the other. But if beneath the dross there is the pure metal, the righteous intention, is there not also divine approval? And thus was it not written:

"Blessed above women be Jael  
The wife of Heber, the Kenite  
Above women in the tent blessed."

---

<sup>1</sup> Job xxxi. I assume that the Book of Job belongs to the Hochmah literature.

## STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

## IV.

## Tradition in its Relation to History; (2) To Inspired History.

## I.

In examining, now, more by itself and more in detail, the relation of tradition to *inspired* history, and to inspiration in general, it seems best to begin with a few suggestions as to inspiration itself; though only so far as immediately concerns the present topic.

## 1. REVELATION AND ITS VEHICLE.

The Bible having been given to us in the two chief characters of a *literature* and a *revelation* it seems clear that the special function of inspiration with reference to these will, in a certain way, vary. It is, I suppose, with inspiration, as to its general sphere, much as when the Apostle Paul in describing the various operations of the Spirit in the church, shows how gifts of knowledge, of wisdom, of faith, of healings, of working of miracles, of prophecy, of discerning of spirits, tongues, interpretation of tongues, are distributed in the membership, and concludes all by saying, "But all these worketh that one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally, as he will." In so far as the Bible is revelation, the function of inspiration may be said to be the single and simple one of making known that truth for the knowledge of which men are dependent upon such a supernatural communication. When we come to consider the vehicle of the revelation, however, which is the Bible itself as a literature, we find in the Word something of that "diversity of operation" which Paul describes as seen in the Church.

It is necessary, indeed, that this literary vehicle of the revelation should be, in its own way, also inspired. A purely human instrument could not be relied upon to communicate and preserve a divine revelation. In fact, I am not sure but I may say that the vehicle of the revelation becomes inspired just in being *made* the vehicle of the revelation. If human thought or utterance, in the very act of expressing itself, finds, or seeks to find, a fit and just mode of expression, can it be different with the divine thought? Can you conceive such a thing as God speaking to men, even though it should be through human lips, in such imperfect ways as that—which sometimes happens with men themselves—the word spoken should either inadequately represent, or perhaps even *misrepresent* the thought? Of course, it is not forgotten that human modes of utterance are in their own nature imperfect. Language itself is an imperfect medium, while every form of literary expression is apt to be, in one way or other, faulty. So the vehicle of the revelation, being of human invention and characterized by human infirmity, can never be perfect in the same sense that the revelation is. Nevertheless, we must suppose that its whole operation is supervised and directed by the author of the revelation; that in fact, just in being made the vehicle of divine thought and divine communication it is brought as nearly to a perfect utterance as in its own nature it is capable of.

But since this vehicle is a literature, and a literature in many forms, the element of inspiration in it will to a certain extent manifest itself variously. One of its many "diversities of operation" will be seen in prophecy, another in psalm,

another in the maxims of a sententious philosophy, another in pastoral song, another in epic or drama, another in the statutes of divine legislation, another in history. It does not seem necessary to suppose that the subject of the inspiration is carried out of himself in every instance in just the same way or in the same degree. Nor does it seem necessary to hold that what is written as history is given to the historian in the same way as what is written as prophecy is given to the prophet. I cannot think that Ezra, or Nehemiah, in reciting incidents in which each had personally shared must have done so under the same kind of dictation as that under which Isaiah sketched his moving picture of the Man of Sorrows. History is written, in its secular form, in a use of *material*; where is the objection to supposing that the Bible histories were also written, in a certain way, more or less in the use of material? It is possible, therefore, that to some extent there may be truth in what Lenormant says in the opening sentence of the passage quoted in a former article: "That which we read in the first chapters of Genesis is not an account dictated by God himself, the possession of which was the exclusive privilege of the chosen people;"—although it should seem that the account of the creation, alike of the world and of man, must have been so: for otherwise how could it have been known? Lenormant's remark may hold good so far as this, that the subsequent record was not, all of it, dictated, at least to Moses, in the same way as the Second Psalm to David, or the coming of Messiah the Prince to Daniel. I do not see that we hazard anything in allowing that, to some extent, the Bible histories were written like other histories, in a use of historical material, providentially preserved. The divine intervention would be in that preservation, and in prompting, guiding, *inspiring* the writer.

Now, it is at this point that the question of the relation of tradition to inspired history, and to inspiration itself, may be taken up. May we allow any place at all to tradition, in such a connection? if so, *what* place, and how conditioned?

## 2. SOURCES OF PRIMITIVE BIBLE HISTORY.

An important fact in this connection may be made the starting-point in our inquiry. This is the fact that if tradition be recognized as among the sources of Bible history (I limit myself for the time being to *primitive* Bible history), it is quite unnecessary in tracing it to go outside the line of Bible men themselves. When it was learned, a few years since, how a Chaldæan literature existed, perhaps earlier than any Hebrew literature, in which accounts are given of the same events narrated in the first chapters of Genesis, and in many particulars strikingly resembling them, many persons concluded at once, and there are those who still hold and teach, that here, in these ancient Chaldæan legends, must be the original source of primitive Bible history. Much seems to have been made of the fact of apparent priority of date in the Chaldæan legends. The date assigned to the oldest of these is about B. C. 2000, while that of Moses is, according to the usual chronology, some five hundred years later. This is clearly very inadequate ground to go upon, especially in view of considerations which I shall notice further on. But, in any case, it is offset by the fact that the Mosaic narratives have in them indications of at least the possibility of an origin, so far as material is concerned, back as far as the very creation of man.

That patriarchal line to which belonged, after Adam, Seth, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the fathers of the tribes, seems to have been

as signally providential as the priesthood and prophetic order of the Mosaic dispensation, and the apostleship of early Christianity. Indeed, it would appear that in antediluvian times there was a chosen people, called in the narrative "the Sons of God," and that these in their way answered to the antediluvian world the ends served in later ages by the chosen people Israel, and later still, and in our own times, by the Christian Church. Their high function was discharged, it is true, under circumstances peculiarly unfavorable. The revelation of God was as yet in its most rudimental form; restraining influences were weak as compared with what they have been in later ages; meanwhile the world's depravity ran riot, the race in its primitive energy, as yet unenervated by civilization, nor wasted by barbarism, rushing on in evil with a momentum unparalleled since. "The Sons of God" became, themselves, after a while mingled and nearly lost in the sinful mass—the Church absorbed by the world. "There were giants in those days"—giants in depravity, above all. Human forces had a tremendous vigor and were exercised in formidable ways of which perhaps the old classic traditions preserved a recollection in the myths of gods and heroes. It would seem that the piety and morality of the antediluvian age could not cope with forces of evil such as these, and there came a time when it was necessary that human history should have a new beginning, and knowledge, and virtue, and religion a new theatre. Yet the line of faithful men did not, up to the very time of the deluge, quite fail. In consequence, too, of the great length of human life, some of the world's first fathers lived on till nearly the moment of that mighty cataclysm. In whatever transmission of sacred tradition there may have been, there were but three steps from Adam to Noah. Adam was still living, at the birth of Enoch, and Methuselah, the son of Enoch, was still living at the birth of Noah. If we go by the accepted chronology of the antediluvian age, Methuselah, who must have seen Adam, did not die until the very year of the deluge, and Lamech, the father of Noah, only five years before that event. Following the deluge, the computation shows us that Shem was still alive at the birth of Abraham; immediately following whom came Isaac and Jacob, and those twelve sons of Jacob who became the fathers of tribes. Even if the accepted post-diluvian chronology must be revised, and the Semitic genealogy so computed as to allow a larger interval between the flood and Abraham, this view of the matter would not be seriously affected.

Now, so much as this is certain—that while the Chaldean legends do not even intimate their original source, the narrative of Moses embodies facts which there can be no good ground for discrediting, even as simple history, and which enable us to see how, in a line of men who have been examples of faith and piety to every age, that history of the world's first period which Moses gives may have come down to him, either in oral or in written form. Indeed, where would be the necessary hazard in assuming that "the Sons of God," in antediluvian times, and that whole line of patriarchal men, were appointed, as one purpose of their setting apart, to the duty of preserving, in authentic form, under that same inspiration which prophets and apostles shared in later ages, so much of the world's primitive history as should be necessary to purposes of subsequent revelation, and as supplying to all subsequent time a reliable record of the first ages? So long as there is a fair measure of evidence that this even may have been so, where is the necessity for resorting to mere conjecture, and for saying, on a basis of conjecture, purely, that the Hebrew narrative is just a mere transcript of the Chal-

dæan one, only stripped of polytheistic accretions, and otherwise elevated in character and tone? The far more probable view would be, just in an examination of the documents themselves, that the two sets of narratives came down each in its own independent line, the one in that of mere tradition, the other in tradition possibly, yet tradition so originating and so preserved, as to be in fact *history*?

The question may, perhaps, be raised, Why, if such be the origin of the Mosaic narratives, or any portion of them, some express indication of the fact is not somewhere given, and so any mistake on this point anticipated and guarded against? To this the answer may be two-fold: In the first place, that it is not the manner of the Bible, anywhere, to go thus into detail on points anticipative of possible criticism; and in the second place, that the literature of the Bible is, to a wonderful extent, in the form and detail of it, such as was natural to the age in which it was produced. Now, questions such as the biblical criticism of this present time brings forward, belong, in their nature, to a cultivated and critical age. The literature of the Bible, especially the Old Testament, belongs to a period uncritical, and in a great measure uncultivated. The earliest books, above all, have accordingly a peculiarly primitive form and tone. The earlier half of Genesis, for example, reads as if written by men who had no dimmest conception of the difficulties some critical student in a critical age might find in the narrative. Suppose it had been different; suppose that all these critical questions were anticipated there, and the narrative written with as careful reference to scientific and otherwise learned scrutiny as if it had been written to-day;—how hard, in that case, to make men believe that this is really one of the oldest writings in all the world's literatures! It is, then, this primitive character of the earlier biblical literature that makes it so nearly silent on questions as to origin, date and authorship.

Taking it, however, just as we find it, we have in it indications of origin which relieve us, to say the very least, of all necessity to look for that original human source to any Chaldæan or other uninspired tradition. In the line of that patriarchal order to which his own family belonged, Moses could scarcely fail to find ample material for his narrative. So that, even if we recognize in the sources of his narrative more or less of the traditional, we can see how, as I have said, that tradition may have been so preserved as to become true history, and to simply need reproduction under inspired guidance.

### 3. THE MOSAIC HISTORY AND THE CHALDÆAN LEGENDS.

I go on, now, to remark that the Mosaic narrative and the Chaldæan legends differ so widely as to make the theory an impossible one that the latter are the originals of the former, while their resemblances simply go so far as to make the Chaldæan story a testimony to the truth of the Mosaic. For the present, I confine myself to these earliest chapters in the history and traditions of our race, because at this point the general question before us can best be tested. How what is found here bears upon what belongs to a later date will perhaps appear by and by.

Now, it will be remembered that in the passage quoted from Lenormant in an earlier article of this series, he distinctly admits the marked and radical differences in character and value between the accounts given by Moses in the first chapters of Genesis and legendary narratives of the same events in those libra-

ries made up of tablets of baked brick found on the site of ancient cities in the valley of the lower Euphrates. He is, indeed, as emphatic in characterizing these differences as any one of us might wish to be. What he says is therefore much more deserving of attention from us than what may be said by writers utterly regardless of these contrasts, and perhaps incapable of appreciating them. The nature of the differences in question is, throughout, very much like that which we found noticeable in the extract from the deluge tablets already given. The Chaldæan account everywhere bears upon its face evidence of its legendary character. It is besides thoroughly polytheistic, as much so as a Grecian or a Roman myth. The Mosaic conception of God, quite alone, would make a difference between the two accounts as vast as between Christianity itself and Heathenism. Now, how is all this to be accounted for, upon the theory that the Chaldæan is the original source of the Mosaic? How did the Hebrew Genesis come to be so immensely superior to the Babylonian one?

It will be remembered how Lenormant accounts for this difference. The Mosaic record, he tells us, compared with "the sacred books of Chaldæa," furnishes an example "of one of the most tremendous revolutions which have ever been effected in human beliefs." He terms it "a miracle." "Others," he adds, "may seek to explain this by the simple, natural progress of the conscience of humanity; for myself, I do not hesitate to find in it the effect of a supernatural intervention of divine Providence, and I bow before the God who inspired the Law and the Prophets."

We cannot but admire the manly and Christian frankness of this testimony, so much in contrast with the evasive methods of some other writers in dealing with the same matters. But, after all, is this the true way of accounting for the phenomena in question? Such a revolution as is here assumed is, no doubt, conceivable. We may imagine Abraham, as he went forth from the land of the Chaldees, so wrought upon by the Spirit of God, supernaturally so enlightened beyond all his contemporaries, as to become the originator of such a revolution in human belief as is here spoken of. But where is the evidence of it? Simply in the fact that in the line of the posterity of Abraham these higher conceptions of God are found, these rudimental forms of a true faith, expanded later into that true religion which now commands the allegiance of the best part of the race. But, as before shown, the narratives which in the line of Abraham's posterity have come down to us, imply nothing whatever of any such revolution. Their indications are, to the contrary, that Abraham represented, personally, and in his faith, a line of belief which is as distinctly marked before his time as after it. If we go by the documents, themselves, and leave mere theory apart, we shall say that a knowledge of the true God and of the history of his earlier dealings with the human race came to Abraham by inheritance: that the only revolution of which we have any indication was simply the gradual expansion of this knowledge of God, in the measure of it and in the number of those who had it, as the posterity of Abraham himself increased.

I do not know whether any special account ought to be made of the Hebrew elements entering into the name, first of Abram, and then of Abraham. Gesenius derives the second syllable of the former of these names from the Hebrew אֲרָם (râm), "to lift up oneself, to rise, to be lifted up;" and the whole name he gives as meaning "The father of altitude," as Abraham means "The father of a multitude." Considering how in primitive ages, and among all primitive peoples

names are significant, one may perhaps be justified in inferring that the name Abram was as providentially significant, as that of Abraham was declared to be by Jehovah himself when he said to the patriarch, "a father of many nations have I made thee." Other indications appear in what Paul says in the eleventh of Hebrews, where he puts Abraham in the line of believing men with Abel, Enoch and Noah, and tells us that when he "went out not knowing whither he went," it was "by faith." It looks as if Abraham, even amongst his own kindred—who evidently had become more or less idolatrous—and while still in Chaldæa, represented the faith of the faithful men of a former time—the faith of Seth, and Enoch and Noah, and Shem, and that in some way the very name originally borne by him was significant of this. He represented that upward tendency which still in a measure survived, even while the course of all other things was downward; he was "the father of that which was high;"—and in the call he had, became in due time "the father" of that "multitude" who in the ages and centuries to come were to share his faith. I cannot, for my own part, find at any rate in the narrative any indications of such a revolution as Lenormant assumes, even in Abraham himself, and do not see why we should make a conjecture to this effect the basis of our theory, when so many reasons appear why we should regard the faith of Abraham as simply the faith of those of his fathers who had not themselves lost the knowledge of the true God, nor ceased to believe in him.

Perhaps I ought to notice here the theory lately advocated by certain writers, that the accounts given in Genesis of the creation, the fall, the deluge, and indeed the whole of that primitive history was copied by Jews in Babylon, during the captivity, or reproduced by them from those Chaldæan books, remains of which have been found by Mr. George Smith, and others. Prof. Dillmann, of Berlin, in an article translated not long ago for an American quarterly, says of this, most truly and justly:

"As must be admitted the disposition of the Jews in Babylon towards their oppressors was such that it seems simply incredible that they should have appropriated whole sections out of the mythological writings or traditions of those same persons, and placed them at the very head of their statute-book. The national and religious antipathy was too strong in that period to admit of the formation of a mythological syneretism. There is, moreover, no example of adoption of Babylonian superstition or belief of that date, and even indifferent things, like the Babylonian names of the months, the Jews appropriated only slowly and after they had come into general use under the Persian dominion. Then, too, the Babylonian myths now under consideration, even in their oldest shape, accessible to us, that of the cuneiform writing (how much more so in the sixth century and later), were so overgrown with a polymorphous doctrine of the gods, and with grossly sensual views, that it would not have been possible for even an eminent religious faculty such as the Jews altogether failed to retain in those centuries, to reconstruct them, so to speak, according to a purer original form, to present them anew in the monotheistic simplicity, beauty, and truth in which they occur in the Bible."

There surely was never a wilder notion propounded by the wisdom of critics than this, that the Book of Genesis, characterized as it is, was written by some one or more of the captives in Babylon, and based upon the Babylonian myths. I think it fair to say that the evidence upon the whole subject, when sifted, points conclusively to this result; That the histories in Genesis and the Chaldæan and Babylonian legends, so far as any traditional element may be thought to exist in the former, had a common origin in the sense that the original source of both was the same—that original source being a knowledge of the beginning of things, transmitted from generation to generation through Noah and his sons, who had received it from antediluvian sources. But the two accounts differ immensely in this, that while what was written by Moses came down to him in a line of inspired



and faithful men, in whose hands it was, properly speaking, not tradition but history; that which has been found in the Chaldæan books, had the usual fate of tradition, and not only so, was corrupted and depraved in proportion as the people who preserved it became polytheistic, idolatrous and wicked. All this is *supposing* that Moses may have made any use at all of tradition, oral or written, as material. Even if he did so, the purity and absolute trustworthiness of his history, as history, is in the way I have pointed out made sure. Meantime the *resemblances* between the two accounts are just a testimony, from a source which cannot possibly be supposed an interested one, that other accounts of many of the same events recounted by Moses existed in the world at the time he wrote, and so far justifying faith in that which he wrote as a true history. This is the real, and so far as I can see, the only value of the Chaldæan legends, considered in relation to the history in Genesis.

---

The subject of tradition in its relation to inspired history will be resumed and concluded in another article.

---

## NOTES FROM ABROAD.

BY ROBERT F. HARPER.

---

The Summer-Semester is fast drawing to an end. According to the Catalogue, this Semester should close on August 15th, but, in reality, it will close between August 1st and 5th. On August 1st, the students are granted the privilege of presenting their "*Anmeldungs-Buch*" to the Professors for their signature, and they generally take advantage of this privilege. Already the Lecture-halls have begun to wear a gloomy appearance. The students are rapidly leaving, and one meets only one-half the number at lectures as formerly.

The past Semester presented an unusual number of attractions to the student in Semitic. Here, as in America, the Lectures in this department, are generally delivered to very small audiences.

This is to be regretted. Where there are ten in Semitic philology, there should be fifty. Especially are the American students few in number. In fact, another gentleman, a brother of Dr. Toy, of Harvard, who is studying Egyptology, and myself have the honor of representing America in this department.

It may not be uninteresting to note some of the lectures delivered during the past Semester:

*Schrader*: 1) History of the Babylonians and Assyrians; 2) the Interpretation of selected Assyrian Inscriptions; 3) Ethiopic.

*Sachau*: 1) Exercises in Arnold's Arabic Chrestomathy; 2) Interpretation of the Arabic poems ascribed to Imrunkais; 3) Syriac Grammar, with an Introduction to the Aramaic Dialects; 4) Interpretation of selected chapters in Arabic History.

*Barth*: 1) Interpretation of Ibn Mâlik's "al-Alfija;" 2) Arabic Grammar.

*Dieterici*: 1) Interpretation of the Koran and Explanation of the Laws of Arabic Syntax; 2) Interpretation of the Arabic book, "Theology of Aristotle;" 3) Interpretation of selected Arabic Poems.

*Jahn*: Arabic Grammar compared with the other Semitic languages, especially the Hebrew.

*Brugsch-Pascha*: 1) History of Ancient Egypt; 2) Hieroglyphic Grammar; 3) Demotic Grammar.

*Erman*: 1) Interpretation of Egyptian Inscriptions; 2) Interpretation of the most recently discovered Hieroglyphic Inscriptions.

*Lepsius*: No lectures. (Died July 10th).

*Dillmann*: Interpretation of the Book of Genesis.

*Strack*: 1) Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament; 2) Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah.

The lectures on Introduction and Isaiah by Prof. Strack, although not coming strictly in the Philological department, were very interesting and suggestive, even when viewed from a linguistic stand-point. His examination of the "Critical Questions," his notes on Hebrew Poetry and his handling of proper and geographical names were especially valuable.

The Catalogue for the Winter Semester, which came from the University publishers to-day, exhibits the following courses of lectures, which are of special worth to the Semitic student:

*Schrader*: 1) Elements of the Assyrian Script and Language and Interpretation of the Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Royal Museum; 2) Interpretation of selected Assyrian Inscriptions; 3) Babylonian-Assyrian Antiquity; 4) Grammar of the Chaldee Language and Interpretation of the Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra.

*Sachau*: 1) Syriac Bible and Apocrypha; 2) Syriac Chronicle of Zecharia; 3) Lebid, Dinan; 4) Geography of Assyria and Babylonia according to Elmu-kaddesi.

*Barth*: 1) Interpretation of a Miselna-Traktat with an Introduction to Neo-hebraic Literature; 2) Syriac Grammar and Explanation of Rödiger's Chrestomathy; 3) Arabic Syntax and Explanation of Arabic Exercises.

*Dieterici*: 1) Arabic Grammar; 2) Explanation of the Arabic Book "Thier und Mensch."

*Jahn*: 1) Arabic Syntax compared with the other Semitic languages, especially the Hebrew; 2) Explanation of the Koran—Commentary of Beidâwi.

*Brugsch-Pascha*: 1) Hieroglyphic Grammar; 2) Demotic Exercises; 3) History of Egypt.

*Erman*: 1) Elements of the Egyptian Script and Language; 2) History of Egypt.

*Dillmann*: 1) Introduction to the Old Testament; 2) Interpretation of Isaiah; 3) Interpretation "der kleineren nach-exilischen Stücke" of Isaiah; 4) History of the Text of the Old Testament.

*Strack*: 1) Hebrew Grammar; 2) Interpretation of Genesis; 3) History of Jewish (Neo-hebraic) Literature; 4) Exercises of the "Institutum Judaicum."

*Kleinert*: Interpretation of the Psalms.

The New Testament, Church History, Homiletics, etc., etc., are equally well represented. In looking over such a list of lectures one finds great difficulty in deciding what he will hear and what he will not hear. He would gladly listen to all of them, but this is, of necessity, impossible. For the Old Testament student Dillmann's History of the Old Testament Text and Strack's History of Neo-hebraic Literature will be especially interesting.

KARL RICHARD LEPSIUS, the Egyptologist, died on the morning of July 10th at his residence in Kleiststrasse 1. Lepsius was born on Dec. 23d, 1810. His father was the famous historian, Karl Peter Lepsius. He studied in philology in Leipzig, Göttingen and Berlin. In 1833 he went to Paris, where he devoted himself exclusively to the study of Egyptology, and where he later published "Paläographie als Mittel der Sprachforschung." In 1836 he left Paris for Rome, where he entered into a close relationship with Bunsen and became second Secretary of the Archæological Institute. Here he published his "Brief an Rosellini über das hieroglyphische Alphabet." In the summer of 1838 he went to England, where he remained two years. After returning to Germany he published his "Auswahl der wichtigsten Urkunden des ägyptischen Alterthums" (32 plates) and "Das Todtenbuch nach dem hieroglyphischem Papyrus in Turin," to which was added later "Aelteste Texte des Todtenbuchs." In 1842 he was elected Professor *extraordinary* in the University of Berlin, and entrusted with an expedition to Egypt. On his return in 1846 he became Professor *ordinary*. Lepsius also played a prominent part in the founding of the Egyptian Museum. His greatest work, "Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopen" (published at the expense of the government), appeared in 1849-1859 (900 plates). In 1867 he accompanied the Crown Prince in his journey through Egypt and Nubia. Among his other publications are the following; "Königsbuch der alten Aegypter;" "Chronologie der Aegypter;" "Grundplan d. Grabes König Ramses IV.;" "Briefe u. Berichte aus Aegypten, Aethiopen u. Sinai," etc., etc. With the co-operation of Brugsch, he edited the "Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde." By his death not only Germany, but the whole civilized world, has lost the recognized first authority in Egyptology.

Memorial services in honor of Dr. Dorner, of the Theological Faculty, who died about the first of this month, will be held in the University Hall on July 26, at 6 P. M. The various Faculties and their students will take part in these exercises.

The usual number of books and studies have not appeared during the past month. In the *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, No. 27, Strack has a review of Fritz Hommel's "Die vorsemitischen Kulturen in Aegypten und Babylonien." The reviewer seems to think that Hommel has undertaken to do too much in editing his "Encyclopädie der semitischen Sprach und Alterthums-Wissenschaft," of which the above is the first book; that such an undertaking is not warranted by the present status of Assyriological study. After setting forth the proposed contents of the Encyclopædia, he gives an extended review of the first volume. The author and reviewer do not seem to be at one on several points. In closing he gives a long list of corrections and adds the rather apt remark that "One must read this book with pen in hand."

Berlin, July 23d.

→CONTRIBUTED NOTES.←

**Biblical Interpretation as an Ideal.**—Who is the *ideal* interpreter of the Bible? What are the prerequisites for making the ideal, real? Ideals are aims. In all realms of thought, the searcher of truth, who is a theist, aims to find the original purpose of God. The geologist, the chemist, the astronomer, are ideal interpreters as well as the student of the Bible. Each presses towards a mark:—*the purposes of God*: the purposes of God in creation; the purposes of God in the laws of matter; the purposes of God “in the ordinances of the heavens;” and the interpreter of the Bible, with a theme the sublimest of all, is a seeker for the purposes of God in redemption.

To each of these interpreters a text is given for explanation: to the geologist, the earth’s crust; to the chemist, the elements of matter; to the astronomer, the universe; to the student of the Bible, the *Bible itself*. No one of them needs to originate a text, for the text is already provided. How then, with *his* text, shall the interpreter of the Bible best approach his ideal, the purpose of God in revelation.

The process is three-fold. First of all, *by an identification of himself with the language of the Bible*. I mean by this that he must be thoroughly acquainted with the laws of speech. Hebrew and Greek roots have living histories. They are not corpses for post-mortem examination. They live when the nations whose lives were wrapped up within their irregular outlines, have passed away. They are endowed with perpetual youth. What we know of Babylon’s luxury and of Egypt’s religion, monumental alphabets alone can tell us.

And so, the ideal interpreter of the Bible must train himself to trace patiently the goings and comings of words; from Egypt to the Jordan; from Jerusalem to Babylon; through the exact definitions of the Law and the usages of the national prophets. His purpose is not accomplished until he has pierced to the very life of the word. The result is not a curious specimen to be described, labelled and laid away in some museum of antiquity. It is to be cherished and honored as the history of a human heart.

But the examination of a prophecy or a psalm by the mere method of word analysis is but the raised letters for the fingers of the blind. Ideas are there. They are clearly and sharply defined. But they have not received their appropriate setting. This is also the work of the ideal interpreter, who must not only identify himself with words in themselves and sentences by themselves, but with their purposed arrangement. He must, therefore, in the second place, *identify himself with the author’s mind*. Words are heart-histories. Sentences are heart-histories made thought-histories. What did the prophet mean *then and there*? What purpose did he have in this particular and, it may be, peculiar manner of expressing his thought? Here identification with the language enters the interpreter into the prophet’s mind; helps him see as the prophet saw and hear as the prophet heard. The yearnings of the prophet’s heart, as he strives to portray Israel’s doom, the interpreter feels. His own heart echoes the prophet’s ringing shouts of joy at the vision of Jehovah’s salvation. The prophet and he are one. The same interests appeal to each. The same thoughts inspire both. Only by identification with the prophet’s mind can the 53rd chapter of Isaiah be truly

interpreted. Every word has a history. Every sentence is loaded, yea, burdened with thought. Thought and words are here more closely identified than anywhere else in the Old Testament. The prophet seems ready to break down under the pressure of his theme;—viz. Glory achieved through the sufferings of the Servant of Jehovah. That one theme pervades the whole. It sighs. It groans. It weeps. It moans. It almost dies. Then it strikes that highest note of victory, "It is finished."

If, now, the interpreter has performed his work well, he has passed, by identification of himself with the language, and with the thoughts of the poets and prophets, into a far higher identification. He has had a vision of the glorious truth of God. In the third place, then, the ideal interpreter of the Bible *will identify himself with the purposes of God*. His work has been progressive. Out of the materials of thought, he has constructed the thinker. As he has patiently watched these many thinkers of many times, always above them all, the eternal, self-existent Jehovah has appeared, guiding and directing his servants. While other men may have regarded His plans as mysterious and dark, the ideal interpreter sees God's purposes "ripening fast." The seeming diversity in revelation is lost in the essential unity of the whole. Many authors have become to him, one Author. Many books, one book. And the interpretation of *the Book* is found to center in the one Christ, in whom all the rays of revelation focus the words of John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was *with* God, and the Word was *God*." \* \* "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that hath been made. And the Word became *flesh* and *dwelt* among us, (and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only-begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth."

Identification of himself with the language of God's Word, with the thoughts of God's servants, and with the purposes of God, as He has revealed them through the medium of human thought, this is the process of the ideal interpreter. He has handicapped himself with no preconceived hypotheses. His wings have not been clipped by the dogmatic shears of philosophy or logic. He has simply surrendered himself to the Bible and listened to what the Bible *says*. In this way he has become a minister of the progressive apprehension of truth. The elements of progress are not to be found outside and beyond the Word of God, but within the range of revelation. As the light that has been shining for thousands of years, is still a study and a wonder to the devout lover of God's works, so the depths of God's purposes in the government of His moral universe, as they have been shining in prophecy and promise all down the ages are still the study and the wonder of His reverent children.

W. O. STEARNS.

---

**The Place of Incense in the Mosaic Ritual.**—Moses saw incense burning on Egyptian altars, and Abraham watched in Mesopotamia the fragrant clouds ascending as a ladder from man to the immortals. Both East and West it was taken for granted that the nostrils of the exalted judges of the fate of men were pleased with delicious odors. So great was the demand for incense, that spices form the earliest articles of commerce. It was merchants in balm and myrrh that carried Joseph into Egypt. When Jehovah showed Moses the pattern of the tabernacle, in which he was to be worshipped, He pointed out between the altar of brass and the mercy seat, a small altar of shittim wood overlaid with gold on which incense was to be burned. At lamp lighting and at light extinguishing, at the time

of the morning and of the evening sacrifice, the priest was instructed to take live coals from the brazen altar, and placing them on the golden altar, scatter incense on them. This incense was a compound of the apothecary and could be used for no other purpose. Its component parts were four aromatic substances, three of them gums of shrubs or trees, namely, frankincense, galbanum and myrrh, and one probably an odoriferous secretion of a shell fish called onycha. These substances in their pure form were exceedingly rare and costly, though found in Arabia on the borders of which the Israelites were wandering. They gave forth pungent odors, which however when mixed were very fragrant. Galbanum added body to the incense and its unpleasant fumes were deodorized by the rest. All four were beaten very fine, mixed in equal parts, then tempered and hallowed by the sacred salt, and, thus consumed, emitted a heavy cloud of sweet smelling savor, that floated over the veil into the most holy place. Once a year the veil was lifted and the incense was burned on a censer in the very presence of the Shekinah, whose glory was thus reverently shadowed. Incense therefore not only accompanied daily worship but also constituted with blood the only element used in the awful climax of the ceremonial of the day of atonement. In the New Testament these spices are no less conspicuous, for the wise men brought frankincense and myrrh to the infant Saviour, and the four-and-twenty elders hold in one hand harps and in the other golden vials, full of odors. The revelator tells us that these odors are prayers of saints, and the psalmist exclaims: Let my prayer be set before thee as incense. In another place he seems to have in mind the priest standing before the cloud rising from the golden altar, when he says: He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most High, shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty. It will not be unwarrantable spiritualizing to infer from the place of the golden altar between the altar of sacrifice and the altar of mercy, that sacrifice is the indispensable foundation of prayer, and that prayer is the necessary complement of sacrifice. The ambassador must present his credentials before his communications can be delivered. Only the blood washed can offer the incense of prayer. The bloody altar of sacrifice is seen before the golden altar of incense or the golden cherubim over the mercy seat. Calvary is seen before Pentecost descends. Calvary is transfigured by Pentecost. The sacrifice was not complete until the golden altar was reached. The atonement is made effectual only by prayer. Some say "no mediator," others cry "many mediators," but we say "one mediator."

Like incense prayer is a compound, and its four elements are adoration, confession, petition and thanksgiving. They are all present in the Lord's Prayer, which is our model, and they are commonly found joined in the psalms of David. What more beautiful invitation could be given us to turn aside to pray, as the shadows gather and again as they rise and flee away, than the image of the white-robed priest approaching in the early morning and again at the cool of the day, with spices and coals of fire, the curtained tabernacle. Or choosing the figure of the apostle on Patmos, may we not ask ourselves: Is my vial full of odors, is it filling fast, or is it running so low that there is not even a scent of fragrance lingering about it?

W. W. EVERTS, JR.

---

**Some Practical Hints.**—*What Commentaries to Buy?* We refer, of course, to commentaries on the Old Testament. The question is ever recurring, and is not an easy one to answer in a summary way. The primary question is a question of

pecuniary ability. With ample means we should say buy all you can lay your hands upon, for as a wise teacher once said: "No book written concerning the Bible can be otherwise than useful to a critic. It will stimulate thought." But the larger class of students are compelled to husband their resources, and are dependent upon small libraries. What shall they do? We answer negatively, Do not buy a *series* of commentaries. Such a series may be the product of many scholarly writers, passing under the eye of a very scholarly editor, but, as a rule, they follow one type of thought and one mode of interpretation. One who reads them exclusively becomes like unto them, depends upon them, swears by them, and soon loses all desire for independent thought or critical judgment. The bane of a series of commentaries is slovenliness and sluggishness. We soon use them as a lame man his crutches.—Again, do not buy English commentaries exclusively. They are read more easily, and may contain the results of the best scholars of many nations, but nothing is more healthful and helpful than to feel a man's thoughts in his own language. It is like reading a psalm in the Authorized Version and then reading it in Hebrew. The former act leaves one vaguely thinking about everything and nothing; the latter lets you into the very aroma of the lyric poet, and fills the soul with thoughts too big for expression. Read Knobel or Dillmann's commentary on Genesis, and then read Murphy, and mark the difference on your mind, not so much in the line of information perhaps, but as a mine of thought to kindle your own. Buy, therefore, the best commentary to be had on each book of the Old Testament. Few men ever produce more than *one* good book, a book which will survive the wear of time. Often it is his *first* book, the one into which he put all there was of him, the one on which he staked his fame, the one he made with the sharp eyes of a world of critics upon him. That is his *chef-d'œuvre*. It is doubtful if he ever surpasses it. It is his investment for a series, and the series may be passed by for the chief of another series, which will be a work upon another book of the Old Testament. Keil's fame rests upon his commentary on Joshua; Alexander's on his Isaiah; Perowne's on his Psalms; Stuart's on his Daniel; Cheyne's on his Isaiah; Tuchs on his Genesis, etc. A hint here is enough.

*How to Use a Commentary.* As a reference book and nothing more. A student, even but partially familiar with the Hebrew language, so far as the exact meaning of the text is concerned, ought to be ashamed of himself, if he finds himself consulting a commentary before he has made his own translation, and has pondered carefully its meaning. Does the letter of a friend require an interpreter as to its main import? If in another language, the French for instance, aside from local coloring, can its main purpose not be easily ascertained? The interpreter by your side, who has gone over it before you, and has perhaps sweat over it and wrung from it some of its obscurities, may assist your best endeavors, but he ought not to be called in until you have done your best to understand it. Then it is your own, and there is a luscious pride, a manly pride, in its being your own. But before one has called in his favorite interpreter he should by all means call to his aid the early versions of the Old Testament. Those translators stand much nearer to the spirit and thought of the Hebrew language than we do or can do with all our boasted microscopic learning and principles of hermeneutics, we can enter the thought of the sacred writers in no way more suggestively and critically than by their help. In the study of the Psalms, for instance, let the student keep on his table an "Hexapla of the Psalms," containing the Hebrew text, the

Vulgate, the Psalter, a translation of that Vulgate, Jerome's Vulgate and the Septuagint, and by running his mind through them all before his commentary is touched, he will frequently catch a fresh meaning in the original as it was understood by those living nearer to the original text and understanding many shades and idioms of the original text better than any modern lexicographer, grammarian or exegete. Passing the original text through so many crucibles he can almost always extract from them a grain of gold. Versions, though by no means ultimate appeals, are at least eye-glasses. The text and the versions should always precede the commentary. After them let the commentary take the place of a subordinate help and a fuller inspiration.

O. S. STEARNS.

---

### ➤GENERAL NOTES.◀

**The Empire of the Hittites.**—Five years ago there was no one who suspected that a great empire had once existed in Western Asia and contended on equal terms with both Egypt and Assyria, the founders of which were the little-noticed Hittites of the Old Testament. Still less did any one dream that these same Hittites had once carried their arms, their art, and their religion to the shores of the Ægean, and that the early civilization of Greece and Europe was as much indebted to them as it was to the Phœnicians.

The discovery was made in 1879. Recent exploration and excavation had shown that the primitive art and culture of Greece, as revealed, for example, by Dr. Schliemann's excavations at Mykenæ, were influenced by a peculiar art and culture emanating from Asia Minor. Here, too, certain strange monuments had been discovered, which form a continuous chain from Lydia in the west to Kappadokia and Lykaonia in the east.

Meanwhile other discoveries were being made in lands more immediately connected with the Bible. Scholars had learned from the Egyptian inscriptions that before the days of the Exodus the Egyptian monarchs had been engaged in fierce struggles with the powerful nation of the Hittites, whose two chief seats were at Kadesh on the Orontes and Carchemish on the Euphrates, and who were able to summon to their aid subject-allies not only from Palestine, but also far away from Lydia and the Troad, on the western coast of Asia Minor. A century or two afterwards Tiglath-Pileser I. of Assyria found his passage across the Euphrates barred by the Hittites of Carchemish and their Kolkhian mercenaries. From this time forward the Hittites proved dangerous enemies to the Assyrian kings in their attempts to extend the empire towards the west, until at last in B. C. 717 Sargon succeeded in capturing their rich capital, Carchemish, and in making it the seat of an Assyrian satrap. Henceforth the Hittites disappear from history.

But they had already left their mark on the pages of the Old Testament. The Canaanite who had betrayed his fellow-citizens at Beth-el to the Israelites dared not entrust himself to his countrymen, but went away "into the land of the Hittites" (Judges i., 26). Solomon imported horses from Egypt, which he sold to the Syrians and the Hittites (1 Kings x., 28, 29), and when God had sent a panic upon the camp of the Syrians before Jerusalem, they had imagined that "the



king of Israel had hired against them the kings of the Hittites and the kings of the Egyptians" (2 Kings vii., 6). Kadesh itself, the southern Hittite capital, is mentioned in a passage where the Hebrew text is unfortunately corrupt (2 Sam. xxiv., 6). In the extreme south of Palestine an offshoot of the race had been settled from an early period. These are the Hittites of whom we hear in Genesis in connection with the Patriarchs. Hebron was one of their cities. \* \* \*

Another Hittite city in the south of Judah was Kirjath-sepher, or "Book-town," also known as Debir, "the sanctuary," a title which reminds us of that of Kadesh, "the holy city." We may infer from its name that Kirjath-sepher contained a library stocked with Hittite books. That the Hittites were a literary people, and possessed a system of writing of their own, we learn from the Egyptian monuments. What this writing was has been revealed by recent discoveries. Inscriptions in a peculiar kind of hieroglyphics or picture-writing have been found at Hamath, Aleppo, and Carchemish, in Kappadokia, Lykaonia, and Lydia. They are always found associated with sculptures in a curious style of art, some of which from Carchemish, the modern Jerablús, are now in the British Museum. The style of art is the same as that of the monuments of Asia Minor mentioned above.

It was the discovery of this fact by Professor Sayce, in 1879, which first revealed the existence of the Hittite empire and its importance in the history of civilization. Certain hieroglyphic inscriptions, originally noticed by the traveller Burckhardt at Hamah, the ancient Hamath, had been made accessible to the scientific world by the Palestine Exploration Fund, and the conjecture had been put forward that they represented the long-lost writing of the Hittites. The conjecture was shortly afterwards confirmed by the discovery of similar inscriptions at Jerablús, which Mr. Skene and Mr. George Smith had already identified with the site of Carchemish. If, therefore, the early monuments of Asia Minor were really of Hittite origin, as Professor Sayce supposed, it was clear that they ought to be accompanied by Hittite hieroglyphics. And such turned out to be the case. On visiting the sculptured figure in the Pass of Karabel, in which Herodotus had seen an image of the great opponent of the Hittites, he found that the characters engraved by the side of it were all of them Hittite forms.

Hittite inscriptions have since been discovered attached to another archaic monument of Lydia, the sitting figure of the great goddess of Carchemish, carved out of the rocks of Mount Sipylus, which the Greeks fancied was the Niobé of their mythology as far back as the age of Homer; and similar inscriptions also exist at Boghaz Keui and Eyuk, in Kappadokia, as well as near Ivris, in Lykaonia. Others have been discovered in various parts of Kappadokia and in the Taurus range of mountains, while a silver boss, which bears a precious inscription both in Hittite hieroglyphics and in cuneiform characters, seems to belong to Cilicia. In fact, there is now abundant evidence that the Hittites once held dominion throughout the greater portion of Asia Minor, so that we need no longer feel surprised at their being able to call Trojans and Lydians to their aid in their wars against Egypt.

The existence of Hittite inscriptions at Hamath goes to show that Hamath also was once under Hittite rule. This throws light on several facts recorded in sacred history. David, after his conquest of the Syrians, became the ally of the Hamathite king, and the alliance seems to have lasted down to the time when Hamath was finally destroyed by the Assyrians, since it is implied in

the words of 2 Kings xiv., 28, as well as in the alliance between Uzziah and Hamath, of which we are informed by the Assyrian monuments. Hamath and Judah, in fact, each had a common enemy in Syria, and were thus drawn together by a common interest. It was only when Assyria threatened all the populations of the west alike, that Hamath and Damascus were found fighting side by side at the battle of Karkar. Otherwise they were natural foes.

The reason of this lay in the fact that the Hittites were intruders in the Semitic territory of Syria. Their origin must be sought in the highlands of Kappadokia, and from hence they descended into the regions of the south, at that time occupied by Semitic Arameans. Hamath and Kadesh had once been Aramean cities, and when they were again wrested from the possession of the Hittites they did but return to their former owners. The fall of Carchemish meant the final triumph of the Semites in their long struggle with the Hittite stranger.

Even in their southern home the Hittites preserved the dress of the cold mountainous country from which they had come. They are characterized by boots with turned-up toes, such as are still worn by the mountaineers of Asia Minor and Greece. They were thick-set and somewhat short of limb, and the Egyptian artists painted them without beards, of a yellowish-white color, with dark black hair. In short, as M. Lenormant has pointed out, they had all the physical characteristics of a Caucasian tribe. Their descendants are still to be met with in the defiles of the Taurus and on the plateau of Kappadokia, though they have utterly forgotten the language or languages their forefathers spoke. What this language was is still uncertain, though the Hittite proper names which occur on the monuments of Egypt and Assyria show that it was neither Semitic nor Indo-European. With the help of the bilingual inscription in cuneiform and Hittite, already mentioned, Professor Sayce believes that he has determined the values of a few characters and partially read three or four names, but until more inscriptions are brought to light it is impossible to proceed further. Only it is becoming every day more probable that the hieroglyphics in which the inscriptions are written were the origin of a curious syllabary once used throughout Asia Minor, which survived in Cyprus into historical times.

We may expect to discover hereafter that the influence exercised by the Hittites upon their Syrian neighbors was almost as profound as that exercised by them upon their neighbors in Asia Minor, and through these upon the fathers of the Greeks. For the present, however, we must be content with the startling results that have already been obtained in this new field of research. A people that once played an important part in the history of the civilized world has been again revealed to us after centuries of oblivion, and a forgotten empire has been again brought to light. The first chapter has been opened of a new history, which can only be completed when more Hittite inscriptions have been discovered, and the story they contain has been deciphered. All that is now needed are explorers and excavators, who shall do for the buried cities of the Hittites what Botta and Layard have done for Nineveh or Schliemann for Mykenæ and Troy.—*From Sayce's Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments.*

→ EDITORIAL NOTES. ←

**The Summer Schools of Hebrew.**—The *Chicago School of Hebrew* opened July 1st, and continued until July 29th. There were in attendance about seventy students. Besides the Principal of the School, Professors S. Burnham, of Hamilton, N. Y.; C. R. Brown, of Newton Centre, Mass.; E. L. Curtis, of Chicago; G. H. Schodde, of Columbus, O., and Messrs. Ira M. Price, F. J. Gurney, G. S. Goodspeed, and E. R. Pope, assisted in furnishing instruction. Classes in Arabic, Ethiopic, Syriac, Aramaic, and Old Testament Theology were formed. The usual amount of work was accomplished. The interest was, if possible, even greater than in former years.

The *Chautauqua School* was organized July 22d. The number of students was twenty-five. This small number was due partly to the fact that the ministers in attendance at Chautauqua this summer were fewer than usual, but chiefly to the fact that the opening of the School was placed at too early a date. The Chautauqua School will, another year, be the third instead of the second, and will not begin before August 5th. The students were earnest and enthusiastic, they had come solely for the instruction in Hebrew, and the character of the work done was equal in every respect to that done at the other Schools.

The *Worcester School* was organized August 5th in the Worcester Academy. The Academy lies on a large hill overlooking the city, the view being unusually fine. The situation is admirable as a boarding school for boys, and equally well suited for Summer School work. Professor Abercrombie, the Principal of the Academy, contributes largely by his thoughtfulness and genial manners to the comfort of the members of the Summer School. The attendance is not so large as at the Chicago School, nor was this expected, but it is not confined to students from New England. Four Southern States are represented, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Alabama. The enthusiasm runs high, and at the time of writing (August 19th) we have the prospect of a most successful month of work. The fruits of the inductive method are obvious already. This method vigorously applied for a full four weeks cannot fail to give a student a good beginning in the Hebrew language. The special classes in Aramaic and Assyrian are also doing honest work, and daily progress is visible. Of the lectures before the school, two have been delivered by Prof. E. C. Bissell, of Hartford, on Penta-teuchal Criticism, two by Prof. D. G. Lyon, of Cambridge, on Babylonian-Assyrian Culture; three by Prof. B. Manly, of Louisville, on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, and two by Prof. O. S. Stearns, of Newton Centre—one on Prophecy and one on the Book of Zechariah.

**Resolutions.**—In accordance with the special request of members of the Chicago Summer School of Hebrew, the following Resolutions, passed by them at the close of the term, are given here:

1. *Resolved*, That we, the Students of the Hebrew School, held at Morgan Park, Ill., July, 1884, desire to bear testimony to the excellence of the methods used by Dr. Harper and his associates, and to their great tact and enthusiasm in teaching the Hebrew language. We wish to express our thanks for the results they have accomplished in and for us, and we would commend most heartily to

our brethren in other institutions of learning, to all Ministers of the Gospel, and to Students who are preparing for that sacred calling, the privileges and opportunities afforded in the Hebrew Summer Schools.

2. *Resolved*, That we also commend to the thoughtful consideration of all lovers of sacred learning the rare opportunities afforded by the Hebrew Correspondence School, conducted by Dr. Harper and his associates, for the acquisition of an accurate and thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language.

3. *Resolved*, That, in view of Dr. Harper's plan to organize a permanent undenominational Institute for the thorough study of the sacred tongues and others closely allied thereto, we commend to the prayerful consideration of all Christians this very praiseworthy enterprise, and we hereby pledge ourselves to do all in our power to advance its interests.

---

**Expedition to Babylonia.**—Miss C. L. Wolfe of New York has given renewed evidence of her public spirit in making a contribution sufficiently large to pay the expenses of a small archaeological party who are to explore the valley of the lower Tigris-Euphrates. The party will consist of Dr. W. H. Ward, editor of *The Independent*, Mr. J. T. Clarke, one of the chief actors in the American excavations at Assos, and two other gentlemen. It is hoped that one of the others may be Dr. J. S. Sterrett, who was Mr. Clarke's colleague at Assos. Mr. Clarke is now in London and Dr. Sterrett is in Asia Minor. The party will probably leave London early in October. Passing by Constantinople most likely, it is expected that they will take the overland route from Alexandretta to Mosul on the Tigris. Just opposite Mosul lie the ruins of Nineveh. From this point they will proceed toward the south and make their headquarters at Bagdad, Bosra or some other point between these two cities. They will thus be in easy reach of Babylon, Ur of the Chaldees, Erech, Sippar and the ruins of numerous other cities of the ancient Babylonian empire. They desire to reach their destination about the middle or close of November. They will then have the three most favorable months of the year for their work. Excavation will not be a part of this work. The object of the party will be rather to examine sites and report places where they think excavation might be profitably carried on. The priority of English and French excavators will be duly recognized. American excavations will be confined to new territory. And the territory is broad enough for several nations to work harmoniously together. The Turkish government looks, it is true, with suspicion on all enterprises carried on within its domain by Western peoples, but we hope that we shall be permitted to excavate when we are ready to do so.

The increasing interest felt in this country in Semitic study and archaeology, and particularly in Assyrian and Babylonian antiquities leads us to hope that the American expedition may be eminently successful, and may be the fore-runner of other expeditions such as shall enrich our American museums and enlarge our knowledge of some of the oldest records of our race.

---

**Minute Accuracy of the Old Testament.**—The confirmation of Bible statements down to the minutest details by Egyptian papyri and Assyrian tablets is astonishing at the close of an age of rationalistic attacks on the sacred volume. To be sure Herodotus and Berosus have likewise risen in authority since these discoveries have been made, but where the Hebrew and the Greek traditions differ,

the hieroglyph and the cuneiform appear to favor the Jewish record. "My historical criticism," says Ebers, "is the more full of devotion as every day of study leads me into deeper reverence for those wonderful books." Rawlinson declared in 1877 that he had found no difficulty in accepting the literal sense of the Mosaic narratives from any evidence of the monuments.

We mention a few minor points in which the agreement is striking. Pharaoh gave to Abraham sheep but not horses. Contemporary monuments represent sheep, while horses do not appear until after the Hyksos invasion.

In the many details of the life of Joseph nothing occurs, says Ebers, "that would not agree exactly with court life of the Pharaohs in the time of their glory."—The Harris papyrus thus refers to the Exodus: "The population of Egypt had broken away over the borders, and among those who remained there was no commanding voice." The Bible says Hezekiah paid Sennacherib 30 talents of gold and 300 talents of silver which is the more strikingly confirmed by the apparent discrepancy of the Assyrian record, which contains 800 talents of silver. But as Schrader says, the agreement is exact, as three Palestinian silver talents were equal to eight Assyrian.

The length of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, 43 years, is confirmed by the clay tablets. His madness, when he ate grass as an ox, seems to be referred to by the record made after his recovery: "For four years I did not build high places; I did not lay up treasures; I did not sing the praises of Merodach; I did not offer sacrifice; I did not clear out the canals."

Belshazzar, the last king of Babylon, whose existence was long doubted, has been found as Bilshuruzur. Alasuerus has been identified as Xerxes, and his presence at Susa in the third year of his reign and again in the seventh, when Esther was made queen, coincides with the date of his return from his invasion of Greece.

14 nations, 14 kings, 40 cities, and 10 idols named in Scripture occur in their proper place and time on the monuments. Such numerous and minute points of historical contact are now flung like a net over Scripture books and dates, and will hold them in their places in spite of all the herculean efforts of those who would displace or rearrange them.

---

### →BOOK NOTICES.←

#### LAGARDE'S SEPTUAGINT.\*

It has long been known that Paul de Lagarde of Göttingen was at work upon the text of the Septuagint. At different times he has published contributions to the solution of this difficult problem.† Two years ago he announced the long ex-

\* *LIBRORUM VETERIS TESTAMENTI CANONICORUM. Pars Prior, Græcæ. Pauli de Lagarde, edita. Göttingæ: A. Hoyer, 1883. XVI, 544 pp.*

† It is worth while to give the list of these contributions here: *Veteris Testamenti ab Origene recensiti fragmenta apud Syros servata quinque* (1879), *Materialien zur Geschichte und Kritik des Pentateuchs* (1867), *Psalterium, Job, Proverbia arabice* (1876), *Der Pentateuch Koptisch* (1867), *Psalterii versio memphitica* (1875), *Anmerkung zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbia* (1863), *Genesis græcæ* (1868), *Dio Parisier Blaetter des Codex Samaritanus* (1879). Bearing more directly upon the Hebrew are *Hieronymi quaestiones hebraicæ in libro Genesios* (1868), *Prophetæ chaldaicæ* (1872), *Hagiographa chaldaicæ* (1874), and *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi* (1874).

pected work in a separate pamphlet\* which proved a disappointment in some respects—in others it was interesting if not edifying. This pamphlet really announced the abandonment of the attempt to give us a “final” edition of the Septuagint. It gave the reasons at some length and the impartial reader could not deny their weight. At the same time the author announced *an* edition if not *the* edition of his text, and this has now appeared. If a disappointment it is not so externally. It is a large octavo well printed on good paper and decidedly a handsome volume. It contains the books from Genesis to Esther in the order in which they are usually found in the Greek—the same as in our own version.

But the external appearance is only secondary in a book of this kind and we turn at once to the text to discover wherein this edition differs from those which have preceded it. And here we discover that former printed editions are based upon one or another of the great uncial manuscripts. The source of the Complutensian Polyglot is not yet definitely ascertained. Grabe followed mainly the Alexandrine Codex. The Roman edition (which is copied closely by Tischendorf) reproduces the Vatican manuscript, which contains a New Testament text of acknowledged superiority. But the uncials are not the only sources at our command for the Septuagint. There are many cursive manuscripts; and the derived versions are of considerable if not equal importance. How shall we deal with this mass of matter? The natural answer at first sight seems to be—make up a text from the best manuscripts and disregard the others. This would mean to make up a text from the uncials especially ABS (or  $\aleph$ ).

But a little reflection shows the objections to such a course. In the first place although this group of MSS. is older than any other actually existing, its members are yet three centuries further away from the autograph than in the case of the New Testament. The greater age is less distinctly an advantage. In the second place it seems not impossible that these great uncials which are of about the same date and which resemble each other closely in many ways may present a single type of text. They may be derived, that is, from a single original of not much greater age than themselves. In such a case their coincidence would be authority only for the reading of their immediate ancestor, which might be good, bad, or indifferent.

The question of superiority then is not so easily decided by simply comparing the age of existing copies. The internal probability of readings must first be tested. In order to this we must bring to view the whole mass of material. First however it will be well to eliminate as many variants as possible by the genealogical method. What that method undertakes is very clearly set forth by Westcott and Hort in the second volume of their Greek Testament. The application of it by Lagarde is instructive enough to consider a little.

The first thing he noticed was that certain MSS. (all cursives, it is not necessary to describe them here) agreed in a number of cases where they all differed from others; or to put it differently, that they were constant in agreement among themselves—but irregular as to others. This fact established their affinity—which means of course that they were all copied (or descended) from a single prototype. By the ordinary rules of comparison they will restore to us this prototype. In the process of restoration all the cases in which they differ will have been considered and their variations may henceforth be disregarded and the mass of unruly material will have been diminished by so much.

\* Ankuendigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griech. Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments (1882).

Lagarde's edition is simply the restoration of this lost original—it gives us a new MS. and allows us to lay aside the six from which it is derived. The question comes, however,—what sort of a MS. was this of which we now have a copy? The first answer is—it was certainly an uncial and therefore of considerable age. This is shown by the variations of the derived MSS. among themselves, e. g. one has *ειδωνα* for *Σιδωνα*; *Βααλερμων* is written *Βαλαερμων*; *Χαλααμα* becomes *Χααλαμα*, *Μααιναν* *Μαλιναν*. These are evidently mistakes in copying an uncial text and a long list of similar ones is given in the preface.

The second fact discoverable is that this early MS. contains a very different text from that given by the uncial group. It differs more widely from all of them than they do from each other. To show this would take more space than is proper to a simple book notice, but it can be shown conclusively. Lagarde himself gives the outline of a demonstration in his preface. This does not prove, of course, that the new text is better than the others—which is the better we are yet to find out. All it shows is that we are in possession of a text which has escaped to a large degree the influences which have affected the group ABS—or on the other hand that we now have a text which has been affected by influences which they have escaped. In either case it is desirable that we should have both forms in order to comparison.

A third fact is discovered by Lagarde and the outline demonstration is given in the preface. It is that a text closely conformed to the one before us was in the hands of Chrysostom and he quoted copiously from it in his homilies—not from the recension represented by the uncials.

Fourthly, the meagre fragments of the Gothic version of Ulfilas (made at Constantinople or at least under Constantinopolitan influence) seem to represent this text and not that of the other group.

The combination of these facts with an assertion of Jerome (made more than once) is easily made. Jerome, namely, says that three recensions of the Septuagint were current in his time. The Antiochian made by Lucian, the Alexandrian made under the supervision of Hesychius and the Palestinian which was circulated after Origen's labors by Eusebius and Pamphilus. The Antiochian was current in Constantinople and Asia Minor and would naturally be in the hands of Chrysostom. Lagarde therefore claims (not without reason) that his edition restores for us the text of Lucian. The uncial group, if it is purely of either of the others, is probably (?) Palestinian, as Origen's reputation gave that large currency in the East (this is not Lagarde's conclusion; he expresses no opinion at all about this group).

A somewhat extended comparison of this edition with that of Tischendorf authorizes the assertion that it is generally further removed from the Hebrew (as we now have it). This would argue for its nearness to the original Septuagint. On the other hand there are numerous instances in which this has been corrected by the Massoretic text and the other has been left unchanged.

Enough has been said to show the value of this work, and the difficulty of the problem it attacks. It is to be hoped that the editor will be disappointed in his gloomy forebodings as to the sale of the work. No theological library should be without it, and those who are disposed to examine in earnest [the text of the Septuagint will find it indispensable. We commend it also to those who desire a copy of the Septuagint for study. This text is certainly as good as any other and it is better printed than the most.

H. P. SMITH.

## A CONSERVATIVE REPLY.

The recent activity in Old Testament criticism on the negative side is calling out the defenders of older views. Their contributions are mostly fragmentary to be sure, but in these things detailed inquiry must precede a comprehensive statement. The work of Prof. Böhl\* entitled "To the Law and to the Testimony," stands upon traditional (we use the word without invidious purpose) ground and is an endeavor to hold that ground especially against Wellhausen.

The plan of the book is to examine first the conceptions *Law and Covenant* and show that they do not come to their right in the critical investigation. It then draws a parallel between the history of Israel and that of the Church, devotes one section to the prophets Samuel and Elijah, and examines "the modern view of the Old Testament in general." The next part considers the *pie fraus* and the last goes into the literary analysis of the various books.

The position of the author is distinctly stated at the outset (p. 2): "The first step was the decisive one. When the Mosaic authorship of the Law or the Pentateuch was given up, then the first step was taken which must lead to this end [Wellhausen's theory]. But the Law and sacred history in general is something *sui generis*; it does not commend itself to each and every one, but only to those who accept it under certain presuppositions [*voraussetzungen*]." Just here we might be inclined to put an interrogation point. Is it true that sacred history can only be understood under certain presuppositions? Of course it is meant that these presuppositions must be different from those necessary to the study of all history. But if such an affirmation is made it seems to preclude any general science of sacred history at all, and this is to say the least, discouraging.

The author now insists that we must first of all answer the question—"Was the Law from Heaven or of men?" It would seem however that the question could only be answered *after* study of the Old Testament and not before. What is said in regard to Kuenen is no doubt correct. To start out with the answer "of men" is to beg the question. But that does not justify the exactly similar process which starts with the other answer.

The great error of the critics (says Dr. Böhl) is that they make the Law the foundation of the Old Testament economy. On the contrary it is only an episode—something which came in beside as Paul says (*παρεισελάβον* cf. Rom. v., 20; Gal. III., 17), not a part (humanly speaking) of the original plan. The key of the whole situation is the incident of the golden calf. "The service of the golden calf makes a decisive turning point in the history of Israel; a turning point like that in Gen. III. Then—as the Israelites within forty days transgressed the covenant—they compelled God to find new measures in order that he might remain further in the midst of a backsliding people. So it came to pass that God, *anticipating the rebellion of his people*, gave Moses before the open fall the necessary indications concerning the Tabernacle and its furniture and its ministers (Ex. xxv.-xxxI.). The Tabernacle receives practical meaning after the setting up of the golden calf, not immediately at the beginning of the divine revelation at Sinai—as though it were the foundation stone" (p. 12). It is not the work of the reviewer to discuss all these points; his work is done if he gives a correct idea of the contents of the book. Nevertheless it may not be out of place to call attention to the

\* ZUM GESETZ UND ZUM ZEUGNISS. Eine Abwehr wider die neu-kritische Schriftforschung im Alten Testament, von Eduard Bochl, Professor in Wien, etc. Wien, 1883. 8vo, vi and 231 pp.



weak point of this ingenious argument as indicated by the words put in italics above—*anticipating the rebellion*. This anticipation exactly deprives the theory of any basis it might otherwise have had in the history.

Dr. Böhl is as well aware of the problem as is any one of the critics. "The history related in the books of Judges, Samuel and (in part) Kings stands in contradiction to the laws named after Moses" (p. 15). The remarkable thing, he adds, is the position of the prophet as reformer and of the priest as inactive. "The position [of the priests in Judah] was such that they never down to the Exile formed a hierarchy with firm ground beneath their feet and a firmly organized influence in larger circles. They could not crowd into the foreground as members of a favored caste, but, in Judah also gave precedence to their freer brethren the prophets" (p. 16). True! but this only removes the difficulty one step further back. How could the guild of priests when once established after the Pentateuchal scheme fall so low in influence? And how came it that the prophets if they accorded to the Pentateuch anything like what we call canonical authority, yet proceeded in their reforms with so little attention to it? These questions are not answered and they are the important ones.

In the section on the Covenant, however, we find a reference to the second part of the problem—the relations of the prophets to the Pentateuch. With the prophets (such is Dr. Böhl's hypothesis) the main thing is God's covenant with the people. They look at that covenant as it was made on the arrival at Sinai. They disregard the ritual commands as belonging to the interepisode—the *zwischen-epretenes*. It is in this view that Jeremiah says (VII., 22 sq.) "I gave your fathers in the day I brought them out of Egypt no command in regard to burnt offerings and thank-offerings. But this only I commanded them: Hear my voice and I will be your God and ye shall be my people; and walk in all the ways that I will show you that it may be well with you."

The parallel between the history of Israel and that of the Mediaeval Church has often been drawn. It is reproduced at some length in the book under consideration. "Church History shows the exactly similar phenomenon—that important factors of doctrine lie as it were fallow for long periods of time and the church in power acts towards them as though they did not exist. Think only of the Second Commandment, the doctrine of Justification, the sufficiency of the offering on Golgotha, the sole authority of the Word of God,—all this leads an apparently lifeless existence through centuries, exactly as did the so-called Law from Moses to the Captivity" (p. 42). The exactness of the parallel must be decided by the Church Historian. The question might be raised whether the latency of a doctrine is the same as the latency of a written code of law and a thoroughly systematized hierarchy. Dr. Böhl, however, carries out his parallel in an ingenious manner, and much that he says will meet with approval. The same may be said of the rest of the book. Some assertions, however, are open to criticism. How can he say for example: "We are expressly told of Samuel that he gave himself to the study of God's Word, in a time when that Word was precious in the land (1 Sam. III., 1)"? Such interpretation of the verse is willful perversity. It seems strained also to say: "To understand this authority of Samuel we must leave him the only support he had, namely, the Pentateuch" (p. 63), or again: "He [Samuel] drew from the Word of God in the Pentateuch, he taught upon this basis and so all Israel knew that Samuel was entrusted with the prophetic office" (p. 64). Of Elijah we read: "This law, not one in process

of growth, but one already complete [*das gewordenes*] written, was the starting point of Elijah's whole activity. We can as little conceive an Elijah in the history of his time without the Mosaic Law as we can later in the Gospel without Moses" (p. 83). If the author could prove these things he would bring us and every one else on to certain ground. But of proof there is only a semblance.

The author recognizes differences of style in Genesis. He accounts for them by supposing the Jehovistic narratives to be patriarchal traditions written down by Moses in much the style in which he heard them. The Elohist frame-work was added by Moses himself to bring in the chronological data. The difference in the use of the divine names he supposes to be due to Moses's desire to accustom his people to the name Jehovah without letting the older Elohim go out of use. In Exodus the difference is no longer observable, and he supposes this book, therefore, to be entirely the work of Moses. The legal style he thinks to be pre-eminently that of the Lawgiver.

H. P. SMITH.

#### MORE TALMUD.\*

At the present rate we shall soon be in possession of the whole Talmud in translation. It is desirable that the work should be done by competent hands, however, and on this account the book now before us can hardly be valued very highly. The present reviewer indeed does not claim to judge the fidelity of the translation to its original. On this point we have an opinion from Prof. Strack, a well-known authority in this department.† Anyone, however, can judge the translation as to its clearness of expression, and almost anyone so judging it will put it very low in the scale. Moreover, a large number of Hebrew words are introduced, and even whole sentences, without translation. And these words, instead of being given in the Hebrew letters, are transliterated after the style of the Polish Jews. An example of this follows, the German being translated but the Hebrew words left:

"At the end of the Sabbath *Wihinoam* must be said first. When the Megilla is read it must be entirely unrolled and spread out like a letter, not read rolled together like a Tora roll. In the morning *Alhauisim* is to be prayed in *Shmone Esreh* at *Modim* but without mentioning the name Adonai because it concerns things in the past. The half *Kadesh* is spoken, then the Tora roll is taken from the ark, and three men are called for the section from *Wajowo Amolek* to the end of the Sidra *Beshalach*, although it contains only nine verses. The Tora roll is not replaced in the ark (as is customary), but remains on the Almemor till the end of the Megilla reading, at the close, the benediction is pronounced after the Megilla as on the preceding evening, then *Aschre Uwo Lezian* but not *Sammazeach* because it has *bejom zero*, also on the 14 and 15 no *Tachnun* because it says *jom mischte wesimcho*." Pages 9, 10.

\* DER TRAKTAT MEGILLA NEBST TOSAFAT (!) vollstaendig ins Deutsche uebertragen von Dr. M. Rawiez, Bezirksrabbiner in Schmicheine (Baden). Frankfurt am Main; J. Kaufmann. II. and 117 pp.

† *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1884, No. 23 (June 6). Prof. Strack pronounces (1) many passages wrongly translated, especially in the Tosaphoth; (2) many others left untranslated in such a way that what is given is unintelligible; (3) Raschl's notes so wrought into the text that they cannot be distinguished except by comparing the original; (4) no notes of his own are added by the translator; (5) the style and punctuation as well as the rendering of the proper names are defective; (6) the numeration of the Mishna and the pagination of the Talmud are not indicated; (7) there is no index.

The criticisms already made being justified by this quotation, we mention some of the *curiosa* which occur to the reader of this treatise.

The following as embodying Jewish tradition on some points of Introduction is interesting: "Rabbi Irmija [Jeremiah?] says that the final forms of Mem, Nun, Zade, Pe, Kaph were introduced by the later prophets. Rabbi Irmia [sic] also says the Targum to the Tora was composed by the proselyte Onkelos as he heard it from R. Eliezer and R. Josua, the Targum to the Prophets by Jonathan ben Uzziel as he heard it from Chagai, Secharija and Maleachi. At the publication of the latter Palestine trembled [moved?] 400 paces, and a voice from heaven cried: Who reveals my secret to mankind? Then Jonathan stood up and said: I did, but not for my own fame or the fame of my father's house, but to Thy glory, that controversies be not multiplied in Israel. He desired also to publish a Targum to the Hagiographa, but a voice cried: Enough! for the end of the world is indicated in them, therein is made known when the Messiah is to be expected. (Qu.\*) Rab interpreted the verse Neh. VIII., 8 to mean, they read the Bible in the original with the Targum \* \* \* so that the Targum was earlier than Onkelos [was it not]? (Ans.) It had been forgotten and Onkelos brought it again to light." Page 5.

A quite different example: "Rawa [Rabba?] says at Purim one ought to drink until he cannot distinguish between 'Orur Haman' and 'Baruch Mordechai' [i. e., between 'Cursed be Haman' and 'Blessed be Mordechai']. Raba and Seira held the Purim feast together, and as they were drunken Raba killed Seira. The next day he prayed for him, and he was brought back to life. The next year Raba invited him again, but he declined with the words: A miracle does not happen every year." Pages 19, 20.

In the discussion of the question whether it is lawful to use copies of the Bible in any other than the Hebrew language we find the following: "Our teachers allow Greek only, and R. Juda says this in the case of a Tora roll on account of the history of Ptolemy. For it came to pass in the case of Ptolemy that he collected seventy-two elders and had them put into seventy-two rooms without letting them know the reason. Ptolemy went to each one and ordered him to write the Bible, and God inspired each one to make the following changes [in the text]: (1) Gen. I., 1 Elohim boro be'reschit [change of order]. (2) Gen. I., 26 eesse odam bezelem ubidmuth [instead of נעשה], (3) Gen. II., 2 wajchal bajom haschischi [instead of השבע], (4) Gen. I., 27 sochar unekewo [נקבו instead of נקבה], (5) Gen. XI., 7 howo erdoh weewlah scham sefasam† [for נרדה ונבלה], (6) Gen. XVIII., 12 watschak Sarah bikroweho [for בקרבה], (7) Gen. XLIX., 6 ewus [for שור]." (There are given in all fifteen such supposed changes). This passage has especial interest as showing the study given to the Septuagint at one time by Jewish scholars, and their discovery of differences between it and the Hebrew.

The Rabbis confess that they sometimes learned from the common people: "Rabbi's pupils could not explain the word *serugin* till one day they heard his servant girl call (they were coming in at intervals, one by one) 'how long do you come *serugin*?' So with the word *salseleho* Prov. IV., 8—the maid said to one who was a long time at something, 'how long art thou *mesalsel* with thy hair?'"

\* The reader will remember that a large part of the Gemara is in the form of question and answer.

† This is a flagrant specimen of the author's transcription, which has been retained however in all the examples.

For the size of the book this notice is already too long. Megilla, however, is one of the most interesting sections of the Talmud. Much may be learned even from this defective translation.

H. P. SMITH.

---

#### BY-PATHS OF BIBLE KNOWLEDGE.\*

---

*The Religious Tract Society* of London is publishing a series of books, with the above title, upon subjects connected with Bible study. The field intended to be covered is large, for the design is to present the results of the most recent investigations among the ancient monuments and other records of the Eastern peoples. History, geography, archæology and other topics, which within the past few years have done so much for the better understanding of the sacred narratives, are all to be treated of by men thoroughly competent in these respective departments. The results of the labors of many minds and long years are to be gathered in brief compass and presented in a way which will be helpful to all Bible students who have little leisure for more thorough study. This is the plan, and certainly the work, if well done, will be of great value and assistance to many.

Three volumes of the series have been already issued; the second and third are before us, and have been perused with much interest.

Mr. Harkness, in *Assyrian Life and History*, has compressed a large amount of information within 107 pages. He presents in a clear and systematic way the history of this Kingdom from its beginning under Assur-nazir-pal till its downfall about 600 B. C. The principal kings are spoken of succinctly and their deeds in connection with Israel and Judah are plainly brought out.—Prof. Sayce, in his contribution to the series, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, dwells more particularly upon this history, and shows how much of added interest is given to the historical and prophetic portions of the Old Testament, and how dark passages are now readily understood in the light thrown upon them from the Assyrian Tablets. Prof. Sayce's book is designed to call attention to these points of agreement between the biblical and other histories, while Mr. Harkness does not seek to cover this ground.

After dwelling upon the history of the Assyrians, Mr. Harkness takes up in succession their writing, literature, religion, architecture and art, military and hunting matters, and domestic habits and customs.—In speaking of their writing, he seems to magnify the difficulties of learning the Assyrian language (see p. 37 sq). For although it is undoubtedly difficult, yet one can read with a much smaller vocabulary than he states—and it is not necessary to cumber the mind at the outset with the Archaic and Babylonian forms.—It is amazing how abundant a literature these people had, for although only one library (Assur-bani-pal's at Nineveh) has been thoroughly explored—the amount already available for students is much larger than all the Hebrew literature of the Old Testament.—All of these topics taken up by Mr. Harkness are presented in a manner which brings vividly before one the life of this ancient people, giving to us their methods

---

\* ASSYRIAN LIFE AND HISTORY. (By-paths of Bible Knowledge, II.) By M. E. Harkness. 5x7¼, pp. 107.—FRESH LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS. (By-paths of Bible Knowledge, III.) By A. H. Sayce, M. A. 5x7¼, pp. 190. London: *The Religious Tract Society*.

and style of building, their dress and food, and their daily employments so far as known.

Prof. Sayce in his volume, takes up the Bible from Genesis down to the time of Nebuchadrezzar—and presents the points upon which the discoveries in Egypt, Assyria, Palestine, Babylonia and Asia-Minor throw special light. He covers in a large measure the same ground as Rawlinson in his *Historical Evidences*, but much more clearly in view of the recent discoveries. There is one trouble with this book, Prof. Sayce is somewhat inclined to be dogmatic in his assertions, and thus is led to regard some things as settled which the majority of scholars as yet consider doubtful. For instance, he evidently agrees with Friedrich Delitzsch in his location of Eden in Babylonia, and states it as an established fact, but Prof. Francis Brown gives weighty arguments against this view (see his article in this number of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, p. 1),—so also many would be loathe to identify the cherubim of the Scriptures with the winged monsters of Assyria and Babylonia; other examples of this tendency might be given, but these will suffice.

Prof. Sayce in his discussion of the 10th chapter of Genesis shows how much interest may be given to apparently the driest subject by the grouping of historical facts from all available sources around the Word of God. The Exodus out of Egypt is discussed; and the discovery of the city of Pithom with its treasure-chambers made in part of strawless bricks is mentioned. The discovery of the ancient empire of the Hittites by means of inscriptions found in Asia-Minor and at Hamah, the Assyrian kingdom (of which we have already spoken), and the Babylonian, these all give facts which are very helpful to the clearer understanding of the later days of the kingdom of Israel and the captivity of Judah.

Both of these works are presented in attractive style, of convenient size, finely printed, and illustrated in such a way as to greatly add to their value. We heartily recommend them, feeling satisfied that no one can read them without great benefit.

If the series is completed in the manner it has begun, it will be valuable to many classes of people, and a necessity in the library of every minister who wishes to be at all up with the times in sacred archæology.

#### THE EXPOSITOR IN THE PULPIT.\*

This is the title of a lecture delivered by Dr. M. R. Vincent before the students of Union Theological Seminary.

Dr. Vincent's treatment of the subject is fresh, suggestive, and masterly,—he exhibits in a marked degree the characteristics which he lays down as essential to true exposition.

The preacher, says the lecturer in substance, is first of all the interpreter of God's Word. This is his manual; and it is his duty to declare its truths to the people. "Exposition is *exposing* the truth contained in God's Word, *laying it open*, *putting it forth* where the people may get hold of it." All preaching then is exposition and every true sermon expository. Four requisites to true exposition are named. (1) *Knowledge* on the part of the preacher, critical and close. "No day should pass without a draught at the *integri fontes* of Scripture—the Greek Testa-

\* THE EXPOSITOR IN THE PULPIT. By Marvin R. Vincent, D.D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 1884. Pp. 38.

ment and the Hebrew Bible. Keep some book—gospel, epistle, prophecy—constantly on the work-bench, doing something on it every day,—until the book lies in your mind as a whole in the light of the best scholarship of the age;” (2) *Comprehensiveness* of treatment, getting at the foundation-thought of a passage and presenting it in the light of the context, the book, and in view of the *unity* of God’s Word; (3) Impress the *reality* of the narratives upon the minds of the people. Make the Bible heroes *real* men to them; (4) *Make the Word its own interpreter*. Illustrate one passage by another. “Never fear the results of exposition. Inspiration knows what it ought to say—take what you find there and present to the people.”

Under each of these heads Dr. Vincent gives examples, by way of warning and illustration, which make the thoughts he desires to impress fairly luminous. The lecture is most helpful not only for the class to whom it was originally addressed, but for all who would present the truth to the people, and will amply repay careful perusal.

---

### ◀ SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY. ▶

#### AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- BEAL, REV. S. Buddhism in China. New York: *E. & J. B. Young & Co.*  
1 vol., 240.....\$0.75
- BROWN, CHARLES R. An Aramaic Method, a Class Book for the study of the Elements of Aramaic. Part I. Texts, Notes and Vocabulary. Chicago: *The American Publication Society of Hebrew*. Pp. 132.....\$1.75
- CHASE, IRA J. The Jewish Tabernacle. Two lectures. Cincinnati: *Standard Pub. Co.* 120, pp. 84.....\$0.75
- ERRETT, ISAAC. Evenings with the Bible. Old Testament Studies. Vol. I. Cincinnati: *Standard Pub. Co.* Pp. 351.....\$1.50
- GEIKIE, CUNNINGHAM. Hours with the Bible. Vol. VI. Completing the Old Testament. New York: *James Pott*.....\$1.50
- WATSON, F. The Law and the Prophets. Hulsean Lectures, 1882. New York: *Thos. Whittaker*, 8vo.....\$2.50

#### FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- BENNETT, W. H. The Mishna as Illustrating the Gospels. London: *Bell & Sons*. 8vo, pp. 104.....4s. 6d.
- BERTRAM, R. A. A Homiletical Commentary on prophecies of Isaiah. Vol. I. London: *Dickinson*, 1884. 8vo, pp. 530.....9s.
- BISSELL, A. P. The Law of Asylum in Israel Historically and Critically Examined. Leipzig: *T. Stauffer*, 1884. Gr. 8vo, pp. 86.....M.1.50
- CROSS, J. A. Some Notes on the Book of Psalms. London: *Longmans*. 18mo, pp. 50.....2s.
- DYKES, J. O. The Law of the Ten Words (Household Library of Exposition). London: *Hodder & Stoughton*. 12mo, pp. 250.....3s. 6d.
- LEVEN, M. L’hygiene des Israelites. Versailles: *Cerf et fils*, 1884. 12mo, pp. 19.
- LIEBLEIN, J. Egyptian religion. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*. Gr. 8vo, pp. 46....M.1.50

- LINTON, HENRY. The Books of Haggai and Zechariah with explanatory notes and appendices. London: *Philip*. 12mo, pp. 96.....1s.
- LORTET. La Syrie d'aujourd'hui, voyages dans la Phénicie, le Liban et la Judée: 1875-1880. Paris: *Hachette & Co.*, 1884. 4to, pp. 679.....50 fr.
- An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. Vol. V. Jeremiah—Malachi. Edited by Bishop Ellicott. London: *Cassell*. Roy. 8vo. ....21s.
- SCRIVENER, F. H. A. The authorized edition of the English Bible (1611): its subsequent reprints and modern representatives. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 8vo, pp. 290.....7s. 6d.
- STUART, A. MOODY. The Bible True to Itself. A Treatise on the Historical Truth of the Old Testament. London: *J. Nisbet & Co.* Pp. viii, 504....5s.

## RECENT ARTICLES.

- ABERCOMBIE, R. The Cradle of Myths. *The Academy*, July 14, '84.
- BERTIN, G. The Akkadian Heresy. Letter. *Ibid.*, June 14, '84.
- The Genesis and the Sinaic Revelation. *American Israelite*, July 18, '84.
- WISE, I. M. The Essence of Judaism. Homily on Micah vi., 1-18. *Ibid.*, July 25, Aug. 1, '84.
- LADD, G. T. The Interpretation of the Bible and the Doctrine of Sacred Scriptures. *Andover Review*, July, '84.
- BOARDMAN, G. N., D. D. Inspiration; with Remarks on the Theory presented in Ladd's Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, '84.
- PICK, B., Ph. D. The Study of the Hebrew Language among Jews and Christians. *Ibid.*
- FORD, S. H. The Imprecations of David. *Christian Repository*, Aug., '84.
- REID, W. H. The Sweet Psalmist of Israel. *The Episcopal Recorder*, July 24, '84.
- REID, W. H. The Psalms, No. I. *Ibid.*, Aug. 14, '84.
- COX, S. The Hope of Immortality: Jewish and Christian. Isaiah xxx., 19. *The Expositor*, July, '84.
- PLUMPTRE, E. H. Ezekiel—an ideal biography. *Ibid.*, June, July, '84.
- YONGE, J. E. Esau and Jacob: Gen. xxvii. *Ibid.*, July, '84.
- CRAFTS, W. F. The Old Testament Tested. *Journal of Christian Philosophy* July '84.
- FOSTER, A. P. Is the Bible Free from Historic and Scientific Errors? *Ibid.*, July, '84.
- DAVIES, W. W. Authorship of Ecclesiastes. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, '84.
- TERRY, M. S. The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch. *Ibid.*
- MATTHES, J. C. The False Prophets of Israel. *Modern Review*, July, '84.
- KERR, REV. JOHN H. The Newer Criticism. *Presbyterian Journal*, June 26, '84.
- TAYLOR, WM. The Miracle at the Battle of Bethoron. *The Pulpit Treasury*, August, '84.
- PORTER, PRES. J. L. Phœnician Influence on the Israelites. *Ibid.*, July, '84.
- GREEN, W. HENRY. The Ark Brought to Zion. *Sunday School Times*, June 28, '84.
- PICK, B. Parent and Child as shown in the Talmud. *Ibid.*, July 26, '84.
- SMITH, PROF. H. B. Light from Hebrew Proper Names. *Ibid.*, June 21, '84.
- VINCENT, M. R. The Penitential Psalms. *Ibid.*, July 12, '84.
- VUILLEUMIER, H. La critique du pentateuque dans sa phase actuelle. *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, May, '84.
- OORT, H. De Aaronieden. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, May, '84.

- LYNCKEN, K. W. Die Sociale Bedeutung des Mosaischen Gesetzes. *Beweis d. Glaubens*, March, Apr., May, June, '84.
- BUDDE, K. Seth und die Sethiten. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 1884. Heft 2.
- NOWACK, W. Bemerkungen über das Buch Micha. *Ibid.*
- SMEND, RUDOLF. Anmerkungen zu Ies. XXIV.—XXVII.. *Ibid.*
- STADE, B. Ies. XXXII., 33. *Ibid.*

## REVIEWS.

- BENNETT, W. H. The Mishna as Illustrating the Prophets. *The Sunday School Times*, July 19, '84.
- BISSELL, A. P. The Law of Asylum in Israel. (By R. Smend.) *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, July 26, '84; *Modern Review*, July, '84; *Presbyterian Review*, June, '84; (By A. Rohling) *Archiv f. kath. Kirchenr.*, 1884, 4.
- BUDDE, KARL. Die Biblische Urgeschichte. (By Francis Brown.) *Presbyterian Review*, July, '84.
- CHEYNE, T. K. The Book of Psalms. *The Nation*, May 22; (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litbl.*, May 21; *Modern Review*, July, '84.
- CONDER, C. R. Heth and Moab. Syrian explorations in 1881, 82. *Unitarian Review*, June, '84.
- Current Discussions in Theology, Vol. II. *Christian Union*, Aug. 14, '84; *The New Englander*, July, '84.
- ELLICOTT, C. J. Old Testament Commentary, Vol. V. *The Academy*, June 21, '84; *Modern Review*, July, '84.
- GRILL, J. The 68 Psalm (by H. L. Strack). *Theol. Litbl.*, May 19, '84.
- GREGORY, C. R., et ABBOTT, E. Prolegomena in N. T. Tischendorfianum. (By J. H. Thayer) *Andover Review*, June, '84; (By R. B. Drummond) *The Academy*, June 7, '84; (By O. Zöckler) *Ev.-Kirch.-Ztg.*
- KING, E. G. Hebrew words and 'synonyms. \*I. The names of God. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litbl.* 25.
- LOWE, W. H. The Mishna on which the Palestinian Talmud rests. (By H. L. Strack.) *Lit. Centralbl.* 26.
- NEWTON, R. HEBER. Book of the Beginnings. *The Sunday School Times*, June 28, '84.
- REUSS, E. History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures. *Modern Review*, July, '84; *Bib. Sac.*, July, '84.
- SAINT-HILAIRE, E. R. Etudes sur l'Ancien Testament. (By F. E. Daubauton.) *Theol. Studien*. II., 4.
- TOY, C. H. Quotations in the New Testament. (By G. F. Moore.) *Andover Review*, July, '84.
- TRUMBULL, H. C. \*Kadesh-Barnea. (By H. Guthe). *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, June 14, '84.
- WRIGHT, G. H. B. The Book of Job. (By K. Budde.) *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, June 14, '84; (By C. A. Briggs). *Presbyterian Review*, July, '84.