

➤THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.◀

VOL. VII.

APRIL, 1888.

No. 8.

THERE are some men who *never* have an opinion of their own. Neither they nor those with whom they are associated ever know on which side of a question they stand. In the utterance of an expression of the simplest character they employ a sentence which is full of "perhaps," "probably," "possibly," etc. These men are everywhere, nowhere. There are other men who have clear and decided convictions upon every question which has ever come up, and upon many which are to come up within the next two or three centuries. These men do not wait for the various sides of a question to be presented. This, indeed, would be quite foreign to their idea; for, in their estimation, there is but one side; there *can be* but one side. Time given either to the statement or refutation of the other side is time wasted. There is always danger that the statement of other views than those which they hold will do great injury.

Is there a middle ground which might prove acceptable? Is it possible on certain important questions to maintain not an uncertain, but a neutral position? Is it possible to say in reference to a certain series of facts: *This* explanation removes such and such difficulties, but leaves such and such unsolved; *that* explanation removes some, but leaves still others? Still further, is it possible to take up the discussion of a question and present either or both sides without being the advocate of one or the other? No one will deny that this is the proper spirit with which to pursue an investigation? Does the unprejudiced scholar prosecute an inquiry with mind made up beforehand as to its outcome? If then this attitude, not of indifference, nor of uncertainty, but of neutrality, is that which, as all demand, must characterize investigation, may not the same spirit, perhaps with profit

to all concerned, characterize the presentation of a theory of which the increasing weight of evidence and authority seem almost to compel acceptance, but which, at the same time, the dangerous consequences of its general acceptance would force one to reject.

THE theological seminaries have been held responsible for the ignorance which many ministers exhibit in regard to the Bible. The truth is that the present seminary curriculum is an inheritance from the time when the Bible was quite thoroughly learned by all children in Christian families. The large majority of the students who formerly went to the seminaries had learned in childhood the entire Bible history; they were familiar with many of the Psalms, and with many passages in the New Testament, in fact with a large share of the Bible. The seminary course was designed for such students. Circumstances are now changed. In Christian families there has been a famine, not so much of hearing the gospel preached as of studying the Scripture-records. Young men from Christian families grow up, become Christians, engage in Christian work, enter seminaries, and there evince ignorance of the Bible that is astounding. Fifty years ago a child twelve years of age would have been disgraced by the ignorance that is sometimes shown by a seminary student. Under such circumstances it is not a matter of wonder that the seminary training fails of its object. The old curriculum is no longer adapted. Suppose that upon entrance a student were asked to write in chronological order the names of the following persons: Abraham, Adam, David, Elijah, Isaac, Isaiah, Jacob, Jeremiah, Jesus, John the Baptist, Joshua, Moses, Noah, Paul, Samuel, and state the position and work of each. The large majority of students would fail on several points. Fifty years ago the failures would have been confined to a small minority. If such men are permitted to enter the seminary, and no training in the elements of Bible history is given them, they will graduate with ignorance that is absolutely disgraceful. Hence there is rightly a popular call for more knowledge on the part of ministers. An important question is, Where is the proper place to supply this need? As things now are, it seems necessary for the seminaries to do this. Ought the seminaries to accept the position that this is their permanent work? If they do, will it be taken as a lowering of the standard of their training? More thorough knowledge of the Bible is imperative; but ought it not perhaps to be gained before entering the seminary?

IS it a sufficiently familiar idea, that the Bible was *acted out*, before it was *written out*? that the events described in it took place, in some cases, long before the description given us was recorded? that sacred history antedates sacred Scripture? No one denies this; and, after all, what difference does it make? It may, perhaps, raise some serious questions. Let us consider one or two:—

If the event described took place in one century, and the narrative of it which we have belongs to another century, or to a later period of the same century, evidently allowance must be made for the time which has elapsed. This allowance, if granted, will show itself, perhaps, (1) in the use of a different language, as in the case of Noah's curse which could not have been uttered originally in Hebrew; (2) in the existence of two or more versions (not contradictory but different) of the same event, as in the case of the narratives of the life and words of our Lord, which present some striking differences, although written down before an entire century had passed; (3) in the difference of stand-point from which the event is regarded, as is witnessed by the parallel accounts of the same events furnished in Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles; (4) in the fuller statement of a speech, or fuller description of an event, as in the case of the words of the prophet of Judah to Jeroboam (1 Kings 13), the form of which the most conservative commentators concede to belong *to a much later date*, and in still other ways.

BUT the question at once arises: While we may readily grant all this as true of profane writings, how can it possibly be true of *inspired* writings? There is, of course, a difficulty here; but it will not do to restrict ourselves to questions which do not raise difficulties. Let us grant three facts: (1) that these events occurred at a given time; (2) that the narratives describing them were written somewhat later and (3) that the phenomena just alluded to are due to the difference of time which elapsed between the occurrence and the description. Now put side by side with these, the *fourth* fact which is just as much a fact as any or all of the three, that both the occurrence and the description were divinely ordered, divinely inspired. Is there, after all, any real difficulty? Is God to be limited as to the means which he is able to employ in imparting revelation, or in the wisdom which shall lead to make use of this or that particular method? All the points above referred to may not be granted. But, *should* they be, is the difficulty insuperable? By no means; unless we feel obliged to defend that most strict theory of inspiration known as the verbal theory.

STILL another question, less serious and more interesting: If the events took place and their description followed; if David was persecuted by Saul and Psalms grew out of it; if there was great danger from Assyria, and Isaiah's prophecies are based upon it; if there was a captivity, and because of it the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah were delivered, *what follows?* (1) That sacred history in many cases furnished the occasion for the revelation of sacred scripture; (2) that sacred history, to some extent, molded and shaped sacred Scripture; (3) that the more one knows of sacred history the more familiar he is with its details, the better he will understand and appreciate sacred Scripture; (4) that, to put it more strongly, ignorance of sacred history is, likewise, ignorance of sacred Scripture; (5) that, sacred history being understood in its widest sense as including geography, archæology, etc., and sacred Scripture being known to contain frequent allusions to topics in these departments, their study is, in all but the highest sense, study of sacred Scripture; (6) that, to be specific, an intellectual study of the Bible is not a hindrance, but a mighty aid to the comprehension of its spiritual contents and teaching.

THE following communication is one of a number which have recently been received upon the same subject. It is not too much to say that a very large number of Bible students entertain the feeling to which the Rev. Mr. Nordell has here given utterance. We publish the letter with the hope that, as a result of the publication, information may be gained which will aid us to decide whether or not it is, upon the whole, desirable to accede to this request. If there are others who desire this, or if there are any who would object to it, may we not hear from them?

My Dear Professor Harper:

It is conceded among all Bible students that the burning question of our day is the so-called "Pentateuchal Analysis." If it were only a matter of literary criticism touching the nature and origin of the material which the alleged author used or incorporated into his finished work as it lies in our hands, we might let the critics fight it out among themselves and settle it in any fashion they please. But the question is transcendently more important than its mere literary aspects. Its results are so destructive of traditional historical views, so conflicting with current notions of inspiration, and so far-reaching in their consequences, that it is not surprising that they should be received by reverent minds as really subversive of the foundations of the Christian faith. Nevertheless the problem cannot be ignored any longer. Nor can it be decided from *a priori* postulates, however easy and agreeable such procedure might be. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the results are accepted by the practically unan-

imous biblical scholarship of the Continent, and by a large part of the best scholarship in England. Nor can it be permanently satisfactory to any candid mind to be continually fortifying itself in conservative opposition by reading only polemics against it. The fact is that not a few of our young men, impelled by indiscriminating enthusiasm, are adopting just the opposite course in going over to the side of the critics without an adequate or dispassionate survey of the conditions presented by the problem. If the results embody truth, this truth has most likely come to stay, and, however distasteful it may be, we must in some way adjust ourselves to it. If the results present, not truth, but error, we may be sure that after a little transient flutter, it will go the way of all other errors that have sprung up to undermine the authority of the inspired Word. While it is true that the Pentateuchal Analysis in its extreme and most repulsive form is held by rationalists who seek by every means to eliminate from the Scriptures their supernatural element, yet it should not be forgotten that even a thorough-going rationalism has rendered invaluable service to faith.

The above is simply introductory to a suggestion and a request. They grow out of my own not very successful endeavor to present to my eye clearly and graphically the results of the Pentateuchal Analysis, in so far as there is a substantial agreement respecting the documents of which the Pentateuch is composed. Would it not be possible to present in successive issues of *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* the whole or a part of the translation of the Pentateuch, with the different documents distinguished by different type, so as to present the *alleged facts* clearly to the reader's eye, and perhaps with a few explanatory footnotes? It seems to me that such an arrangement would be of inestimable service to all students of the Bible who desire an independent and intelligent opinion on the merits of the case. Such a service might be rendered more appropriately by *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* than by any other periodical that I know of, and I doubt not it would be of permanent value to a very large proportion of its readers. This service, it would appear, could be rendered in the interests of a reverent biblical scholarship without in any wise committing *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* to an advocacy of the critical views—a position I would unhesitatingly deplore.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. NORDELL.

NEW LONDON, CONN., March 17, 1888.

MACAULAY'S USE OF SCRIPTURE IN HIS ESSAYS.¹

BY REV. R. DEWITT MALLARY,

Lenox, Mass.

II. ALLUSIONS TO THE PERSONS OF SCRIPTURE.

[*On Walpole.*] "The literature of France has been to ours what Aaron was to Moses, the expositor of great truths which would else have perished for want of a voice to utter them with distinctness."²

[*On Bacon.*] "Cowley has in one of his finest poems compared Bacon to Moses standing on Mount Pisgah. It is to Bacon, we think, as he appears in the first book of the *Novum Organum*, that the comparison applies with peculiar felicity. There we see the great Lawgiver looking round from his lonely elevation on an infinite expanse; behind him a wilderness of dreary sands and bitter waters, in which successive generations have sojourned, always moving yet never advancing, reaping no harvest, and building no abiding city; before him a goodly land, a land of promise, a land flowing with milk and honey. While the multitude below saw only the flat, sterile desert in which they had so long wandered, bounded on every side by a near horizon, or diversified only by some deceitful mirage, he was gazing from a higher stand upon a far lovelier country, following, with his eye, the long course of fertilizing rivers, through ample pastures, and under the bridges of great capitals, measuring the distances of marts and havens, and portioning out all those wealthy regions from Dan to Beersheba."³

[*On Bacon.*] "Had his (Bacon's) civil ends continued to be moderate, he would have been not only the Moses, but the Joshua of philosophy. He would have fulfilled a large part of his own magnificent predictions. He would have led his followers not only to the verge, but into the heart of the promised land. He would not merely have pointed out, he would have divided the spoil."⁴

[*On Byron.*] "Cowper and Alfieri rendered a great service to literature." "Sick of the languid manner of their contemporaries," the "example they set of mutiny against an absurd system was invaluable. The part which they performed was rather that of Moses than that of Joshua. They opened the house of bondage; they did not enter the promised land."⁵

[*Mirabeau.*] "Boswell, a literary Gibeonite."⁶

[*Mackintosh.*] "It had never occurred to him (King James) as possible that a reverend divine might begin to discover much matter for useful meditation in the texts touching Ehud's knife and Jael's hammer."⁷

[*On Walpole.*] "The victims of popular rage are selected like the victim of Jephthah. The first person who comes in the way is made the sacrifice."⁸

[*Conversation between Milton and Cowley.*] Milton speaks, giving his opinion of the condition to which the nation was reduced in the times succeeding the

¹ Continued from the March number.

⁴ Joshua.

⁵ Deut. 34:1.

⁶ Josh. 9:23.

² Ex. 4:16.

⁷ Judg. 3:21; 4:21.

³ Deut. 34:1

⁸ Judg. 12:34-42.

Restoration: "England is sleeping on the lap of Delilah, traitorously chained, but not yet shorn of strength. Let that cry be once heard—the Philistines be upon thee; and at once that sleep will be broken; and those chains will be as flax in the fire."¹

[*Temple.*] For the comparison between Ahithophel and Shaftesbury, which appears in this essay and in the one on "History," Macaulay acknowledges his indebtedness to Dryden, but its use by the Essayist gives it additional force and lustre. It makes Shaftesbury's character vivid to the dullest mind. "The counsel of Ahithophel (Shaftesbury), that counsel which was as if a man had inquired of the oracle of God, was turned into foolishness."²

[*On Hallam.*] "He (Cromwell) went down to his grave in the fulness of power and fame; and he left to his son an authority which any man of ordinary firmness and prudence would have retained. But for the weakness of that foolish Ishbosheth," etc., etc.³

[*Warren Hastings.*] "Doest thou well to be angry?" was the question asked in old time of the Hebrew prophet. And he answered, "I do well." This was evidently the temper of Junius, and to this cause we attribute much of the savage cruelty which disgraces several of his letters."⁴

[*Southey's colloquies.*] "I do well to be angry" seems to be the predominant feeling in his (Southey's) mind."⁴

III. QUOTATIONS FROM SCRIPTURE IN THE FORM OF VERSES, OR PARTS OF VERSES.

From a collection (incomplete) of forty-two such quotations, the following, taken at random, are given:

[*Dante.*] "Surely there is no sword like that which is beaten out of a ploughshare."⁵

[*Milton.*] "He that runs may read them" (the traits of Puritan character.)⁶

[*Hunt.*] The literature of the Restoration "earthly, sensual, devilish."⁷

[*Southey's colloquies.*] "The bravest and wisest of the Cæsars found their arms and their policy unavailing, when opposed to the weapons that were not carnal, and the kingdom which was not of this world."⁸

[*Hallam.*] "Posterity is not extreme to mark abortive crimes." The quotation here is from the version of which use is made in the Book of Common Prayer.

[*Mackintosh.*] "Political science is in a state of progression.... Faint glimpses of truth begin to appear and shine more and more unto the perfect day."⁹

[*Burleigh.*] Leicester "was the man whom she (Elizabeth) delighted to honor."¹⁰

[*Temple.*] The advocates of Shaftesbury satirized in the following language: "To whitewash an Ethiopian¹¹ by giving him a new coat of blacking, is an enterprise more extraordinary still."

[*Pitt.*] "Pitt (in the estimation of his blind admirers) was not merely a great poet in esse and a great general in posse, but a finished example of moral excellence, the just man made perfect."¹²

¹ Judg. 16:9,12. ² 2 Sam. chs. 15-17. ³ 2 Sam. chs. 2-4. ⁴ Jonah 4:9. ⁵ Joel 3:10. ⁶ Hab. 2:2. ⁷ James 3:15. ⁸ 2 Cor. 10:4; John 18:36. ⁹ Prov. 4:18. ¹⁰ Esther 6:6. ¹¹ Jer 13:23. ¹² Heb. 12:23.

[*Cowley and Milton.*] "There is a law of self-preservation written by God himself on our hearts."¹

[*On civil disabilities of Jews.*] Macaulay here satirizes the position of those who feel bound to insult the Jews because prophecy has uttered some "terrible denunciations" against the race: "How can we excuse ourselves for leaving property to people who are to 'serve their enemies in hunger, and in thirst, and in want, and in nakedness, and in want of all things;' for giving protection to the persons of those who are 'to fear day and night, and to have none assurance of their life;' for not seizing on the children of a race whose sons and daughters are to be given unto another people'?"²

[*Cowley and Milton.*] Here is a comparison between the Protectorate of Cromwell and the parable of Jotham. Cowley speaks: "Then were we like the trees of the forest in Holy Writ, given over to the rule of the bramble; then from the bases of the shrubs came forth the fire which devoured the cedars of Lebanon."³

[*Barere.*] "Whatsoever things are false, whatsoever things are dishonest, whatsoever things are unjust, whatsoever things are impure, whatsoever things are hateful, whatsoever things are of evil report, if there be any vice, and if there be any infamy, all these things were blended in Barere."⁴

After these copious, though by no means exhaustive, references to the scriptural style of Macaulay, it will not be possible, within the limits of this article, to compress all that these extracts suggest might be said. It surely must be somewhat staggering to our preconceptions, on rising from such a study of Macaulay's writings, to read those words of Prof. Phelps: "Some religious weakness of the Clapham preachers probably gave to Macaulay's mind an anti-christian (?) lurch from which he never recovered." Our presuppositions would infer a life influenced to a large degree by the precepts of that Book which he had "at his fingers' ends." May it not be that Prof. Phelps' words convey a meaning which they were never intended to convey? They are conjectural, and a hypothesis is not always trustworthy. Moreover, that Macaulay's "mind was anti-christian" we dare to say is not proven. The tone of the "Essays" utters a vehement rebuttal against such an assertion. His mind might have rebounded from a narrow form of "evangelical" piety; from that form of religion which consisted in "having a plain dress, lank hair, no starch in his linen, no gay furniture in his house; in talking through the nose, and showing the whites of the eyes; and in naming one's children Assurance, Tribulation and Maher-shalal-hash-baz."⁵ But his spotless life, his twice-shown willingness to resign office rather than support measures which his conscience condemned, his testimony everywhere to the high character of the Christian religion, his exalted estimate of the Scriptures, and his womanly tenderness of character—all disprove the charge that he was "anti-christian." Our space prevents the insertion of passages from the Essays which show a fine and exalted spirit, sensitive to the indications of divine guidance. And we attribute much of this to his diligent search and use of the Scriptures. The polished darts which he made the Bible to yield for the quiver of the rhetorician, became "arrows in the hand of a mighty man" with which to repel and keep at bay spiritual foes. An article might be written, based upon our study of Macaulay, upon the *Advantages of a Biblical Style*, as affording a perspicuity, a force,

¹ Jer. 31:33. ² Deut. 28:48,66 and 32. ³ Judg. 9:14. ⁴ Phil. 4:8. ⁵ Isa. 8:1, (from "Leigh Hunt.")

a grace of diction to be obtained in hardly any other way. In the "Fors Clavigera" Ruskin bestows this high praise upon the Scriptures as the rhetorician's vade mecum: "To that discipline (at home in the Bible), patient, accurate, and resolute, I owe, not only a knowledge of the Book... but much of my general power of taking pains, and the best part of my taste in literature... and, once knowing the Bible, it was not possible for me, in the foolish times of youth to write entirely superficial and formal English." The acquisition of the art of chaste and clear expression not unnaturally follows the study of the Book of which Macaulay said: "It is a stupendous work, which, if everything else in our language should perish, would alone suffice to show the whole extent of its beauty and power." The advantages of a biblical style are not alone in its outward effects, but in its inward ones upon the mind of the author.

We would leave our subject, then, not with pleasure that we have turned attention to Macaulay's scriptural style as a literary curiosity, but with the hope that what has been said may be weighed especially by those who expect at some future time to wield the mother-tongue dexterously, the students of our colleges and seminaries. We would especially commend a saturation in the English Bible to all young men who have in contemplation the work of the ministry, not only because the Scripture is the sword of the Spirit, but because of its collateral and incidental use for the rhetorician. We would urge, with the classic English of Macaulay before us, the provision of courses of study in the English Bible, particularly in our theological seminaries, graduates from which institutions too often (in all respect be it said) know less of the Bible, than they do about it. And we would especially call attention to the emphasis which the selection from Macaulay's Essays accompanying this article, put upon the study of the *Old Testament*. Shall not the idol of non-religious culture fall before the introduction and in some instances the restoration of the Bible to the prescribed courses of college study, in order that the highest ideal of culture, both moral and intellectual, may attract the minds of our youth?

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE DISCOURSE IN HOSEA 1, 2?

BY PROFESSOR FRANCIS B. DENIO, M. A.,

Bangor Theol. Seminary, Bangor, Me.

This question does not admit of a decisive answer. Serious difficulties confront one whenever he comes to the point of deciding the question in either of the ways in which it is possible to answer it. Whatever answer one finally makes he is bound to recognize the difficulties and to allow their full weight. If he does this, he cannot be very dogmatic in expressing his opinion. None the less is it desirable to consider the problem and give as decided an answer as the case admits. There are three possible opinions which, with the chief reasons for holding them are given below.

A. These chapters are historical and give the account of the marriage relative of Hosea into which God commanded him to enter for the purpose of teaching Israel a lesson.

Reasons for holding this opinion :

1) These chapters make the impression on the reader that they contain a narrative of actual occurrences. At first view the language gives the following impression: The prophet Hosea, acting under divine direction, takes as his wife a woman of immoral character who already has children as the result of her immoral life. She becomes the mother of children to him, and apparently then deserts him. Later he finds her in the position of a slave and buys her back; but does not at once restore her to a wifely position. Instead he places her under discipline. This wife and Hosea's children by her are used as symbols of Israel in the relations with God and in the discipline to which Israel is subject.

2) "And the Lord said" (Hos. 1:2; 3:1) seems to indicate the actual occurrence of the following narrative.

3) The type of the relation between God and Israel was, so far as we know, never wrought out before this, and there was need of some positive experience as the basis of this type. It is to be noted that the relation between Hosea and Gomer was a legitimate relation. She was his wife.

4) This view is supported by the analogy of other symbolic actions performed by prophets under divine direction. Isa. 20:2, Isaiah went barefoot and without his outer garment, in order to symbolize the condition of a captive. Ezek. 12:1-7, Ezekiel dug through the side of his house and made preparations as if for a journey in order to signify the approaching captivity of the nation. Ch. 24:15-24, he lost his wife and did not bewail her for a reason somewhat similar to that of the last action.

5) Lyric poetry is too realistic to use a fictitious narrative.

Difficulties in the way of accepting this opinion :

1) For many minds it is difficult beyond measure to think that the Holy One of Israel would command one of his prophets to marry a person of so degraded a character. So far as God is concerned it seems morally impossible. To many minds there is no greater moral difficulty in the Old Testament. Hos. 1:2, "Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredom and children of whoredom" cannot naturally be taken to mean anything but marrying a dissolute woman and adopting her illegitimate children. This difficulty is met in various ways:

(a) It is assumed that the woman was to be won, if possible, by Hosea to a reputable life, and her children were to receive proper training. This would have been a striking object lesson for the purpose of showing the patient and forbearing love of God as shown in his treatment of Israel. Yet this purpose is not once hinted, and the only reclamation mentioned is that of the woman from the captivity to which her sin had taken her. Making all allowance for the age and morals of the time, it is not easy to believe that a prophet of Jehovah could have married a woman of this character and not have lost the power which would have belonged to him as a prophet of Jehovah. So far as any purpose is to be inferred from the narrative it is to get a wife whose conduct should illustrate the conduct of Israel toward God, and to have children to whom names might be given symbolic of the relation into which the sins of the nation should bring the individuals of the nation.

(b) It is said that the woman is described by the character which she afterward developed, and that the children are those which she had after her marriage and are described by the character of their mother. The narrative was written after the history of Hosea's marriage relation was ended. In other words, there

is a prolepsis in the narrative and not a literal statement of the command of the Lord. This prolepsis is so violent that one might well hesitate to accept it unless he were obliged to do so. If the moral aspect of the question is saved in this way the literalness of the command in Hos. 1:2 is sacrificed to such a degree that the historicity of the account is the more difficult to maintain. So far as the passage gives any testimony God designed just this outcome and selected just such a person as Gomer for the marriage, and Hosea married her knowing her character and because of her character.

2) Among all the symbolic acts of the prophets there is no parallel to this, in presenting moral difficulties. Jer. 13 gives the account of the command to take a girdle to the Euphrates and the ruin of the girdle. Possibly it is actual. On the other hand the passage Jer. 25:15-29 gives an illustration of a symbolic action that cannot be regarded as actual. Here Jeremiah was commanded to give the cup of wrath to several nations to drink, and he said that he gave it to the following peoples or kings or to both kings and peoples: Judah, Egypt, Philistines, Edom, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, Sidon, Arabia, Elam, Media, and to others. It is impossible to think that anything but an ideal act is here meant, especially as the drink given is an ideal one. Again Ezekiel is said (Ezek. 3:1-3) to have eaten a roll upon which there was writing; this is as likely to have been ideal as actual. It is also quite as likely to be the case of Ezekiel's besieging a tile (4:1-3), of lying on his side (4:4-9), and of his being shaved with a sword (5:1-4). The command to eat scant and unclean food (Ezek. 4:10-17) must be regarded as occurring in vision just as a somewhat similar command to Peter in Acts 10. Again in Zech. 11:4-11 the prophet there is commanded to assume the office of a shepherd. He does this selecting two staves, Beauty and Bands. The mingling of the prophet with God in the actions that are mentioned in this passage favors the opinion that the acts of the prophet here mentioned were only a part of the vision. It may be that most of these passages just given narrate acts that were actually performed, some of them certainly were not, and probably all of them were merely constituent parts of visions.

3) It is replied that this relation between God and Israel was not wholly suggested in the earlier literature. Idolatry is called going "a-whoring after" other "gods" in Ex. 34:15,16; Lev. 17:7; 20:5,6. Also in Num. 14:33 idolatry or rebellion is called whoredom. Deut. 32:16-21 idolatry is said to provoke God to jealousy. These citations and Psa. 45, together with the Canticles, cannot be regarded as breaking the force of the argument given above as 3).

4) The argument for the literalness of these chapters from the improbability of a fictitious element occurring in lyric poetry loses its force when Isa. 5:1-6 is considered.

5) The historicity of these chapters seems bound up with the unity of the woman and the succession of the experiences with her. A careful examination of these chapters raises a doubt whether the same woman is meant. Ch. 3 seems in reality to repeat the meaning of the two previous chapters rather than to progress from them. The *termini a quo et ad quem* are the same in each case. Both start with an acquired right over a woman, the goal of both is reconciliation with God. In chs. 1 and 2 the process is that of being left to unrestrained sin and its results. In ch. 3 the process is that of being deprived of opportunity to sin and of intercourse with God until such intercourse should become an object of longing. All this is in accord with the common mode of prophetic discourse in

which reiteration, repetition in a different form is a common method of arriving again and again at the same goal.

6) The length of time over which this symbolic action extended and what this must imply introduces another difficulty in regarding the passage as historical.

B. This is a purely fictitious narrative, intended like the parable of the Prodigal Son to teach a specific lesson. If it is fictitious, it is either allegory, symbolic parable or typical parable. *Allegory* is a symbolic narrative in terms impossible to be literally true. An illustration is to be found in Psa. 60:8-16 in the narrative of the vine from Egypt, also in Ezek. 16. *Symbolic parable* is an account of what commonly takes place in nature, i. e., in the physical world, and which is used to illustrate by analogy a spiritual truth. The parable of the Sower is an illustration. *Typical parable* is a narrative of what may take place in human life, and in the lower or worldly sphere it exemplifies a higher or spiritual truth. It is intermediate between the symbolic parable, which it closely resembles, and the allegory to which it sometimes approximates. These chapters contain an account of a possible occurrence in human life, therefore if fictitious they are two typical parables.

Reasons for holding that these chapters are parabolic :

1) The difficulties in the way of regarding them as historical. This is the strongest reason.

2) This reconciles the apparent incongruities by making two parables instead of a tautological narrative.

3) The blending of the type and the thing typified in ch. 2 resembles the typical parable or allegory rather than history.

Objections :

1) There is no intimation that a parable is intended. This is true.

2) It is urged that all the names ought to have a significance if it is a parable. It is replied that the names all have a possible significance.

3) There is no record in antecedent literature from which such a parable could be suggested or understood. There is certainly weight in this objection.

C. These chapters record an internal experience, a vision like that of Peter on the housetop at Joppa.

Reasons for holding this opinion :

1) "When the Lord spake at the first by [with] Hosea, the Lord said unto Hosea, Go," etc. This may have been that part of the experience at the outset of the prophetic career which was deemed best to put on record. It may have been a vision inaugurating Hosea into the prophetic office, and thus in some important respects it would be like Isa. 6; for both inaugural visions give the substance of all that each prophet uttered.

2) This was just the method by which a new idea was given to Peter. In fact, it was probably the only way in which elements of truth so repugnant could have been easily impressed upon him. This must be regarded as being as effectual as the actual experience for the purposes of teaching the generation of Hosea.

3) The strongest argument for the parable lay in the difficulties in accepting the historicity of the passage. All the arguments for the parable are as strong for the vision, while this third explanation has less to be urged against it than the second.

4) This explanation obviates all the difficulties arising from the double nature of the passage, from the lapse of time and from the blending of the type and that which is typified.

5) The objection arising from the impropriety of the relation is obviated. The vision in Acts 10 summoned Peter to do what he was not expected to do. Although here the relation was in itself a legitimate one, it does not seem that while God has honored marriage so highly as he has he would be likely to have one of his servants use so holy a relation in a manner that must inevitably have lowered its sanctity in the minds of the contemporaries of Hosea. Such a course seems unnecessary when a vision would have answered all purposes.

The sole objection to the view that these chapters give a vision arise from the fact that there is no mention of a vision. Perhaps there was no need for the persons for whom the book was originally written.

After all, the two main arguments are on the one side the apparent historicity, and on the other the moral difficulty. On account of the inaccessibility of facts each student will decide according to his susceptibility to one or the other of these arguments. If he sees too great difficulties in the way of holding the non-historicity of the passage, yet is open to the moral difficulties, he is apt to make some concession which so weakens the literal view that he might as well give it up entirely. To the writer it seems best, on the whole, to adopt the third explanation.

PARAPHRASE OF GENESIS 3:1-6.

BY REV. W. W. EVERTS, JR.,

Haverhill, Mass.

"Now the serpent" (that belonged to the last order of animals created, Gen. 1:25) "was more subtil than any beast of the field" (not subtle but subtil, and as such has been generally worshiped by the heathen as the god of wisdom) "which the Lord God had made" (and being made by Him was good and perfect in its way). "And he said" (As the serpent cannot speak of itself, and as there is but one other instance in Bible history of a brute speaking, and as the Bible does not deal in old wives' fables, but sharply draws the line between man and the lower orders of creation, and as this narrative cannot be an allegory which always explains itself, nor a parable which is accompanied by a key; and as, further, this incident is a prelude to the real history of the human race, and as some means must have been used in nature outside of themselves to tempt the innocent pair, and as the serpent could by no means of itself conduct a conversation so profound, and as finally one apostle affirms, 2 Cor. 11:3, that the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, and another, Rev. 12:9, calls the old serpent the devil and Satan, who, that believes in miracles, can doubt that this account is real as well as true, and that an actual serpent was the instrument and the personal devil, though unnamed, the credible and indispensable agent of the temptation. The presence of a conquering Satan is the basis of Old Testament and universal history. The presence of a conquered Satan is the basis of the New Testament and the history of

redemption). "And he said unto the woman" (Woman was chosen as the victim, as she is the weaker vessel, more impressible and inquisitive, more easily persuaded than man. And yet she was not alone. Her husband was with her, and both had been warned to be on their guard against the enemy and "keep" the garden, 1:15. She manifested neither surprise nor fear, but deported herself as if perfectly secure and master of the situation). "Yea, hath God said?" (Here is an affirmation quickly transposed into a question, the yea and nay of the deceiver. "I only want to know, I simply ask a question." But he questions God's truthfulness). "Ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden" (The worst of arts is "Scripture warped from its intent." The one tree of the prohibition, the tempter multiplies into all the trees. The slight restraint on absolute liberty is magnified into unendurable tyranny. He suggests that this yoke of God be thrown off by "an infraction of the established rule of reference to a supreme and single will." He implies that God is an austere man, taking up what he laid not down and reaping what he did not sow).

"Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it" (Thus far Eve repeats fairly well the divine prohibition, though she omits the generous words "every" and "freely." Her mind was clear when it was given and her memory was good. Her mistake was in conversing with the serpent or listening to him at all. The man was given as a help meet for her; the serpent was her subject, not her adviser. It was worse than vain to correct the misrepresentations of the tempter. He was not worth an argument, but beneath her notice. Moreover, she corrects him with little show of indignation, and when she adds to the divine prohibition "neither shall ye touch it" she manifests a restiveness as though she was under restraint, and would dearly love at least to touch the forbidden fruit. Thus she forgets all her benefits and thinks only of her single restraint).

"Lest ye die" (This is a marked abridgment of the divine penalty, which prescribed the day with great positiveness, "for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"). "And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die" (The tempter restores the "surely" the woman omitted, but in a solemnly impressive manner, by the use of a threefold negative, with damnable iteration, he annuls the decree of death. He has nothing to lose and everything to gain by his bold falsehood. The devil is a liar and the father thereof).

"For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as God knowing good and evil" (Having reduced the penalty of death to an impotent threat, he ascribes the threat to envy. Satan was envious and, like the Greeks, he attributed the same feeling to the higher powers. Now he draws a picture that arouses the ambition of Eve. She who was made a little lower than the angels might become equal with God. Satan thought it justifiable robbery to be equal with God. Thus he arouses desire for fame, "that last infirmity of noble minds," by casting doubt first on God's truthfulness, then on his disinterestedness. There was a grain of truth in the promise that their eyes should be opened, but according to God's wish not to sin and shame. There was also some truth in the promise that they should be as God, 1:22, but the divine purpose was that, not by transgression, but by obedience man should become a partaker of the divine nature). "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food,"

2:9 (The first temptation is directed to the appetite of the body, as afterwards to Jesus' "hunger," to "the lusts of the flesh").

"And that it was a delight to the eyes" (The second temptation is addressed to the lust of the eyes, to the desire for fame. This may well have been the motive of the temptation to the Lord Jesus on the pinnacle of the temple).

"And that the tree was to be desired to make one wise" (The knowledge gained was to make her as God. It is the temptation to ambition, the vain-glory of life, "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," which Satan showed to the Saviour).

"She took of the fruit thereof and did eat" (She preferred the tree of knowledge to the tree of life and holiness, culture to character, knowing to being. Ear, eye, mind and heart captured, the hand unchecked stretches out and takes the fruit. Appetite, taste and ambition combined to produce the first sin. God left sin possible, not necessary; man made it actual. It was not spontaneous, yet it was deliberate and willful. It was not a sin of ignorance or weakness, but open disobedience, transgression and trespass, Rom. 5:14,15,19). "And she gave also unto her husband with her and he did eat" (Deceived, she at once becomes a deceiver, and so sin propagates itself, one victim procuring another. Thus Satan crept into the house and took captive a silly woman, laden with sins, led away by divers lusts. "God tempteth no man; but each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed").

PROFESSORS GARDINER AND BISSELL ON THE PENTATEUCH QUESTION.*

FROM PROFESSOR GARDINER'S ESSAY.

"There remains one other point which is approached with hesitation. To him who looks to our Lord as absolute truth and the Source of divine knowledge, it is not easy to speak of Him only in His human capacity, and to think of the bearing of His words simply as emanating from a sinless man. Yet this task must now be essayed; for, of course, if His heavenly authority be admitted, our whole discussion has been settled in advance. Looking at Him then, only in His human character, what light does His life and teaching throw upon the origin of the religion in which He was born and trained? There is no room for question that He regarded it as divine, for He constantly asserts this, and while He recognizes no other authority upon earth, He always maintains the divine authority of this. Two suppositions have been made to explain His position while denying that it was right. One, that He was so much under the influence of the prejudices and habits of thought in which He had been trained, that He did not Himself see the falsity of their ground; the other, that while He really saw this, He yet did not think it wise to put Himself in conflict with the prevailing opinions and prejudices of his countrymen.

* FROM ESSAYS ON PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM. No. 2 (By Frederic Gardiner, D. D.): "Was the Religion of Israel a Revelation or a merely Human Development?" No. 3 (By E. C. Bissell, D. D.): "Pentateuchal Analysis." New York: *Funk & Wagnalls*.

“In regard to the former, the general sagacity of our Lord must be admitted. He had a deep spiritual insight, and thoroughly understood the needs of the human heart; He was able so far to cast Himself loose from the past as to found that new religion of the future which is still only in the midst of its progress; He was a man of deep reflection, to whose nature all shams and conventional deceptions were utterly abhorrent—a man who sought and taught only pure and absolute truth; He was brought into contact with all the forms in which the religion of His day appeared, and He never failed to pierce and expose, as with an Ithuriel’s spear, whatever in it was hollow and untrue. Of all who ever lived, He was the ‘man in advance of His time,’ who, unshackled by the past, belonged to the future; nay, He was the very embodiment of the future. The supposition that such an one was mistaken as to the essential character of the religion which He gave His life to complete and supercede, is simply incredible. We may set aside the theory of ignorance and prejudice in ‘Jesus of Nazareth’ in this fundamental matter of His whole life, as a supposition which can have no standing in the court of reason.

“But while He knew better, may He not have judged it wise so to adapt Himself to the prejudices of His countrymen as to avoid stirring up needless opposition to His main work? Certainly his utterances do not have the air of accommodation, but of positive and emphatic teaching. But not to insist on this, what really were the opinions with which He came in contact? Neither the authorities nor the people seem to have been at all occupied with any question as to the original source of the law; that was considered a settled point, the discussion of which was not moved at all. The whole question in which they were interested was of the authority and binding force of those glosses and interpretations by which they had ‘made the law of God of none effect.’ In defense of these all their narrowness and party rancor was aroused, and to these our Lord showed no consideration or mercy. He thrust them aside, and taught that they were derogatory to His Father, and in contradiction to the law itself. In the matter of the law, then, our Lord did not conform to the prejudices of His countrymen, but from first to last set Himself and His teaching in absolute contradiction to them. It was this that roused their hatred and led, as He clearly foresaw, to His condemnation as a malefactor and to His death upon the cross.

“His view, therefore, of the Mosaic law can be accounted for in neither of these ways. The record of that view is in His almost every utterance. It appears in His devout submission to its requirements as of divine authority; in His reference to its teachings as heavenly truth; in His citation of its statutes as embodying the duty of man, and of its representations of the God of Israel as absolute truth. Even when He enlarges or modifies its precepts, He still shows that His teaching was the original intention of the law, temporarily changed for ‘the hardness of men’s hearts.’ He stood firmly and fully upon the Old Testament in all His promulgation of the New. He ever recognized its authority as absolute and of God, while He admitted no other authority. To Him the ‘law, the prophets, and the Psalms’ were sacred books, divinely given. He certainly was sufficiently well informed, and had a sufficiently deep insight and sagacity. Is it likely that there was a radical error on this fundamental point in Him who spake ‘as never man spake’?”

FROM PROFESSOR BISSELL’S ESSAY.

“At the outset of our inquiries concerning the Pentateuch laws, then, we are

confronted with the fundamental question whether the representation they make that they come 'from Moses and the desert' is probably genuine or belongs simply to their 'literary form of presentment,' as it is alleged. It is certain that there is nothing in the substance of these laws to encourage a theory of deception. The moral plane on which they move is confessedly the highest. Not only is supreme loyalty to Jehovah demanded, but thoroughly upright dealing between man and man. Let there be noted, for example, under what strict rules judges and officers are put in the discharge of their functions (Deut. 16:18-20; 17:8-13); the requirement respecting those testifying in criminal suits (Deut. 17:6; 19:15); the severe punishment visited upon false witnesses (Deut. 19:15-21), and the strenuous insistence on the use of correct weights and measures in business transactions (Deut. 25:13-16). It is too much to suppose, as the theory of Kuenen does, that persons introducing laws of this character would themselves flagrantly sin against them.

"It might be said, however, and is said, that in attaching the name of Moses to the Pentateuch laws there was no fraudulent intention whatever. It was merely a device, openly adopted, just as the Qoheleth of the Book of Ecclesiastes, under a thin and easily penetrable disguise, was represented to be Solomon, in order to heighten the effect of the work. It is by no means easy to accept such an explanation of the matter. It is an hypothesis which surely verges on the incredible to suppose that this could have been so, and no vestige of the fact have been discovered until our day. Besides, what purpose could possibly have been served in David's time or Ezra's time by ascribing a law then, as it is supposed, first required by actual circumstances, and first promulgated, to Moses, who lived centuries before in circumstances entirely diverse? The theme of the Book of Ecclesiastes and its treatment accord, in the main, with the *nom de plume* of the writer. Solomon was a real king, and there is an accepted history of his times and of his personal habits and tastes.

"With Moses it is very different. He lived, as our critics allege, in a rough and cruel age. The narrative we have of him is largely mythical. Few, if any, laws really came from his hand. Nobody can have known this better than his compatriots of the later day. How then could it have enhanced in any sense or degree the authority or worth of a law of theirs to put his name supposititiously upon it? What, for example, should fit him, on the basis of such an estimate of him, to be an ideal legislator for the temple on Mount Moriah, with its complex and splendid ritual? The only thing which would render it either consistent or in the least probable that later legislators would thus refer laws of their own, whether surreptitiously or openly, to the hero of the exodus, would be a prevalent understanding and admission that Moses himself was a divinely guided legislator and that, in its general features, the biblical account of him and his times is true. But this is the exact thing that is called in question, although in so doing our critics fatally undermine their own most fundamental position.

"We have considered the matter from the point of view of common experience and common sense. It appears just as improbable when considered from that of literary criticism. The composition and arrangement of the Pentateuch laws is such that the unlikelihood of their origin in the way our critics fancy closely verges on the impossible. The three codes, it is believed, reflect not only three distinct and widely separated periods, but almost every intervening period. They are a growth in thought, it is said, which began first to take on tangible written

form about the time of the earlier kings of Israel and reached its present completeness at the time of the exile, or, as Kuenen maintains, considerably later than that. During all this time priests and prophets, especially the former, were making new laws supposed to be suitable to the exigences of their own periods, and, in order to give them currency, ascribed them to Moses, or to Moses and Aaron, or to Moses and Eleazer, after the assumed death of Aaron. As a part of the illusion, Moses is made to say that all the commandments, institutions and judgments which he had to teach to Israel he received from Jehovah, on Mount Horeb, and on the 'face of the whole legislation, we read that the theatre is the desert; Israel is encamped there; the settlement of Canaan is in the future.'

"Can we fairly conceive of such a process of law-making as possible? It is kept up for a millennium, the sons doing as the fathers did in this respect for thirty generations. Every new statute coming into being is carefully and most ingeniously given the Mosaic stamp and the coloring of the desert. Or, if this was not done at the time the laws were made, it was done subsequently through the skillful retouching of later editorial hands. It might be asked, Why should it have been done at all, if not at first? If the help of Moses' name was needed, it was needed most when the laws were first promulgated. To attach it to them after they had once come to be known as the work of contemporaneous legislators would have been, one might suppose, an occasion of weakening, more than strengthening, their authority.

"But in the one way or the other this most anomalous method of legislating for a great people, it is affirmed, went on for hundreds of years. Nobody pretends to assert that there has ever appeared any evidence that the people of Israel themselves recognized, as such, the illusion with which they beguiled themselves. Every supposed legislator—there must have been scores of them—keeps himself as carefully out of sight as though he had never existed. The result of the whole is the Pentateuch, a literary composition equally a marvel of moral elevation and intellectual strength—a work that presents a body of laws making just claim to be essentially a unit in conception and teaching, and one that, placed at the beginning of the Bible, has left its indelible mark on every part of it. It is admitted that there are some serious difficulties involved in the common view of the origin and literary structure of the Pentateuch; there are surely none that call for such a stretch of credulity as this.

"But it is pronounced highly improbable that such a body of legislation *could* have originated in the limited period allowed, that is, during the first year after the exodus and the closing months of the fortieth year in the wilderness. Admitting the claim, however, that these laws were, to a large extent, supernaturally given, there need be no improbability attaching to the matter. Even without this postulate, their origin in this limited time, all things considered, is much more credible than the alternative hypothesis. The Bible nowhere states that every specific law arose *de novo* at the period of the exodus. It is exceedingly probable that not a few of those found in the so-called Book of the Covenant represent, either in a written or unwritten form, previous customs of the people under their elders and judges. Israel went down into Egypt as a family under its patriarchal head. It dwelt in Goshen as a distinct, and for a long time, as it would appear, as a *quasi* independent people. It cannot have been without laws of some sort during this time. Whatever laws they may have had they doubtless took back with them to Canaan. In principle, many of them we believe are found

in chs. 21-23 of Exodus. The terse, laconic form in which they appear is entirely in harmony with this supposition; and there is documentary confirmation of it. Before the giving of the law on Sinai Moses is represented as saying to Jethro, his father-in-law: 'The people come unto me to inquire of God . . . and judge between a man and his neighbor, and I make them know the statutes of God, and his laws.'

"Apart from the Book of the Covenant there is the legislation respecting the tabernacle and its worship contained in Exodus—Numbers and the code of Deuteronomy. A remarkable misapprehension seems to exist as to the amount of matter contained in these codes. Possibly the mistake arose from a sense of their unexampled influence upon the institutions of the civilized world. In this respect the Decalogue, which might be written on a five-cent piece, is a tremendous code. But, deep and wide as has been their effect, the actual words of the Pentateuch laws are comparatively few. The first code covers about five pages, or a space of twenty by seven inches, in the Hebrew Bible. The laws of Deuteronomy, we are told, were inscribed on plastered stones after reaching Canaan. Had the character in which they were written been enlarged to five times their size as they now appear in the Hebrew, they could all have been written on a space eight feet by three and would then have required less room by one-half than was allotted to the famous Behistun inscription of the Persian Darius. Compare the amount of new or revised legislation called for in one of the United States in a single year with that of the whole Israelitish nation in a peculiar period of its history and during the space of forty years. Compare further with the same the changes that are often thought necessary in laws, made one year, by a legislature meeting the next or the second year after, under circumstances, to all appearance, quite similar, and one will be surprised not only at the condensed form but the wonderful unity and consistency of the laws of the Pentateuch."

A BIBLICAL CHECK TO BIBLE CHRONOLOGY.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES RUFUS BROWN, PH. D.,

Newton Centre, Mass.

Strictly speaking, there is no biblical chronology; for the biblical writers do not give us a *system* of chronology, but merely detached chronological statements. For convenience, the inferences from what they say, made by different writers and combined in systems of their own, may be called biblical, inasmuch as they purport to be based on biblical passages. It must be remembered, however, that these inferences have no absolute authority for us, and it is an open secret that no scheme has yet been devised which has not contradicted some statements made by the Bible. If learned men have failed to discover a system reconcilable with the Bible and have differed in the inferences they have drawn from it, it becomes a very grave question in our own interpretations of the Bible what to do with a statement involving chronology. One canon is certainly sound. If by an inference from some biblical passage we reach a conclusion which seems on other accounts improbable, positive evidence in the Bible itself against this conclusion will justify us in saying that the inference was wrong. Take a case in point—the

familiar statement in 2 Kings 18:13. It would seem from 18:1,10, if we suppose the fall of Samaria occurred in B. C. 722, as if Hezekiah came to the throne in or about the year 727. In that case (according to 18:13) the invasion of Sennacherib would fall in or about the year 714 B. C. It appears, however, from the external history of the time that this last event occurred considerably later than this.* Is there any biblical evidence that Hezekiah's reign did not begin in 727, as supposed? There is. Let the reader examine for himself 2 Chron. chs. 29-31, without chronological presupposition and without the aid of commentaries, and say whether all the events there narrated did not occur in the first year of Hezekiah's reign and *after the captivity of the ten tribes*.† If so, the first year of Hezekiah must have been later than 722, and may have been 714, as seems to be demanded by the Assyrian records. The writer has spoken of this, to show once again how, by a careful examination of the Bible, supposed contradictions with settled facts may be eliminated.

* See the careful and convincing argument of Schrader, in *Die Keilinschriften u. d. Alte Test.* pp. 313-317, who places it in 701 B. C.

† After preparing the above, the present writer noticed with pleasure the recognition of these facts by J. Schwartz, in the *Bib. Sac.* for Jan., 1888, p. 69, whose article is referred to and perhaps too summarily condemned in the March STUDENT.

INDUCTIVE BIBLE STUDIES.

[Copyright by W. R. Harper, 1887.

PREPARED BY

PROFESSORS W. R. HARPER (Yale University), W. G. BALLANTINE (Oberlin Theol. Sem.), WILLIS J. BEECHER (Auburn Theol. Sem.), and G. S. BURROUGHS (Amherst College).

THIRTY-FIRST STUDY.—THE PROPHECY OF MICAH.

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Professor Burroughs. It is edited by Professor Harper.]

I. PRELIMINARY NOTES.

1. The Book of Micah resembles in many particulars that of Hosea. It is a summary of an extended prophetic activity in Judah, while the Book of Hosea summarizes a lengthy ministry in Israel. Like Hosea, it is abrupt in its transitions, sharp in its contrasts, abundant in its imagery, often obscure in its details. Like Hosea, it also commingles, in a striking manner, severity and tenderness. For these reasons, its comprehension appears, at the outstart, difficult to the student. But patient labor in its study will meet a sure reward. Its unity, as an organic whole, is much more marked than in the case of Hosea.
2. The prophet Micah was the contemporary of Isaiah. These two, laboring together in Judah, in the Assyrian period, have much in common in their historical situation, in their mission, in their ideas and their expression of them. The study of the prophecy of either casts much light upon that of the other. Particularly does the prophecy of Isaiah, because of its greater fullness, illustrate and light up that of Micah. In all probability the latter leaned not a little upon the former, and was largely influenced by him.
3. The peculiar glory of the Book of Micah is its Messianic prophecy, especially that regarding the person of the Messiah. In the description of the Ruler from Bethlehem the book finds its culmination. The positive, explicit and personal character of its Messianic prediction places the Book of Micah in a central position in the development of prophecy in Judah.

II. THE BIBLICAL LESSON.*

1. *Read, slowly and thoughtfully*, in the Revision, the Book of Micah, and endeavor to grasp its general and leading thoughts. Consider the following questions:
 - (1) Where do you find *marked* breaks or transitions in the thought of the book? Into what larger sections would you divide it, by means of these breaks, for convenience in study?
 - (2) What less important transitions do you discover in these larger divisions? How would you subdivide them into smaller portions?
 - (3) Having indicated those portions of the book which contain *denunciation*, and also those portions which present *consolation*, *hope*, or *promise*, how do

* The following literature may be consulted: Delitzsch, "Messianic Prophecies," § 44; "O. T. Hist. of Redemption," § 57; von Orelli, "O. T. Prophecy," pp. 305-311; Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," pp. 180, 181, 216-219; Gelkic, "Hours with the Bible," vol. 4, pp. 351-368; Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, "Micah," T. K. Cheyne; Pusey, "Minor Prophets;" Kell and Delitzsch, Minor Prophets, "Micah," C. F. Kell; Lange's Com., "Micah," Paul Kleinert and George R. Bliss; Smith's Bible Dict., "Micah."

these divisions stand related, in general, to those previously made? Having compared the two, arrange the former with reference to the latter, considered as major divisions.

2. *Re-read* chs. 1 and 2, and consider the following matters:

- (1) Does judgment or mercy preponderate? Portions devoted to each?
- (2) Omitting the superscription, (a) how many verses are occupied with a threat of punishment? (b) How is the judgment of Jehovah represented? (c) What are the leading figures employed? (d) What is the cause of Jehovah's self-manifestation in judgment? (e) What is the special sentence against Samaria? (f) What is the relation of Samaria's sin and sentence to the general message of the book?
- (3) (a) Which remaining verses of ch. 1 contain the prophet's lamentation, together with its cause? (b) Whom has the prophet in view in this portion of the chapter? (c) What is the form of his lament? (d) What lies before the seer's eye in vs. 10-16? Compare Isa. 10:28-32. (e) What use does the prophet make, in this description of the invading Assyrian army, of the signification of the names of places spoken of? Why would this be more impressive to his Hebrew hearers than to us? (f) In what section of the country were these places located? (g) How is the prophet's sympathy thus particularly aroused? See v. 14. (h) Have we an allusion to this invasion in Isa. 20:1 (cf. Isa. 10:5 seq.)? (i) With what address is the lament closed (v. 16)?
- (4) Analyze ch. 2 as follows: (a) The sin causing Jehovah's judgment, and the punishment corresponding to it. (b) The reply to the words of the false prophets (cf. Amos 2:12; 5:10; Isa. 30:9,10). (c) The sin of the people again spoken of. (d) The character of the false prophecy. (e) The prophet's word of hope. Indicate the verses which belong to these sections, severally. Does any other analysis suggest itself to you as preferable?
- (5) Read carefully vs. 12,13. (a) Meaning of "Jacob"? "the breaker"? Who is "their king"? What is the figure here? (b) The general thought? (c) Does a careful consideration of the passage seem to favor the view that we have here a sample prediction of one of the false prophets or, by a sudden transition, an utterance of promise on the part of Micah?

3. *Re-read* chs. 3-5. Consider the following questions:

- (1) How may ch. 3 be divided into three parts, (a) giving an account of the evil conduct of the nobility and their judgment, (b) announcing the punishment of the false prophets and its character, (c) describing the sins of the leaders of the people and the ruin which will be visited upon Zion as the result?
- (2) (a) What is the figure employed in (a)? (b) What condition of society is described in this chapter? (c) How does the prophet, in connection with the preceding chapters, emphasize the relation between idolatry, together with the decadence of spiritual religion, and social corruption? Cf., in this regard, Amos, Hosea, Joel. (d) What city is viewed as the centre of this corruption? (e) With what class of the people does the prophet show himself in close sympathy? How is this readily explained?
- (3) (a) What picture is given us, in (b) and (c), of the religious condition of the nation, particularly of the capital? (b) Meaning of "prepare war" (v. 5)? "Build up Zion with blood" (v. 10)? "Lean upon the LORD" (v. 11)? Compare v. 12 with Jer. 23:18-19 and 2 Kgs. 18:4 seq. (c) From this comparison, when do you locate the condition of religious affairs described in this chapter?

4. Make a special study of the Messianic prophecies of chs. 4, 5, in the following manner:

- (1) Consider the prediction of 4:1-4. (a) Compare Isa. 2:1-4.* (b) Meaning of "in the latter days"? "established in the top of the mountains"? Is the idea here presented that of a physical transformation, so that the temple-mountain will be visible to all nations? See Zech. 14:10; Ezek. 40:2. Is the prediction, therefore, symbolic in form? (c) What are the blessings that go forth from Jehovah to the nations? What is the result of these changed conditions? (d) What is the relation of v. 5 to vs. 1-4? Have we here a reversion, in the prophet's mind, to the existing situation of his time?
 - (2) Consider the portion 4:6,7. (a) Meaning of "in that day"? Compare 2:12; also Isa. 24:23; Zeph. 3:19. (b) What is the general sense of the passage?
 - (3) Consider the prediction 4:8-13. Compare Amos 9:11-15, also Joel 3:9-14. (a) Meaning of "tower of the flock"? cf. 2:12. (b) Do we find in vs. 9, 10 the punishment from which Zion shall be led forth purified? (c) Is the representation in vs. 11-13 symbolical? Does any other explanation appear preferable?
 - (4) Consider the prediction of ch. 5. (a) What is the thought in v. 1? Does this verse go with what precedes or what follows? How far is your interpretation influenced by this preference? (b) Meaning of "daughter of troops"? *Whose* "troops"? Of Judah or of her enemies? Meaning of "whose going-forth," etc. (v. 2)? cf. 7:14,15,20; also Amos 9:11; Hosea 6:3. "She which travaileth" (v. 3)? cf. Is. 7:14. "They shall abide" (v. 4)? cf. 4:4; also Amos 9:15; Joel 3:20. "Our peace" (v. 5)? cf. Is. 9:6; Zech. 9:9, 10. (c) What is the twofold destiny of Israel in relation to the nations? See vs. 7,8, "dew from the LORD;" "as a lion," etc. (d) What shall be the character of the life of the Messianic kingdom, in contrast with existing evils? see vs. 10-15. (e) How far does the prophet appear to be influenced, in the form of his utterance, by the thought of the first and simple Davidic kingdom? see also 4:8.
 - (5) As the result of the above study, summarize, in its essential statements and characteristics, the Messianic prophecy of Micah.
5. *Re-read* chs. 6, 7.
- (1) Analyze ch. 6, as follows: (a) The announcement of Jehovah's controversy with his people; (b) the plea of Jehovah; (c) the inquiry of Jehovah's people as to the method by which he may be propitiated; (d) Jehovah's reply through his prophet; (e) Jehovah's denunciation, because of the lack of conformity to his requirements.
 - (2) Analyze ch. 7, as follows: (a) The lamentation of the true Israel; (b) her confidence in Jehovah; (c) the prophetic announcement of blessing after judgment; (d) the prophet's prayer; (e) Jehovah's answer; (f) the conclusion of triumph; (g) the conclusion of praise because of the divine mercy.
 - (3) Compare these chs. (6, 7) with Hosea ch. 14. See "study" twenty-four, II. 4. (3).
6. That you may have in condensed and permanent form the result of your work upon the Book of Micah, (1) write out a short summary of each chapter; (2) unify the thought and state, as briefly as possible, the scope of the teaching of the book as a whole.

III. SPECIAL TOPICS.

1. **The Prophet Micah; his Date; his Peculiar Characteristics.** (1) Signification of the prophets name? see 7:17b, seq., specially v. 18. Inference to be drawn from his name regarding the religious character of his parentage? How is he distinguished from the prophet mentioned in 1 Kgs. 22:8 seq?

* For a consideration of the question whether Isaiah or Micah was the original author of this prediction or whether both have quoted it from some earlier prophet, see the commentaries and introductions.

Where was Moresheth (1:1,14)? (2) How extended was the prophet's activity, as regards time, if the superscription (1:1) be accepted? Its longest duration? Its shortest? By what dates would you relatively indicate the commencement and close of this activity? Is any difficulty regarding this extended activity to be inferred from Jer. 26:18,19? (3) From your study of the book of his prophecy what do you consider to have been Micah's marked personal characteristics?

2. **The Style of the Prophet.** What of his use of irony, paronomasia, bold interrogation? What of his figures of speech? Whence derived? see 1:8; 2:12; 5:4,5,7,8; 7:14, also 1:6; 3:12; 4:3,4,12,13; 6:15; 7:1,4. How far may we see in these the impress of his surroundings and habits of life? What as to his rhythm? His diction?
3. **Comparisons with other Prophets.** (1) In what respects, citing passages, would you compare him with Amos? (2) With Hosea? (3) In what respects find similarity to Isaiah? in what respects contrasts with that prophet? What influence of Isaiah upon Micah would you note after a study of both prophets?*

THIRTY-SECOND STUDY.—THE PROPHECY OF NAHUM.

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Professor Burroughs. It is edited by Professor Harper.]

1. PRELIMINARY NOTES.

1. The prophecy of Nahum finds its place at the close of the activity of Isaiah and Micah. It fittingly concludes the prophecy of the Assyrian period in Judah. Taking its stand upon the character of Jehovah, it emphasizes his justice toward the heathen world-power, as represented in Assyrian Nineveh. The character of Jehovah must condition his attitude and action toward the heathen, as well as toward Israel-Judah. Herein is found hope and comfort for his people.
2. The comparatively recent explorations in the East, uncovering the site and bringing to light the contemporary history of this heathen capital, together with the continued advance in Assyrian researches, cannot but render the study of this book peculiarly interesting and instructive. Nineveh, uncovered from her mounds, stands before us as she was in the days of the prophet. Thus "the Bible and the Monuments" are mutually interpreting one another.
3. The attention of the student is particularly called to the Book of Nahum as a specimen of Hebrew literature. Those who are interested in the literary study of the Bible may well devote themselves to a careful consideration of the form of this book. Such as can, even with effort, read it in the original, should endeavor to do so. Its striking beauties, however, may be quite thoroughly comprehended by a study of the English text of the Revision, aided by the suggestions of an appreciative student of the Hebrew. †

* The following list of passages for comparison is taken, with alteration, from Cheyne's "Micah," Introd. p. 12; Micah 2:1,2 with Isa. 5:8; Micah 2:8,11 with Isa. 30:9-11; 28:7; Micah 2:12; 4:7 with Isa. 10:20,21; Micah 3:5-7 with Isa. 29:9-12; Micah 3:12 with Isa. 32:14; Micah 5:2,3 with Isa. 7:14; Micah 5:5 with Isa. 9:8; Micah 5:9-15 with Isa. 2:8-21; Micah 6:8-8 with Isa. 1:11-17; Micah 7:7 with Isa. 8:17; Micah 7:12 with Isa. 11:11, etc.

† Particular attention is called to the *Hebrew* (now *O. T.*) *Student* for October, 1882, containing the Hebrew text of Nahum, with translation of the same, together with translation of the Septuagint, Targum and Vulgate texts, the work of the "translating committee" of the exegetical class of the Hebrew Summer School of 1882. The form of the book is well brought out by Kleimert, Lange's Com., "Nahum." Consult also the literature given below.

II. THE BIBLICAL LESSON.*

1. *Read, carefully*, in the Revision, the Book of Nahum, noting particularly the glowing descriptive style of the prophet. Observe his metaphors. Exercise the imagination as you read. Mark, as you proceed, such passages as are not clear. At the conclusion of your study of the biblical lesson, if these have not cleared themselves up, after thought has been bestowed upon them, consult a good commentary.

Answer, from your reading, the following questions:

- (1) Is the book one connected prophecy? Do the chapter-breaks indicate suitable divisions of the text for convenience in study? Do these divisions fall in with turns in the prophet's thought?
 - (2) Considering the several chapters as separate, consecutive portions; (a) What is the relation of the first to the two following? (b) What the relation of the second to the third? What contrast do you find between them? (c) What the relation of the third to the two preceding? Wherein does it appear to be a fitting conclusion to the progress of the book?
 - (3) What, in short, is the character of "the burden of Nineveh"? How would you briefly describe "the vision of Nahum (1:1)"?
2. *Re-read* ch. 1. Make a particular study of the following points:
- (1) In what portion of this chapter is the character of Jehovah set forth? In what twofold manner is it represented? What is the basis of the prophet's declaration regarding Jehovah? See v. 1, cf. Exod. 20:5; 34:14; Deut. 4:24. In the description of Jehovah, the judge, what images, drawn from nature, are employed? See (a) 3b; cf. Micah 1:2,3; Ps. 83:15; (b) v. 4; cf. Joel 1:18 seq.; Isa. 33:9; (c) v. 5; cf. Amos 9:5; Micah 1:4. Notice the general influence of the Psalms upon the prophet's expression.
 - (2) In what following verses is the application made of the relation of this character of Jehovah to the case of Nineveh, (a) by special reference to evils lately suffered from the Assyrians, (b) by direct announcement, first to Judah and then to Assyria? How complete and how extensive is the destruction thus announced?
 - (3) What is the figure at the conclusion of the chapter (v. 15)? What may we infer, from the statements here found, as to any recent invasion and its effects?
 - (4) What is the probable meaning of vs. 9b, 10? How do you interpret vs. 11, 12? Are we to think of a definite individual here? If so, can we determine whom? In v. 14 does "thee," refer to an individual or to the city Nineveh, as representing heathen world-power?
 - (5) Do we find in ch. 1 a fundamental principle stated, viz., that righteousness is supreme in world-history? Show the relation of this thought to the special statements of this chapter and those which follow. Is it repeated in the course of these chapters? Where and how?

* The following literature may be consulted: Delitzsch, "O. T. Hist. of Redemption," § 60; von Orelli, "O. T. Prophecy," p. 311 seq.; Geikie, "Hours with the Bible," vol. 5, pp. 115-125; Keil and Delitzsch, *Minor Prophets*, "Nahum," C. F. Keil; Lange's Com., "Nahum," Paul Kleinert and Charles Elliott; Pusey, "Minor Prophets;" Smith's Bible Dict., "Nahum." The literature illustrative of the Book of Nahum is very extensive. The student is referred to Lange's "Nahum," *Introd.*, and particularly to "The Literature of Biblical Assyriology," O. T. STUDENT, Feb., '83, Twenty-first Inductive Study, p. 195. From these extended lists, he may select such books as may be suited to his reading and may be accessible.

3. *Re-read* ch. 2.

- (1) Would you characterize this chapter as peculiarly a "vision" of the prophet? How would you divide it so as to bring out the following scenes: (a) the gathering of the hosts about the doomed city; (b) the preparation for the defense and the panic connected therewith; (c) the capture of the city, the flight and the taking of the spoil; (d) the exulting shout of triumph; (e) the cause of this destruction.
- (2) Is this description such as to lead us to conclude that the prophet had seen Nineveh? or, is it general in character, based upon current information regarding the city and such knowledge as might have been obtained from having seen the Assyrian army during their invasion of Judah?
- (3) What is the probable meaning of vs. 6-8a? How do you interpret "Huz-zab" (v. 7)?

4. *Re-read* ch. 3.

- (1) Does the prophet, in this chapter, return to the realities of the present, uttering his denunciation against Nineveh, on the basis of the principle laid down in ch. 1?
- (2) Do you, however, find a connection between the latter part of ch. 2 and ch. 3, viz., (a) 2:11,12, Nineveh, the enemy of mankind, and 3:1-4; (b) 2:13, Nineveh the enemy of Jehovah, and 3:5-7.
- (3) Analyze the chapter as follows: (a) Nineveh the enemy of man, therefore her destruction is seen; (b) Nineveh the foe of Jehovah, therefore her destruction is sure; (c) greater No-Amon could not escape, therefore Nineveh cannot; (d) all resistance is hopeless; (e) the conclusion, the wicked oppressor, destroyed, is un mourned.
- (4) Make a study of the figures employed in this chapter; consider carefully their meaning and connection; with the aid of marginal references, note similar figures in Scripture, observing in what books they occur.
- (5) Wherein is found the message of the Book of Nahum to men of all time?

III. SPECIAL TOPICS.

1. **The Prophet; his Birthplace; his Date.** (1) Signification of the prophet's name? See 1:12b,13. Why was the book one of "consolation" to Judah? (2) What locations have been assumed as the prophet's birthplace? Do there appear to be any reasons of moment for its location in Assyria? Does the imagery of the book, together with its general character, appear on the contrary, to indicate a Palestinian location for its author? Considering the date of the book (see below), would you incline to consider "the Elkoshite" a man of Judah? (3) What appears to be the date of the book, judging from internal evidence, (a) the condition of the Assyrian power, (b) the allusions to invasions and their effects, (c) the reference to the destruction of No-Amon?*
2. **The Style of the Prophet.** What may be said as to the prophet's diction? What are the marked characteristics of his style? Do you find energy, beauty, clearness in his poetry? Compare with the Book of Joel. What

*The sack of Thebes referred to is conjectured to be its taking by Assurbanipal, known from the Assyrian records and located about 690 B. C. The prophecy of Nahum can hardly be placed earlier than under Hezekiah, after the departure of Sennacherib from Judah; its location in the times of Manasseh seems to fall in well with all the evidence in the case.

as to the connection of thought with thought, throughout the book? What as to the effect of the book as a whole upon the reader?

- 3. Comparison with the Book of Jonah.*** Make a careful comparison of the Book of Nahum and that of Jonah. (1) What is the theme of prophecy in both cases? (2) What is the contrast brought forward in the Book of Jonah? If Nineveh be spared, what shall be the fate of Israel, unrepentant? What is the contrast in the Book of Nahum? If Nineveh, the wicked world-power perish, how great is the security of the people of Jehovah, trusting in Him (v. 7)? Contrast Jonah's message to Israel with Nahum's message to Judah. What cause for the contrast is found in the diverse character of the kingdoms? Show how the moral government of Jehovah is set forth in the combination of the messages of these two books.

* See the twenty-second study.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

An interesting series of articles by Prof. Wallace W. Lovejoy of the Reformed Episcopal Divinity School, upon "the historical study of the Bible" has begun to appear in the *Episcopal Recorder* (Phil.). The series will include five articles.

The details of the Babylonian expedition from the University of Pennsylvania have now been arranged. Professor Peters, the Director, and Dr. Robert F. Harper, who has been assigned the second position in the expedition, will leave this country about the middle of June. Their summer will be spent in London, Berlin and Constantinople making preparations. It is their plan to reach Bagdad about October 1st.

It is announced that two sessions of the Hebrew School, each of three weeks, will be held at Chautauqua, N. Y., beginning respectively July 5th and July 26th. While these schools are not under the direction of the American Institute of Hebrew, they are, however, conducted in person by Professor Harper, the Principal of the Schools of the Institute. He has arranged to be present at both schools during their entire session, and will be aided by Professors Sylvester Burnham, D. D., Hamilton, N. Y.; J. F. McCurdy, D. D., Toronto, Can.; D. A. McClenahan, M. A., of Allegheny City, Pa.; Revere F. Weidner, D. D., Rock Island, Ill.; and F. K. Sanders, New Haven, Conn.

Of late years, there has been a rather wide spread misunderstanding as to the position of the elder Delitzsch on the Pentateuchal question. It has frequently been said that he has become a convert to Wellhausenism. The recent publication of his new Genesis commentary shows conclusively how erroneous and unjust such a view is. It is true that he has adopted the theory that the Priest Code is the latest element in the stratification of the Pentateuch, and thus on the historical order of the various codes he does agree with so much of the literary hypothesis that underlies the Wellhausen reconstruction of Israel's religious history. But nearly all critical scholars on the continent accept this re-arrangement of the documents; and they do not thereby adopt the anti-biblical superstructure of the radical school. The literary problems involved are one question, and the theological, are another. Delitzsch's scholarship is so eminently Christian in spirit that it would be spiritual suicide for him to adopt the radical views. He is still the same devout believer in the inspired Word that he always has been, notwithstanding that on a question of literary criticism he has changed his views materially. That on a leading literary point he agrees with Wellhausen is a fact; that he had adopted the latter's reconstruction hypothesis, is fiction.

One of the strongest coincidences in the history of theological research is the fact that Joseph Rabinowitch, the leader of the Jewish-Christian movement in Southern Russia, without being influenced at all by modern Pentateuchal discussions, and indeed not even knowing of them, has independently and by a method of his own, reached conclusions that essentially agree with the newer phases of this perplexing problem. By studying the contents of the Pentateuch, in so far

as these influenced the religious development of the children of Israel, particularly their relations to Christ and Christianity, he has come to the conviction that the Pentateuch contains two legislations, an earlier and prophetic one, and secondly a later and priestly one. The genuine and original spirit of Mosaism is represented in the older legislation of the Book of the Covenant and of Deuteronomy, while the Elohist legislation of the middle books, i. e. the Priest Codex, was added later. The latter he regards as unprophetic in character, and its one-sided observance by the later Jews led to their rejection of Christ as the fulfillment more of the older and prophetic legislation. These views he has elaborated in a work called *Horeb and Sinai*, which he has circulated in manuscript form among some of his friends, and of which we have an account in his recently published autobiographical sketch. Horeb is for him the sign of the older prophetic legislation and Sinai for the later priestly. In a second part of this work he proposes to give the philological and other reasons for this analysis.

→BOOK NOTICES←

THE BIBLE, THEOCRATIC LITERATURE.*

The aim of the book is to explain "the point of view" from which, in the judgment of the author, the Bible should be approached, namely, the historical. It includes parts of lectures delivered to two different bodies of theological students in Birmingham and Edinburgh.

In opening, a brief but interesting resumé of the history of interpretation as related to inspiration is given, with the purpose of showing how many modern theories of inspiration are of comparatively recent date. In the remainder of the book the Hebrew nation is considered in relation to its special mission, and the character and true method of dealing with their literature is expounded. The view taken by the author is quite liberal. His style is clear and interesting. There is no other book that covers in so excellent a way the same ground. To those who are not satisfied with the more conservative theories of inspiration, and to all who wish to know what view of the Bible is taken by many of the best modern critics and yet do not care to examine the more elaborate works on the subject, this will certainly prove extremely valuable. The attitude of the writer is reverent and not over confident as to the infallibility and originality of his ideas. It certainly merits a wide circulation among all intelligent Bible students.

THE BOOK OF JOB.†

The time will never come, *should never come*, when men will cease to write on this the greatest of the world's literary works. Two volumes, one from an American, the other from an English pen, lie before us. The one is a commentary; the other a course of lectures delivered in Westminster Abbey. Both acknowledge the superiority of the Revised Version and use it as a basis. Both are intended "to answer the demand for a plain combination and re-statement of the best results of modern criticism and exegesis upon this remarkable Old Testament poem, such as shall meet the wants of intelligent but not technically scholarly readers, who use their English vernacular." Both build on Ewald, Delitzsch and Davidson. Both accept a comparatively late date for the book. Both are written in accordance with modern methods of interpretation. Both will be found attractive, suggestive and helpful.

* THE BIBLE, AN OUTGROWTH OF THEOCRATIC LIFE. By D. W. Simon. 8vo, pp. 219. Price, \$1.50. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

† THE BOOK OF JOB, with an expository and practical commentary, enriched with illustrations from some of the most eminent modern expositors, and a critical introduction. By Daniel Curry, D. D., LL. D. 8vo, pp. 302. Price, \$1.75. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

LECTURES ON THE BOOK OF JOB, delivered in Westminster Abbey. By the very Rev George Granville Bradley, D. D., Dean of Westminster. 8vo, pp. 333. Price, \$1.90. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL OF HEBREW.

The Correspondence School page gave place in the February number of the *STUDENT* to the Principal's Report. In the March number it was crowded out by other matter. This number, therefore, contains reports for the last *three* months.

The following have become members in various courses of the Correspondence School since the last report:

Rev. L. C. H. Adams, Pleasantville, N. Y.; Rev. H. S. Atchison, Avery, Iowa; Rev. J. H. Babbitt, West Brattleboro, Vt.; Rev. E. H. Barnett, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. W. Beale, Clarkton, Mo.; Rev. W. D. Bene, Grenada, Miss.; Miss Frances Blackburn, Oxford, England; Rev. H. A. Bourland, Belton, Texas; Rev. J. T. Bowell, Maple Bay, Vancouver Island, B. C.; Rev. Henry Branch, Ellcott City, Md.; Rev. J. F. Clarkson, Osborn, Mo.; Miss E. S. Colton, Farmington, Conn.; Rev. J. R. deW. Cowie, Waterford, New Brunswick, Can.; Rev. G. J. Crandall, North Loup, Neb.; Rev. A. B. Curry, Gainesville, Fla.; Rev. D. F. Davies, Glendower, Ohio; Mr. W. F. Davis, Suffolk Jail, Boston, Mass.; Rev. D. T. Denman, Hannibal, Mo.; Rev. J. W. Easley, Onancock, Va.; Rev. T. M. Evans, Frostburg, Md.; Rev. B. W. Fielder, Hendersonville, N. C.; Rev. S. J. Gamertsfelder, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. A. H. Gjevve, Clay Banks, Wis.; Rev. A. H. Heath, New Bedford, Mass.; Rev. John Howland, Guadaluajara, Mexico; Rev. Robt. Lloyd Jones, Retford, Notts., England; Rev. S. E. Jones, Wheeling, W. Va.; Rev. M. R. Kirkpatrick, Clover, S. C.; Rev. A. D. Knapp, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Benj. Labaree, D. D., Marletta, Ohio; Mr. Joseph Landow, Alfred Centre, N. Y.; Rev. W. W. Lovejoy, Palmyra, Mo.; Rev. M. M. Marshall, Kalida, Ohio; Rev. James McAule, St. Andrews, Quebec, Can.; Rev. J. D. McGhillvray, Clifton, Nova Scotia, Can.; Rev. D. B. McLeod, Kinross, Prince Edward Island, Can.; Mr. T. E. Moffat, New Wilmington, Pa.; Rev. G. T. Newcomb, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mr. J. S. Norgaard, Osceola Mills, Wis.; Rev. B. A. Pendleton, McDowell, Va.; Rev. G. A. Place, Ph. D., Slaterville, N. Y.; Miss C. Quinlan, Dutton, Mich.; Rev. F. P. Ramsay, Wetheredville, Md.; Rev. G. H. Rout, D. D., Versailles, Ky.; Rev. J. H. Simpson, Brucefield, Ont., Can.; Rev. C. F. Sliterly, Ph. D., Chester, N. J.; Miss E. R. Sterling, Bridgeport, Conn.; Rev. J. N. H. Summerell, Tarboro, N. C.; Rev. G. C. Tenney, Melbourne, Australia; Rev. O. F. Thayer, Marlboro, Vt.; Rev. C. W. Trawick, New Orleans, La.; Rev. C. C. Upton, Aurora, Texas; Rev. A. A. Von Iffland, Bergerville, Quebec, Can.; Miss M. Whitney, New York City; Rev. R. B. Willis, Oxford, N. C.; Rev. F. H. Wright, Hillsburg, Nova Scotia, Can.

Of the fifty-six new members of the school thirty-one are in the Elementary Course, twelve

in the Intermediate, five in the Progressive, and eight in the Advanced. They represent twenty-four States, six Provinces, and three foreign countries. Three report themselves as Baptists, seven as Congregationalists, three of the Church of England, two as Lutherans, eight of the M. E. Church, two of the M. E. Church South, five of the Northern branch of the Presbyterian Church and twelve of the Southern, two as Seventh Day Baptists. The Associate Presbyterians, Cumberland Presbyterians, Evangelical Association, Reformed Episcopalians, Seventh Day Adventists, United Presbyterians and Wesleyan Methodists each have one representative. From these facts it will be seen that the cosmopolitan character of the school is fully maintained.

Never before in the history of the school has the work done been of so high a character. This is shown by the unusually large number of perfect papers which have been received. The following shows the number sent by each person: Rev. E. H. Barnett, D. D., Atlanta, Ga., 2; Rev. J. Chapple, Bradley, Eng., 1; Rev. C. G. Crooks, Richmond, Ky., 5; Rev. T. F. Day, American Fork, Utah, 3; Rev. G. L. Deffenbaugh, Lewiston, Idaho, 1; Prof. Holmes Dyeinger, Newberry, S. C., 9; Rev. H. M. Henry, Allegheny, Pa., 1; Rev. P. H. Hoge, Wilmington, N. C., 1; Mr. S. D. Lathrop, Richmond, Mich., 5; Rev. B. A. Pendleton, McDowell, Va., 2; Rev. J. F. Steele, Anand, India, 2; Rev. J. T. Whitley, Elizabeth City, N. C., 2; Rev. J. H. Worcester, D. D., Chicago, Ill., 1; Rev. S. E. Young, Princeton, N. J., 3.

The graduates since the last report are as follows: Rev. Wm. Barrows, Oxford, Pa.; Rev. P. T. Bohbäck, Hyrum, Utah; Rev. C. J. Burton, Berlin, Ill.; Rev. J. G. Cowden, Polo, Ill.; Rev. Ira D. Darling, Sheffield, Pa.; Rev. T. F. Day, American Fork, Utah; Rev. B. A. Dean, Harrisville, N. H.; Rev. J. Dyke, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Rev. S. L. Gillespie, Box Elder, Utah; Rev. E. C. Gordon, Salem, Va.; Mr. A. M. Hilliker, Faribault, Minn.; Rev. H. M. Hopkinson, Perkinsville, Vt.; Rev. C. G. Hudson, Anderson, Ind.; Mr. W. B. McIlwaine, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. B. W. Mebane, Dublin, Va.; Rev. E. T. Miller, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Rev. J. W. Moore, Gustavus, Ohio; Rev. J. F. Morgan, Freehold, N. Y.; Miss S. P. Morrison, Bloomington, Ind.; Rev. Wm. Moses, Jeanesville, Pa.; Mr. Wm. Murchie, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. T. J. Packard, Croome, Md.; Miss Clara Pierce, American Fork, Utah; Mr. A. A. Quinlan, College Mound, Mo.; Rev. N. L. Reed, Pallsades, N. Y.; Rev. W. J. Sproull, Mars, Pa.; Rev. M. Stevenson, Monmouth, Ill.; Rev. J. H. Vorce, Essex, Conn. Of these, fifteen completed the Elementary Course, ten the Intermediate, and three the Progressive.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- First Book of Samuel.* By W. G. Blaikie. 8vo.7s. 6d.
Second Book of Samuel. By W. G. Blaikie. 8vo.7s. 6d.
Forbes's Studies on the Book of Psalms. Edited by J. Forrest. 8vo.7s. 6d.
The Story of the Psalter. By H. A. Glass. 8vo. 5s.
Inspiration and the Bible. By R. F. Horton. 8vo.6s.
History of the People of Israel till the Time of King David. By E. Renan. 8vo.14s.
Isaiah, his Life and Times. By S. R. Driver. 8vo.2s. 6d.
Deltzsch's Biblical Commentary on the Psalms. Vol. II. Translated by D. Eaton. 8vo.7s. 6d.
Die Alexandrinsche Uebersetzung d. Buches Hosea. Ein Beitrag zu den Septuaginta u. der Auslegg. d. Propheten Hosea. Heft I. By L. Treitel. Karlsruhe: A. Bielefeld, 1887. pp. 221.
Criticism, Exegesis and Interpretation of Scripture References. By J. J. Moss. Cincinnati: Standard Pub. Co., 1887. 8vo., pp. IV, 261.\$1.00.
Lectures on the Book of Job, delivered in Westminster Abbey. By G. G. Bradley. London: Froude, 1887. 8vo., pp. 320.7s. 6d.
Commentar zur Genesis. By G. W. Gossrau. Halberstadt: 1887. 8vo., pp. 390.M. 7.50.
Russische Ausgrabungen in Jerusalem. 2 Briefe an Herrn Prof. Dr. H. Guthe in Leipzig. 2 Aufl. By B. Mansurov. Heidelberg: Koester, 1888. 8vo., pp. 24.M. 1
Beth el Makdas, oder der alte Tempelplatz zu Jerusalem; wie er jetzt ist. Mit e. Anhang u. artist. Bellagen. Nr. 1 bis 4. By C. Schick.

- Jerusalem, 1887. [Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf.] 8vo., pp. VI, 174.M. 5
La bibbia e le scienze profane: lezioni. By A. Berta. Torino: G. Speirani, 1887. 8vo, 182.
Etude d'archéologie juive et chrétienne. Ire serie. By D. Kaufmann. Paris: libr. Leroux, 1888.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- La philosophie de Qoheleth.* II. By A. Revel in Revue de théol. et de philos. 1888, I.
Ueber das Adlergesicht in der Apokalypse des Esra. By A. Dillman in Sitzungber. d. K. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, 1888. pp. 215, 237.
Zur Stelle Richter, 14, 9. By Krummel in Der Beweis des Glaubens, Feb., 1888.
Nehemiah's Night-Ride. By G. S. Clair in Palestine Exploration Fund. Jan., 1888.
The City of David. III. Zion, South not North of the Temple. By W. F. Birch. Ibid.
Sepulchres of the Kings. By G. S. Clair. Ibid.
The Samaritans, their Numbers and the Ancient Copy of the Law. By G. S. Clair. Ibid.
The Prophet Joel. By A. B. Davidson in Expositor, March, 1888.
Advice about Commentaries. I. The Pentateuch and Joshua. By C. H. H. Wright. Ibid.
Die biblische Literatur des Jahres 1887. By O. Zöckler in Ztschrft. f. kirchl. Wissenschaft u. kirchl. Leben, 1888. Heft. 1.
Our Religious Inheritance from Israel. II. Editorial in Andover Review, March, 1888.
Archæological Notes. By J. P. Taylor. Ibid.
Kellogg's Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt. By J. P. Taylor. Ibid.
German Theological Literature. By A. C. McGiffert. Ibid.