

➤THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.◀

VOL. VIII.

MARCH, 1889.

No. 7.

MUCH is being printed which professes to furnish a *key* to the Bible or *key-words* to its separate books. The figure is a forcible one, suggesting both the riches that are contained in these Scriptures and the possibility of difficulty in appropriating them. But can one possessor pass his key on to another? No; every one must fashion his own. What may be suggested as two *keys* of which all may avail themselves? These—*devout study and simple obedience.*

THE exalted character of the Bible is in no way more clearly shown than in a comparison with the finest products of other literatures. There have been many theories of the mode and process of creation, but none have ever approached the simple and sublime affirmations of the first chapter of Genesis. Many great thinkers have essayed to solve, in elaborate systems of philosophy or in epic and dramatic representations, the problem of human life with its inequalities and disappointments, but every one of them must yield to the profound wisdom of the Book of Job. And when the figure of the Man of Nazareth rises before us, who does not recall the glad confession of Augustine: "In Cicero and Plato and other such writers I find many things acutely said and many things that awaken fervor and desire, but in none of them do I find these words, 'Come unto me and I will give you rest.'" Gladly then should all such comparisons with other literatures be welcomed by lovers of the Bible, and those who pursue them be encouraged to continue. As the lesser hills of human thought standing by themselves seem lofty, so when brought under the shadow of the high mountains of God, while they will lose none of

their own grandeur, they will serve to make more impressive the majesty of those loftier peaks of divine revelation whose summits are lost in the heavens.

THE benefactors of any age are not those that criticise, but those that construct. A certain amount of destruction is inevitable in systems of thought as in material things. Both wear out and must make way for better things. This enters into the divine method of working. "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." It is a favorite saying to-day and a true one, that "every age must have its own theology." Our spiritual needs must be met; our peculiar difficulties and temptations adequately provided for. The past may bring up its materials. It is our task to fashion them into new forms. The danger here is that what is negative and destructive will be emphasized and pushed, to the comparative neglect of that which is established and positive. In the passion for discarding what is old, that which is permanently valuable is thrown away. The student of the Bible should remember this. Let him never forget to aim at positive results. If he must tear away and cast down much of the theological architecture of the fathers, let him see to it that he builds up something which shall be a shelter and a citadel for his generation. In other words, in the study of the Bible, the chief aim, the ultimate purpose must be *constructive*.

PATIENCE is a virtue which has its place in Bible-study. Is it not often the case that students are in too much of a hurry to solve hard questions and unravel intricate difficulties connected with these Scriptures? Do they not often discard and deny because some contradiction or knotty point does not yield at almost the first investigation? Have we not seen young men who were already convinced that certain biblical problems were insoluble? It is well to bear in mind the element of patient reflection. Consider the growth of the Bible through the measured progress of centuries—how slowly it gathered itself together and became what it now is. What has been begotten in patience, in patience should be pondered and studied.

To denounce the "higher criticism" of the Bible is regarded by some as a mark of orthodoxy, and soundness in the faith. More often, however, it is a mark of ignorance or bigotry. What is this

higher criticism so much dreaded and feared? The higher criticism of the Bible is that science which investigates the Sacred Scriptures in reference to their historical and literary character. The lower criticism is concerned with the study of the text, the mechanical part of these ancient writings; the higher, with the human life that was the vehicle of divine revelation. "An ancient book is, so to speak, a fragment of ancient life; and to understand it aright we must treat it as a living thing, as a bit of the life of the author and his time, which we shall not fully understand without putting ourselves back into the age in which it was written." To do this is the work of higher criticism. It brings into relief, as far as possible, the living man who was the penman of God, but who wrote as no machine, nor even as a stenographer, taking mere dictation down, but with all his faculties alive and asserting their own individual force and power. The higher criticism discerns the personal peculiarities of the sacred writers, notes their special language and style, the material or class of facts, events, and thought, in which they present God's message to men. Without the results of the higher criticism, the Bible would be a dead mechanical book, containing the revelation of God in a colorless form. But with the results it becomes a book instinct with life. We see behind it and through it living men, we hear their peculiar form of utterance, we listen to the special doctrines in which they delighted, we observe how they were moulded and influenced by the times in which they dwelt. They were men, not angels, who spake moved by the Holy Ghost, and it is the province of the higher criticism to bring out this human side of the Bible. This has been the especial field of biblical study during the present century, and if in any way the Bible is more clearly understood in historic setting and literary form than formerly, the debt is due to the higher critics. They are a noble band of scholars, taken as a whole, and their work should not be derided or made the subject of sarcastic sneer on account of the wild vagaries of a few of their number.

THE SCHOOLS OF THE SONS OF THE PROPHETS.

BY PROF. IRA M. PRICE, PH. D.,

Chicago Baptist Union Theological Seminary, Morgan Park, Ill.

The prophetic order of the Old Testament is generally regarded as founded upon the authority of the utterances in Deut. 18:15,18. The order itself, however, did not exist until the time of Samuel. Between Moses and Samuel Israel passed through the middle ages of its history. Few characters appear who give shape to and mould political and religious life. No great character comes forth until Samuel is called. He is the last and the climax of the Judges, the end of the old order of things and the beginning of the new, the water-shed, the borderland between the theocracy and the monarchy. He, the reformer, the reorganizer of Israel, politically and religiously, the priest, prophet and judge, anoints the first two kings of Israel. Political and religious Israel is revolutioned in his day. By later Old Testament writers he is compared with Moses (Jer. 15:1, cf. Ps. 99:6). During his life we find the existence of collections or schools of sons of the prophets. These are attributed to Samuel as their founder. They form the beginnings of the prophetic order, whose continuous existence can be traced down through Old Testament times, and whose influence is felt in all subsequent Old Testament history and literature.

In the treatment of this subject the Old Testament will be used as the authority. Tradition and legend will not be considered. The endeavor shall be to examine and classify the information given concerning the sons of the prophets 1) as collected in bands or schools; 2) in particular localities; 3) under different teachers; 4) with specified instruction; 5) with an occupation; 6) as to their means of subsistence.

1. BANDS OR SCHOOLS. The earliest mention of these bands is found in 1 Sam. 10:2-5. When Samuel has anointed Saul king of Israel he sends him away with certain directions. Saul is to meet three men going up to Bethel to worship. "After that," says Samuel, "thou shalt come to the hill (marg. Gibeah) of God, where is the garrison of the Philistines: and it shall come to pass, when thou art come thither to the city, that thou shalt meet a band of prophets coming down from the high place;" Samuel without doubt knew all about this band of prophets, and their order of worship at particular times. In 1 Sam. 19:20 we find: "And Saul sent messengers to take David: and when they saw the company of the prophets prophesying, and Samuel standing as head over them; the spirit of God came upon the messengers of Saul, and they also prophesied."

Here a company is mentioned, while in the preceding passage they are called a band, without any information as to their probable numbers. When Jezebel was determined on the destruction of the Lord's prophets we find (1 Kings 18:4): "Obadiah took an hundred prophets and hid them by fifty in a cave, and fed them with bread and water." At this point (Samaria) we have further evidence of a band or collection of prophets in 1 Kings 22:6: "Then the king of Israel gathered

the prophets together about four hundred men." Again when the farmer from Baal Shalishah brought his contribution to Elisha, the old prophet commands him to set it before the people (sons of prophets), the man replied (2 Kings 4:43): "What, should I set this before an hundred men?" When Elisha returned from the east of Jordan, after the ascension of Elijah, the sons of the prophets at Jericho, fearing lest Elijah might have been cast upon some mountain or in some valley, and desiring to search for him, said (2 Kings 2:16): "Behold now, there be with thy servants fifty strong men." These passages all show that the sons of the prophets were not only collected in bands or companies, but that these companies consisted of considerable numbers.

2. **THEIR HEADQUARTERS.** 1) *Ramah*. This was the birth-place and home of Samuel. After he made his yearly circuit as judge, "his return was to Ramah, for there was his house; and there he judged Israel: and he built there an altar unto Jehovah" (1 Sam. 7:17). When Saul was in pursuit of David (1 Sam. 19:18-24) "David fled, and escaped, and came to Samuel to Ramah. . . . and Saul sent messengers to take David, . . . they saw the company of prophets prophesying, and Samuel standing as head over them." In the narrative we find that three successive sets of messengers from Saul prophesy as soon as they come into contact with the sons of the prophets and also that Saul himself finally comes into the same state. At this place was without doubt the original school of the prophets as founded by Samuel.

2) *Bethel*. We have no definite information that a school existed in this place in Samuel's day. But the inference from the information given is that it was a centre of worship (1 Sam. 10:3) and ere long became a headquarters for the sons of the prophets. In the reign of Jeroboam an old prophet made his home at this place (1 Kings 13:11). While Elijah and Elisha were on their way to the place of translation of the former, "The sons of the prophets that were at Bethel came forth to Elisha, and said unto him, knowest thou that Jehovah will take away thy master from thy head, to-day? And he said, Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace," (2 Kings 2:3). After his return from the east of the Jordan, and after the healing of the bitter waters near Jericho, Elisha "went up from thence to Bethel" (2 Kings 2:23), undoubtedly with the express purpose of reporting to the sons of the prophets his sad experience in the loss of his master, Elijah.

3) *Gilgal*. Samuel's command to Saul (1 Sam. 10:8): "thou shalt go down before me to Gilgal," and the consequent prophesyings of Saul among the sons of the prophets in the neighborhood of Gibeah, are a reasonable evidence that at or near this point a school of the prophets was to be found in Samuel's day. At any rate, in Samuel's yearly circuit as judge (1 Sam. 7:16), Gilgal received his regular visits. Not again until Elijah's day do we have definite information on this point. "And it came to pass, when Jehovah would take up Elijah by a whirlwind into heaven, that Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal" (2 Kings 2:1). The two prophets were probably giving instruction in the school at this place. On their way they stop at two other schools to leave a parting word (2 Kings 2:2,4,5). A number of years after this time there was a famine in the land "and Elisha came again to Gilgal" (2 Kings 4:38). At this time he heals the pottage, poisoned by the use of wild gourds. At this point we learn that there were at this time about one hundred of these sons of the prophets (2 Kings 4:43).

4) *Jericho*. The third stopping place of Elijah and Elisha on their last journey together was at Jericho. Here Elijah gives his last exhortation to the sons of the

prophets. After this was done (2 Kings 2:4-7) "they two went on. And fifty men of the sons of the prophets went, and stood over against them afar off." After the departure of Elijah, Elisha returns to Jericho (vs. 15-18) and tarries three days with the sons of the prophets, whence he goes on up to Bethel. The prosperity of this school may be inferred from 2 Kings 6:1,2, in which it is evident that they had grown in numbers beyond the capacity of their building.

5) *Carmel*. The evidence for this place as a headquarters of the sons of the prophets is inferential rather than positive. In 1 Kings 2, we find that Elisha on his return from the Jordan and Jericho, "went up from thence unto Bethel" (v. 23), and "from thence to Mount Carmel" (v. 25). When the Shunammite woman was sorrowing over the death of her son (2 Kings 4:8-25) "she went and came unto the man of God (Elisha) to Mount Carmel" (v. 25). This must have been one of his regular engagements, because it was "neither new-moon nor sabbath" (v. 23), at which times he undoubtedly held special services at the religious centres other than the schools. Mount Carmel may have been chosen as a centre for the sons of the prophets in commemoration of the test between Elijah and the false prophets, and the consequent slaughter of the latter (1 Kings 18).

6) *Samaria*. And Elisha "went up from thence unto Bethel" (2 Kings 2:23), and "from thence unto Mount Carmel, and from thence he returned to Samaria" (v. 25). At Jericho and Bethel and probably at Mount Carmel, Elisha had already visited the schools of the prophets. Samaria was, at least a part of his life, his home (2 Kings 6:32). Samuel had his greatest school at his residence and home, Ramah. It is hardly credible that so forcible a character as Elisha should settle down in Samaria, and not collect about himself a body of sons of the prophets. In fact—we find (1 Kings 18:4) during the persecutions of Jezebel: "Obadiah took an hundred prophets and hid them by fifty in a cave, and fed them with bread and water." Again at this same place, when Jehoshaphat and Ahab were about to war with Ramoth-Gilead (1 Kings 22:1-6), "the king of Israel gathered the prophets together, about four hundred men" (v. 6). These passages reveal the fact that at Samaria there were large numbers of prophets. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that these men were members of a school of the prophets which was under the direct control of Elisha whose residence was at this place.

The result of the examination of the above passages finds schools of the prophets at 1) Ramah, 2) Bethel, 3) Gilgal, 4) Jericho, and probably 5) Carmel and 6) Samaria.

That they dwelt apart and in their own buildings is certified by two or three passages. In 1 Sam. 19:18,19, we find that when David fled to Ramah "he and Samuel went and dwelt in Naioth" (i. e. dwellings, buildings, probably college buildings); "And it was told Saul, saying, Behold, David is at Naioth (the college buildings) in Ramah." "And he went thither to Naioth (the college buildings) in Ramah; and the spirit of God came upon him also, and he went on and prophesied, until he came to Naioth (the college buildings) in Ramah" (v. 23). In 2 Kings 6:1-2, "the sons of the prophets said unto Elisha, the place where we dwell before thee, is too strait for us. Let us go, we pray thee, unto Jordan, and take thence every man a beam, and let us make a place there, where we may dwell." This school was probably at Jericho, as they went down into the Jordan valley for their timber (v. 4). In 2 Kings 4:38-41 we find an additional evidence of their common dwelling. They all ate from the same pottage. And in vs.

42,43 the gifts of the farmer are set before all. So that we can conclude that while a few may have married and had homes of their own (2 Kings 4:1) the sons of the prophets as a class occupied buildings together, and ate together as members of one household.

3. **THEIR TEACHERS.** The sons of the prophets had as their teachers, at least, three of the great men of their day. 1) *Samuel*. When the messengers of Saul went to Ramah to capture David (1 Sam. 19:20), "they saw the company of the prophets prophesying, and Samuel standing as head (superintendent) over them." He was the presiding officer of this school, whether of any other we know not. "He went from year to year in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and he judged Israel in all those places" (1 Sam. 7:16). In Bethel and Gilgal there were in later times schools; but we have no evidence that Samuel founded them or that he did more in these places than to judge the people.

2) *Elijah*. Only in the last days of Elijah's life have we any evidence of his relations to these schools. The word of Jehovah seems to have found him at Gilgal, the seat of one of the schools, (2 Kings 2:1). On his way to the east of the Jordan he stops at the school at Bethel (vs. 2,3), and at Jericho (vs. 4-6). Jehovah had sent him to these places (vs. 2,6), evidently to deliver his last message of instruction to these sons of the prophets.

3) *Elisha*. Elisha was the God-appointed and anointed successor of Elijah (1 Kings 19:16,19); and he was recognized as such by the sons of the prophets, (2 Kings 2:15). Almost his entire life after the departure of Elijah was spent among the various schools of the prophets. If *this* had been his master's work, Elijah must have been the main supporter and guide of these schools in his day. Elisha's authoritative connection with them seems to have begun when his master had departed. He visits the schools at Jericho, Bethel, Carmel and Samaria (2 Kings 2). A little later we find him at Gilgal (2 Kings 4:38). Then he is found by the Shunammite at Carmel (2 Kings 4:25); and again at Jericho (2 Kings 6:1-7). He seems to have cared as well for their families, where any were in need (as in 2 Kings 4:1-7), as for themselves. While carrying almost the entire burden of the kingdom of Israel on his shoulders, he was vigilant and faithful in his care of these schools.

The teachers of the sons of the prophets were so far as the Bible reveals, 1) *Samuel*, 2) *Elijah* and 3) *Elisha*. The chief man was known in these schools under different titles. Samuel is called Father (1 Sam. 10:10); Elijah is designated Master (2 Kings 2:3,5,16), Father (v. 12); Elisha is called Master (2 Kings 6:5), Man of God (2 Kings 4:40). These all indicate superiority and power. Compare also on this point, 2 Kings 2:15; 4:38.

4. **THINGS TAUGHT.** The information on this point must be also largely inferential. We can suppose that the law was taught, and that the ceremonies connected with worship were fully explained.

1) *Prophesying*. It is difficult to understand the full force of this word. When Saul met the prophets coming down from the hill of God, they were prophesying (1 Sam. 10:5). Again when Saul met the band of prophets in Gilgal, "the spirit of God came mightily upon him, and he prophesied among them" (v. 10). When the three sets of Saul's messengers to capture David came to Ramah they all prophesied; Saul himself yielded to the same spirit (1 Sam. 19:18-24). This was probably a physically active and exhausting method of worship. We find that Saul was so worn out by it that he lay down exhausted one day and night

(v. 24). In the other cases above referred to, the simplest explanation is that the prophesying was a recital of verses or psalms in praise to God.

2) *Music*. That these prophesyings were accompanied with music is shown in 1 Sam. 10:5; the band of prophets came down from the high place "with a psaltery (suggesting the use of psalms), and a timbrel, and a pipe, and a harp before them." Some years after this time (1 Chron 25:1-7) we find that "David and the captains of the host separated for the service certain of the sons of Asaph, and of Heman, and of Jeduthun, who should prophesy with harps, with psalteries and with cymbals." "And the number of them, with their brethren that were instructed in singing unto Jehovah, even all that were skillful was two hundred fourscore and eight" (v. 7). It is quite evident that, if in David's day the temple music was so elaborate, there must have been considerable musical instruction somewhere within the reach of these sons of the prophets. The almost necessary accompaniment of prophesying as well as of worship was music. Even Elisha attests this statement (2 Kings 3:15).

Without doubt these sons of the prophets composed sacred poetry and music and used them widely in their praises and worship. Perhaps also they were instructed in the religious and political matters of the times in which they lived. They learned of the wisdom of their master (2 Kings 4:38).

5. *THEIR OCCUPATION*. 1) *Study and Worship*. Their first duty was probably to make the most of their instruction. They were to be exercising in worship and praise; in bringing under their influence all whom they met (1 Sam. 10:10-13; 19:18-24). 2) *Run errands*. In 2 Kgs. 9:1-12 we find: "Elisha the prophet called one of the sons of the prophets, and said unto him, Gird up thy loins, and take this vial of oil in thine hand, and go to Ramoth-Gilead" (v. 1). Elisha gives him his orders, and his words for Jehu, whom he is to anoint king over Israel. "The young man, even the young man the prophet" (v. 4), performed with precision and promptness his master's command. 3) *Regular duties of a prophet*. When Ahab had allowed Ben-hadad to escape (1 Kgs. 20:29-34), "a certain man of the sons of the prophets" (v. 35) met him, and by an illustration (vs. 34 and 40) inveigled Ahab into pronouncing judgment upon himself. Ahab regarded him as one of the prophets, and "went to his house heavy and displeased." This work of one of the sons of the prophets corresponded in every respect to the work of any regular prophet. It can scarcely be imagined that *all* of the sons of the prophets received revelations; it is probable that they did not. On the other hand, there were those outside of these schools who received messages of God and delivered them (Amos 7:14).

6. *THEIR MEANS OF SUBSISTENCE*. If these young men were constantly engaged in religious services and duties, they had little time to look after the necessities of life. The information on this point leads to the conclusion that they were dependent on the charity of Israel. Some of the most definite information on this point is found in 2 Kgs. 4. Passing over the poverty of one of the wives of the sons of the prophets (vs. 1-7), and the house provided by the Shunammite woman for Elisha in his journeys (vs. 8-11), we find the sons of the prophets gathering their food in the fields—evidently uncultivated (v. 39). Soon "there came a man from Baal-Shalishah, and brought the man of God bread of the first fruits, twenty loaves of barley, and fresh ears of corn in the husk. And he (Elisha) said, Give unto the people that they may eat. And his servant said: What, should I set this before an hundred men?" (vs. 42 and 43). The severity

of the dearth about Gilgal may have induced this husbandman to aid Elisha and these sons of the prophets, but the aid is received as a matter of course, and justifies the supposition that this was not out of the usual order of events. A still clearer case is found where Gehazi (2 Kgs. 5:21-24) follows the chariot of Naaman, saying, "My master hath sent me, saying, Behold, even now there be come to me from the hill country of Ephraim two young men of the sons of the prophets; give them, I pray thee, a talent of silver, and two changes of raiment" (v. 22). The bare fact that such a request should be made, shows that it was in accordance with the custom of the times to aid and help support these sons of the prophets. They were evidently largely dependent upon the charity of Israel and the people of God.

In conclusion, we have found in this brief discussion that the sons of the prophets 1) were collected together in bands or schools; 2) in six different localities, viz., (a) Ramah, (b) Bethel, (c) Gilgal, (d) Jericho, (e) Carmel, (f) Samaria; 3) under the tuition of (a) Samuel, (b) Elijah and (c) Elisha; 4) with instruction in (a) prophesying-worship, (b) sacred music, (c) practical matters of their day; 5) with their time wholly occupied in (a) study and worship, (b) doing errands for their masters and God, (c) performing the regular duties of a prophet; 6) largely dependent for their support upon the charity of the people.

All of these facts and inferences throw a new halo about the prophet of the Old Testament.

THE BABYLONIAN IŠTAR-EPIC.

BY JAMES A. CRAIG, PH. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

Among the Assyrian kings, Aššurbanipal is conspicuous both as a ruthless warrior and as a man of letters and scientific aspirations. It is to him and to his famous library, which was destroyed in the downfall of Nineveh, through the Chaldeans, that we are indebted for the preservation of this poem as well as for a large part of the literature that has come down to us. He was the great patron of science and art. He not only employed scribes to record his own fortunes and achievements in war, but also, either out of a purely literary instinct or from a consciousness of the solidarity of the human family, felt impelled to preserve for his own and future times the intellectual products of the past. For this purpose he gathered about his court competent scholars to translate the heritage of literary works bequeathed to the Babylonian and Assyrian Semites, from a people whose ancestry, language and traditions were distinct from his own, viz., the early Akkadian inhabitants of Babylonia. Touching the lineage of this people archaeology has not much information. Their language was highly agglutinative. Several of its syllabic characters bear a suggestive similarity, both in form and meaning, to the early Chinese characters, the difference being between horizontal and perpendicular lines. In the compounding of ideographs there is a further similarity. Their physiological features and habits of life, so far as we know them, would also favor comparison. The Akkadians are called in the texts sal-

mat kaḳḳadi, i. e., blackheaded. Their affinities in speech, etc., so far as we know them, from the monuments are, at least, Ural-altaic, and it may be that further discoveries and investigations such as have been begun by Prof. T. LaCouverie, of London, may reveal unsuspected kinships.

In religion they were polytheists, and this polytheism probably resulted from a primitive Shamanism, such as exists at present among the Ostiaks and other tribes of Siberia.

Theirs was an individualized pantheism; the lower world and the heavens were full of spirits good and bad. Demoniacal possession was a prominent article of their belief. These embodied themselves in man, in reptiles, in the winds, etc., and all were subject to their attack. Over these demons the priests had the power of exorcism by means of certain magical incantation-ceremonies. Gradually these spirits became deified, and those of the sky, earth and under-world attained to prominence—the others ranked as *dii minores*. Later, as with the Assyrians so with the Chaldeans, the gods were conceived of anthropomorphically, and with the exception of Nineb and Nergal represented in human form.

In our epic we have mention of several gods. Samaš is the sun-god, who, owing to the peculiarity of the warm southern climate, and the astronomical or astrological tendencies of the people, held a rank inferior to Sin, the moon-god, who was, according to their mythology, his father. Ea, who creates the messenger, Uddušu-nâmir, was the god of life and knowledge, the determiner of destiny, king of the abyss and rivers, plays a large role in the account of the deluge, informs the Babylonian Noah, Hassisadra-Xisuthros, of the conclusion of the gods and commands him to build a ship,—he also becomes the father of Bel, the tutelary divinity of Babylon. Allâtu, who bore the name of Irkalla also,—was the goddess of the lower world and the spouse of Nergal, who in one of the hymns is styled “the majestic croucher” (the great lion) among the gods. Namtar, originally conceived of as a destroying plague, is personified; he was regarded as the son of Allâtu, and as her faithful servant to whom was entrusted the conduct of those condemned to punishment to the great prison-house. On the earth his mission was to inflict with disease, and thus acquire new subjects for his mistress in the lower world. His deadly mission was performed in the night, for so long as the sun-god had sway in the heavens this power of darkness was more or less circumscribed. In Istar and Tammuz we find the archetypes of western cults.

Tammuz was the sun-god of Eridu, the young and beautiful spouse of Istar, who was bereft of him through the antagonistic and slaying might of winter. He is the Adonis of Greek mythology, which represented him as the son of the priest of the Paphian Aphrodite, Cinyras, by his own daughter, Myrrha. His worship passed over to the Greeks through the Phœnicians, who commemorated his death at Byblos on the north of Beyrût, on the highway between Babylonia and the west. Here, as the blood-colored waters rolled down from the Lebanon range through the Nahr Ibrahim seaward, the inhabitants of Byblos (Gebal) gathered to celebrate the funeral festival of the god. Streets and temples were filled with wailing women who tore their hair, disfigured their faces and cut their breasts in token of their grief. With the eunuch priests of Astoreth their cry ascended to heaven. This festival was a part of Ezekiel’s vision recorded in chap. VIII. Istar, the Astoreth of the Phœnicians, the Aphrodite of the Cyprians, the Artemis of Ephesus, was of Akkadian origin, as shown both by the name and by the

confusion among the Semites in regard to her. She stands on an equality with the other deities of the pantheon, females among the Akkadians being accorded the preference. In later times she was worshiped both at Nineveh and at Arbela, but in the previously established centre, Aššur, no temple was erected to her honor. Among the earlier Assyrian kings she was rarely invoked and always as a subordinate; but in the time of Esarhaddon she was elevated to a position of supreme power. She is the mighty one who has founded his throne for numberless days and endless years, and to him, her faithful son, she promised power to overcome and vanquish all his enemies. Assurbanipal (Sardanapalus), his son and successor, who worshiped her in Arbela, and whose creation, together with that of Aššur, he acknowledged himself to be, invoked her aid as the "queen of war." When Teumman, the Elamitic king, who was said by the Assyrian scribe to be "like a devil," devised evil against his kingdom and hers, her aid was invoked and granted. "Fear not!" was the returning word, "for I have compassion upon thee for the lifting up of thy hands, for thine eyes which are full of tears." She manifests herself to the seer, in a night-vision, in human form and angry mien, armed with bow and broadsword for war. She speaks as a mother to the fearful king, and promises victory: "his face should not pale, his feet should not stumble, nor his strength wax feeble." It was particularly among the Assyrians, who were themselves a warlike people, that she was honored for her warlike tendencies; the same feature was emphasized in the Ephesian goddess. The Babylonians, on the other hand, dwelt upon her finer instincts, as did also the Phœnicians with the Cyprian goddess. It is this gentler side of her nature, the love side, which in course of time became degraded and debauched, that is seen in our epic. She mourns the loss of her youthful Tammuz, and descends into the lowest depths to search for the waters of life by which she may restore him from the power of death. Originally she must have been the deified spirit of the earth, who was wedded to the sun-god. He was killed by the might of winter and she was left to mourn in widowhood. The Phœnician and Grecian cults of Ashtoreth and Aphrodite (Venus) are, therefore, to be found in their germs in Akkadian mythology. Ištār did not remain simply the great life-producer, but in time became the goddess of love and reproduction. Fecundity and procreative power and sensual instinct were her gifts, hence her withdrawal, in the poem, from the upper world is attended by the completest disruption of social life, not through a perversion of natural instinct, but by its complete cessation.

This poem has, following Geo. Smith, been regarded by almost all Assyriologists, as an Episode of the Nimrod-Epos, and this view has hindered the proper understanding of the closing lines, as in other instances wrong translations have led to fanciful theories. Fox Talbot, who translated it in part twenty-five years ago, and who ten years later gave a translation of it to be found in Vol. I. of the "Records of the Past," was led by a groundless translation of Reverse, 17-18, to offer the conjecture that it was a kind of miracle-play actually performed in one of the temples, adding: "Juggling tricks which have been known in the East from immemorial (*vide* Pharaoh's magicians) were probably introduced for the amusement of the audience." As a mark of the advance in the study of Assyriology it may be interesting to quote the translation. It is: "The chiefest deceitful trick! Bring forth fishes of the waters out of an empty vessel." The lines were, indeed, difficult. The present understanding of the text is due not to any *single* Assyriologist, but to Assyriologists. Although the names of Tal-

bot, Schrader, Smith are most intimately connected with it, yet they left much to be desired, as was to be expected. In 1887, my fellow-student and friend, Dr. Jeremias, gave a new translation and commentary much in advance of anything else on the subject. In his introduction he denies that there is anything in the poem which would lead one to suppose that the descent of Istar was in any way connected with a desire to avenge herself of the insult offered her by Nimrod and Eabani. Rather is it a rhapsody indirectly related to the stories of the love-adventures of Istar, inasmuch as the mythological relation of Istar to Tammuz forms the back-ground of the narrative. Moreover, in the Nimrod-Epic, Istar appears as the daughter of the god Anu, while here she is the daughter of Sin. The closing lines throw light on the whole. They do not belong to the epic proper; nevertheless, they form the core of the whole, since they furnish the reason for the narration of the "Descent of Istar." A man is mourning the death of his sister, and betakes himself to a magician to ascertain how he can redeem her from the prison-house of Hades. To prove to him that the gates of Hades were not impassable, he tells him the story of Istar, and advises him to secure, by offerings and prayer, the help of Istar, the conqueror of Hades, and Tammuz. After this he is to perform certain funeral-rites over the sarcophagus of the dead, and assisted by the companions of Istar (the *uhâti*), begin the wail. In the fifth line from the last the departed spirit hears the brother's lament and beseeches him to perform these ceremonies on the days of Tammuz (cf. Ezek. 8:14) and there effect her deliverance from the lower-world.

It is interesting also to note the correspondences between this Hades of the Akkadians and that of the Old Testament. Doors and bars are covered with "dust," and the imprisoned spirits feed upon clay. It is a place of darkness, a prison whence there is no escape, a place where there is no hope or help, a veritable *bêth 'ôlâm* (*êkal kêtû*) hid in the lower depths. So the hope of Job "goes down to the bars of Šheôl, when once there is rest in the dust," and Hezekiah said: "In the noontide of my days, I shall go into the gates of Šheôl. In Ps. 88:4 sq., the suppliant mourns: "I am counted with them that go down into the pit; I am as a man that hath *no help* cast off among the dead." . . . "Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in dark places, in the depths." To these lowest depths of Šheôl, Isaiah and Ezekiel assign the king of Babylon and the Assyrian host. In Job 10:21,22 Job prays for a little comfort before he goes hence whence he "should not return," even "to the land of darkness and shadow of death;" a land of thick darkness, as darkness itself; a land of the shadow of death without any order, and where the light is as darkness. The concreteness with which everything is described contrasts, on the other hand, with the Hades of the Old Testament.

The porter at the gates and the waters will at once recall the Grecian mythology with its Charon, Acheron, Cocytus and Periphlegethon.

I may say in offering the following translation that, in reproducing in modern language the epics or lyrics of the past, it is not only justifiable but even necessary, if we wish them to appeal to us as they did to those for whom they were composed, to present them in some of the forms of our own poetical products. This is the finest epic of ancient Chaldea. Its poetry is seen even in the particulars of the construction. The chief peculiarity of Semitic poetry (the *parallel membrorum*) runs throughout. Brevity is used to make the scenic and the tragic more vivid and impressive. The imagination of the reader is forced into activity

—transitions are rapid even to abruptness. Asyndeton prevails everywhere. Moreover, there seems to have been an intentional effort at metrical composition as in the lines 20–24 which I shall give here in the Assyrian :

usêlâ mitûti âkilê baltûti
 êli baltûti imâidu mîtûti
 kêpu pâšu êpušma ikabbi
 izzakara ana rabîti Ištar

Again, in the conduct of Ištar through the seven gates by the porter, there is a consistent repetition of the words of the first line in the second, and the third rhymes with both, where there is no necessity of repetition if the effect which it produces were not desired. The true character of the poem can be preserved by throwing it into metrical form and a literal rendering can be given by using liberty in changing the metre or introducing broken lines. It is with the desire of preserving more fully the poetic virtues of an epic, which at times reminds one of a Homer or Aeschylus, that I offer the following, with the view rather of intimating how it might be done than of doing it—*poeta nascitur, non fit.*

A BABYLONIAN EPIC.—IŠTAR'S DESCENT TO HADES.

On the land without regress, the land that thou knowest,
 Ištar, Sin's daughter, did fix her attention,
 The daughter of Sin did fix her attention,
 On the dwelling of darkness, the abode of Irkalla,
 On the dwelling whose inhabitant comes no more out,
 On the road whose advancing knows no returning,
 On the house whose inhabitant 's remov'd from the light,
 Where they 're nourished with dust and clay is their food,
 Where they see not the light, but in darkness are dwelling,
 And are clad like the birds with a covering of wings;
 On door and on bars lies the dust thickly gathered.

Arrived at the door of the land without regress,
 To the porter in keeping, this order she giveth :
 Thou watcher of waters, throw open thy portal !
 Throw open thy portal, within will I enter !
 If the door be not opened that I may pass through it,
 The door will I shatter, its bolts break in pieces,
 Its sills will I burst, its leaves tear asunder,
 The dead will I raise up, will food and life give them,
 Even unto the living the dead will I raise up.

The porter then opened his mouth and made answer,
 To the great goddess Ištar, made answer the porter :
 "Withhold ! O my lady, do not break it away,
 I go to Allātu, thy name to announce."

The porter announced to the queen, to Allâtu :
 "Thy sister, Istar, is come over these waters
"

When Allâtu these tidings received she made answer :
 "What bringeth her heart to me, pray ? What trouble ?
 These waters I have
 Like the rush and the roar of the flood am I weeping,
 Am weeping o'er men who their wives have abandoned,
 O'er maidens who mourn the embrace of their lovers,
 Am weeping o'er infants destroyed e'er their day.
 Go ! porter, throw open thy door—open to her !
 And treat her according to olden-time law."

The porter departed, threw open his door ;
 "O enter, my lady, exult underworld !
 Palace of the land, that knows no returning,
 O let it rejoice in thy presence."

The first door he caused her to enter, disrobed her,
 Removed the great crown from her head.
 "Why tak'st thou the great crown from *my* head, O porter ?"
 "O enter, my lady, for so bids Allâtu."
 The next door he caused her to enter, disrobed her,
 And the rings were removed from her ears.
 "Why tak'st thou the rings from my ears, O porter ?"
 "O enter, my lady, for so bids Allâtu."
 The third door he caused her to enter, disrobed her,
 The necklace removed from her neck.
 "Why tak'st thou from my neck the necklace, O porter ?"
 "O enter, my lady, for so bids Allâtu."
 The fourth door he caused her to enter, disrobed her,
 Her jewels removed from her breast.
 "Why tak'st thou from my breast the jewels, O porter ?"
 "O enter, my lady, for so bids Allâtu."
 The fifth door he caused her to enter, disrobed her,
 The gemmed-girdle removed from her waist.
 "Why tak'st thou from my waist my gemmed-girdle, O porter ?"
 "O enter, my lady, for so bids Allâtu."
 The sixth door he caused her to enter, disrobed her,
 Took the rings from her hands and her feet.
 "Why from hands and from feet take the rings, pray, O porter ?"
 "O enter, my lady, for so bids Allâtu."
 The seventh door he caused her to enter, disrobed her,
 From her body her cincture removed.
 "Why take from my body my cincture, O porter ?"
 "O enter, my lady, for so bids Allâtu."

To the land without regress when Ištar descended,
 Allātu beheld her and raged in her presence ;
 Imprudently, boldly, did Ištar attack her.
 Then opened Allātu her mouth and commanded,
 To Namtar, her servant, the order was given :
 " Go, Namtar, and open my (case of enchantments) !
 Go bring (them hither).
 * { With disease of the eye and the hip and the foot,
 { With disease of the heart and the scalp, go smite Ištar !
 Afflict her whole person ! "

After Ištar, the goddess, had (been thus afflicted)
 The bull no more covered the cow, nor ass gendered ;
 No more in the street lay the man with the maiden ;
 The man went asleep when he would,
 When she would, slept the maiden.

The god's-servant, Pap-sû-kal, tore his face in the presence
 Of Šamaš—while clothed in the garb of deep mourning—
 Šamaš went, sorely wept before Sin, his father,
 His tears ran down before the king, Ea,
 Saying : " Ištar's gone down to the land, and returns not.
 Since Ištar's descent to the land without regress
 The bull no more covers the cow, nor ass genders ;
 No more in the street lies the man with the maiden.
 The man falls asleep when he will,
 When she will, sleeps the maiden."

Then Ea created a male in his wisdom,
 The god's-servant, Uddušu-nâmir, created.
 " Go ! Uddušu-nâmir, to the land without regress,
 The seven doors of the land without regress open !
 Let Allātu behold thee, and rejoice in thy presence !
 When her heart is at ease, and her spirit is joyful ;
 Then do thou adjure her in the name of the great gods :
 ' Thy head raise, to the fountain direct thy attention,
 O lady, confine not the fountain, I pray thee ;
 I desire to drink of the waters within it. ' "

This hearing, Allātu her sides smote, her nails bit.
 " Of me thou hast asked an impossible favor.
 Hence ! Uddušu-nâmir, in the dungeon I'll shut thee ;
 Thy food shall be the mud of the city,
 From the drains of the city shalt thou drink the water,
 The shadow of the wall shall be thy dwelling,
 Thy dwelling-place shall be its foundation.
 Confinement and dungeon, thy strength let them shatter."

* In the original there are five lines here.

Allātu then opened her mouth and commanded,
 To Namtar, her servant, the order was given :
 "Go! Namtar, break down the palace eternal!
 Go! shatter the pillars, foundation-stones scatter,
 Go! lead forth the spirits, on golden thrones set them,
 With the water of life sprinkle Istar, the goddess,
 Lead her forth from my presence—"

Then went Namtar and broke down the palace eternal,
 And shattered the pillars, the foundation-stones scattered ;
 He led forth the spirits, on golden thrones sat them,
 With the water-of-life sprinkled Istar the goddess.
 Led her forth from her presence.
 Through the *first* door he led her, gave to her her cincture.
 Through the *second* door he led her, and gave her rings to her.
 Through the *third* door he led her, gave back her gemmed-girdle.
 Through the *fourth* door he led her, gave back her breast-jewels.
 Through the *fifth* door he led her, gave to her her necklace.
 Through the *sixth* door he led her, gave to her her ear-rings.
 Through the *seventh* door he led her, and the great crown gave to her.

Here ends the descent of Istar. The priest continues:—

"If her freedom she grant thee not, turn to *her*, facing,
 And for Tammuz, the bridegroom of the years of her youth,
 Pour out water e'en purest, with sweet balm [anoint him]
 And clothe him with garments, a flute [give unto him]
 The companions of Istar, let wail with loud [wailing],
 And the goddess, Belili, the precious case breaking. . . .
 With diamonds(?) (the place) shall be filled (to o'erflowing)."
 The complaint of her brother she then understanding,
 The great goddess Belili the precious case breaking . . .
 (The whole place) with diamonds(?) was filled to o'erflowing.
 "O let me not perish, nay, do not, my brother!
 On the feast-days of Tammuz play the crystal flute for me,
 At that time, O play me the flute.
 Let the mourners then play for me, both men and maidens,
 Let them play upon instruments, let them breathe incense."

OLD TESTAMENT WORD-STUDIES: 7. SACRIFICE AND WORSHIP.

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

New London, Conn.

Every attempt to heal the alienation produced by a wrong or injury involves not only an expression of penitence, but an instinctive sense of the propriety of some gift or presentation which, offered by the offender to the offended party, becomes a visible pledge of the restoration of friendly relations. The offering is of the nature of an atonement between alienated parties, healing the breach. This conscious need of reparation becomes especially acute when a transgressor is constrained to approach an offended deity. The feeling that his life is forfeited prompts the effort to expiate his guilt by the substitution of some other life, animal or human, as a sacrifice in place of himself. This seems to be the idea lying at the root of sacrifice as it is encountered in all religions. Whatever its primary origin, it certainly was sanctioned in the Mosaic legislation, and its sanction was accompanied by specific ritualistic directions.

In considering a group of words so closely related to the results of the recent Old Testament criticism it may not be improper to note, in passing, certain facts lying on the surface of the concordance. The interpretation of these facts must of course be determined by each reader for himself.

Mīnhāh present, offering.

Mīnhāh, though denoting primarily a simple gift or present, seems almost at once to pass into a specific designation for a gift offered to a deity. This is a quite natural development of its meaning, since, even where it refers to a present from man to man, there is always an implied desire to propitiate the person to whom the gift is offered, as in the case of Jacob's mīnhāh to Esau, Gen. 32:13, 14, and in the mīnhāh brought down to Joseph by his brethren, Gen. 42:11. Certain "sons of Belial" who despised Saul, the newly anointed king of Israel, brought him no mīnhāh, 1 Sam. 10:27. The mīnhāh sent by a subjugated people to their conqueror is at times a special gift intended to gain his favor, Judg. 3:15. At other times it takes the form of regular tribute, as that brought by the Moabites and Syrians to David, 2 Sam. 8:2,6, and by the adjacent kingdoms to Solomon, 1 Kgs. 4:21. More frequently, however, it denotes an offering presented to Jehovah for the purpose of winning his favor. The earliest occurrence of the word in this sense is in Gen. 4:3,4,5, where it designates both the bloody offering brought by Abel, and the unbloody offering presented by Cain. Later on a distinction was made between them, and mīnhāh became the specific term for offerings that did not involve the shedding of blood; Eli's sons made themselves "fat with the chiefest of all the mīnhōth of Israel," Judg. 2:29; "Bring no more vain oblations (mīnhōth)," Isa. 1:13. Malachi designates by it all offerings, bloody and bloodless, brought by corrupt Israel to Jehovah's altar, 1:10,11,13; 2:

12,13. The leading use of the term is in connection with the ritual of the tabernacle and the temple. Its one hundred occurrences in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, present a sharply defined technical sense—the “meal offering,” composed of fine flour, oil and frankincense, Lev. 2:1. In a few instances the earlier prophets seem to give it a similar meaning, Joel 1:9,13; 2:4; Amos 5:22.

Next to its occurrences in the Priest Code of Exodus-Numbers, we find its most frequent employment in the so-called “holiness law” of Ezekiel, 42:13-46:20, the latter using it in precisely the same technical sense as the former. The writers of the period between the exodus and the exile use it indeed of an offering to Jehovah, but in connections that do not necessarily imply a reference to a ritualistic “meal offering,” except perhaps Joel and Amos, and it is barely possible that in these instances it may refer to unbloody offerings in general rather than to the specific “meal offering.” In the exilic books of Kings and the post-exilic writings of Nehemiah and the Chronicler the references are explicitly to the “meal offering.” We find, on the contrary, that in the so-called “prophetical” documents *m'yn ḥāh* has in general the sense of a simple propitiatory gift from one man to another, or of an unbloody offering to Jehovah, as throughout Genesis, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah and the earlier Psalms. Over against its one hundred occurrences in the Priest Code, the great prophetic law-book of Deuteronomy does not so much as mention it.

Qōrbān offering.

From *qārābh*, to bring near, to present, hence that which is brought near, a gift. It never signifies a gift from one person to another, but always a gift from man to God. As such it may denote an offering of meal, Lev. 2:1; of first fruits, 2:3; of animals for sacrifice, 1:2; 3:6; or any gifts, such as gold and silver utensils for the tabernacle, wagons, etc., Num. ch. 7. It would denote, therefore, anything devoted to Jehovah. The thing so dedicated could not be recalled, or put to common uses. Note in Mk. 7:11 the extension of the application of this word by a spirit of gross selfishness.

Aside from its seventy-eight occurrences in the Priest Code it is found only in Ezek. 20:28; 40:43. *Qōrbān* is used in the Priest Code in the same sense that *m'yn ḥāh* is used in the prophetical portions of the Old Testament, viz., to express the general idea of a gift or sacrifice to Jehovah.

Zēbhāh sacrifice.

Zēbhāh, almost invariably rendered “sacrifice” in the A. V. and *θυσία* in the LXX., is found in the entire range of Hebrew literature from the earliest to the latest, in the “prophetical” as well as in the “priestly” portions, and with the same fundamental meaning of bloody in distinction from bloodless offerings. This meaning comes from the verb *zābhāh*, to kill, slaughter, 1 Sam. 28:24; Deut. 12:15; 1 Kgs. 19:21; Ezek. 34:3. Very soon it passed from this simpler sense of killing an animal for food to that of killing for the purpose of offering a sacrifice to the deity. This is the prevailing sense of the verb, and from it we also have the derivation *m'yzbē(ā)h*, altar, that on which the *zēbhāh* is consumed. In Leviticus and Numbers *zēbhāh* is always conjoined with *sh'ālā-mīm* in the phrase “sacrifice of peace offerings” or “thank offerings.” Compared with the simple *zēbhāh* it seems to have been offered under more solemn and imposing circumstances. Elsewhere it is most frequently associated with the

burnt offering, Ezra 18:12; Deut. 12:6,11; Josh. 22:26,28, etc. From the earliest times it seems to have been a sacrificial feast or communion meal of which a portion was offered to Jehovah and the rest eaten by the invited guests, as when Jacob parted from Laban, Gen. 31:54, or by the assembled worshipers, as when the people at the high-place of Zoph refrained from eating until Samuel the man of God had arrived to bless the zēbhāh, 1 Sam. 9:11-14. Cf. 20:60; Lev. 7:15,16. That similar sacrificial feasts were customary among the aboriginal Canaanites is clear from the fact that the Israelites were strictly enjoined from participating in them, Exod. 34:15. In general it may be said that the zēbhāh, like the m'ynhāh, was an expression of gratitude for Jehovah's favors, and a plea for their future continuance.

'ōlāh burnt offering.

Like zēbhāh, this word is of frequent and almost universal occurrence in the books of the Old Testament. It is derived from the common verb 'ālāh, to go up, ascend, and contemplates the sacrifice as ascending from the altar to Jehovah in flame and smoke. The thought is the same as in Judg. 20:40, "The Benjaminites looked behind them and the whole city *went up* to heaven" in smoke. Hosea (10:8) seems to play on the word in saying, "the thorn and the thistle shall go up, yā'lēh, on the altars" of Israel instead of the ascending 'ōlāh. The A. V. translates it "burnt offering" in all but two places,—1 Kgs. 10:5, where the margin of the R. V. gives "his burnt offering which he offered," instead "his ascent by which he went up," and Ezek. 40:26, "there were seven steps to go up to it." The general LXX. renderings, *δολκαβτωμα*, or *δολκαβτωσις*, seem to have been justified by the fact that the animal offered as an 'ōlāh was entirely consumed on the altar, whereas in the zēbhāh only the blood and fat were burned, while the flesh was reserved to be eaten by the priests or worshipers. 'Ōlāh, as already noted, is frequently joined with zēbhāh. When the former is singular and the latter plural, "burnt offering and sacrifices," Ezra 18:12; Josh. 22:26; 2 Chron. 7:1, the 'ōlāh may perhaps be regarded as one or more animals selected from the whole number of z'bhāhim and especially dedicated to Jehovah as a burnt offering on his altar. Very slight difference of meaning is discernable at different periods, except that the pre-levitical usage seems to emphasize the idea of expiation, and the Mosaic that of self-dedication. In the law, however, the idea of expiation is transferred from the 'ōlāh to the ḥāṭṭā'th.

Ḥāṭṭā'th sin offering.

This word is rendered "sin offering" 115 times out of 284, and "sin" in almost every other instance. We have already noted (O. T. STUDENT, Dec., 1888, p. 145), that this is the common Hebrew term for sin, and that it means literally a missing of the mark, hence a failure to attain the divine standard for human conduct. This is the general conception underlying the word, but in the Levitical legislation this meaning has been transferred from the sin itself to the sacrifice presented in expiation of the sin. The ḥāṭṭā'th, or sin offering, is therefore, like the 'ōlāh, a subordinate variety of the zēbhāh with a more specific signification. That it is of later origin is generally admitted.

We would naturally expect to find this word characteristic of the Priest Code. We discover, accordingly, that it is used in the sense of "sin" only twenty-nine

times, but ninety-five times in the sense of "sin offering." In all the subsequent literature antedating the exile there are no references to the sin offering, unless they are found in 2 Kgs. 12:16(17) and Hos. 4:8. The former passage reads, "The guilt-money, *kēsēph 'āshām*, and the sin-money, *kēsēph ḥāṭṭā'th*, was not brought into the house of Jehovah; it pertained to the priests." The R. V. renders it, "The money for the guilt offering and the money for the sin offering," etc.; but this rendering is only conjectural and introduces a thought not found in the text. The reference in Hosea is still more doubtful, "They feed on the sins of my people," a figurative expression which has sometimes been interpreted to mean that the priests eat the sin offering, a thing that could not be rebuked since the Mosaic law distinctly commanded it, Lev. 10:17. Nor is *ḥāṭṭā'th* in Gen. 4:7 to be translated as some have suggested, "If thou doest not well, a sin offering lieth at the door," but "sin croucheth," like a wild beast "at the door." The LXX., familiar with a ritualistic worship, renders it, "If thou hast brought it [the offering] rightly, and hast not rightly divided it, hast thou not sinned?" The first mention of the sin offering after the Levitical legislation occurs in Ezek. 40:39-46:20, where it is referred to fourteen times, and appears in connection with the burnt offering, the meal offering, and the guilt offering. In the post-exilic literature it is distinctly mentioned, Ezra 8:35; Neh. 10:33(34); 2 Chron. 29:21,23, 24. Deuteronomy contains no hint of a sin offering.

'āshām guilt offering.

The general statements made about *ḥāṭṭā'th* hold good also of *'āshām*. Its primary reference to guilt is carried over to the guilt offering. The precise difference between the *ḥāṭṭā'th* and the *'āshām* is obscure and has never been satisfactorily cleared up. They have much in common, but seem to have differed chiefly in that the former was intended to bring about an atonement for guilt, while the latter seems to have been regarded in general as a kind of satisfaction over and above the full restitution made for an injury to another, or for a violation of the law of holiness. The specific instances in which the *'āshām* was prescribed were as follows: for ceremonial defilement, Lev. 5:1-6,15-17, including that of the Nazarite, Num. 6:11; for trespass against another's property, Lev. 2-6; Num. 5:8; or person, Lev. 19:20,21; for purification in case of recovery from leprosy, Lev. 14:12-25.

Like the *ḥāṭṭā'th*, the *'āshām* is nowhere referred to as a part of the Israelitish cultus except in Exodus-Numbers and Ezekiel. A kind of guilt offering is spoken of in 1 Sam. 6:3 seq., but this was offered by the Philistines at the suggestion of their priests and diviners, and consisted of five golden tumors and five golden mice, by which they hoped to allay the wrath of Jehovah, whose ark they had captured on the battle-field. This of course had nothing to do with the guilt offering of Jehovah's ritual.

Kīppēr to make atonement.

The thought of atonement was expressed among the Hebrews by the word *kīppūrīm*, occurring only in Exod. 29:36; 30:10,16; Lev. 23:27,28; 25:9; Num. 5:8; 29:11, and always in the plural. It is from the verb *kāphār* which occurs with only three exceptions in the intensive forms of Piel and Pual. Its primary meaning is to bend, to wind around, hence *to cover*. In this sense and in the Kal form it is found only once, Gen. 4:14, "Thou shalt cover, *kāphārtā*, it within

and without with pitch, *bākkōphēr*." The earliest occurrence of the word in its metaphorical sense is in Gen. 32:20(21), where Jacob, on the point of meeting Esau, says, "I will appease him (lit. cover his face) with the present that goeth before me." To Jacob's awakened conscience it appeared that repentance and amendment were insufficient to expiate past guilt, and to bring about a genuine reconciliation. There must be an offering on the part of the offender to the offended. Esau's face must be covered so that he should not see any more the wrong committed against himself. Jacob's present serves then the double purpose of covering the face of the offended brother, and of covering or hiding the offence from his sight. Essentially the same use of the word occurs in Prov. 16:14, "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death; but a wise man will pacify it, *kāpp'rēnnāh*," i. e., cover the wrath expressed in the king's face by some appropriate act of expiation or offering that will screen the offender from the wrath and lead to reconciliation. The peculiar use of the word in Isa. 28:18, "Your covenant with death shall be annulled, *kūppār*," seems to point to a process of destroying the covenant by covering the writing with repeated strokes of the pen or pencil. In all its remaining occurrences the verb is closely connected with the thought of sin and penalty, either individual or national. There could be no approach to a holy God until the sinner had been covered by an atonement. It is not the face of God that is covered, according to the analogy of Gen. 32:20(21), for *kūppēr* never takes God as its *object*, but always the sinner or his sin, except in the few instances where it is used absolutely, Deut. 21:8; 32:43. Conversely, in all transactions between God and man *kūppēr* never takes man as its *subject*, for the covering of sin is in every instance the gracious act of God himself, or the official act of his priestly representative. In the former case the act of covering is an exhibition of pure mercy, of direct forgiveness, Deut. 21:8; Ezek. 16:63; 2 Chron. 30:18; in the latter an act of atonement, or forgiveness in connection with sacrifices, and this is the meaning throughout the Levitical law.

Of the 103 occurrences of the verb seventy-eight are in the Pentateuch, and seventy-five of these in Exodus-Numbers, these latter having in every instance the sense of priestly atonement. In the pre-exilic literature of Samuel, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, it occurs twelve times, and with one exception, invariably in the sense of forgiving or purging away sin as a free divine act. The exception, 2 Sam. 21:3, "And David said unto the Gibeonites, What shall I do for you? and wherewith shall I make atonement, that ye may bless the inheritance of the Lord?" is significant, there being no reference to priestly expiation, but to a restitution to be made to the Gibeonites for the evil done them by Saul and his bloody house. Ezekiel uses the word four times, 16:63; 43:26; 45:15,17, and, except the first instance, in a strictly ritualistic sense. This is its first occurrence in this sense after the legislation of Exodus-Numbers. Subsequent to Ezekiel it occurs five times, Neh. 10:33(34); Dan. 9:24; 1 Chron. 6:49(34); 2 Chron. 29:34; 30:18, and in every instance except the last it denotes atonement in the ritualistic sense.

From the same verb we have the word *kāppōrēth*, mercy seat, found seventeen times, and outside of Exodus-Numbers only in 1 Chron. 28:11.

A number of other interesting words might be noticed in connection with this group, but the space already occupied precludes their consideration.

THE TARGUMS.

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

Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

ORIGIN OF TARGUMS.

Targum is the technical term for the Aramaic versions or paraphrases of the Old Testament. The etymology of the word is not settled. Formerly it was derived from *ragam* i. e. "to throw" (stones), and figuratively, "to transfer" or "translate," corresponding to *jacere* and *traficere*. Pinches, however, discovered an Assyrian verbal root *ragamu*, to which he assigned the meaning "to speak," and from which the noun *rigmu*, "word" is derived, Fr. Delitzsch (*Heb. and Assyr.* p. 50) accepts this as the true etymology of Targum, and translates *targumamu* as "the speaker," one who speaks for others by interpreting their words. Schrader (*KAT.*² 517) gives to the root *ragamu* the meaning of "crying aloud," "exulting." In the Old Testament the participle only is used, and that but a single time, namely in Ezra 4:7, and rendered "set forth" in the R. V. but "interpreted" in the A. V. As a quadriliteral verb *targem* is often found in post-biblical Hebrew, in Talmud and Targums in the sense of "translating," or "interpreting." The word has found its way into nearly all modern languages, e. g. in the English "dragoman."

In origin and history these versions differ materially from the Septuagint. They are in no sense or manner the outgrowth of a literary movement or ambition. They arose from the necessities and needs of the worship in the synagogues, and their production was from the beginning encouraged and fostered by the religious authorities. Just at how early a date the masses of uneducated Jews forgot the Hebrew and adopted the Aramaic, thus making the use of Aramaic translations and interpretations a necessary part of public worship, cannot be accurately determined. The data for deciding this question are as meagre as are those for its companion problem as to what language, Aramaic or Greek, our Lord was accustomed to use. Neh. 8:8 does not furnish a *terminus a quo*. The word there rendered "clearly," by the A. V., and "distinctly," or (in the margin) "with an interpretation," by the R. V. is, in the Talmud, explained by "Targum," (cf. Deutsch, Art. "Targums" in *Literary Remains*, p. 321). From this source Christian scholars formerly drew their date for the beginning of Targumic interpretation in the synagogue. It is known from good historical evidence that *written* Targums, and especially those yet in existence, can not antedate by more than a few years the Christian era. The earliest written Targum or translation mentioned is one on Job from the middle of the first Christian century. As Job is one of the Hagiographa and was not like the Law and the Prophets, used officially in the synagogue but generally only for private devotion, it is quite probable that written Targumin of the latter were in existence at an equally early date at least. The Talmud in its oldest portions describes the manner in which the Aramaic interpretations were given. A verse or paragraph was read in the original by the

render of the synagogue, which was followed by an interpretation in Aramaic, not read, but given from memory, by the targumist. This was in harmony with the general principles of early Palestinian Judaism, according to which only the original word of revelation was to be used in public worship, the interpretation in the language understood by the people to be distinguished as human by the fact that it was only orally given. Just why, when and how this oral tradition became written tradition is not known. The probabilities are that the written form was intended to fix and harmonize this tradition.

TARGUM OF ONKELOS.

The best and most important of the Targums is that of Onkelos. Concerning the personality of the author we have only such data as are given in later Jewish literature. These, which have been best discussed probably by Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, agree in this, that he lived about the time of the destruction of the second temple. The Talmuds, at one place make him a pupil and friend of the older Gamaliel; at another, they place him in the first half of the second century. They agree in regarding him as not a native Jew but a proselyte. These statements, together with the character of his Targum, have been the occasion of a great deal of speculation with regard to his person and his connection with Aquilas, the translator of the extremely literal Greek version of this Old Testament prepared for the purpose of supplanting the old and more free Septuagint. The identity of the two has again and again been asserted, but this view is generally rejected by competent scholars, (cf. the article Targums in the IX. edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*).

But the character and kind of the two versions are much alike. The Targum of Onkelos is really a translation, and that, too, a good one. While some of the later Targums are really interpretations, with incidental translations, Onkelos is a translation with only incidental interpretation. As a rule it is very literal, even paraphrases being employed only at times. In poetical passages, such as Gen. 49, Num. 24, Deut. 32,33, haggadistic amplifications and embellishments are introduced. Further departures from the original consist chiefly in circumlocutions employed for the purpose of doing away with the anthropomorphisms and anthropopathies in the conception of the Deity, in accordance with the whole train and method of Jewish thought at that time, also in the Greek Alexandrian circles. Nöldeke, who is the best authority on the Aramaic languages, says of Onkelos, "the translation in the official or Babylonian Targum is throughout painfully literal, and even if this literal character does not make the frightful impression of Aquila's Greek, this results from the fact that the language of the Targum, on account of its close relation to the Hebrew, could adapt itself more easily to this idiom, and partly because we are so little acquainted with the real usages of the Aramaic language. Aesthetic and grammatical reasons never stand in the way of this literalness, but just as soon as such a rendition would cause offence or could lead to a misunderstanding from the point of religion, it is at once dropped and then the author does not shun wide circumlocutions." He says of the language that it is "a somewhat younger development of the Palestinian Aramaic already known to us in several of the books of the Old Testament" (cf. his *Die Alttestamentliche Literatur*).

The date of Onkelos' Targum is a disputed point. At an early age the version was regarded as a high authority by Jewish writers, having even its own

Massora. The Talmud quotes it as such (cf. Frankel, *Zu dem Targum des Propheten*). The older view had accordingly been that it must be assigned to the first Christian century, a position still defended by so good an authority as Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds, Einleitung*. Frankel, chiefly for linguistic reasons, assigns it to the third century, and Luzatto even to post-Talmudic times. A somewhat strange view is that of Bleek-Wellhausen, § 287. In accordance with the idea that the earlier Jewish paraphrasing was the freest in character, which under the influence of the legal school lore was gradually curtailed and hemmed in to conform more and more to the words of the original, the literal character of the Onkelos version is regarded as an argument rather for its late than for its early composition. The present Onkelos is regarded as the outcome of a long development, the result of learned work and research. The writer says, "the Jerusalem Targum is indeed in its present literary form younger than the Babylonian [i. e. Onkelos], but it stands in a closer connection with the old oral interpretation, while the latter grew out of the transforming reformation brought about by the learned men. The former is thus the wild outgrowths from the old roots; the latter is the shoot subjected to the direction of the hands of the gardener."

The text of the Targum has been frequently printed, e. g. in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf and in the London Polyglott. A critical edition of the text was issued in the first volume of A. Berliner's "Targum Onkelos," 1884. This is the best text and should be used in the study of the version. The literature and also the grammatical and lexical aids for the study of Onkelos and the other Targums are given with comparative fullness in the article on the subject in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. To the list there given must be added as extremely valuable, particularly for the vowel system and the philological side in general, the *Chrestomathia Targumica* of Merx, 1888. Brown's Aramaic Method will serve as an introductory book. The neglect which the text had suffered from the hands of scholars had prevented the issuing of a comparatively reliable text until recently, and with this had made it impossible to utilize thoroughly and satisfactorily the grammatical data furnished by Onkelos and the other Targums. It was only within the last few years that a satisfactory grammar of Biblical Aramaic could be prepared. The Massoretic edition of the Books of Daniel and Ezra by Baer and Delitzsch, enabled Kautzsch to do this much-needed work. Hence for lexical, grammatical and text-critical purposes these Targums have been rendering but meagre services so far. That they can render more and better service is plain from the writings of Lagarde, and this is illustrated by the excellent use made of the Targum by Cornill in his tentative reconstruction of the Hebrew text of Ezekiel (pp. 110-136), and, with not quite as good success, by Ryssel in his treatise on the text of Micah.

THE TARGUM OF JONATHAN BEN UZZIEL.

Jonathan, the son of Uzziel, is mentioned in the Talmud as the author of a Targum on the *prophetæ priores et posteriores*, i. e. the historical and the prophetic books of the Old Testament. He is said to have been a pupil of Hillel, hence older than Onkelos and the Christian era. These data are discussed in Weber (p. 14). This Targum is not homogeneous in character as is that of Onkelos. Quite a difference can be observed in his treatment of the earlier prophetic books (Joshua, Samuel, Kings) and the later prophets (Isaiah and others). In the former he is more strictly a translator, paraphrasing only in poetic sections, such as the

Song of Deborah; in the prophets proper he is remarkably free with explanations, additions, etc., so that he often falls into the manner of later haggadistic and midrashic writers. For this reason it was supposed that the Targum was the work of two different writers; but since Gesenius this opinion has generally been abandoned. The language is, on the whole, the same as that of Onkelos. Concerning his age there is the same dispute as in regard to the date of Onkelos. A large number of scholars are willing to accept the traditional view of the synagogue and church as based upon the statements of Jewish literatures. Others, among them Jewish scholars like Frankel and Geiger, arguing from such internal evidence as language, etc., merely claim it for the third or the fourth century, and maintain, as they do for Onkelos, that it is the result of the editorial work of the learned Jewish schools at Babylon, which are known not to have been established until the third century. This, however, is not understood as excluding the use of older documents in such editorial composition. Indeed, this is maintained as a fact. e. g. by Schürer, in his *Lehrbuch* (p. 479), who draws attention to the fact that Chaldee versions are mentioned in the Mishna and claims that some New Testament passages, e. g. Eph. 4:8, show the influence of the Targumic method of interpretation in that era. Observe some interesting details in *Bleek-Wellhausen* (§ 287). A critical edition of the consonant text, based upon the excellent *Codex Reuchlinianus*, was published by Lagarde in 1872.

JERUSALEM TARGUM ON THE PENTATEUCH.

Altogether different in character and in every particular much inferior in value to the new classical Targums already mentioned is a second Targum covering the whole of the Pentateuch, which is sometimes claimed to have been prepared by Jonathan ben Uzziel (Pseudo-Jonathan) but is now generally designated by the better term of Jerusalem Targum. All critics acknowledge it is a Palestinian product, its language, too, being that of the Jerusalem Talmud. It is further agreed, that it cannot possibly be younger than the close of the seventh century. In Num. 24:19 it mentions the sinful city of Constantinople and in v. 24 the land of Lombardy; in Gen. 21:21 it mentions the two wives of Mohammed Chadidja and Fatima. Compare especially the solid article of Volck, in *Herzog. Real Encycl.*, 2d. Ed. Vol. XV. The version can scarcely be called a translation; the text is for the writer only a pretext for introducing all possible midrashic notions. In Deutsch's article already mentioned (to be found also in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*) the English reader can find specimen verses in translation not only from this, but also from the older Targums. Pseudo-Jonathan is full of myths and fables, ideas and representations common to late Jewish literature. The language is full of foreign words and barbarisms. But that it contains also portions of older Targums is evident from the contents (cf. especially Nöldeke, l. c.)

FRAGMENTS OF A PENTATEUCH TARGUM.

There is also preserved a Targum, improperly called the Jerusalem Targum, which contains, after the manner of Pseudo-Jonathan, translations and interpretations of a number of verses from the Pentateuch. It is now generally designated as Jerusalem Targum II. Concerning the relations of the two Jerusalem Targums to each other, which is acknowledged on all hands to be very close, there has been considerable discussion and about the same amount of disagreement. These fragments are Palestinian in character and language and are, perhaps, the

remnants of a larger Targum. This, again, is disputed by some. Volck regards it as a "haggadistic supplement to Onkelos," it being clear that Onkelos is used by the author (cf. Schürer and Volck, l. c.).

TARGUMIN ON THE HAGIOGRAPHIA.

All of these are of a late date and their authors are unknown. The Targum on Ps. 108 speaks of Constantinople. We have a Targum on the Psalms, Job and Proverbs. That on Proverbs is comparatively literal. That on Psalms shows dependence on the Peshitto and is slightly haggadistic; that on Job is very much so. The Targums on the five Megilloth (Ruth, Esther, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs) constitute a class of their own, and were composed after the Talmud. Of the Book of Esther there are several Targums. All these on the Megilloth are expositions more than translations. A Targum on the two Books of Chronicles was published in 1715 by Beck. It is a comparatively late production. The most complete bibliography of the whole Targum literature is in the article of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* by Dr. S. M. Schiller-Szinessey.

TIELE ON BABYLONIAN-ASSYRIAN CULTURE. III.

BY REV. A. S. CARRIER,

McCormick Theol. Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

RELIGION.—THE CULTUS AND THE RELATIONS TO THE DEITY.

Since religion occupied such a prominent position in the life of the Assyrians and Babylonians, ruling every thought and act, it is no wonder that Assyrian kings were so solicitous for the public worship of the gods, and that they, no less than the devotees themselves, supported the mighty and learned priesthoods. Inscriptions of Assyrian kings almost always close with accounts of the construction or restoration of some temple. Babylonian treat almost exclusively of such matters, and one of the proudest titles is Finisher or Restorer (Zaninu) of the two chief temples of Babel and Borsippa. Each place possessed at least one temple for its tutelary divinity. Nebuchadnezzar II. names, among the temples which he restored in Babel and Borsippa, ten in the former city and six in the latter, beside the chief sanctuaries. Sargon II., when he built his new city, Dûr-Šarukîn, a place of small extent, erected sanctuaries for Êa, Sin, Ningal, Rammân, Šamaš and Adar. No town was secure which did not well provide for its gods; no king could count on divine protection who did not devote a share of his spoils to the temples; and while many were content simply to restore damage, to beautify or enlarge, those more strict took the greatest pains to uncover the lowest foundation stone and repair every breach.

Among the oldest and most famous temples were those of the Sun in Sippar, Nergal at Kuta, Bêl at Nippur, but especially Sin at Ur. In Assyria the temples of Ištar at Nineveh and at Arbail deserve special notice. At the latter there seems to have been a prophetic school. Great uncertainty prevails as to the inner construction of these temples. We can only speak with certainty regarding the

chief temples at Babel and Borsippa. The first, called Ê-sagila, dedicated primarily to Maruduk, was a sort of Acropolis, which comprised several sanctuaries, and perhaps formed part of the royal palace. Within was the shrine of Maruduk, containing his golden chair, and the sacred boat, which was carried in processions; a shrine for his father Êa, for his spouse Zarpanitu, and for his son Nabû, the latter being called, like the entire temple at Borsippa, Ê-zida. Either in Nabû's shrine or Êa's was the Holy of Holies, Parakku, the sacred seat of the gods who determine destiny, where in the first feast of the year the great god of heaven and earth (Êa or Nabû) came down amid the reverently standing gods to decide the destiny of prince and kingdom. In the midst of the temple space rose the terrace-tower, Ziķûrat, called the "house of the foundation stone of heaven and earth," or at Borsippa the "house of the seven luminaries or spheres of heaven and earth." Ê-sagila was connected, by Nabopolassar, by a new street with the great thoroughfare Ai-bur-šabu, which crossed the city from one end to the other and opened into the street of Nânâ, the latter probably leading to Borsippa, where was a temple originally dedicated to Maruduk, later to his son Nabû. This temple was in constant communication with the one at Babel, and during the great feast, Zaķmuku, Nabû was conducted in his ship to visit his father at Ê-sagila. In Ê-zida, at Borsippa, were various shrines of Nabû, one of which was called "the great house of life." Here dwelt his spouse Nânâ, and above all rose the Ziķûrat, originally forty-two cubits high and raised still higher by Nebuchadnezzar. These were the most celebrated temples in the whole land, and Assyrian kings considered it an added honor to call themselves completers of Ê-sagila, even after subduing an obstinate rebellion in Babylonia. Moreover they did not neglect other Babylonian temples, bestowing no less attention on them than on the sanctuaries of their own land.

The temples were built and adorned in a style of utmost magnificence. The statues of the gods were often overlaid with silver and gold. But we seldom read of new images; age was here synonymous with holiness. These statues, for the most part, had the human form; but often, as with the Egyptians, we find mixed human and animal figures. Bulls and lions with human heads, and eagle heads with human bodies, were common. The highest deities, however, are human in form, and frequently are accompanied by their sacred animals. A symbol of the highest divinity, perhaps borrowed from Egypt, was the winged sun-disk. In this was often placed a figure human above, feathered below, holding a ring or shooting an arrow. Two pairs of wings, and from one to four pairs of horns, as symbols of power, are common in the reliefs. The water-vessel and the pine-cone which they carry are symbols of life and fertility.

No greater misfortune could happen to a city than to lose its images after they had been consecrated and become the incarnation of deity. The bloodiest war would be undertaken to recover them.

Erection, restoration and endowment of temples were acts which secured for one life and health and the favor of the gods. The phrases *in remedium, pro salute animæ*, so common in mediæval religious foundations, find numerous parallels in the oldest Babylonian inscriptions. We often see such dedications as "for my life," "for my life and my fathers" and "the life of my son."

The kings, who bore as well the title išsaku, had the right to exercise the priestly function, and like their Egyptian brothers certainly belonged to the learned class. Comparison of cuneiform texts with Greek writers, like Diodorus Siculus, warrants us in distinguishing temple priests, atoning priests, and prophets, though the Assyrian names of these three classes cannot yet with certainty be determined.

We can, however, be certain that the išsaku, the highest priestly title, was a temple priest. So were probably the Šangu and the Kalû, the latter a Babylonian title, signifying "the exalted." Of special interest is the terms Maggi, Magi, whose superior, the Rabmag, accompanied Nebuchadnezzar to Jerusalem. Although this title signifies simply "Splendid," we know from many sources that the word had in Babylonia the meaning which we attach to the word Magi.

Beside these functionaries were the "Scribes" whom Sargon II. commissioned along with his plenipotentiaries to teach the fear of God and of the king to the mixed population of his new city. "Recorders" (*dupsarri*), and perhaps also prophets (Nabê), are mentioned. How their functions were apportioned and what was their hierarchal rank we cannot decide. We can only be certain of the duties of the Recorders and the true priests.

The chief duty of the priests was to sacrifice and to pray. Sacrifices consisted of free-will offerings of clean beasts and fruits, of libations of oil and wine, of burnt offerings, which doubtless included incense. Human sacrifice and the sacrifice of chastity were probably not out of vogue, though not mentioned in cuneiform literature.

We are yet in the dark as to the high feasts and processions and also as to that great Mystery, "the grasping the hands of Bêl" of Babel or Deri, in which kings alone participated, and which they considered of the highest importance. We are better instructed in the performance of the ritual acts for private persons. The belief in spirits, powerful wielders of magic, to whose craft and tricks mankind is daily exposed, is plainly evident, the belief was just as profound that through certain incantations and by the help of the higher gods, these evil spirits might be rendered harmless.

But all magic was not looked upon as lawful. Sorcery practiced to gain power for evil or to overthrow enemies, was forbidden. But magic practiced to gain the favor of the gods for healing, long life or eternal blessedness, was encouraged. The multitude of incantatory formulas which are preserved show how highly esteemed the art was.

The fame of the Babylonian priests, under the name of Chaldeans, spread far to the westward. The formulas consist of a prayer often quite beautiful, a litany, and they were employed against the demons of disease, fever, death, insanity and delirium. Eclipses of the moon and the dedication of the royal sceptre called them into play. Ceremonies probably extending over seven days, were required to free one from the effects of a curse (*arrat*). All the gods were summoned, but chiefly the spirits of heaven and earth, the savior, Maruduk, and the beneficent Êa, as the incantations of their city Eridu were the most famous.

The form of worship compared with that of Egypt or India was extremely simple, designated merely as a lifting or folding of the hands, but religion gave dignity and consecration to the whole life. Holy pictures adorned palace walls, and holy symbols were carried into battle; important contracts and royal charters were headed with such symbols. In common with many ancient nations, the

Assyrians compounded their proper names with those of deities. But it is noteworthy that so many names are in the form of a wish or prayer. Each day was sacred to some god, and daily sacrifices were offered by the king. The seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first and twenty-eighth of each month, and the nineteenth as well, were rest days, *šabattu*, on which one was in danger from the evil eye, and from morn till night neither king nor priest might eat his usual food, go about his usual business or wear his festal robes. Every tenth day seems to have been a day of jubilation, on which no psalm of penitence might be sung. The great days were certainly the feasts of the chief gods, the holiest of these being the *Zakmuku* feast at Babel, occurring about the time of the Jewish Passover.

That religion ruled the whole life is plain also from the firm belief in a divine providence which planned for the requital of good and evil, which called kings even from the mother's womb to rule the nations, and which in the midst of insurrections and foreign wars gave victory to the royal arms and moved to submission the hearts of neighboring princes.

Like all ancient nations, the Babylonians believed it possible to know the future, and the decisions of the gods. But they had reached the point where they no longer looked for direct manifestations of deity. Theophanies belonged to the mythical histories. The highest gods communicated with man through their sons alone, and they only by oracles and dreams, but especially by the aspect of the heavens. Famous oracles existed in the leading cities. Dreams, though occasionally coming to any pious believer, were the special prerogative of seers, the Magi being the authorized interpreters and communicating to the suppliant the purport of the divine utterance. Thus the gods spoke through the mouth of their servants to Sennacherib when he asked concerning the result of a campaign,—"Go, march forth; we will march by thy side; we will help thee in the expedition." Thus *Ištar* encouraged *Ašurbanipal* when he planned an expedition against *Aḫšêre* of *Man*,—"I am the destroyer of *Aḫšêre* of *Man*." We are told also of written words beheld in a dream upon the altar of *Sin*; of a vision of *Ištar* in full panoply and celestial splendor promising to appear to her votary, the king. The belief in such manifestations was only a limitation of the old faith, not a modern rationalism; the people of antiquity considered them just as real as direct theophanies.

Astrology was diligently studied, and while not the source of mythology, the chief gods were yet associated with stars and constellations, and the various peculiar changes of the heavenly bodies were regarded as warnings sent by the gods which men must heed. Sometimes the portent was interpreted by a species of analogy, if the star of the king of the gods was bright, the earthly king was to be fortunate and powerful. Eclipses were objects of the most diligent study. All this may seem artificial and superstitious, yet it was based upon a firm belief in an immutable order of the world and an uninterrupted series of divine manifestations.

The warm piety of the Semite, the deep religious sense, was not absent from the Babylonians and Assyrians. In purity and exaltation of conception they were but little removed from the Israelitish prophets. In their prayers and hymns they embodied thoughts which charm and attract. This is shown in the inscriptions of Babylonian kings, notably those of *Nebuchadnezzar II.*, as well as in their penitential psalms and lamentations. It is true sin is not always sharply distinguished from its penalty, but it is deeply felt and represented to be a wan-

dering from the right way, impurity, hostility to God, who is entreated to take it away and graciously avert his righteous anger. In spite of their polytheism, the tone and spirit of many passages remind us strongly of the Hebrew Psalms, the god who is addressed being exalted to the very highest heaven. Invariably, however, the intercession of some other god is implored, a mediator was deemed necessary. There is one psalm in which no particular deity is named. The poet, as usual, makes the penitent speak of his god or his goddess, but this probably means nothing more than guardian angel; further, confession of a "known or unknown sin" is made to a "known or unknown god." Though this is not monotheism, it approaches it closely. The god or goddess invoked as the petitioner's own, is none other than his better Self. If he sins, his god or goddess forsakes him, and his first intercession is for the god's return, his first effort for his propitiation.

All this proves that religion in Babylonia reached early a comparatively high development. However much of the external and formal, of the superstitious and magical may have clung to the worship, there was no lack of deep religious feeling and moral earnestness, which expressed itself most powerfully in the penitential psalms.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

Quite a number of changes have taken place within the last few weeks in the Old Testament professorships of the German universities. At Rostock, in the place of the late Dr. Bachmann, we now find Dr. E. König, late docent at Leipzig, and with this change the last of the anti-analytical men has been succeeded by one who believes in pentateuchal analysis. Professor König is one of the leading opponents of the Wellhausen reconstruction scheme and is a prolific writer. The University of Halle has lost both its Old Testament men, Schlottmann and Riehm. In the place of the former, who was also President of the German Bible Revision Committee, Professor Kautzsch, of Tübingen, has been called. Professor Riehm's place is not to be filled for the present. Professor Kautzsch has secured his enviable reputation for accurate scholarship rather through the quality than the quantity of his literary work. There are few among the men in his department who have written less than he; but his revision of Gesenius' grammar, his Aramaic grammar, and other work is of superior excellence. Professor Cornill, who only two years ago was called as extra ordinarius to Königsberg, has been made an ordinarius. Bertheau, of the philosophical faculty in Göttingen, who died several months ago, has been succeeded by Smend, of Basel. It was the intention of the authorities to call Wellhausen, of Marburg, but he was entirely unacceptable to the Hanoverian churchmen. In this way Smend leaves the theological faculty and enters the philosophical, just as Wellhausen did a few years ago.

The announcement comes from Canada that Mr. Hirschfelder, the lecturer in Hebrew and other oriental languages in the University College, Toronto, retires from active duty. Rev. Dr. McCurdy, already a lecturer in this department in the same college, is to be advanced to the position of professor of oriental languages in Toronto University.

→BOOK NOTICES←

WELLHAUSEN'S HISTORY OF ISRAEL.*

This work has already been noticed in these columns. Attention is called to it again by reason of the fact that Messrs. Macmillan and Company now offer it for sale in this country. The original work has already become standard and this translation, authorized by Wellhausen, is reliable and will doubtless be read by many who are seeking for light upon the problems of Old Testament criticism. It is a book for scholars and thinkers, for such as are well established in the faith. Its learning and acuteness are undoubted; its spirit will not be regarded as commendable.

A CONCORDANCE OF THE SEPTUAGINT.†

A much needed help for students of the Septuagint is afforded in this volume. It is a large octavo of 284 pages, 9½ × 6½ inches, clearly printed and at a moderate price. It is unfortunate that Tischendorf's edition was the best available text of the Septuagint at the time this work was prepared. Swete's edition, when completed, will doubtless supersede all others. This fact will detract somewhat from the value of this concordance; yet it will always be more or less serviceable. Students of the Old Testament in general are coming to realize more clearly the importance of the comparison and indeed of the separate study of the Septuagint version along with the Hebrew original. Let us hope that this concordance will assist in bringing about a consummation so desirable.

A HANDY EDITION OF THE BIBLE.‡

This is a very convenient edition of the two Testaments in the original, details concerning which are given below. It is stated that this volume is the fruit of a suggestion made by one of the professors of Hartford Theological Seminary and the direct outcome of the interest inspired by him in independent biblical research. The idea is commendable and its realization in this neat and handy book is all that could be desired. The type is clear, the paper thin but opaque, the book not too bulky, its general make-up excellent. For class-room use, for frequent reference, for permanent companionship and study, those who procure it will highly prize this tasteful edition.

* PROLEGOMENA TO THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL: WITH A REPRINT OF THE ARTICLE "ISRAEL" FROM THE ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA. By Julius Wellhausen. Translated under the author's supervision by J. S. Black and A. Menzies: with preface by Prof. W. R. Smith, Edinburgh: A. & C. Black. New York: Macmillan & Co.

† A HANDY CONCORDANCE OF THE SEPTUAGINT, giving various readings from Codices Vat., Alex., Sin., and Ephr.; with an appendix. London: S. Bagster & Sons. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

‡ THE HOLY BIBLE COMPLETE IN THE HEBREW AND GREEK. The Hebrew Bible of Letteris and the Greek New Testament of Westcott and Hort. In one volume 6×4 inches. Price, boards \$2.50; morocco, \$3.50. Orders may be sent to Elwood G. Tewksbury, Hartford Theol. Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Aryans, Semites and Jews, Jehovah and Christ. A Record of Spiritual Advance from the Household or Personal God of the Semite Abram and from Jehovah, the Tutory or National God of the Israelites, to the Universal Father revealed by Jesus the Christ.* By Lorenzo Burge. Boston: Lee & Shepherd. \$1.50
- Modern Science in Bible Lands.* By Sir J. W. Dawson, LL. D. New York: Harper & Bros. *Manuel d'Archéologie orientale. Chaldée, Assyrie, Perse, Syrie, Judée, Phénicie, Carthage.* By E. Babelon. Paris, 1888. 3.50fr.
- The Poet's Bible: Old Testament Section.* By W. G. Horder. London: Isbister. s.1.6.
- Die Geschichtlichen Hagiographen (Chronika, Esra, Nehemtah, Ruth, Esther u. das Buch Daniel, ausgelegt.* By S. Oetli u. J. Meinhold. Kurtzgef. Comm., etc. Nordlingen: Beck. M.5.50
- Recherches Bibliques.* By J. Halevy. Fasc. 8. Versailles: Cerf. et fils., 1888.
- From Adam to Abraham, or, Lessons on Genesis I.-XIV.* London: Nisbet. s.1.
- The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I. Isa. 1-39.* By G. A. Smith. Expositor's Bible. London: Nisbet. s.7.6.
- Natural Religion: Inaugural Lecture at Glasgow.* By Max Müller. London: Longmans. s.1.6.
- The Story of Genesis.* By Frances Younghusband. New York: Longmans. \$0.75.
- Holiness as understood by the writers of the Bible.* By J. A. Beet. N. Y.: Phillips & Hunt. \$0.35.
- Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian.* Arranged and Edited as an Introduction to the Study of the Bible. By Edward T. Bartlett, D. D., and John P. Peters, Ph. D. Vol. II. Hebrew Literature. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.50.
- The Sermon Bible: 1 Kings to Psalm 76.* New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. \$1.50.
- Der griechische Einfluss auf Prediger u. Weisheit Salomos.* By P. Menzel. Halle: Kämmerer & Co. M.1.20.
- On the Book of Daniel, Brief Comments.* London. s.2.6.
- Der Prophet Jeremia v. Anatot.* By K. Marti. M.1.20.
- Genealogical Chronology; or, The World before Christ: being the Origin, Genealogy, and Chronology of the Earliest Races of Mankind.* By Albert Wells. Edited by his daughter. London: Allen. s.25.
- Veteris Testamenti de Cherubim Doctrina.* Inaug.-Diss. By Fr. Trlebs. Berlin: Sittenfeld.
- Das Bundesbuch u. die religionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung Israels.* Teil I. Inhalt u. Plan des Bundesbuch. By J. W. Rothstein.
- Die Stebzig Wochen Daniels.* Ein kritisch-exeg. Studie. Inaug.-Diss. Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.1.50
- Die Priester-gesetze bei Flavius Josephus.* Eine Parallele zu Bibel und Tradition. By P. Grünbaum. Inaug.-Diss.
- Daniel's Prophecies. Now being fulfilled, with a Harmony in the words of the H. V.* By E. P. Cachemalle. London: Hodder. s.2.6.
- Die Metaphysik und Ethik des Judenthums von den ersten Anfängen der monotheistischen Ideen, bei den Abrahamiden bis zum Schluss des Talmud; in vier heften bearbeitet und wissenschaftlich dargestellt.* 1 Heft. Die Metaphysik des Pentateuch. By David Langfelder. Wien, pp. 95 \$0.45.
- Historia sacra antiqui Testamenti.* By H. Zschokke. Ed. III. Emendata et instructa v. delineationibus et tabula geographica. Wien. \$3.70.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- On the Legends Concerning the Youth of Moses.* By A. Wiedemann, in Proc. of the Soc. of Bib. Arch., XI. 2, 1888.

- Etudes sur le Deutéronome. II. Les sources et la date der Deutéronome (Suite).* By L. Horst, in Rev. d'Hist. des Religions, Nov., Dec., 1888.
- L'Orquell de Salomon.* By J. Levi, in Rev. des Etudes Juives, Juli-Sept., 1888.
- Anti-Parsee Sentences in Deuter-Isaiah.* By Dr. Alexander Kohut, in Jewish Exponent, Feb. 1, 1889.
- The Vernacular Language of Our Lord.* By Dr. Franz Delitzsch in Sunday School Times, Feb. 2, 1889.
- Classification of Bible Poetry.* By Philip Schaff, D. D. Ibid, Feb. 9.
- Modern Critics on Men of the Bible.* Reviews of Driver's *Isaiah* and Cheyne's *Jeremiah*. Ibid. *Bible Beacons. I. Samson.* By R. G. Ferguson, D. D., in Evangelical Repository, Feb., 1889.
- The Foundation of Rome by Noah.* By Federico Garlanda, Ph. D., in The Independent, Feb. 7, 1889.
- The Mexican Messiah.* By Dominik Daly, in American Antiquarian, Jan., 1889.
- The Mosaic Doctrines of Death and After-Death.* By Prof. R. V. Foster, D. D., in Cumberland Presbyterian Review, Jan., 1889.
- La Vérité de l'Histoire biblique. I. Le Nouveau Roman de M. Renan sur l'Histoire sainte. II. Etudes de l'inspiration de l'histoire biblique.* By J. Brucker, in Etudes religieuses, philos. hist. et litt., Dec., 1888.
- Del Segno degli Ebrei. II.* By G. Rezasco. In Giornale Ligustico. Sett.-Ott., 1888.
- Narrative of a Scientific Expedition in the Trans-Jordanic Region in the Spring of 1886.* By Post, in Pal. Expl. Fund., Oct., 1888.
- Delitzsch's Neuer Commentar über die Genesis.* By E. Kautzsch, in Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 2, 1889.
- Fabre d'Évieux's Le Livre du Prophète Daniel.* Review by A. Loisy in Bulletin Crit., 23, 1888; by J. Knabenbauer, in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, 10, 1888.
- The Higher Criticism and its Results.* By Prof. C. A. Briggs, D. D., in The Congregationalist, Feb. 21, 1889.
- Will the Revised Version be Accepted?* By Rev. J. A. Faulkner, in Sunday School Times, Feb. 23, 1889.
- The Rites, Ceremonies, and Customs of the Jews.* By Prof. B. Pick, Ph. D., in Homiletic Review, March, 1889.
- Studies in the Psalter. No. III. The Nineteenth Psalm.* By Dr. T. W. Chambers. Ibid.
- Scripture Poetry.* By A. J. Maas, S. J., in Am. Cath. Quar. Rev., Jan., 1889.
- Philo and his Latest Interpreter.* By F. C. Porter, in New Englander, Feb., 1889.
- In Self-Defence: Critical Observations on my Hebrew New Testament.* By Prof. Franz Delitzsch, in Expositor, Feb., 1889.
- The Hallel.* By Rev. Ed. G. King, D. D. Ibid.
- A Comparison of Brahmanism and Buddhism with Christianity.* By John Alfred Faulkner, in Reformed Quarterly Review, Jan., 1889.
- Swete's Septuagint.* Review by E. Hatch, in Classical Review, Feb., 1889.
- Renan's Histoire du Peuple Israel.* Review in Athenæum, Feb. 2, 1889.
- Smith's Isaiah.* Review by Cheyne, in Academy, Feb. 9, 1889.
- Inspiration and Infallibility.* By S. L. Bowman, S. T. D., in Methodist Review, March-April, 1889.
- Current Discussion. The Ethics of the Old Testament.* Ibid.
- Der Dekalog u. das snaitische Bundesbuch im innern Zusammenhang dargestellt.* By O. Naumann, in Ztschr. f. Kirch. Wiss. u. Leb., XI., XII., 1888.
- Grundrissen der alttestamentlichen Propheten.* By Fr. Düsterleek. Ibid.

