

## ❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT❖

---

VOL. V.

MAY, 1886.

No. 9.

---

WE GIVE our readers in this number the conclusion of the Symposium on "Bible-study in the Theological Seminaries." The opinions here expressed are no less interesting and no less worthy of consideration than those published in the previous number. If we may judge from the expression of opinion upon this subject made orally, in letters, and in print, we may confidently feel that the opening up of the discussion was not untimely. It is difficult, of course, when in ruts, to get out again; yet it is always possible. Our ministers need a practical and comprehensive knowledge of their hand-book, the Bible. Let us see that they have it.

---

THOSE interested in Semitic and oriental studies will be pleased to learn that besides Summer Schools, there are also to be Winter Schools where an opportunity is furnished for the study of the Semitic languages, including Hebrew, Arabic and Assyrian. This new departure—for the *Summer* School of Hebrew is now a thing of some age (six years)—is taken by Prof. Paul Haupt, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. In January of 1887 he will conduct a four week's School in which *he* will give instruction in Assyrio-Babylonian and Sumero-Akkadian, while two of the Fellows of the University will give instruction in Hebrew. Men have learned that four weeks spent in the continuous study of one subject accomplishes much more than was generally supposed. We trust that this Winter School may be a most successful one.

---

THERE is danger, it must freely be granted, that we may make a serious mistake in reference to Bible-study. We *may* spend so much time in breaking the shell, that no time will be left for extracting the meat. Not a few students have a weak spot in this direction. There

is not a geographical or historical allusion which they cannot, in the case of a given verse, explain. The exact meaning of every word is known, the force of every construction worked out. They have learned, too, the historical stand-point, and the relation of this verse to that which precedes and that which follows. One would naturally think that, with all this known, little could remain. But it is not so. All this is the shell. He who stops here has missed practically everything. The very thing wanted is not obtained. The *thought*, the underlying meaning is not grasped. Now all this preliminary work is necessary, absolutely necessary; but it is far from sufficient. It would only require a slight additional effort to get that which is of supreme value. It is just like the preparation of a task for recitation. One man spends an hour and fifty minutes; he has really mastered the lesson; but the finishing touch has not been given, and it is recited poorly and soon forgotten. Another man spends ten additional minutes. He fastens it firmly in his mind, recites it satisfactorily and, what is of more value, holds it when the recitation is a thing of the past. That extra ten minutes was of more practical value than the preceding hour and fifty minutes. Let us remember this. It is a false economy to stop when our work is almost finished, and lose what is really the great thing desired. The meaning of these wonderful expressions, the principles which they contain must be learned, and to confuse them with the geography, the history, the grammar of the passage, is a sad mistake. It is the thing dressed, not the dress, which is of vital importance.

NINE-TENTHS of theological controversy arises from a difference of opinion as to the meaning of the terms employed. Could the principal technical terms have been assigned a specific signification and have been used strictly in accordance with this signification, thousands of volumes need not have been written, hundreds of men need not have been born. It has been a question in the minds of many of the readers of the *STUDENT*, whether *all* of the contributors to the symposium in the April number understood alike, or, at any rate, used alike the terms "Higher Criticism" and "Biblical Theology." It has been suggested by some eminent scholars that in the symposium the former term was by several used synonymously for "rationalistic criticism," and that the latter was not really distinguished by some from "Systematic Theology." This is a matter for the writers themselves to consider. We take this opportunity of reproducing a note from the *STUDENT* of April, 1884, in reference to Higher Criticism. There are some points which, however sharply put, fail to impress them-

selves ; and the exact meaning of the term Higher Criticism seems to be one of them :

“Biblical Criticism is that branch of historical criticism which deals with the biblical books as literary productions. It may be divided into two great branches, Textual Criticism and Higher Criticism. Textual Criticism is that science which seeks to establish the exact text of the biblical writings as they left the hands of their authors. This is done by a careful comparison of MSS., versions and citations from subsequent authors. Higher Criticism sets out from the results of Textual Criticism and enquires as to the authenticity (authority), genuineness (relating to the proof or disproof of alleged authorship), sources and character of the several books of the Bible. It asks and seeks to answer such questions as these : Is the writing so attested that we can rely upon its statements ? Is the author candid, trustworthy ? What are the materials from which he drew, and are they reliable ? Who is the author or authors ? What is the time, place, occasion of composition ? Was the nature of his work *revision* or original composition ? What literary form has this work assumed ? It is very plain that the nature of the reply which scholars give to these questions cannot constitute them Higher Critics, or the reverse. Higher Criticism is to be distinguished from Textual (Lower) Criticism, and if the name *Lower* had been applied to the introductory science, confusion would not have arisen in regard to the one appropriately designating the advanced science. A Delitzsch, or a Green, or a Bissell, who seeks to answer the above questions, is a Higher Critic ; so is a Wellhausen, or a Smith, or else a scholar who is conducting such investigations cannot be placed at all until he has reached his conclusions ; and, then, from the point of view of such scholars as attach a stigma to the term, he is to be called a Higher Critic, should he have departed in his conclusions from conservative views ; while with those who deny the right of Wellhausen and his school to the name Higher Critic, our enquirer would be excluded from the class. The confusion on both sides is removed by making the term refer, not to the results, and not altogether to the methods, but to the character of the questions, which the critic of all beyond the mere text proposes.”

It may not be amiss also to reproduce from Oehler, the definition of Old Testament Theology, or Biblical Theology, so far as concerns the Old Testament :—

“The theology of the Old Testament, the first main division of Biblical Theology, is the *historical exhibition of the development of the religion contained in the canonical books of the Old Testament*. As a *historical science*, Biblical Theology is distinguished from the *systematic statement of biblical doctrine* by this, that while the latter investigates the unity of divine truth, as seen in the *whole course of revelation*, and the aggregate of its manifestations, the former has the task of exhibiting the religion of the Bible, according to its *progressive development* and the *variety of the forms in which it appears*. The theology of the Old Testament has therefore to follow the *gradual progress* by which the Old Testament revelation advanced to the completion of salvation in Christ ; and to bring into view from all sides the *forms in which, under the Old Covenant, the communion between God and man found expression*. Now, since the Old Testament revelation did not present itself simply in words and as a divine testimony concerning doctrine, but was made in a connected course of divine deeds and institutions, and on the basis of these produced a peculiarly shaped religious life ; and further, since all knowledge derived from revelation is not given independently of the facts of the history of salvation and the divinely instituted rules of life, but develops itself in continual connection with them ; it follows that the theology of the Old Testament cannot limit itself to the directly didactic matter in the Old Testament. It must embrace the essential factors of the history of the divine kingdom in the Old Covenant : its task is, in short, the *exhibition of the whole of the Old Testament dispensation*.”

## A SYMPOSIUM ON BIBLE-STUDY IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

### II.\*

On account of an unusual pressure of work, I can only in the most brief and desultory way suggest what I would say. The general line of thought which you propound is not strange to me. In 1867 I was invited to connect myself with the Theological Seminary in California, and gave the subject much thought, which resulted in some conclusions adverse to the procedures then common in the old seminaries, and in the directions which your questions suggest. In briefest, then, I would reply:

1. I think the great lack of our theological instruction is that it does not sufficiently ground men in the Bible; that it takes a predetermined system of doctrine into the Scripture to look for support, rather than saturating the mind with Scripture and evolving a theology thence.

2. I believe that the value of *one year* of a course in theology should be spent in seeking to master the substance and spirit of the *English Bible*. Only so can anything like the power as a Biblical preacher which such a man as Moody has, be gained.

3. I should value the illustrative use of Biblical history very far below its value as divinely uttering saving truth. I doubt whether to a generation like ours, Biblical has value over church, or even secular history. The fact that a certain course of conduct has been tried, and with what results, is the pith of history; and I am not clear that the fact that such results appeared in David's, or Solomon's, life, intensifies its value for popular use over what would be true in the life of Napoleon, or Gordon, or Bismarck.

4. I am uncertain about Hebrew. When men can readily have, and keep, and use, the knowledge of it, it is a great blessing. But it does not seem to me to compare with Greek in *indispensableness* to a minister, and I am by no means clear that for the sake of gaining a smattering of it—to remain that alone—the time would not be much better spent on the English Bible.

5. It is my *impression* that a better thing than to found and fund new chairs of Biblical in distinction from Systematic Theology, would be to *Biblicize* the occupants of the chairs already existing, to that degree that the result would be a theology self-consistent and self-coherent enough to bear being called Systematic, yet so coincident with Scripture in all its lines and angles, that nobody would ever dream of denying it to be Biblical.

HENRY M. DEXTER.

*Office of The Congregationalist, Boston, March 12, 1886.*

1. My conviction is that the attention paid by seminaries to Bible-study is far from what it ought to be. There is *great need* of "a deeper, broader study of the Bible."

\* No. 1 of this Symposium, containing replies from Lyman Abbott, D. D., A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., Rev. Joseph Cook, Howard Crosby, D. D., LL.D., Wayland Hoyt, D. D., G. W. Lasher, D. D., F. N. Peloubet, D. D., Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., J. A. Smith, D. D., Wm. Hayes Ward, LL.D., appeared in the April number of THE STUDENT.

2. It depends on the range of the study in the original languages. If that is merely critical and exegetical, there could be a profitable study of the Bible in English outside of this—especially in its history, biography, geography, topography, etc., and to learn how, through the progressive revelations of the Old Testament, the way was prepared for the New.

3. By all means, *Bible* history before *Church* history. There is no such book of illustration, in its biographies and narratives, as the Old Testament. It is the only book in which human life and character are photographed *just as they are*, without partiality or prejudice. It is *invaluable* on this account. "Higher Criticism," in view of present tendencies, should receive careful attention.

4. Whether a knowledge of Hebrew should be required in order to graduation, I am not ready to say. But its study should certainly be encouraged, and no scholarship should be regarded as complete in its absence.

5. In my judgment, what is called "Systematic Theology" should give place to Biblical Theology. The study of the Bible, and an ascertainment of its truths in their relations to each other, *without regard to any system of theology*, is what is needed. The interpretation of the Bible in the light of any of these systems of theology, I regard as fraught with evil, and tends to the perpetuation of systems and sects of which the Bible knows nothing, except to condemn them.

ISAAC ERRETT.

*Office of the Christian Standard, Cincinnati, March 18, 1886.*

1. I think the attention paid to Bible-study in our theological seminaries might very profitably be emphasized in many institutions. From what I have learned regarding the real acquaintance with the Bible which the majority of our graduating theological students possess, there is a demand for a deeper, broader study of the divine Word itself.

2. I feel quite confident that great practical good would result from a close study of the Bible in English. Whether such a study would demand a separate department I am hardly prepared to say.

3. Every theological student ought to have a detailed knowledge of *Biblical* history. That is the history upon which he will continually draw for the material and illustrations used in his sermons. He may forget much he has learned of Church history when employed in the active ministry, but he ought not to allow any fact or truth connected with Biblical history to drop from memory.

4. More time might be profitably spent in the study of Hebrew, at least time enough should be devoted to it so that the student could afterwards use it with ease and pleasure.

I think the study of Hebrew should not be required of all divinity students. Many men, from a want of aptitude in the acquisition of languages, might more profitably spend their time in studying the English Bible. They may become efficient pastors even though deficient in linguistic knowledge. I would, however, retain the regular degree of Bachelor of Divinity for those who have successfully pursued the study of Hebrew.

If it could be made practicable, I should think that a knowledge of the principles of the Hebrew language would be a good thing before students enter the seminary. But, unless the study were pursued in the colleges from which the students graduated, I do not see how it would be practicable to *require* this knowledge before they entered the seminary.

5. I think there is ground for the distinction between Biblical theology and Systematic theology. I believe the time will come when a proper division of labor will require the chair of a Professor of Biblical Theology as distinct from that of Systematic Theology.

[Bishop] SAM'L FALLOWS.

*Chicago, April 1, 1886.*

Pre-eminently the Bible is the minister's hand-book. It is the great mine from which to obtain his materials for doctrine, for instruction, for reproof, for exhortation. As a public teacher it is his business to bring before the people what this book contains. He may draw illustrations, as did the great Teacher, from the world about him, from the fields, the harvests, flowers, birds, the heavens, the common events of daily life, but the Bible itself is the great store-house whose riches he is to unfold. In this book is contained the preaching which God bids men preach (Jonah III., 2), and the message which Jesus commands to be carried into all the world.

These things being true, it follows that beyond comparison the most important part of the minister's equipment is to be sought in the thorough enrichment of his mind and heart with the contents of the Bible itself. This point can scarcely be too strongly emphasized, and a weighty responsibility rests here with those who have the training of ministerial candidates in charge. That the theological seminaries fall sadly short in this matter is strikingly apparent from the average curriculum provided for students. There is an abundance of work mapped out, all of it important and valuable; but singular as it may seem, the one great book, to the minister especially the Book of all books, finds but a limited recognition. It is true that selections are made from the Hebrew of the Old Testament, from the Pentateuch, the historical books, the Psalms and the Prophets, for training in reading and for exegesis, and for like purposes from the Greek of the New Testament. But these are mere fragmentary studies, and the great body of the Bible remains untouched. Should it occasion surprise that frequently graduates from the seminaries, who are understood to have studied theology in its various phases, the Hebrew and Greek languages, biblical interpretation, and many other things important to a good ministerial outfit, are painfully deficient in their knowledge of the Bible in its great fullness?

This knowledge, for the minister who is to preach in the English language, should be acquired in the English Bible. The great value of the Hebrew and the Greek is not to be for a moment underrated, and thoroughness in the study of these languages is greatly to be coveted. But no man can preach to an English congregation in Hebrew or Greek. He cannot even frequently offer a reading different from the common, with the announcement that so it is in the original, without incurring the risk of appearing pedantic. But of the polished shafts of the English Bible he can never have his quiver too full. Even a plain preacher, with but very moderate advantages of culture, whose mind is richly stored with the Bible itself, who like Apollos is "mighty in the Scriptures," will often prove himself among the most effective of men, outstripping frequently the trained men from the seminary, as witness some of the successful evangelists of our time.

The point to be especially emphasized is that the English Bible be made a regular study in the seminaries;—not that it be read simply for devotional purposes, or even for forming a general acquaintance with it;—but that it be studied

systematically and closely as text-books of science are studied in college, with reference to its history, its structure, its contents; and that this study, in recognition of its paramount importance, be continued through the several years of the course, and be conducted with reference to the stated examinations. The potent reason justifying the proposition for such a change in the usual seminary course, lies in the fact that with the Bible more than with all other books the minister should be closely familiar. The rapidly increasing familiarity of the people with the Bible through the agency of the Sunday-schools demands that the minister shall know its contents better—not what interpreters have wrought into elaborate systems of theology, but what the Book itself contains. And he who will most enrich his sermons from the wonderfully fertile fields of the Bible, in its Old and New Covenants, will reach the largest success both as a winner of souls and in instructing his people in the knowledge of divine things.

O. P. GIFFORD.

*Boston, Mass.*

In what I say I speak, of course, simply from my own personal knowledge of what is being done in our own denominational seminaries. What I say is to be conditioned by the fact that already within the last few years a very perceptible change has begun, as notably in the Philadelphia School and the Cambridge School; which are both full of promise for the future.

1. The attention paid by seminaries to Bible-study does not seem to me sufficiently emphasized for the place assigned the Bible in the Christian Church. They are the exceptions, I think, who leave our seminaries with that real acquaintance with the Bible which they ought to have. As I look back upon my own instruction in seminary years, it seems to me to have been absurdly and preposterously inadequate. Intellectually it was of an order suitable for an average Bible class, and when I began to preach I had, so far as this instruction went, no proper knowledge at all of the books of the Bible. Whatever is or is not taught in the seminary, it seems to me that a thorough knowledge of the biblical books should be given from every possible point of view. As I have conversed during the past few years with students in some of our seminaries, I have been pained to find how little solid advance has been made in the matter of broad, scholarly study of the Bible. Whatever their individual stand-points, it seems to me that all clergymen must unite in the demand for a deeper and broader study of the Bible.

2. It seems to me that perhaps the most important part of Bible-study in the seminary is that which, clearly, can be carried on in English. The whole department of introduction, while, of course, it raises at every point questions as to the original, can yet well be carried on without any extensive knowledge of the original on the part of the student. And this province seems to me by all odds the most important one at present. A man cannot, of course, have a scholarly knowledge of the subject from reading the English Bible alone, but he can have a good general grasp of the subject, which is all-important to put him in the right attitude. It will become him under such conditions to be modest as to detail, but he will be prevented from floundering about in the ridiculous bog in which so many young parsons find themselves up to their neck, without any footing whatever. The leading seminary in our own church, so far as I can learn from its students, has no systematic instruction in the matter of Introductions to the various books of the Bible. If this is at all a sample of what is going on in our seminaries through the land, it is pitiful indeed.

3. I have, I presume, partly answered the queries of this section in what I have just said as to the department of Introduction. Questions of higher criticism should be raised, as it seems to me, in the class-room just so far as they are raised anywhere. I cannot conceive of a thoroughly honest and free class-room where the students do not feel themselves not only at liberty to bring forward any questions of the higher criticism against which they may have run, but encouraged to do so. They will inevitably meet these questions during their seminary years or very quickly after them, if they are going to carry on any home study, and therefore they should meet them squarely in the class-room. I have not the slightest confidence in any system of instruction which dodges difficulties and which makes a bugaboo of any honest department of human inquiry. If the higher criticism is mistaken it must needs be refuted; if it is correct anywhere, its correctness must be granted. Whether right or wrong, its questions must be met as freely as they are raised anywhere in the walks of scholarship.

4. I shall probably put myself down amongst the Philistines in honestly answering the questions of this section. I should say that the desirability of any thorough mastery of the Hebrew depends upon what province of clerical labor a man is looking forward to. Abstractly, of course, every clergyman ought to be at home in the original tongue of the Old Testament. Practically, the parish parson and the preacher will find little time to continue those careful studies in the Hebrew which alone will yield him solid fruit, while he will find ready at hand for him, in the labors of trained scholars, more than all the most valuable fruit which he could have laboriously mastered for himself. I should say that every student should be sufficiently at home in Hebrew, as in Greek, to enable him to judge between the renderings of different scholars, but that for the average parson, engaged in parish duties and in preaching, his intellectual leisure can be put into more fruitful fields than the minutiae of Hebrew scholarship.

R. HEBER NEWTON.

*Garden City, Long Island, March 15, 1886.*

1. I have long been convinced that "Bible-study in the strict sense of the term" has not been sufficiently emphasized by our seminaries. I fear that too many young ministers, at graduation, know less of the English Bible, and how to use it, than some men otherwise uneducated, who have made it the subject of special, constant and reverent study. There are seminary students who know all about the great heresies of church history, and the dogmatic and philosophical differences between the great schools of theology, adepts in Greek, Hebrew and patristic lore, who might stand abashed before some plain expounder of the Word, thoroughly familiar with its text and spirit. We do not desire our students to know less of the former, but more of the latter.

2. A special study of the English Bible in our seminaries will have the good result of making the preacher familiar with his one "Text-book." To do the Bible-work well in the homes of his people, he must make this Book his "Vade-mecum." Many of us have been hampered all through our ministry by starting out with too little knowledge of it. I should hail heartily any movement to inaugurate in our seminaries a separate department for its particular study. We cannot overestimate its importance.

3. We should give more attention than we do to the examination of our candidates for the ministry, in Biblical History. Their average ignorance on this

subject is astonishing and lamentable—knowing comparatively little of the correspondence between the prophetic and historical portions of the Old Testament, or of the relation of the Psalter to the life of David, and the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. Looking upon these books as a part of Church History, I regard them as of the greatest value in “furnishing material for illustration.” Any man with an illustrative talent, and with a memory stored with the facts of sacred history, has an inexhaustible mine, for the lack of which no familiarity with profane history, or modern literature, can compensate him.

4. Too little, not too much, time has been given to Hebrew; but it has not been used always in the right place. I advocate the mastery of the fundamentals in Hebrew before entering the seminary. It would be a grand thing if every candidate for seminary instruction could take at least one term in the Hebrew Summer Schools, or such instruction as would be equivalent to it, before commencing his theological studies. I would then discriminate between gifts—demanding of those who have gifts to preach and no linguistic talent, nothing further in the Hebrew than these fundamental principles, giving them more time in the seminary for the thorough and practical study of the English Bible; while they who have the “gift of tongues,” and desire to master this “Holy Tongue,” may press their way to the “last things” in such study, using their pre-seminary knowledge of the language as a firm ground for such advanced studies, securing thus, at the same time, more time for the most thorough acquaintance with and study of the English Bible.

5. I believe that there is very strong ground for the “distinction now coming to be made.” It is of the greatest practical importance. Let it have a distinct department, with a separate Professor, as familiar with the Bible as Moody and his followers, and who knows, as they do, how to handle and make use of the Word. We ought to combine such knowledge of and power with the Bible with the culture of the schools. If we could not do so, and if it were necessary to sacrifice the one to the other,—which I do not believe,—let us give up the latter and cling to the former. We can have both. Certainly our ministry furnishes us noble examples of such combination.

C. E. ROBINSON,

Rochester, N. Y.

1. I do not know how it is now, but, judging from my own experience in the theological seminary twenty years ago, I should most decidedly say that the attention paid by seminaries to the direct study of the Scriptures is not sufficiently emphasized. If I remember rightly, our exegetical studies comprised the critical examination of only a few chapters in the Greek New Testament, the reading of a portion of the Book of Genesis in Hebrew, and the hasty examination of the Chaldee of the Book of Daniel. So much time was given to the study of Systematic Theology, Church History and Homiletics, that comparatively little was left for a broad and thorough examination of the Word of God. If the same rules hold in our seminaries now, I should say that the demand for a closer and profounder study of the Bible, especially—since just now it is the special object of attack—the Old Testament, is well grounded.

2. For a certain class of students the study of the Bible in English seems to me very desirable and helpful. I think, of course, that as far as possible students should give their attention to the Bible in the original tongues. Until they do

this they will never secure the full meaning of the Inspired Word. Still it seems to me to be wise to provide those who have never had the opportunity to make themselves acquainted with the Greek and Hebrew, but who nevertheless feel themselves called to preach the Gospel, a course of study in English. The creation of a special department for such study should be determined, I think, by circumstances. There are parts of the country where such a department is a great necessity.

3. By all means, I should say, greater attention should be given to the study of Biblical History and Literature. Every young man coming into the ministry should certainly know, and be able to give, the facts pertaining to the critical study of his great text-book. Surely also he should be familiar with the historical setting of its various books, and the circumstances attending and often conditioning its utterances. Without such knowledge no man can preach as he ought. All questions affecting the integrity of the Sacred Word, either as a whole, or, in any of its parts, should be considered in the class-room. As for illustrations from Biblical History, Geikie has shown in his *Hours with the Bible* that the most valuable ones that a minister can employ may be found in the text itself and its associations. For general use biblical illustrations are always by all odds the most valuable.

4. The study of Hebrew should, in my judgment, form part of the curriculum required for regular graduation, and sufficient time should be given to it to enable the student to read fairly well any portion of the Old Testament. Ordinarily, I fear, about enough Hebrew is taught to last the young pastor two or three years after leaving the seminary. It would be well if the study of Hebrew was begun before the student enters the seminary, but with our present college term, and other difficulties in the way, I do not see how this is practicable. The better plan, I think, is not to require a previous knowledge of Hebrew, but to extend its study in the seminary. Perhaps, after a while, our seminaries may advance to a four years course, and there would then be ample time.

5. I have never been able to see any valid reason for a distinction between Biblical and Systematic Theology. If Systematic Theology is not thoroughly biblical, in both its statements and its methods, the sooner it is gotten rid of the better. There is, of course, a sense in which the term Biblical Theology may be used in distinction from that of Systematic Theology, but such comparison of book with book, or part with part, as is involved in such a conception, may and should be referred to the department of Exegesis. The creation of two theological chairs in the same school would lead, I should think, to inevitable difficulty and confusion.

A. J. ROWLAND.

Baltimore, March 18, 1886.

---

1. It is my opinion that Bible-study is not sufficiently emphasized in our seminaries; and that men do not leave the seminary with that knowledge of the Bible which they ought to have. It is certainly true that the demand for a deeper, broader study of the Bible is well grounded.

2. I believe that the study of the Bible in English in the seminary would be attended with good results; and this work seems to be of such importance as to make a separate department for it desirable.

3. Sufficient attention is not given to the study of biblical literature and history, which certainly deserves as much study as is accorded to church history. How far questions of higher criticism ought to be considered in the class-room depends upon the scholar and the teacher. Biblical history is of the very greatest value in furnishing material, and for illustration; for when you talk about the Bible, the people know what you are talking about. They do not know when you speak of the Patrippassionists of such a century.

4. Some men spend too much time on Hebrew; others, too little. Everything depends upon the man. The study of Hebrew should certainly be recommended to all divinity students. I am not inclined to think that a knowledge of it ought to be required in all cases for graduation.

5. I think there is ground for a distinction between Biblical Theology and Systematic Theology. The former department is one of great importance, and why may it not be taught as a part of Exegesis.

Permit me to add that I have heard my father quote from Prof. Moses Stuart his desire to see a seminary where the instruction should be wholly biblical, wholly devoted to teaching the Bible.

H. L. WAYLAND.

*Office of the National Baptist, Philadelphia, March 15, 1886.*

1. "Is Bible study emphasized sufficiently?" What amount of emphasizing would entitle us to say that? Very strongly emphasized, it undoubtedly is.

To the question whether men leave the seminary with that knowledge of the Bible which they ought to have, I would say emphatically, No. But this may not be the fault of seminaries. It is quite as likely, it is far more likely, to be the fault or the misfortune of early education. The preacher's mind should be saturated with the Bible. But this result could not come from a three years' seminary course. It needs years and years of habitual familiarity with the book. Whatever "demand" really exists, and a great deal more than really exists, might find ample ground in the existing need.

2. Well conducted, the study of the English Bible in the seminary would unquestionably be attended with good results. There are kinds of work which can be done as well from the English Bible, as from the Bible in the original languages, and indeed far better. Porson, the greatest Greek scholar of modern times, was not ashamed to admit that he read authors in English more easily than he could in Greek. For extensive and comprehensive reading and study of the Bible as a whole, or of books of the Bible as wholes, nay, even of considerable passages in books, the English form is, for any English student, however well versed in the original tongue, better than the Greek or the Hebrew.

As to separation of departments, there is room for difference of opinion. It deserves to be deeply considered whether it would not tend to produce better results, in several very important respects, to have the heads of the departments usually existing distribute among themselves the work of teaching the Bible in English. I myself should strongly favor this plan over any other.

3. Biblical Literature may fairly be considered to derive all its real importance from the illustrative light that it throws on the Bible itself. It is a means, a method, of biblical study—therefore, kept duly subordinate, very helpful. Biblical History is itself Bible, and therefore this question has already been answered. As to the so-called "higher criticism"—this also, properly conceived, is

an instrument of studying the Bible. Use it, but do not abuse it. Biblical History, as a source of homiletic illustration, is, generally speaking, *more* valuable than Church History, or any history not in the Bible, according as it is better known to average hearers than other history. There are cases, however, in which novelty of illustration is better than familiarity.

4. Both too much and too little time is given to the study of Hebrew. Too much, in the case of students who will never learn it—too little, in the case of students who might learn it well. All divinity students should not be required to study it, but for full graduation it should be demanded. I would have the seminary organized in schools or sections, with right of graduation in each independently.

Preparation in Hebrew before entering the seminary might often be required to advantage, not always. In the case of students desiring to make Hebrew a specialty, it would be well; but in the case of others, such a plan would be doubtful, in view of what besides must be required.

5. There is ground for the distinction between Biblical and Systematic theology—but this is so much the worse for Systematic theology. There is no other department in theology, aside from that of Biblical theology, that has of right the half of one good leg to stand on. Theology ought to be "Biblical," at all hazards, and "Systematic" only as the teacher can make it so in consistency with that first condition. I suspect that God is the sole Systematic Theologian in the universe. We cannot systematize knowledge very successfully, when our knowledge at best consists but of a few infinitesimal fragments, disjointed at that, of all there is to be known. "Our little systems have their day."

W. C. WILKINSON.

Tarrytown, N. Y., April 1, 1886.

I cannot answer the questions *seriatim*, and I know too little of theological seminaries generally, to speak with any confidence regarding them. But the danger in all such institutions is to put the means in the place of the end; and to send out specialists, in one department or another, rather than preachers. We need good and great Hebrew and Greek scholars, but these must be exceptional, and any system of training which would shunt young men out of the main line that leads to the pulpit, into a siding of mere scholarship—making it their ambition to be professors, rather than to be preachers of the Gospel, is greatly to be deprecated. I confess that when I see, as I sometimes have seen, a young man who would make, just as he is, an excellent and useful minister, starting for Europe to study Hebrew, or Syriac, or Arabic, or Assyrian, that he may come home and settle down into a professor, I am a good deal saddened. The church wants *preachers*. Of course it needs professors too, but it needs preachers just now far more than it does professors, and I feel that the *end* should be exalted in all our seminaries far more than the *means* towards its attainment. We blame rich men sometimes for making that which ought to be a means into an end, but in this particular I fear we are guilty of the same folly.

As to having a Professorship of Biblical Theology my mind has undergone somewhat of a change. Ten years ago I would have approved of such a course, without any qualification, but I am not so sure about it now. Systematic Theology must be the outcome of any Biblical Theology, and now I think I would pre-

fer to have the Professors of Systematic Theology proceed by the method of Biblical Induction.

As to the study of the English Bible, I do not know that I would make that a distinct part of a seminary course, but a very thorough knowledge of the English Bible should in my judgment be required for entrance into a theological seminary. It may be that an entrance examination on that subject would exclude many who now apply; but that would be the case only for a little while, since the demand for such knowledge as a preliminary, would lead to more attention being given to it by those who are desirous of gaining admission to the seminary. But such biblical knowledge is indispensable, and whether it be insisted on for entrance, or taught in a separate class, it must not be neglected, as I fear it is too much.

WM. M. TAYLOR.

New York City, April 14, 1886.

---

## THE BIBLICAL CREATION.

BY PROF. M. S. TERRY, S. T. D.,

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

It seems presumptuous to add another word to a literature so voluminous as that of "Biblical Cosmogony." We assume that the readers of this journal are familiar with the various theories which have been employed to "reconcile Genesis and Geology," and we will spend no time to state them or discuss them here. A faithful application of the principles of grammatico-historical interpretation would rule out most of the current expositions, particularly those which make it their special aim to harmonize the biblical narrative with the results of modern science. One of the ablest and most popular efforts of this kind is that of the late Prof. Guyot, whose work on *Creation; or The Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science* (New York, 1884) affirms that the "days" of Genesis I. were vast cosmogonic ages, and are not to be regarded so much as periods of time as "organic phases of Creation." He holds that the word *earth* in Gen. I., 2, means "the primordial cosmic material out of which God was going to organize the heavens and the earth." He also maintains that in the first two chapters of Genesis the word *day* is employed in five different meanings. Such liberties with simple words would seem to set at naught all established laws of exegesis.

Sound grammatico-historical interpretation requires that we explain words according to their common usage, put ourselves as nearly as possible into the position of the writer, and ascertain the ideas he expresses precisely as they lay in his mind. To transfer into the language of an ancient author the ideas of a later age, and torture his words in order to make them fit modern notions, is not exposition but imposition.

The grammatico-historical method of exposition is fairly followed by those who adopt what is quite commonly known as the Chalmerian hypothesis, or renovation theory. This hypothesis supposes the first verse of Genesis to state the primordial creation of the universe, but between the first and the second verse (some say, the first and the third) it allows indefinite ages for the geological development of the earth. It assumes that immediately before the introduction of

man there was a general, if not universal, destruction of previously existing animal and vegetable life, resulting in the dark and empty waste referred to in verse 2. Geological science recognizes several such catastrophes in past ages, and it is assumed that the biblical creation was the renovation and reconstruction of the earth at the beginning of the present human period. Great names appear in support of this theory, and we believe no valid argument can be brought against it on the ground of grammatical exegesis, for it violates no usage of words, and conforms to established principles of interpretation. The great objections to this hypothesis are, first, that highest authorities deny any evidence of such a geological catastrophe immediately preceding the present period, and, secondly, that it imposes upon our faith a dubious strain. This hypothesis commits us to the belief that, as preparatory to the formation of man, all the continents, islands and oceans of our globe were upheaved and divided off, and all living species animal and vegetable, were produced in three or four ordinary days. We have no trouble to accept the miraculous, and are even predisposed to believe that such an event as the creation of man upon earth would be accompanied with other miracles; but the range and extent of the miracles here supposed are out of all proportion to the conditions under which the first man appears to have been formed.

The difficulties connected with this hypothesis led John Pye Smith, more than a generation ago, to suggest a more natural explanation of the biblical narrative. In his work on the *Relation between the Holy Scriptures and Some Parts of Geological Science* he maintained "that there must have been separate original creations, perhaps at different and respectively distant epochs" (p. 49). He urged that a strict interpretation of the language of Genesis required no wider application of terms than to "the part of our world which God was adapting for the dwelling of man and the animals connected with him. Of the spheroidal figure of the earth, it is evident that the Hebrews had not the most distant conception."

This view of the biblical creation has found very few advocates. In fact most writers on "Genesis and Geology" sneer at it, and pass on. Certainly, those who are looking to find theories of cosmical and geological development in the Bible, can get no help from such a simple interpretation as this; for, as Hugh Miller observed, "it virtually removes Scripture altogether out of the field of geology." May it not be that all the difficulties, and the irreconcilable conflicts between "science and religion" which some have found in the first chapters of Genesis, have arisen from the hasty assumption that "heavens and earth" must mean the universe of modern science? There is a charm about those grand conceptions of "the Cosmos," and some seem to go wild over the sublimity of finding in the days of Genesis the successive æons of cosmical development as suggested by the nebular hypothesis. That hypothesis appears to have very much in its favor, and for aught we know may be as true as the Gospels. Why may not God have produced the world in that way as well as in any other imaginable? But we protest, in the name of science and religion, against forcing the simple language of the Scripture to the support of modern theories, however true, which cannot be clearly shown to accord with the natural meaning of the words.

The idea that the biblical creation was of limited extent, and confined to the region where the first man appeared, has been treated, as above stated, with derision; but we confess to have searched in vain to find one valid argument against it. Two objections only have we met with, and these are, first, the *a priori* assumption that it belittles the idea of divine creation to limit this grand picture to

a small portion of the earth, and, secondly, that it is inconsistent with the words of the fourth commandment. But what right has any exegete to approach the study of the first chapter of the Bible with such an *a priori* assumption? Prof. Barrows (*Bib. Sacra* for 1857, p. 78) says: "It is hard to bring it into harmony with the spirit of the narrative, which almost irresistibly inclines one, in the words of Hugh Miller, 'to look for a broader and more general meaning than I could recognize it as forming, were I assured it referred to but one of many creations.'" We submit that what is here called "the spirit of the narrative" is rather the spirit of the interpreter himself, who is so freighted with cosmical and geological ideas of the magnitude of the universe that he feels that the old Hebrew writer must have had his mind upon the same grand thoughts. Nothing, in fact, is more conspicuous in the treatment of this subject by modern Christian scientists than their persistent assumptions that the biblical creation must needs be identical with primordial and universal cosmogony.

The other objection, that a limited creation is inconsistent with the language of the fourth commandment, comes with a bad grace from those who make the six days mean six cosmogonic periods. They are the last exegetes who should press the strict literal import of such words, for the obvious meaning of the commandment is utterly inconsistent with their hypothesis. Whatever force this objection has arises from the expression "all that in them is" (*Exod. xx., 11*). But why supply and urge the copula *is* rather than *was*? The reference is undoubtedly to the days of creation as described in Genesis, and the "all which was in them" or "all which is in them" are to be understood of the things there said to be created, nothing more, nothing less. The words simply mean that in six days God did what he is said to have done in Gen. I., 1 to II., 3, and the heavens, land, sea and all in them mean in the one passage precisely what they do in the other. It is therefore begging the whole question and carrying all the assumptions mentioned above into it, when this objection is offered. We appeal from all such prejudgments to the language of the sacred writer, and insist that before any conclusion is formed we first ascertain the *usus loquendi* of the Hebrew words for *heavens* and *earth*, and, as far as possible, the ancient Hebrew conceptions of the world. Is it not contrary to all safe principles to attempt the exposition of an ancient writer by seeking or expecting to find in his language ideas belonging to another age, and based upon the results of modern science?

While it is true, as Hugh Miller observes, that the interpretation propounded by Pye Smith, "removes Scripture altogether out of the field of geology," it is also true, and worthy of special emphasis, that this interpretation sets up no hypothesis to meet scientific objections, but simply follows the natural meaning of the language. We submit to the careful attention of any one disposed to make the search, that the Hebrew words, commonly rendered *heavens* and *earth*, mean, according to the *usus loquendi* of the Book of Genesis, what we would now more naturally express by the terms *sky* and *land*, perhaps including also the associate ideas of atmosphere, climate and soil. "The heaven" is conceived as the ethereal expanse above, in which the luminaries appear to be set, and the birds fly, and from which the rain falls. "The earth," or rather *the land*, denotes not the solid sphere which we more correctly call the globe, but simply a region, an indefinite (and sometimes a definite) area of territory. The word occurs more than 300 times in the Book of Genesis alone, and in most of those cases it can have no other meaning than that of a limited section of country. The idea of "the earth" con-

sidered as a sphere, or planet, seems never to have entered the Hebrew writer's mind.

May it not then be strongly urged that to the modern mind, stored with results of learned research, the English words "heavens and earth" mean a great deal more than *shamayim* and *'erets* did to the ancient Hebrew? Indeed, there seems to us a monstrous incongruity, with the *usus loquendi* of these words in mind, in supposing the land, visible sky, the waters, and the vegetable and animal species by which the first man was surrounded, to mean all the continents, oceans and islands of the terraqueous globe, the astronomic universe with its "cosmical history," and all the plants and organisms (even of the fossiliferous rocks) which modern research has brought within our knowledge. A portion of land no larger than the Malay peninsula, or the island of Ceylon, would have sufficed for the entire human race before the Noachic deluge. Why then load down this simple narrative by lugging into it all our modern ideas of the cosmos? Is it not confessedly an account of the creation of the land of Eden? What had taken place on other portions of the globe, or what classes of living creatures existed before, or at the time of, this beginning of human life, are questions remote from the purpose of the biblical narrative. How and when God created matter, and what were the first forms of life—whether vegetable, animal, or angelic—it appears not the purpose of revelation to inform us. But this beginning of the Bible does inform us of the miraculous creation of man in the image of God, and of the conditions and environment of his first estate. The language touching sun, moon and stars, is then to be understood as phenomenal and popular, not scientific, and the names of the rivers of Eden furnish no clue to the problem "Where lay Paradise?" The Edenic land was submerged and probably obliterated by the flood. The ark which preserved the family of Noah rested not on the soil of Eden, but possibly thousands of miles from the place where it was builded. But the names of Edenic countries and rivers would have naturally been preserved in tradition, and given to other lands and rivers by the descendants of Noah.

As to the origin of this biblical narrative of creation, and the manner in which its details were made known to man, we have no knowledge, and any reasonable hypothesis is admissible. But we consider unsatisfactory the theory of many modern writers (Lenormant, Dillmann, Ladd), that this narrative is but a monotheistic improvement upon the traditional cosmogonies of ancient nations. We may properly ask: Is this account of man's creation true or false? Is it a revelation of God, or merely the dream, the ideal conjecture, of some Hebrew Leibnitz or Pythagoras? Prof. Ladd, in his *Doctrine of Holy Scripture* (Vol. I., p. 272), informs us that "the traditional cosmogony of the Hebrews preceding this account, probably told of eight or more separate works of creation. But this author has fused and moulded the ideas of the traditional cosmogony according to the idea of God which entered into his own exalted monotheism, and as well according to the Sabbath idea." That is, as appears from the scope of his argument, the Hebrew writer picked up the floating heathen traditions of the East and shaped them into what he considered a becoming form. It is, therefore, essentially a human invention, and at best only an improvement of "the cosmogonies of the other nations, which originated in their observations of nature as interpreted by philosophic and religious conceptions." And yet the writer of the above considers the theory of Chalmers, especially as modified by Pye Smith, "dangerous to the very life of religious doctrine," and suggests (p. 267) that he

must be a notorious errorist who conceives "the *Tohu-va-hohu* of the Mosaic cosmogony" in any other light than as "representing the universal star-dust from which all worlds came!" We venture to suggest that such a theory as that of Smith, which makes no "attempt at *reconciliation*" because it finds no "universal star-dust" in the narrative, or in the conceptions of the sacred writer, conserves "the very life of religious doctrine" more nobly than any theory which insists on seeing universal star-dust there, and, of course, as a necessary consequence, finds "the Mosaic cosmogony at variance with several valid conclusions of modern astronomy and geology," and containing "many errors of fact and faults of conception" (p. 284). Is it not the great trouble of all this class of writers that their eyes are too full of "star-dust"?

Many will prefer the hypothesis, more in keeping with the idea of divine revelation, and far less dangerous to the life of religious doctrine, that this biblical narrative is no imitation of heathen cosmogonies, and no attempt to revise and improve them, but rather the original account from which they were traditionally derived, but became mixed with legendary and incongruous accretions. Until valid reasons to the contrary be shown, we shall hold to the doctrine that man was created upright, in the image of God, and that this record of his beginning is a trustworthy narrative. We venture also the suggestion that, as the best modern exegetes have abandoned the notion that the Noachic deluge was universal, so a closer study of the Hebrew text of Genesis I. and II. may set aside the idea that those chapters were designed to teach a universal cosmogony.

---

## THE BOOK OF KINGS IN MODERN CRITICISM.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.,  
Capital University, Columbus, O.

✱

In order properly to understand the position and importance of the Book of Kings in the ups and downs of modern Old Testament research, it will be necessary to state briefly the leading ideas and aims of this criticism as such. For at the present stage of discussion an Old Testament book is put under the critical microscope, not so much for its own sake as for the purpose of learning what it can contribute toward the solution of the central problem of the debate. This problem is more comprehensive and general than it has ever been before in the history of Old Testament studies. The newer criticism of Moses and the Prophets aims at an entirely new reconstruction of the traditional views of the Old Testament religion and its literary records. For centuries, in fact at all times, it has been considered virtually an axiom in the Christian church and among Christian scholars that the Old Testament is the record of the unfolding of God's plans for the restoration of sinful man; that Moses and the law stand at the head of the Old dispensation, both chronologically and theologically, i. e., that the law was the basis of the educational process by which Jehovah was training his own peculiar and chosen people; that prophecy, in so far as it found expression in literature, appeared later, and that its purpose was to assist in the work of the theocratic government of God in Israel; in other words, the Old Testament has been regarded as a revelation from God and as a history of God's revelation of himself to

Israel and to mankind, and as the narrative of the gradual growth and increase of revealed truth quantitatively and qualitatively through God's chosen messengers. The *summa summarum* of the church's faith has been that the Old Testament was a revealed book, and the Old Testament religion was a revealed religion.

This, we are now told by the adherents of the Kuenen-Wellhausen school, is all a mistake. The religion of Israel differs in kind and essentially in no manner from the religions of the surrounding nations. It is simply one of many religions; only one of many ways in which the heart and thought of man have given expression to his religious needs and feelings. Israel's religion is not one resulting from a special revelation from a higher being, but a purely natural product. Kuenen, probably the boldest among these advanced scholars, has devoted a learned volume to the elucidation of this thesis. But as in origin this religion is a natural product, thus, too, has its course of development been one that showed no indication of any interference or providential guidance of a higher power. Originally the religious ideas that filled the heart of the Israelitish worshiper were very crude and simple. The deep religious and ethical conceptions found in many portions of the Pentateuch are Mosaic neither in time nor in spirit, but are the production of a later period and the culmination of a long development. The earliest picture we have of the religion of Israel is that of the Book of the Covenant, Exod. xx.—xxxiii. and xxxiv., which represents the primitive faith and worship of the Israelites in the days of the earliest kings, and is devoid of the high and deep conception of sin, sacrifice, atonement and similar and allied thoughts which represent what the church has always considered the deepest and most important ideas of Mosaism. These were introduced later, the turning-point being the prophecy of the eighth century before Christ. Then it was that Israel's religion assumed a more ethical character, which, through the influence of the priesthood, that grew then to great power, took the turn toward a highly ceremonial form of worship. Especially during the captivity were these principles developed, and when Ezra and his pilgrim band returned, they brought with them the Priest Codex, i. e., that portion of the Pentateuch which contains the ritualistic and ceremonial portion of the law, and according to its prescriptions the worship of the returned exiles was arranged. This Priest Codex, i. e., the whole of Leviticus and other Levitical portions of the law, thus represents, not the beginning and the fountain-head of the Old Testament religion, but rather its culmination and the final outcome of Israel's political and religious history.

The character thus given by the new school to Israel's religion is a purely naturalistic one. The *fons et origo* of the new wisdom is evidently the philosophical idea of development, and the aim is to make Israel's faith and history fit the Procrustean bed of a general scheme of the science of comparative religion. According to these views there is no need of a God, neither in explaining the conduct of Israel's history nor in order to understand the records of this history. Everything is purely the result of natural factors, and the result is a natural and human product. It should, however, not be forgotten in this connection, that not all who, with the most advanced of Old Testament critics, such as Kuenen and Wellhausen, accept such a chronological order in the stratification of the composition of the Pentateuch as to make the Priest Codex and the Levitical system the latest and last element in the Mosaic code, accept also the theories of wood, hay and stubble which these critics have built upon their analysis of the Pentateuch. Such men as Franz Delitzsch abhor the conclusion drawn by these men as to the

character of this religion and also of the factors and powers that entered into its growth.

But be this as it may, for our purpose this virtually amounts to the same thing. The strongest and most plausible argument brought forth by the new theorists is the *argumentum ex silentio*. It is urged that the Old Testament records down to the post-exilic period show no indications of the existence of the Levitical laws, but that, on the contrary, during all that time even the representative characters of the theocratic life, such as Samuel and David, were guilty of actions directly contradictory to the commands of this system, and this, too, without being for that reason subjected to the censure of God. We need not show here the weakness of this argument, but merely draw attention to the fact that historical parallels abound to break its force. Thus, e. g., from the condition of Pharisaism as represented in the New Testament we would have no reason to think that the Pharisees had ever heard of the canonical books of the Old Testament, and from the condition of the church in the sixteenth century this method of argumentation would lead us to believe that there had been no Bible before the days of Luther. But this statement of the *status controversiæ* will at once make plain the position which the historical books of the Old Testament, especially the Book of Kings, must occupy. The great test of the new theory must lie in answering the question, whether, according to the documentary evidence and sources of information, over which we have command, the course of Israel's religion was really such as is marked out for it by the new theory. The answer to this question must be found in the Prophets and in the historical books, especially in the latter, and here again for a number of reasons the Book of Kings is probably the most important. For the testimony of the Book of Chronicles is indignantly and scornfully rejected by the new school. Were it allowed to speak, the case would at once be decided against the new views. But, we are informed, this book is a post-exilic production and was written especially for the purpose of putting a levitical face on the early history of Israel. It was written by a disciple of the Ezra school, and its object is to fabricate for a later system an historical background which it actually never possessed. In other words, it is a *pia fraus*.

Since this witness is rejected, it is evident that the other historical books must be the battle-ground, at least as far as the strictly historical argument is concerned. And as the Book of Kings opens at that time when even according to the most advanced views we have comparatively correct and reliable information about the history of Israel, the importance of this book is enhanced for the discussion of the great Old Testament problem. The great question with which the Old Testament critic now approaches this book is this, Does the Book of the Kings represent the character of Israel's history to be such an one as the naturalistic theory presupposes and demands? Around this central question hover and circle all the other interrogation points in reference to this book. Naturally this question receives different answers according to the stand-point of the questioner. Wellhausen and his friends are perfectly sure that this book, correctly understood, bears out his hypothesis, while the conservative scholar finds in it an abundance of evidence that presupposes and demands the existence of the Mosaic code. The reason for this difference of views lies in the fact that this book, in order that its testimony in so important a matter might be impartially weighed and measured, must be analyzed and examined as to its trustworthiness and

reliable character as a witness. Is it a correct representation of the history and religion of Israel in those days of which it purports to give the records? This is the great preliminary problem with which criticism must approach this book, before its statements can be used for the real point in question. And here it is where the critics are apparently hopelessly divided, for if it were acknowledged on all sides that this book does give us a correct and historical account of the thoughts and deeds in the days of the kings of Israel and Judah, it would be a matter of no great difficulty to perplex most woefully the advanced theorist. While it indeed offers no insignificant difficulties to the traditional views, yet these seem mole-hills to the mountains that would stand across the path of the opposite ideas. The conservative criticism of the day maintains, and we are convinced with reason and right, that this book in all of its statements is historically reliable, based, as it itself claims to be, upon official and contemporary documents; while the defenders of the new views maintain that the bulk of the book may indeed be historically correct, that it has nevertheless been changed to suit a later condition of affairs, and things had been introduced that it did not originally contain; so that, if a fair criticism is to be practiced, all these later changes, additions, etc., must be cut out, the book restored to its original character, and then be heard on the question under discussion. That in this critical amputation those members are cut off which militate against the favorite views of these scholars needs scarcely to be mentioned, and that this is done with a cruelty and lack of fairness not in harmony with a true exegesis of Holy Writ needs scarcely to be mentioned to those who are acquainted with the productions of this school. But the Book of Kings is the ground upon which at least the historical argument must be chiefly discussed, for it, more than others, is the common ground of both sides. For this very reason the attitude of modern criticism toward this book is considerably different from what it was in past decades, and no doubt, in the general study of Old Testament problems, it occupies a more important position than ever.

## THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. W. J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

MAY 9, SOWING AND REAPING. John IV., 27-42.

This Lesson, along with the one preceding it, brings to view several important items of connection between the Old and the New Testaments. First and most prominent among these is the whole subject of the Samaritan schism. We have in this chapter, and elsewhere in the New Testament, a very distinct picture of the relations existing between the Jews and the Samaritans in the time of Jesus. How did these relations originate? In other words, how did the Samaritans come to be the people they were? Two elements enter into the answer of this question, one or the other of which is apt to be neglected, in the answers that are commonly given.

First, Sargon and the Assyrian kings who followed him largely repeopled the regions around Samaria with inhabitants who were not Israelite in race or religion, but who superstitiously adopted something of the worship of Jehovah, as the local god of the region, in addition to the religion they brought with them from their former seats (2 Kgs. xvii., etc.). They had a centre of worship for Jehovah, in Bethel (xvii., 28). When the Jews returned from the exile under Zerubbabel and Jeshua, being in high favor with the Persian king, these Samaritan worshippers of Jehovah were disposed to make common cause with them, and be regarded as of the same religion. When the Jews refused their overtures, they became hostile. This state of things seems to have been kept up through the century and more that intervened between the first year of Cyrus and the close of the twelve years of the first administration of Nehemiah.

But there was a second element, without which these people would never have become the Samaritans of the New Testament. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah disclose the existence of sharp differences of opinion and practice among the Jews who returned to Jerusalem from the exile, and their descendants. On the one hand, large numbers were disposed to intermarry and affiliate with their Samaritan, Moabite and Ammonite neighbors; and on the other hand, Ezra and Nehemiah and those who held with them were determined to break up these practices, and to preserve Israel separate from the other peoples. Among their opponents were men of high rank, including priests and Levites; even Eliashib the high priest was implicated. The last verses of Nehemiah indicate that this contest reached its crisis while Nehemiah was yet governor. One of the grandsons or great-grandsons of Eliashib married a girl of the family of Sanballat, and Nehemiah banished him. The Bible does not tell us what became of him, but we shall presently find reason for holding that he became high-priest at Mount Gerizim, and that, with his banishment, the contest between the two parties at Jerusalem virtually, at least, became a schism; those who sided against Nehemiah drawing off, becoming permanently affiliated with the people of Samaria, modifying their Judaism accordingly, and thus producing the new form of religion known as Samaritanism. It may have taken a generation or more for the new movement to assume its distinctive form.

Josephus says that a great-grandson of Eliashib, Manasseh by name, married the daughter of Sanballat, and was therefor excluded from the high-priesthood. He does not mention that Nehemiah had anything to do with it, but so far, his account agrees very well with that in the Bible. Nehemiah belonged to the same generation with the sons or the grandsons of Eliashib, and may easily have lived to see the marriage of Eliashib's great-grandson. Josephus further says that the temple at Gerizim, where Manasseh became high-priest, was built by the order of Alexander the Great, after the year 331 B. C. Even this does not contradict the biblical account, on the supposition that Manasseh was the young man whom Nehemiah banished; though if it be true, it shows that he must have become quite an old man before he attained to the object of his ambition. Josephus further says, however, that the Gerizim temple was built at the request of Sanballat. Either this is a mistake, or there was a second Sanballat, for the Sanballat of Nehemiah must have died long before this. But there is no reason for disputing that Manasseh was the young man whom Nehemiah banished, or that he became the founder of the priesthood of the Gerizim temple, or that the temple was built either about B. C. 330, or a little earlier.

The Bible dictionaries and other books of reference give interesting details concerning the Samaritans and their worship, and especially concerning those now living at Nablous, and also concerning the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Samaritan version of it.

In John iv., 20, the woman says: "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain." We must assume that she was appealing to something that she thought would have weight, as argument, with a Jew, and therefore that the facts to which she appeals are those of Old Testament times, and not later. It was in that vicinity that Abraham built his first altar west of the Jordan (Gen. xii., 6, 7). In the mountains Ebal and Gerizim the tribes had celebrated the great solemnity of the blessing and cursing (Josh. viii., 30-35 and Deut. xxvii.—xxx.). It is possible that she had in her mind the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which affirms that the altar on that occasion was built on Gerizim (not Ebal, as in the Hebrew); but even without this supposition, her claim that the fathers worshiped in that mountain ages before Jerusalem became a sanctuary of Jehovah, was well founded. Jesus did not dispute the claim, but he drew from it a very different inference from that which she intended.

In verses 25 and 42, we have an interesting glimpse at the Messianic expectations held by the Samaritans. It is worthy of notice that they are not thinking of him as a temporal prince and local deliverer, but as one who "will tell us all things," one who is "the saviour of the world." Compare with this the language attributed, in vi., 14, to certain Jews: "The Prophet, the one coming into the world," or that of John the Baptist: "The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," or the questions asked of John by the delegation from Jerusalem, and it becomes evident that the current expectations concerning the Messiah were at once much less definite and, in some cases at least, much more spiritual, than many of us are in the habit of supposing.

MAY 16, THE NOBLEMAN'S SON. John iv., 43-54.

MAY 23, JESUS AT THE POOL OF BETHESDA. John v., 5-18.

MAY 30, JESUS FEEDING FIVE THOUSAND. John vi., 1-21.

JUNE 6, JESUS THE BREAD OF LIFE. John vi., 22-40.

In each of the first three of these four Lessons, we find mention made of a feast, or the feast, of the Jews. This word *ἑορτή* with the article, means the Passover; without the article, it means either the Passover or one of the other great national festivals. In the time of Jesus these festivals were evidently in operation, and men went to them from Galilee, and even from more distant countries, and not from the vicinity of Jerusalem only. The frequency and distinctness of these allusions to the festivals in the New Testament biographies, calls attention to the comparative infrequency of allusions of this sort in the Old Testament, and is an item to be used in determining how far the festivals were actually observed, between Moses and Nehemiah.

The Sabbath question is brought to our notice in chapter v., as often elsewhere in the New Testament. The conflict exhibited is not between the teachings of Jesus and the doctrine of the Old Testament, but between the teachings of Jesus and the interpretation put upon the Old Testament by the scribes. Jesus insisted upon a beneficent, common-sense understanding of the law; the scribes insisted upon a mechanical understanding of it, considerably affected by precedents founded on previous mechanical interpretations of it. Our habit of speaking of the Sabbath doctrine of the scribes as if it were the Sabbath doctrine of the Old Testament causes great confusion in treating of these matters.

The miracle of the loaves, described in chapter vi., strikingly resembles, in many points of detail, Elisha's miracle of the loaves, 2 Kgs. iv., 42-44.

The phrase *πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*, John vi., 1, 17, 22, 25, with the parallel phrase *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, John i., 28, should be studied in their parallelism with the Old Testament phrase *ebher hayyarden* in its various forms. John the evangelist uses the phrase indifferently from his own geographical point of view, at Ephesus, or wherever he resided, or from that of any of the characters in his narrative. If it is defined by the immediate context, it may mean "beyond the sea" or "beyond the Jordan," in either direction. Unless it is defined in the immediate context, it uniformly means to the east of the Jordan, and that without any reference whatever to the location of the person using the phrase. By precisely the same phrase, in the Hebrew, the Old Testament books describe the region west of the Euphrates as "beyond the river," and the country east of the Jordan as "beyond the Jordan," irrespective of the actual position of the person who makes the description. It is incorrect to translate these phrases "this side the river," "this side the Jordan," even when we know that the author wrote from the west of the Euphrates, or from the east of the Jordan, for this translation changes a well defined geographical designation into a mere descriptive phrase. Because the phrase is a geographical designation, and not merely descriptive, it would be incorrect to infer from it that the author using it lived either to the east of the Euphrates, or to the west of the Jordan. The argument from this phrase to prove that the Pentateuch was written in the country west of the Jordan, has precisely the same weight to prove that the Gospel of John was written in the same locality.

In [all the] lessons of this [month], there are scarcely five consecutive verses which do not in some way call to mind some Old Testament phrase or fact; but the only passage in them which is commonly recognized as a quotation is in John vi., 31. It is a very simple case of citation, from Psalm lxxviii., 24, where it is an evident allusion to the accounts given of the manna, in Exodus and

Numbers. The Septuagint of the verse in the Psalm is exactly true to the Hebrew, except that it has "bread" instead of "corn." John cites verbally the words of the Septuagint, with a slight change and enlargement from the context. It will sufficiently show this, if we translate the Septuagint verse, italicising the part used by John, and putting in parentheses the word supplied by John:

"And he rained upon them manna *to eat,*  
And bread (out) of (the) heaven he gave them."

---

## A BOOK-STUDY: FIRST AND SECOND SAMUEL.

BY THE EDITOR.

### I. GENERAL REMARKS.

1. The "general remarks" of the two preceding "Studies" are applicable to this "Study," viz., (1) it is intended for students who need and feel their need of help; (2) it furnishes an order of work, not an order for presenting the results of work; (3) it calls for more work than some may desire to do, and perhaps for work in which some may not be interested; (4) the helps to be used are few, the aim being to incite the student to do his own work; (5) the Revised Version should be used exclusively, except for comparison; (6) in all the work done, there should be an effort to secure a clear and well-defined idea of the *purpose* of the writer and compiler; (7) it is necessary to remember the time in which the events we study were transacted; (8) textual difficulties may be studied to advantage only by those who have a knowledge of Hebrew, still a good commentary (Kirkpatrick's) will give sufficient aid for most readers; (9) a map is an indispensable companion in work of this character; (10) it is necessary to a clear and correct understanding of what we read that we have as definitely in mind as possible the historical stand-point of the writer, speaker, or actor.

2. When we take up for consideration the name, divisions, sources, history, author, date of a certain book, we are doing the work of *Higher Critics*.<sup>1</sup> That student who confines his study to the text of the book, seeking to ascertain where and how mistakes have crept in, where and how words have dropped out, etc., etc., is a *Lower Critic*. The work, therefore, of this "Study" is for the most part a work of "Higher Criticism." Let not the fact that this term has been misunderstood by many writers influence us against it. Professor William Henry Green, of Princeton, is in as true a sense a "higher critic" as is Wellhausen.

3. The importance of a knowledge of at least the more general principles of *Hebrew Poetry*<sup>2</sup> cannot easily be overestimated. The careful study of half a dozen Psalms, as they are printed in the Revised Version, a comparison of the lines with each other, of the logical relation existing between them, and then a comparison of the verses in the same manner will open one's eyes, if they have not already been opened, to the essential features of Hebrew poetry. This study, short

<sup>1</sup> See further on this point, page 355 of this number of THE STUDENT.

<sup>2</sup> See article on "Hebrew Poetry" in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, p. 2549; also Briggs' *Biblical Study*, pp. 248-295; Terry's *Biblical Hermeneutics*, pp. 90-103.

though it may be, will also convince the student of the great importance of this knowledge for purposes of interpretation.

4. A great many good people shrug their shoulders, some, indeed, have symptoms of a paroxysmal character, if it is suggested that a book of the Bible is composed of material taken from many different sources. They reason thus: The book, e. g., that of Samuel, is inspired; now, evidently, a book consisting of matter coming from a dozen different sources, put together in some cases without reference to logical or chronological arrangement, containing perhaps two varying accounts of the same event,—such a book cannot be inspired; therefore the Book of Samuel is not a compilation of material from different sources. This is a fair specimen of the logic of a very large proportion of Bible-students. Does it need refutation?

5. It is a mistake to suppose, for a moment, that Bible-study consists in the study of *isolated texts*; or in the study of single chapters; or even in the study of entire books. A man might study *verses* all his life and know comparatively little of the Bible. Besides, the man who studies only *verses*, does one-sided, imperfect, narrow work. He who does not have in mind the entire book, and from this stand-point do his work, does not and cannot appreciate the full force of a single verse contained in that book. The same thing holds good in a higher sphere. It is not sufficient merely to have gained a comprehensive knowledge of a given book. Although we may know the contents, the analysis, the occasion, purpose, author, etc., etc., of this book, there is still something to be ascertained. What? The place of that book in the Bible as a whole; its relation to other books; the relation of its contents to the contents of the entire Bible, to the entire plan of God for the salvation of man. How comparatively contemptible after all is the study of mere verses! How much he loses who satisfies himself that having done this he has done all! We should be close, critical, accurate students of a *verse*; we should be searching, analytical, systematizing students of a *book*; we should also be broad, comprehensive, general students of the Bible.

6. In the fourth Study, which will complete our studies on the Books of Samuel, we shall take up: (1) the more important textual difficulties; (2) the more important historical difficulties; (3) the more important moral difficulties; (4) the prophetic element in these books; (5) the Messianic idea as it appears in the literature of this period; (6) David as a type of Christ.

## II. DIRECTIONS.

### 1. Review as follows:

- a. The *topic*, or *topics* of each chapter in both books, using the slips of paper prepared in the first study.
- b. The *analysis* of each book, made in connection with the previous "Studies."
- c. The *index* of each book, made according to the directions given in the previous "Studies."
- d. The *chronology* of each book, as decided upon in the previous "Studies."
- e. The various general topics suggested:
 

(1) Samuel's Life and Work.	(6) First Twenty Years of David's Reign.
(2) The Prophetic Order.	(7) Second Twenty Years of David's Reign.
(3) Saul's Life and Character.	(8) David's Organization of the Kingdom.
(4) David's Early Life.	(9) David's Work and Character.
(5) David's Early Psalms.	(10) David's Later Psalms.

2. Consider the *name and division* of the books :<sup>1</sup>
  - a. *The name*, Books of Samuel.
    - (1) Another title in the Septuagint.
    - (2) The meaning and force of the title.
  - b. *The Division*.
    - (1) In Hebrew MSS. and in Jewish lists of the Old Testament.
    - (2) In the Septuagint and Vulgate.
    - (3) In printed Hebrew Bibles since the sixteenth century.
3. Consider, in a general manner, some of the *characteristic features and elements* of the Books of Samuel :<sup>2</sup>
  - a. The linguistic character ; classic or late.
  - b. The style ; living, fresh, vivid, or dull, heavy, monotonous ; simple or involved ; minute, or general ; historical, or legendary.
  - c. The evidence furnished by the books themselves that they are a redaction of material gathered from various sources.<sup>3</sup>
  - d. The unified character of the books.<sup>4</sup>
  - e. Passages which seem to oppose the view that the books are unified in character.<sup>5</sup>
  - f. Lack of chronological statements as compared with the Books of Kings and Chronicles.
  - g. Instances of a lack of chronological arrangement.<sup>6</sup>
  - h. Instances of a lack of logical arrangement.<sup>7</sup>
  - i. Instances in which a greater fullness of detail might have been expected.<sup>8</sup>
  - j. The religious and theocratic character of the books.<sup>9</sup>
  - k. The prophetic character of the books.<sup>9</sup>
4. Consider, now, upon the basis of the material thus gathered the *sources, date, and author*.<sup>10</sup>
  - a. Understanding that the following are the sources of the material, assign to each the passages which would seem to belong to it.

<sup>1</sup> See Kirkpatrick's *First Book of Samuel*, pp. 9, 10; Lange's *Samuel* (C. H. Toy and John A. Broadus), pp. 1, 2, New York: *Chas. Scribner's Sons*; Article on *Samuel* in *Smith's Bible Dictionary*; and, indeed, any commentary on the Books of Samuel.

<sup>2</sup> See particularly Lange's *Samuel*, pp. 7-29.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 1 Sam. ix., 9; xxvii., 6; xvii., 12, 14, 15.

<sup>4</sup> You know the contents of the books; think through them, and for yourself determine whether there is a unity in them from the stand-point of the compiler.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. chap. vii., 15-17 with viii., 1 seq. and xii., 2 seq.; ix., 1-10, 16 with viii., x., 17-27; xviii., 5 with xviii., 13-16; 1 Sam. xvii., 4, and 2 Sam. xxi., 19; 1 Sam. xxxi., 4 with 2 Sam. i., 9, 10, etc., etc. On these and similar seeming contradictions, examine the commentary; see also Hailey's *Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*, Andover: *W. F. Draper*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf., for example, 1 Sam. xiv., 47, 48 with xv.; 2 Sam. xxi.-xxiv.

<sup>7</sup> Cf., for example, the separation of xxi., 1-14 and xxiv.; xxi., 15-22 and xxiii., 8-39.

<sup>8</sup> Cf., for example, 2 Sam. viii.-x. with 1 Chron. xviii., xix.; the absence of any of the details mentioned in 1 Chron. xxii.-xxviii.

<sup>9</sup> Here, only points of the most general character need be noticed. Several of these will come up in greater detail as distinct topics.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Kirkpatrick's *Samuel*, pp. 10-13; Lange's *Samuel*, pp. 29-40; article on *Samuel* in *Smith's Bible Dictionary*; and the introductions to the commentaries.

- (1) The prophetic records of Samuel, Nathan and Gad (1 Chron. xxix., 29; cf. 1 Sam. xix., 18; xxii., 5; 2 Sam. xxiv., 11; 2 Chron. xxix., 25; 2 Sam. vii., 2 seq.; xii., 25; 1 Kgs. i., 8 seq.; 2 Sam. xii., 1 seq.). Note also the probability of this from the fact of the prevailing prophetic element in the books, and also from the fact that later history constantly refers to prophetic writers (cf. 2 Chron. xii., 15; xxvi., 22; xxxii., 32; xxxiii., 18, 19).
  - (2) The chronicles of King David (1 Chron. xxvii., 24), statistical and annalistic in character.
  - (3) Samuel's charter (1 Sam. x., 25).
  - (4) National poetical literature, under which may be included the Book of Jasher (2 Sam. i., 18).
  - (5) Oral tradition.
- b. The *date* at which the books assumed substantially their present form:
- (1) The evidence furnished by the language.
  - (2) The evidence furnished by such expressions and references as are found in 2 Sam. xiii., 18; 1 Sam. ix., 9; 1 Sam. v., 5; vi., 18; xxvii., 6; xxx., 25; 2 Sam. iv., 3; vi., 8; xviii., 18.
  - (3) The evidence furnished by 2 Sam. v., 5; in the Sept., 2 Sam. viii., 7, and xiv., 27; and 1 Sam. xxvii., 6.
  - (4) The evidence furnished by the writer's attitude toward offering sacrifices in various places, 1 Sam. vii., 5 seq.; ix., 13; x., 3; xiv., 35; 2 Sam. xxiv., 18-25.
- c. The *author* of the books,—to be considered in close connection with the *date* of the books. Here may be noted the principal views as to the construction of the Books of Samuel:
- (1) The views of Eichorn, Bertholdt, Graf.
  - (2) The views of Thenius, Ewald, Keil.<sup>1</sup>
5. Consider the various *poetical* portions, taking the following order:
- a. Make a list of the poetical passages, and ascertain the subject and occasion of each.
  - b. Read over, in the Revised Version, each passage several times until you are thoroughly familiar with all its details.
  - c. Study the parallelism of the passage, endeavoring to satisfy yourself as to the logical relation of each member to that which precedes and follows it (that is, whether the members considered are synonymous, antithetic, or synthetic) and of the various groups of members to each other.
  - d. By means of "helps," search out the meaning of all obscure words or phrases, and of all archeological and historical allusions.
  - e. In the case of 2 Sam. xxii., compare with it, as follows, Psalm xviii.:<sup>2</sup>
    - (1) Note all differences between the two passages.
    - (2) Explain how these differences may be accounted for.
    - (3) Decide which is the original.
    - (4) What inferences in reference to the trustworthiness of the Old Testament text may be drawn from a comparison of these passages.
6. Compare, now, with the Books of Samuel, the Books of Chronicles, so far as they cover the same historical character. In this work proceed as follows:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The best brief statement of these views will perhaps be found in Lange's *Samuel*, pp. 35-38.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the commentaries on these passages, particularly Perowne on Psalm xviii.

<sup>3</sup> Do this work of collecting the parallel passages yourself; it will be of little help to you if you copy from a commentary the various parallels. When your work is finished, compare it with that of the commentary. And further, do your work in such a thorough manner, as that, when finished, you will be in a position to determine what errors the commentator whom you consult may have made.

- a. Make a list of the general topics (with the chapters indicated) treated of in the Books of Samuel, writing in *black* ink those that are also treated of in Chronicles, but in *red* ink, those concerning which the compiler of Chronicles does not speak.
  - b. Make a list of the general topics (with the chapters indicated) treated of in the Books of Chronicles, writing in *black* ink those that are also treated of in the Books of Samuel, but in *red* ink, those concerning which the compiler of Samuel does not speak.<sup>1</sup>
  - c. Study closely the "omissions" in Chronicles, noting
    - (1) the events narrated in Samuel, but not in Chronicles;
    - (2) the general character of these events viewed as a whole;
    - (3) the purpose which prompted their insertion in one book, and their rejection in the other.
  - d. Study closely in the same manner the "additions" in Chronicles.
  - e. As the result of this study and of previous work, formulate as follows:
    - (1) The point of view from which the compiler of Samuel worked, and the features which, proceeding from this point of view, he emphasized.
    - (2) The point of view from which the compiler of Chronicles worked, and the features which, proceeding from this point of view, he emphasized.
    - (3) The probable author, age and purpose of the Chronicles.<sup>2</sup>
    - (4) A comparison of the age, spirit and purpose of the two historians.
    - (5) The source of the matter common to both Samuel and Chronicles.
7. Consider, lastly, the relation of the Books of Samuel to the divine plan of salvation viewed as a whole. Here may be noted:<sup>3</sup>
- a. The preparatory character of the entire Old Testament dispensation and that for which it was preparatory.
  - b. The chief elements included in this preparation, viz.,
    - (1) The training and development of the nation Israel.
    - (2) The growth and development of the Messianic idea.
    - (3) "God's progressive revelation of himself."
  - c. The relation of the Books of Samuel to the first of these elements, the training of Israel:
    - (1) The period of Israelitish history immediately preceding.
    - (2) The period introduced at this time.
    - (3) The final period, following the period here introduced.
  - d. The Messianic idea during this period.
  - e. God's revelation of himself during this period, as seen in
    - (1) The building of the temple.
    - (2) The institution of the prophetic order.
    - (3) The advance in the closer relation of man to God, as illustrated especially in David's Psalms.

*Remark.*—It will readily be seen that the writer, though having transgressed the space allotted for the "Study," has been compelled to omit many things that seem almost indispensable in the study of these books. Partly for lack of space also, and partly because it was in accordance with the original plan, only a very few references are given. In this "Study," that part of Harman's *Introduction* which relates to the Books of Samuel will be found most valuable.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kirkpatrick's *Second Samuel*, pp. 22-25; Lange's *Samuel*, pp. 32, 33.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., if accessible, the introduction to Chronicles, by any recent commentator.

<sup>3</sup> This topic is based on chapter V. of Kirkpatrick's *Second Samuel*.

<sup>4</sup> New York: Phillips & Hunt.

→BOOK NOTICES←

MICAH.\*

This little work shows the usual fine scholarship, genial spirit and thorough learning of its accomplished author. It is a most excellent commentary in giving a natural, simple and clear exposition of the meaning of the English text. Dr. Cheyne, however, like many of those who no longer hold the traditional views of the authorship of the Pentateuch, writes apparently with the discussion of this question ever in mind. Hence this note on VII., 6: "*dishonoureth*] Lit. 'treateth as a fool.' The same verb in the same form occurs in Deut. XXXII., 6. It is unsafe, however, to argue that Deuteronomy must have been already written in the time of Micah, for we also find the word in Jer. XIV., 21; Nah. III., 6."

Such a note is irrelevant in a work of this size and character. It introduces the discussion of an outside question, which has nothing to do with the explanation of the verse.

On IV., 10 we fail also to see the force of his objection to the words "And thou shalt go even to Babylon," having been in the original text, because "We read in v. 12 that Jehovah has brought the hostile nations to Jerusalem that they may be destroyed there, which seems not to allow space for a transportation of the Judeans to Babylon." There is nothing in the prophecy to indicate that the period of punishment or distress, signified by the "pangs" and "dwelling in the field" of verses 9, 10, was necessarily a short one. In verse 10, a future captivity is announced, in verses 11-13, the final triumph of Zion over her enemies. Their juxtaposition is natural. A difficulty has been here raised which does not exist.

Of chapter v. we are told that verses 5 and 6 appear to have been added by an after-thought of the prophet, because "it was not clear who the many nations and many peoples of IV., 11, 13, were," and because "the prophet in the first gush of inspiration had omitted the period of foreign rule over the land of Israel."

Then we are told with a gush of enthusiasm on the part of our commentator: "How greatly our idea of biblical literature gains in distinctness by the insight we are now acquiring into the methods and processes of the prophetic writers and editors!" Yes, a certain idea of biblical literature; that a prophecy may have been written at one sitting or two; that a certain paragraph may have been the first or second thought of the writer. But how much is this idea of biblical literature helping us to understand the precious contents of the Bible, to bring forth more clearly and beautifully its teachings? To some extent, it is true; yet not so much as would seem to be implied. Perhaps Dr. Cheyne, unless writing for specialists, has emphasized too strongly some points of this kind.

\* THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS. General editor, J. J. S. Perowne, D. D., Dean of Peterborough. MICAH; with Notes and Introduction by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M. A. Cambridge: University Press. New York: Macmillan & Co. Pp. 64. Price, 40 cents.

### THE STORY OF THE JEWS.\*

Prof. Hosmer has written a very readable book, which does not belie its title; it is a story, not a history, although, as he admits, not adapted for immature minds. He has made no endeavor to unfold with scientific exactness the life and events of this most marvelous people, but only to throw in bold and picturesque relief some of the most striking features of their career and position in the world. He has done this well, with great fervor and impassioned word painting; and, if he appears to have been carried away with the tragic elements of Jewish history, this is his prerogative, for he is writing a story. One wishes, however, for more frequent breaks in his fervent language, and descents to a plainer and more simple narrative style. The volume gives evidence also of a short period of composition, of something wrought out to order, the fruit of a season's industrious compilation, rather than a labor of long love, or the toil of the patient investigation of a score of years. It is easy to see that Prof. Hosmer does not believe in the inspiration of the Bible, as that term is generally understood. As a source of history it is apparently esteemed but little more reliable than Josephus. We are told that "the biblical mention of Assyria, though abundant, was scarcely coherent or trustworthy." This is a surprising statement in view of the wonderful corroboration of the record of the Book by the records of the clay tablets. For interesting accounts of Jewish persecutions, for graphic delineations of remarkable Jewish characters, and for a true portraiture of the modern Jew, this work is well worthy of a place in our libraries; but it is not a permanent contribution to Jewish history, nor, perhaps, does it pretend to be,—it is a story. This book is attractive in appearance and has two maps, many illustrations, and an index. We regret that the tabernacle of *flat roof* again appears, embellishing the cover as well as adorning an inside page. What a poor water-shed for Syrian rains!

### A REASONABLE FAITH.†

"To make the Faith of some more reasonable, and the Reason of others more inclined to faith," is the object of this little work. Its spirit cannot be better designated than by the name of our revered American poet, Whittier. He himself indeed has said of it: "I find myself in accord with it. It is *Quakerism* pure and undefiled." In these essays is the same broad, loving, catholic spirit seen in his poems; but the sentiments advanced, like his, will not be always found within the limits of a rigid orthodoxy. We give some keynotes under the leading topics discussed. Fundamental Religion: "a desire for righteousness or holiness." "An earnest persistent endeavor after the fulfillment of God's will in thought, word, and deed, made effectual by divine help,—nothing imputed nor merely 'Reckoned,'—but the real moral condition, is an essential characteristic of religion." God is Our Father: "infinitely good, loving, and true, long-suffering and merciful, yearning tenderly towards His children, and when inflicting pain, in-

\* THE STORY OF THE JEWS. By James K. Hosmer, Professor in Washington University, Mo.; author of a "Short History of German Literature," "The Life of Samuel Adams," etc. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1886. Pp. 331. Size 8x5¼ inches. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.

† A REASONABLE FAITH. Short Essays for the Times. By three "Friends." Revised Edition. London: Macmillan & Co. Pp. 106. Size 5x7¼ inches. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. In aper. Price 40 cents.

dicting it not for Retribution's sake, but for Restoration's sake." God Manifest in the Flesh: "we see in Christ as much of God as can be manifest in a human life." "God manifest in the flesh is, to us, the central truth of Christianity." The Atonement: "it is not the expression of God's anger against sinners, much less against his well beloved son in their stead." "The aim of this part of Christ's work was restoration, not expiation." The Bible: "not simply either a Revelation or the Revelation, but rather the Record of a *Progressive Revealing* of Spiritual Truth."

---

#### JOSHUA.\*

---

This is a very instructive, very readable, and very conservative commentary. It is rich in explanation and, while far from being homiletical, it presents in the best sense homiletical material. The most noteworthy literature of the subjects in hand has been consulted and most apt quotations are again and again introduced. Dr. Maclear is evidently a lover of old English, for he delights in citing the version of Wyclif. Something of interest also is always given respecting what might be regarded very dull narrative. Geographical names are made to glow with history. The unexplainable is wisely let alone. No theories of how the sun stood still and the day was lengthened during the battle of Beth-horon are given, but the simple fact of the miraculous prolongation of daylight is accepted. We do not always agree with Dr. Maclear. His chapter in the introduction on Joshua as a type of Christ we do not regard of particular edification. But on the whole we feel justified in calling this the best commentary on the book of Joshua for the ordinary student of God's Word. It has two maps and a copious index.

---

#### JEWISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE.†

---

This manual is designed for a text-book for Jewish schools, the original being widely thus used in Germany; but it will be very welcome and helpful to every one who cares to know of the activity of the Jewish mind. It is a narrative of facts: a little chronological encyclopedia of Jewish history and men of letters. Especially valuable is it in presenting that obscure portion of Jewish history, the post-Biblical, of which so little is generally known, and so few accounts of which are accessible to English readers. One is able to trace here the rise and fall of all their different centres of learning and influence in Asia, Africa and Europe. Mention is made of all their leading scholars and teachers. The place is here found of all the different Jewish writers, to whose works frequent mention is made by commentators on the Bible. A real want of Old Testament students is thus met by this little work.

\* CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. General Editor: J. J. S. Perowne, D. D., Dean of Peterborough. THE BOOK OF JOSHUA; with Notes, Maps and Introduction by the Rev. G. F. Maclear, D. D. Cambridge: *University Press*. 1883. Pp. 228. New York: *Macmillan & Co.* Price, 70 cents.

† MANUAL OF JEWISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE, preceded by a brief Summary of Bible History by Dr. D. Cassel, translated by Mrs. Henry Lucas. London: *Macmillan and Co.* 1883. Size, 4x8 inches. Pp. 258. Chicago: *A. C. McClurg and Co.* Price, 75 cents.

## CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

### AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Book of Isaiah.* By H. Bannister. *Books of Jeremiah and of the Lamentations.* By F. D. Hemenway. In vol. VII. of Commentary on the Old Testament, edited by D. D. Whedon. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 12mo, pp. 472. ....\$2.25
- Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch.* By Kuenen. Translated by P. H. Wicksteed. London: Macmillan.
- The Open Secret; or, The Bible explaining itself.* By Hannah Whiteall Smith. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell. ....\$1.00
- Abraham, the Typical Life of Faith.* By David R. Breed. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell. 12mo, pp. 160. ....\$1.00
- Spurgeon's Treasury of David.* Final (7th) volume. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. ....\$2.00
- Bible Teachings from Nature.* With some notices of true science as vindicated from false assumptions; or, the newest science as related to the oldest book. By J. Byington Smith. Boston: James H. Earle. 12mo, pp. 300. ....\$1.50
- The Story of Chaldea from the Earliest Times to the Rise of Assyria.* By Zenside A. Ragozin. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 12mo, pp. xv, 381. ....\$1.50
- Of the Buildings of Justinian, by Procopius.* Translated by Aubrey Stewart, and annotated by C. W. Wilson and Hayler Lewis. London: Palestine Pilgrim's Text Society. 8vo, pp. viii, 178.
- The Gospel of Life in the Syriac New Testament.* The Syriac Peshitto contrasted with the Greek, with respect to the following words: Sozo, Soteria, Soter. By J. H. Pettingell. Yarmouth, Maine: Scriptural Publication Society. 16mo, pp. 57. ....15cts.
- A Dictionary of Islam; being a cyclopædia of the Doctrines, Rites, Ceremonies and Customs, together with the technical and theological terms of the Muhamadan Religion.* By Thomas Patrick Hughes. London: W. H. Allen & Co. New York: Scribner & Welford. Royal 8vo, illustrated. ....\$16.80
- The Churchman's Family Bible.* Part XI., Proverbs to Isaiah; Part XII., Isaiah to Jeremiah; Part XIII., Jeremiah to Ezekiel. With Commentary by various authors. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 6d.
- Lost Israel Found.* By E. P. Ingersoll. Topeka, Kas.: Topeka Publishing House. Pp. 84.
- The Order of Creation.* The Conflict between Genesis and Geology. A Controversy between the Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Prof. T. H. Huxley, Prof. Max Mueller, M. Reville, E. Lynn Linton. New York: The Truth Seeker Co. 12mo, pp. 178. ....75cts.
- The Bible and How to Read it.* By F. W. Farrar. Philadelphia: The Oxford Press and Publishing Company.
- The History of Interpretation.* Being the Bampton Lectures for 1885. By F. W. Farrar. London: Macmillan & Co. Demy 8vo. ....16s.
- Das Buch Hiob, nach Luther und der Probebibel, aus dem Grundtext bearbeitet und mit Bemerkungen versehen von Victor Boettcher.* Leipzig: Johannes Lehmann. Pp. 72.
- Die Theologie des Alten Testaments, in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt von A. Kayser.* Nach d. Verf. Tode hrsg. m. e. Vorwort v. Ed. Reuss. Strassburg: Schmidt. Large 8vo, pp. xli, 264. ....M.3.60

### ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- Mr. Gladstone and Genesis.* By T. H. Huxley and Henry Drummond in Popular Science Monthly, April, '86.
- Recent Discussions of the First Chapter of Genesis.* By J. W. Dawson in Expositor, April, '86.
- Sennacherib's Account of his Expedition against Hezekiah.* By M. Lindsay Keilner in the Churchman, April 8, '86.
- The Fourteenth of Genesis confirmed by Assyriology.* By W. H. H. Marsh in Examiner, April 1, '86.
- The Talmud a Witness to Christ and Christianity.* By B. Pick in the Lutheran Church Review, April, '86.
- The English Bible.* Editorial in the Standard, Chicago, April 8, '86.
- Circumcision.* By A. B. Arnold, M. D., of Baltimore. Reprinted from the New York Medical Journal.
- The Bible for Mohammedans.* By James F. Riggs in Christian Thought. March-April, '86.
- The Rite of Blood Covenanting and the Doctrine of Atonement.* By J. Max Hark in Andover Review, April, '86.
- Ewald's "Revelation; Its Nature and Record."* By Edward Robie, ib.
- The Bible a theme for the Pulpit.* Editorial, ib.
- Short Exegetical Notes.* By T. K. Cheyne in Monthly Interpreter, April, '86.
- The Difficulties of Scripture.* By W. J. Deane, ib.
- Introduction to the Books of Isaiah.* Rawlinson, ib.
- The Old Testament in the Light of Recent Discoveries.* By A. H. Sayce, ib.
- The Quarterly Reviewer and Old Testament Revision.* By the Dean of Peterborough in Contemporary Review, April, '86.
- General Character of the Old Testament Revision.* By F. A. Gast in Reformed Quarterly Rev., April, '86.
- The Light of Holy Scripture.* By E. V. Gerhart, ib.
- Has Modern Criticism affected unfavorably any of the Essential Doctrines of Christianity?* No. IV. By D. H. Wheeler in Homiletic Review, April, '86.
- Bibles and Biblical Works in the Allan Library, London.* By George John Stevenson in Zion's Herald, April 14, '86.
- Delitzsch's "Dancing and Pentateuch-criticism in their Mutual Relations."* "Bib. Research" in Independent, March 25, '86.
- Ben-hadad.* Ib., ib., April 22, '86.
- The Present Status of the Revision.* By Philip Schaff, ib.
- Thomson's "Lebanon, Damascus, and Beyond Jordan."* Ib., April 15, '86.
- Bible Study.* Editorial in United Presbyterian, April 8, '86.
- The Hebrew Pealter.* By D. A. M'Clenahan (Inaugural Address), ib., April 22, '86.
- The Canon of the Old Testament.* By Edwin C. Bissell in Bibliotheca Sacra, April, '86.
- The Revised Version of Isaiah XL.—LXVI.* By William Henry Cobb, ib.
- The Book of Jubilees (Chap's VII.—XI.).* Translated by Geo. H. Schodde, ib.
- Genesis and Geology.* Editorial, ib.