

◀THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.▶

VOL. IV.

APRIL, 1885.

No. 8.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR H. P. SMITH, D. D.,
Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

I. THE MASSORETIC TEXT.

Textual Criticism, it cannot be too often repeated, is the study which aims to restore the exact wording of a document whose first draft is lost and which is consequently known to us only by one or more copies. The copies, of course, may be immediate (taken directly from the author's own manuscript) or remote (taken from a copy) by any number of degrees. The work of the critic (I shall use this word throughout for the critic of the text) is therefore negative. He removes errors in copies before him, but cannot restore what the copies do not contain. His work may be properly compared with that of the proof-reader now an indispensable *attache'* of every printing office.

The regular employment of a proof-reader is one of the evidences of the imperfection of all attempts at securing accurate reproduction of written documents. In spite of the compositor's generally high sense of fidelity—as witness the rule, “follow copy though it goes out of the window”—it is yet found unsafe to trust his work without careful revision. All important publications have their proof read more than once, and yet it is scarcely possible to find a book in which there is not an occasional typographical error. Should the proof-reader lose his ‘copy’ but receive two proofs of the same matter, and attempt to restore the original by comparing the two he would become a critic of his text.

In order to an adequate notion of the complexity of criticism when we have to do with ancient literature we must think of the different conditions of transmission in former times. In our printed editions of a thousand or ten thousand copies mechanical means secure uniformity when the type is once correctly fixed in the form. We are therefore well repaid in spending an amount of care on the proof which would be impossible were we preparing a single copy only. But

this is what the *scribe* does. He prepares a single copy of his text. If the price paid for his book will justify it he may go over his copy once more and correct it by the original. Where a Greek or Roman publisher employed a large number of scribes he sometimes had a corrector who inspected their work and removed its errors so far as he could by interlineation or marginal additions, cancelling wrong words in the text or occasionally erasing them. To destroy an inaccurate copy would scarcely be thought of, on account of the cost. Verbal accuracy, however, was not insisted upon by the purchaser, and so the standard of fidelity was not high even among professional scribes. There is no certainty, moreover, that the copies of ancient documents which have come down to us, were made by professional scribes. Every scholar—every man who could read and write—would find it pleasant and (unless very wealthy) profitable to make his own copy of books in which he was interested. His own edification was the aim he had before him, with no thought of posterity as likely to enjoy his book or to puzzle over it. He would therefore pay more attention to the sense of his author than to the order of words. His own spelling would appear in preference to that of his author. He would have little hesitation in emendation where he supposed a preceding scribe to have made a mistake, and so would often substitute an easier (and erroneous) reading for the true one.

Bearing these facts in mind we shall easily see how, what is true of the New Testament* is probably true of other books—that the corruption of the text is most likely to occur at an early period of its history. All important ramifications of transmission (we are told concerning the New Testament, cf. W. and H., p. 93) preceded the fifth century, and we are able to show that "great divergences were in existence at latest by the end of the second century" (p. 113). The fact of corruption becomes so obvious after a while that a cure is sought. This leads on the one side to greater stringency in the rules for copyists. On the other side, if the copies already in existence show troublesome diversities, a standard text is made up by some recognized authority. His recension is introduced by governmental regulation or is favored by his reputation and gradually displaces the others in common use. The New Testament text as settled by Lucian became the received text of the middle ages. The text of the Koran was made uniform by decree of a Caliph and as early as the time of Pericles we

* For what I have here said of the New Testament I have depended upon Westcott and Hort in their Introduction in the second volume of their "New Testament in Greek." The abundance of material providentially preserved to us for the criticism of the New Testament enables us to trace in regard to it the process through which most ancient books of importance have gone.

hear of editorial care exerted in behalf of an authorized Homer. Now in so far as these standard editions produce uniformity they are to their immediate readers a benefit. Unfortunately the ability and the materials were generally wanting, which should secure a genuinely critical edition. It has been left for modern times to make extensive collations and settle the rules for selecting the better readings. In the formation of a standard edition ancient editors either relied upon some one copy already in high repute, or they attempted to combine two or more divergent texts so as to include all the material of both except where this was obviously impossible. The removal of supposed grammatical or rhetorical errors was a natural part of the process. It has recently been pointed out that the revision of Lucian followed this method of mixture or 'conflation' (W. and H., p. 132 sqq.).

The question which comes before the student of the Old Testament is whether it also has gone through such a process as we have already traced in regard to the New Testament. It has sometimes been supposed that this book has been exempt from the common course of transmission. If this were true we should be spared the work of the critic. But if we attributed the exemption to special divine providence we should still be puzzled to explain why one part of the Scriptures should be preserved from influences to which another part was fully exposed. The probabilities are all against such miraculous transmission. In order to settle the true state of the case we need to examine the phenomena of the Old Testament text. This will be conveniently done by looking separately at the Massoretic recension, at the Septuagint and at the other sources of information.

THE MASSORETIC TEXT.

It is known to all who have given attention to the subject that the MSS. of the Hebrew Bible in our possession show remarkable uniformity. The labors of Kennicott and De Rossi in collecting variants resulted in nothing of importance. Differences in writing *plene* or *defective*, the substitution of *Jehovah* for *Adhonai*, or of the *Q'ri* for the *K'thibh*—these were about all they could show for their pains. The reasons for this remarkable uniformity are not obscure. In the first place the scribes of the Hebrew Bible (especially of the Synagogue rolls, but their accuracy here affect favorably all their work) are under a stringent system of rules intended to secure minute fidelity—and efficient in securing it. These rules prescribe the materials for the sacred books, and designate the qualifications of the writer. They enjoin the exact observance of the traditional divisions (paragraphs and verses). They define the space to be left between words, between

lines and between books. Special precautions are taken for the paying of due reverence to the divine name. The extraordinary marks and letters are described. In short nothing is neglected that will secure exact conformity to the model. In the second place we have the Massorah. This is the well known body of notes found in the larger (so-called Rabbinical) Bibles, and very much abbreviated in the common editions. It gives the number of times in which a certain word is found (if at all rare) and takes pains to call attention to similar verses or phrases in which the scribe is liable to mistake. It counts the verses, and even the letters of the different books. It forms in fact a complete 'hedge' about the letter, so that the scribe who follows it can scarcely go wrong. Again, we have a minute system of vocalization and accentuation which fixes the grammatical form and the connection of each word. All these means have fixed the text of the Hebrew Bible for us so that it is substantially the same in all editions. This means, of course, that all existing copies are really conformed to a single original. The question that now arises is—what is this single prototype? If it be the real original of the books we need go no further. It seems probable, however, that it is not an original but a copy chosen at some later period. It may be a copy made up from more than one MS. after the method of Lucian's recension. To answer the question intelligently we need to consider two things. First, can we trace back the method of the scribes to the time of the writers of the Scriptures? Secondly, does the text itself bear any marks of corruption?*

First, then, how far back can we trace the extraordinary care of the Jews for purity of text? The tract Masseketh Sopherim, which contains the rules for the scribes, may be as old as the eighth century of our era. A few of the rules are found also in the Mishna, which was written down in the fourth (?) century. The Massorah did not reach its final form till the sixteenth century if it did then. Some few Massoretic data, however, are also as old as the Talmud. The vowel-points were invented after the fifth century of our era. We may say, then, that the Massoretic *system* may be traced to the early part of the Christian era, and to this agrees the fact that the translations of the Old Testament made in the second and fourth centuries show substantially the Massoretic text. It is obvious that a system which can be traced a certain distance can be no guarantee for what goes still further back, all we can say is that the Massoretic system has success-

* It may be well to remind the reader that corruption in the critical sense does not imply that the text in which it occurs is worthless, or even for popular use seriously impaired. Any copy is *corrupt* which varies even minutely from its original.

fully preserved for us, even in its minor features, a single* MS. of perhaps the first century. How much older it may have been we cannot determine. We may be able to determine approximately whether it represents the autograph as correctly as itself is represented in its descendants.

Secondly, we ask therefore, what evidences are there in the text itself as to its purity? Here the answer, of course, must be to show corruption if we can. The evidence may be arranged under three heads:

1. Some facts go to show that the Massoretic text was not regarded as absolutely perfect even by those who took such good care of it. The existence of the notes called *Q'ri* is one of these facts. Over two thousand words in the text of the Old Testament are corrected by a *Q'ri*. The majority of the corrections are insignificant, consisting of the insertion or omission of a vowel-letter or its transfer from one place to another.† Some of them (though not many) express the desire of the public reader to avoid offensive words in the service of the congregation. But a number are intended to be corrections of textual errors.‡ Besides (as we know) in a number of places words not in the text are inserted by marginal notes, and in others the margin directs that words in the text be omitted in the reading. We need not pause to examine these corrections. All we care to learn from them is that even the reverential treatment of Jewish grammarians discovers errors of transmission in the text. Had the Massoretic system always been in force--had the text been under such a system from its first publication, such errors could not have crept in as undoubtedly do exist among those noted in this way, nor could they have been *supposed* to exist by the traditional guardians of the letter. Certain phenomena in the text itself and so anterior to the Massorah point in the same direction. They are the so-called *extraordinary points*. An example is Num. III., 39—"the whole number of the Levites whom Moses and Aaron numbered—the word *W'aharon* has an unusual point over each letter. The punctuator evidently meant that

* The conclusion that uniformity of text presupposes a single original is so obvious that it is difficult to see how any one should hesitate to admit it. If the original were the autograph, it would at once be seen. But the reasoning is the same when we consider only a single group of MSS. which agree more closely among themselves than any of them agree with other copies. Of course the value of the Massoretic original is not prejudged by this assertion. It might be a model made up by the comparison of different texts. Even in that case it would not (except in *Q'ri* and *K'thibh*) put before us the testimony of its sources in such a way as to be useful to the critic.

† E. g., אבוא of the text becomes אבנ in the margin, עיית becomes עיית.

‡ E. g., אכנה (correction for אכנה), אנרע (for אנרע, once *vice versa* also), על (for אל a number of times), השרה (for הארה), האלה (for האלה), הם פרוצים (for הכפריצים) (for ונכר) (for ונכר), ורה (for ורה)—these are a few samples of the more important.

the word should be erased* from the text. On the other hand the *suspended letters* are corrections by insertion—most evident in Judg. XVIII., where *Moshe* (משה) has thus been changed to *M'nasse* (מנשה). We find, moreover, that Jewish tradition asserts that changes were made in the text by the scribes ("Ezra"). Eighteen such changes are enumerated by the Massorah under the head *Tikkun Sopherim* or *Tikkun Ezra*. The first example given is a good one. In Gen. XVIII., 22 we read in our present text, "And the men turned thence and went towards Sodom, and Abraham was yet standing before Jehovah." The implication of the Massorah is that the original reading was—"and Jehovah [in contrast with the others] still stood before Abraham." This was, however, thought to be derogatory to the divine dignity and the passage was changed as we now read it. As already said there are eighteen such cases recorded by the Massorah and with them should be put the five (or four) cases of "*Ittur Sopherim*" or omission of a conjunction formerly found in the text.

2. There are verses in our Hebrew text which bear marks of corruption not noted by Jewish grammarians, at least not like those given above. One of the plainest of these is 1 Sam. XIII., 1. It reads literally translated, "The son of a year was Saul in his reigning and two years he reigned over Israel." It is parallel (except the numeral) with 2 Sam. v., 4, "David was thirty years old when he became king, forty years he reigned." It seems impossible to doubt that the former verse gave similar information to the latter. Two words became illegible, so that the verse can only be rendered, "Saul was . . . years old when he became king and he reigned. . . . two years over Israel." All sorts of conjectures are made as to the missing numbers, but none of the versions give us any help. Prov. XXX., 1 is another verse that we can hardly suppose always to have read as we now read it. In Num. XVI., 1 a word is lost—object of *wayyiqqah*. 1 Sam. VI., 18 in a con-

* This is in accordance with what we know of ancient book making, where a word wrongly inserted was not erased or crossed out (literally) but designated by such points. According to the *Ochla W'Ochla* there are fifteen words with extraordinary points (in some of them only a single letter is pointed). Ten words not in the text are inserted by the *Q'ri*, eight words of the text are omitted by the *Q'ri*, fifteen words are by the Massorah divided each into two, eight pairs of words are united, each pair being made one word. The Massorah recognizes five cases of wrong division of words, three cases where *kaph* should be *beth* and three where the reverse error is found; two words have *he* instead of *kaph*; four have a superfluous *lamedh*, while one has lost a *lamedh*; six have *beth* which should be *mem* and one the reverse; five have a superfluous *mem* and five lack a *mem* that belongs to them; in six and seven, respectively, the same is true of *nun*; four have a suspended letter; eighteen have an erroneous interchange of *tau* with another letter; twenty erroneously insert or omit a *he*; twelve instances of an inverted *nun* are found; in twenty-four cases *he* is written for *aleph*; in two *daleth* is lacking. This conspectus, which is incomplete, shows that the amount of error indicated by the *K'thilih* is really not inconsiderable. If we assume that the corrections are various readings inserted from MSS. it would still be evident that the Massoretic text has not entirely escaped corruption.

text which presents no difficulties, is obscure and probably corrupt. Other examples are 2 Sam. XXIII., 8 and 1 Chron. XXVI., 24, 25. In all these passages the difficulty is serious and we have no remedy. In others we can discover the source of the error. This may be wrong division of words as in Ps. XXV., 17, where a *w* has been misplaced.* In Ps. XXXV., 7 a word (שחת) has been misplaced, so likely in Ps. XXXII., 5. In Jer. XXVII., 1 the name Jehoichim has crept into the place of Zedekiah (notice verse 3). It may be that a marginal gloss has crept into the text in some cases—notably Jer. X., 11 where an Aramaic sentence is found in a pure Hebrew passage.

3. Light is thrown upon the transmission of literary productions at a very early date, by a comparison of those portions of the Old Testament which occur twice—Ps. XIV. with Ps. LIII.; 2 Sam. XXII. with Ps. XVIII.; some other portions of Psalms; the parallel portions of Kings and Chronicles; 2 Kgs. XVIII., XIX. with Is. XXXVII., XXXVIII.; 2 Kgs. XXIV. with Jer. LII. Even the recurrence of a single name will show us something here. The well-known Jerubbaal (Gideon) is once called (2 Sam. XI., 21) Jerubbesheth. The substitution of *besheth* (shame) for Baal (the name of the false god) has evidently taken place here. Such a substitution is probably the work of Jewish editors after the closing of the canon. We find it also in the case of Ishbosheth (= Eshbaal, also called Ishwi, where the second part of the name seems to be a fragment of the tetragrammaton) and Mephibosheth (= Meribbaal). That the change is of late date is shown by the fact that the older form is preserved by Chronicles, whose author therefore had no scruples about writing or pronouncing the word Baal.

This is not the place for an extended collation of the differences in the longer passages referred to above. I think, however, that any one who takes the pains to compare them will come to the decision that they show all the more common forms of scrivener's error. Vowel-letters are (as we might expect) frequently inserted in one copy where not found in the other.† Small words are omitted or inserted, as the conjunctions or *kol* (all). Words nearly alike in appearance or in meaning are exchanged.‡ At least one case is found where the eye of the

* The present reading is,

"The troubles of my heart they have eased [enlarged]
From my straits bring me out."

The proposed change makes it accord with the context which is throughout a prayer,

"The troubles of my heart do thou ease
And from my straits bring me out."

† In Ps. liii. we find אלהים where Ps. xiv. has יהוה.

‡ In 2 Sam. xxii., 8 we find השמים where Ps. xviii. has הרים and a little later וידא is represented by וירא (v. 11). ים (v. 10) has become צים, צרם stands for צרקה, נבר for גבור.

scribe rested upon a word at its second occurrence instead of its first, so that he omitted a phrase—by *homoioteleuton*, as it is called. This is in Ps. XIV., 5, where we now read, “there they feared a fear for God,” etc. The parallel has, “there they feared a fear *where there was no fear for*” The writer looking at the MS. from which he was copying after he had written the first *fear* (*pahadh*) saw the same word at its second occurrence and supposed it was the one he had just written, so went on with the rest of the verse. Strictly speaking these are all the variations we need to notice for our present purpose. Intentional changes of a text might be made by an inspired writer who adapts a composition (already known) to a new occasion. Quotation of one prophet by another would illustrate what is here meant, and it is possible, of course, that an author should issue two editions of the same lyric. The differences in such duplicates would not come within the scope of textual criticism. I do not care, therefore, to dwell upon some of the more marked differences which are discovered in the passages we are examining. In some of them there is a fair question whether the differences are of this sort or are real various readings. One example only :

Ps. XIV., 5b, 6.

*For God is in the generation of
the righteous
The counsel of the poor ye have put
to shame,
When God was his refuge.*

Ps. LIII., 6b.

*For God scattered the bows of thy
camper (= the one camping
against thee?)
Thou hast put to shame because
God hath rejected them.*

At first sight one is inclined to say the editor of Ps. LIII. has adapted the Psalm already known to him to some particular occasion—some signal judgment of God. In writing the parallel verses in Hebrew, however, we discover so many cases of similar words or letters,* that we cannot deny the possibility at least that in one of the two lines of transmission the verse had so faded as to show only single letters here and there, and that the scribe restored it according to his ability.

The inquiry up to the present point discovers then that, though the Massoretic method has preserved for us a text of great antiquity, that text has nevertheless suffered not a little in the period which elapsed between the original writing and its definite settlement in the present form. Further evidence in the same direction will meet us in the next division of the paper, which will appear in another number.

* הכישהה and הבישו כי. [עצמות and צדיק, בדר and פור.]

ANALYSIS OF RABBINICAL JUDAISM.

BY REV. JAMES SCOTT, D. D.,

Aberlour, N. B., Scotland.

We propose in this article first to trace the origin of the principal writings of the earlier Judaism, and especially of the *Pirke Aboth*, and next to analyze their substance or component elements. Among all the uninspired and non-canonical writings of the Hebrews, there are few that have been more generally esteemed both by Jews and Christians than the Ethics of the Fathers. They consist mainly of the choice sayings of the wise men of the Great Synagogue and Jewish Church who flourished between the return from the exile in Babylon and the compilation of the Mishna towards the close of the second century after Christ. They were collected for the most part by Rabbi Nathan the Babylonian about the year of our Lord 200 into a small volume of six chapters full of the moral maxims of the traditionists, and must not be confounded with a subsequent commentary on them by the same author, consisting of 41 chapters and entitled, "Treatise on the Fathers by Nathan."

The latter is of a more mixed, fragmentary and fabulous character than the former. The *Pirke Aboth* forms the 41st treatise in order of the Talmud, and is to be found not only there and in several separate reprints, but also translated into English by Dr. Robert Young of Edinburgh, together with a succinct and suitable introduction to the Talmud. The sources of this little work, which contains a good sample of the collective wisdom of the Fathers, are various. It is gathered chiefly from the Massorah or tradition of the Jews, but a few portions have been taken from such formal works as the Mishna, the Gemara and the Targums, and probably even from the Jerusalem Talmud itself.

We may pave the way for an analysis of rabbinical Judaism, by stating at the outset not only the relation of these writings to the *Pirke Aboth*, but also their own proper definition and mutual correlation. Now it is evident from the form of quotation or introduction of most of these sayings of the Fathers by Nathan that they are generally taken from tradition. But the peculiar mode of their introduction would not determine whether they are citations of oral or of written tradition, because *sayings* and *writings* are frequently identified not only by the Jewish and Christian Fathers, but by the inspired authors

of the Old and New Testaments, so that a person is reported as *saying* what he has *written*, if not as having always *written* what he *spoke*.* This is a point of biblical philology of primary importance in connection with the proof of the historicity, divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures.

The rabbinical writings already referred to may be thus defined and their relation stated to each other and to the Pirke Aboth. The Mishna, or repetition of the inspired text of the law, a kind of duplicate-development of it contains the opinions of more than 130 Rabbins, compiled and digested into one complete code of laws by Jehudah about 190 years after Christ.

The primary design of this work was to declare the true doctrine of the divine Torah, to disprove the conflicting dogmas regarding Jewish law and practice, which issued from the rival schools of Judaism at Sephoris, Lydda and Tiberias, and thus to serve as a book of reference in all subsequent controversies regarding the true meaning of the Hebrew law. The authority of this work ultimately became so great that it was regarded as divine or equal to the Hebrew text by all Jews except the Karaites, who have steadfastly rejected its authority and clung tenaciously to the literal interpretation of the Torah in contradistinction to the allegorical method by which the divine law has been caricatured and biblical exegesis travestied.

The Targums (*Targumin*) from the Hebrew verb *Ragem* through the Chaldee quadrilateral *Targem*, trajicere, transfer or translate from one language to another, were first verbal translations and afterwards exegetical paraphrases or interpretations of the sacred text of Scripture. They are as old in point of fact, if not of literary form, as Ezra, who stood on a pulpit and read in the hearing of the assembled people the text of the Hebrew Torah, which the priests interpreted by rendering the pure Hebrew into the Aramaic or Chaldee vernacular with which their long exile in Babylon had made them familiar. And as the priests not only gave the sense of the Hebrew text, but caused the people to understand the reading, it is probable that they not only gave a version, but a paraphrase or word of explanation—Neh. VIII., 4-8. More particularly we find that certain officials of Artaxerxes hostile to the Jews wrote a letter of complaint against them in the Syrian or Aramæan tongue, which was interpreted in that tongue, *Sethurgam*—Ezra IV., 7.

The most ancient versions of the Hebrew text, including not only the Aramaic and Arabic, but the Greek Septuagint, are frequently so

* John v., 45-47, Heb. ix., 19.

free and paraphrastic as to be a kind of Targums or interpretations rather than translations, not so much literal renderings, as idealistic paraphrases of the original. These Targums, properly so-called, the principal of which are those of Onkelos and Jonathan, represent the mind of the ancient Jewish teachers and Church in the same way as the collective opinions of the Fathers in the Pirke Aboth and the Mishna. The sayings of these sages permeated the whole fabric of the civil, social and religious life of the nation so that they were absorbed and passed from country to country and from sire to son.

Notwithstanding, in course of time the same doubts arose about the sense of certain parts of the Mishna as have occurred in all ages regarding works of literature or codes of legislation. Accordingly Rabbi Jochanan, of Jerusalem, about the year of Christ 270, endeavored to determine and fix the true meaning of this work by compiling from various authors a kind of commentary on it, which he termed Gemara, because it completed the text of the Mishna and solved its critical and doctrinal difficulties. These comments annexed to the text of the Mishna, and the Gemara and Mishna thus combined, form the Jerusalem Talmud, or perfect doctrinal symbol of the Palestinian Jews. It was followed about the year 430 by another Gemara, which united to the Mishna forms the Babylonian Talmud, or doctrine of the Babylonian Jews, a much more voluminous and authoritative work. It is so highly esteemed by the Jews of all lands both on account of its superior quantity and quality and the venerated names which adorn its pages, that it is generally designated The Talmud, whereas the former is always called by its proper name, "The Jerusalem Talmud." The extensive commentaries of Raschi, Maimonides and others, printed along with the Talmud, have further made it a work not only of enormous size, but in the estimate of all orthodox Jews, of paramount authority. The writings of the Fathers when analyzed are found to consist of conglomerate parts rather than of combined elements. They are in general pervaded by rationalism and ritualism, extremes which often meet in the domain of theology. And they represent less or more fully the thought of the dark ages of Judaism in philosophy, theology and ethics. The East is the acknowledged home or birthplace of all speculation in these departments of science. Oriental speculation, specially the Indian philosophies of Brahmanism and Buddhism, not only colored but even less or more determined both the form and substance not only of the Hellenic or Western philosophy, but even of Christian theology, and specially of Christology for several ages.

Pythagoras and Plato labored to translate the pantheistic specu-

lation of the East into the scientific speculation of the West, and the Alexandrian philosophers transfused into Judaism the Platonic philosophy, which was afterwards modified and applied by the post-apostolic fathers to Christianity. The learned men of Greece and the Orient flocked to the School of Alexandria, founded by one of the Ptolemies to restore the decline of philosophy that followed the desolating wars of Alexander the Great.

The Hellenistic philosophers of Alexandria specially sought not only to blend the Orientalism of India in its various forms with the Hellenic philosophy, but even to unite both with the principles of monotheistic Judaism. The Greek-Jewish School of Alexandria was, therefore, essentially eclectic, and a compound of heterogeneous rather than a combination of homogeneous and coalescent elements. The principles of at least one form of the Oriental philosophy regarding the emanation or derivation of the world from the One Absolute Existence, and the dualism of another form which maintained the eternal coexistence of mind and matter, the correlate doctrines of the inherent malignity and unreality of matter, the essential antagonism between spirit and matter, and the mystic principle of the allegorical interpretation of all fact and truth, were first applied in a modified form by the philosophers of Greece to Western speculation, then by the Jewish Alexandrian philosophers to Judaism, and finally by the Christian Gnostics to the problems of evil and redemption, and by the early Fathers to the mysteries of the Trinity and the Person of Christ. The early Jewish and Christian Fathers subordinated religion to philosophy, and interpreted the former by the principles of the latter, and thereby initiated a method of biblical exegesis which in all ages has misrepresented the Scriptures and corrupted theology.

We have stated that the speculations of the Oriental and Græco-Jewish philosophies or theosophies, and of Christian Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism, are very closely connected, but Orientalism and Hellenism enter through the Greek-Jewish philosophy especially of Alexandria into Rabbinical Judaism. Philo Judæus of Alexandria, whose theosophy consisted of Oriental and Hellenic principles applied to Judaism allegorically interpreted, may be regarded as the type of the Hellenistic philosophy and a principal medium of its influence on Judaism. The rabbinical literature throughout, and specially the cabalistic fragments of Yebzirah and Zohar, contain traces of the philosophical principles of the two great schools of thought, a clear knowledge of which is necessary to a correct conception, not only of patristic Judaism and patristic Christology, but of Pauline and Johannean theology. In the sphere of ontology or metaphysics we find traces of

the Oriental dogma of the emanation or development of all things from the absolute impersonal or indeterminate unity, and of the dualism of Persia and of the Platonic school. The mystical philosophy of Philo on this point, which was a manifest departure or decline from the pure theism, or personal God of the Old Testament and of the earlier authors of the Apocrypha and Septuagint, found its way into patristic Judaism, thus not only paving the path for error in religion, theology and ethics, but leading logically to Pantheism.

Benedict Spinoza in the sixteenth century logically developed from this fundamental principle or postulate of the Cabbala his whole system of rigid Pantheism. The emanation theory is closely associated, if not even causally connected with another in cosmogony, held by the leading Alexandrian philosophers and some of the Rabbins, and even in a modified form by the Christian Gnostics and Platonizing Christian Fathers, that the world or Cosmos was made by the absolute Deity through the medium of a series of intermediate potencies or subordinate agencies denominated respectively *ho Logos*, *Pneumata*, *Angeloi*, and *Aiones*, some of which were regarded as personal beings, others as mere personifications of the divine perfections or of the powers of nature. The dualistic principle of the necessary antagonism of spirit and matter, and the dogma of the inherent evil of matter, the latter of which is involved in the emanation principle, and more fully developed in the Cabbala and in Docetic Gnosticism, are not only presupposed in the Sadducean denial of a superintending providence or present God and in the selfmortification of the Essenes, but in a latent tendency of the rabbinical writers and leading philosophers of the Jewish-Greek school to conceive God as the transcendent rather than as the immanent cause of the world, as existing beyond His works and not as present to imperfect and intractable matter.

Then, underlying all these philosophical speculations, and less or more pervading or producing them, is the allegorical principle, which like a bird of passage winged its way from its native home in the East and nestled and brooded in the western schools of profane and sacred learning. Literal and figurative forms of language, which are not antagonistic but mutually consistent and subservient, are common to all human speech and writing and therefore natural to the human mind. These two complementary principles of interpretation are as necessary as the two corresponding forms of human language, but they have both been carried to extremes in philosophy and religion by the riotous excess of human imagination and religious sentiment. They existed and operated in the Jewish Church and Schools from the beginning, like the Baconian method of philosophy, long before they

became current and counter principles of formal interpretation. The allegory of the Orient was specially applied by Pythagoras and Plato to the facts and forms of Greek philosophy, by the Jewish Fathers to religious Judaism, and latterly not only by the Gnostic Christians, but by Ammonias Saccas and the Platonising Christian Fathers of Christianity. Aristobulus the Jew in the middle of the second century before Christ formally introduced the allegorical method to the fathers of Judaism, and Philo may be said to have put the capstone on the structure which was thereby reared. It was used even by some of the apostolic Fathers, such as Hermas and Barnabas, to interpret the Old Testament, by Ammonias in the second century to harmonize and unify all the conflicting forms of philosophy, and thereafter by the Christian Fathers and especially by the ingenious Origen not only to reconcile Scripture with itself, but Christianity with Platonism. This vicious principle is the chief source of the huge mass of putrescent rubbish by which later Judaism and early Christianity were covered and buried in dishonorable graves. We may also find not only in Aristobulus and Philo, but in the Apocryphal and Rabbinical writings generally, faint traces of the numerical symbolism of the East and the mystic numbers of Pythagoras, whereby not only the numbers 7 and 10, the sacred symbols of the perfect sabbath and perfect law of the 10 words, were employed to represent and reckon ideas and events, but also other numbers both multiple and unequal, for which no mystic or memorial significance could be claimed.

2. The theology of the later Jewish Schools, being closely connected with their philosophy, may be described generally as a system of pure deism tending to pantheism in Philo and others, whose theism was founded on the Platonic dogma of the Unconditioned. Their long and lamentable captivity in Babylon not only effectually cured the Jews of foul idolatry, but has filled them ever since with a rooted aversion to polytheism. Idolatry, the chief cause of all their miseries in the early ages, is now universally regarded as the most heinous and hateful sin. They contend as strongly for the unity of God as Christians of whose creed it is one of the first and fundamental articles, or as Mohammedans who have made it the war-cry of their religion. The motto on the standard of the Maccabees, consisting of the initial letters of the Hebrew text, "Who is like unto Thee among the gods, Jehovah," has ever since been the national banner with the grand device of Judah. But some of the rabbinical writers, and especially the Cabbalists, have construed this text in a sense not strictly compatible with pure biblical theism, or the unity of God. The theology of Judaism lamentably declined under the baneful influence of national

corruption, external persecution and even intestine disorder, but especially of the Oriental and Hellenic philosophy, operating mainly through the Græco-Alexandrian School. God is generally represented in the chapters of the Fathers and in the Mishna not only as the one living God, but as holy, just, wise and good. His unity and unipersonality are stated, but not his tripersonality as in the Old and New Testaments, where it is not only indirectly taught in some passages, and logically deducible from others, but directly declared in the baptismal formula and even in the prophetic announcement, "And now the Lord God, and His Spirit, hath sent *me*,"* the Messiah. The biblical phrases, Messiah, Son of God, and Word of God, Angel of Jehovah, and Spirit of the Lord in the Apocryphal books, especially of Wisdom, and in the writings of the Fathers, begin to lose their weight and ring in the sacred Canon, where they denote the attributes and works of divine persons. They are no longer divine persons with a distinct divine consciousness, but either the perfections of God personified, or God manifested in creative and redemptive acts. They are not properly persons but merely personifications of God, or God revealing himself in gracious acts and influences.

It may be both difficult and dangerous to present a philosophy of history, yet it can be shown that theology, or the doctrine of God, and Christology, or the doctrine of the Logos, declined apace with Judaism as a living and true religion. We find first the pure theism of the Canon, one Jehovah, the Creator of all things, and the Redeemer and King of Israel and of the whole world. Then as vital godliness declined, the natural perfections of God, such as his all-presence, power and knowledge, were brought into relief rather than his justice, truth and covenant love to his people. Thereafter, the persons of the godhead, or the tripersonality of God, which not only underlies the whole of the Old Testament from Creation and the Covenant of Sinai to the close of the Canon, but shines forth as the morning sun in many passages, suffered eclipse in the non-canonical writings of Judaism, where the Son of God, and the Word and Spirit of God appear as mere personifications of the revealed Jehovah, or of his revealed perfections. Next during the rise and prevalence of the Alexandrian philosophy the Hellenic conception of God as the absolute unity, beyond personality and definite existence and incapable of relation to finite things, appears in a distinction made between the absolute, impersonal and supreme God, and the personal Logos, the manifested world-maker and mediator between the absolute God and Israel.

* Is. xxxviii., 16.

Finally, this position led by soft, sloping and almost necessary steps into the abyss of pantheism, where not only single individuals, but whole nations have been engulfed. This decline appears not only in connection with theism generally, but with the history of the Logos in particular. The Word of God of the Canon under the various names of Seed of the Woman, Angel of Jehovah, Shiloh, and Messiah, is manifestly not Jehovah himself, or his revealed perfections personified, but a distinct divine person, possessing the nature, attributes and names of God. But in the apocryphal literature the Logos, or Wisdom of God, begins to be represented as a personified quality of God, and not as a divine person, God of very God in the spirit of the Scripture as expressed in the Nicene Creed. This is the meaning or use of the phrase not only in the rabbinical writings of the Hellenistic but of the Aramaean Schools, and especially in Philo of Alexandria, whose highly figurate rhetoric does not represent the Supreme God and the mediating Logos as two numerically distinct, much less co-eternal and co-equal persons, but merely as the same essential being under different forms of self-manifestation. But in the New Testament, and especially in the writings of John, the Logos in common with the language of the whole Old Testament revelation is not only rescued from its degradation but exalted as the symbol of the personal Son of God, become the Son of Man, the Revealer of God and the Redeemer of mankind. The Angel of Jehovah, the Word of God, the Prophet of the Lord, whom his people would not hear and whom they did not retain in their thoughts, whose name was buried under heaps of vain speculation and human tradition, and his glory veiled by clouds of philosophic dust, again shines forth in the gospel clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as a bannered host.

GOD'S COVENANT IN THE PROPHETS.

BY PROFESSOR C. J. BREDEKAMP.*

Translated by Rev. H. M. Douglas, Harpersville, N. Y.

The criticism of Baur refers the specific character of the Christian religion more to Paul than to Christ. By the latest critical school the human author of the Old Testament religion is made a very insignificant person. Its real authors, the path-finders, the representatives of its most essential and fundamental thoughts, are claimed to be the later prophets of the Northern Kingdom.

In Wellhausen's writings we have almost nothing of Moses and his work. [Compare the judgment of L. von Ranke, *Universal History* I., i. p. 42: "Moses is the most exalted personage of the early history. The thought of the extra mundane and intellectual God was grasped by him and embodied in the people he led"]. According to Kuenen his real work was this, he made a firm alliance between Jehovah and the people he led out of Egypt. Not in what Moses appointed for divine worship or the civil life lies his importance. The great thing is his establishment of *moral* reverence for the God of the fathers whose new name was revealed to Moses. "I will be your God and ye shall be my people:" this he brought to the national consciousness, and this is the summary of his life-work. This consciousness the people retained, while all else, and especially the moral conception of God, they could not grasp. "In a word," says Kuenen, "that which distinguished Moses from his people, was restricted to himself and to individual spirits akin to his. Under the influence of Moses, Israel took a step forward, but it was only *one* step."

With true tact Wellhausen feels the vital importance of the covenant. If a covenant with definite conditions was actually concluded with the people under Moses, if the knowledge of such a covenant began with the national life, the ground is shaken beneath his historical structure. Hence he denies that the idea of a covenant between Jehovah and his people is to be found in the prophets. Thus, of necessity, we shall be led into an examination of the conception of the *berith* and its significance in the prophetic literature. We have to enquire whether the earlier prophets recognize the Mosaic covenant as the basis of their own message or not, and also what construction they give to that covenant.

* Prof. Bredenkamp is the successor of Wellhausen at the University. This article is a section of his work *The Law and the Prophets*.

Berith (from *barah* = to cut, separate) has been explained as determination, establishment. Then a derivative sense is a settlement made between individuals, and regulating their mutual relation. We cannot agree with this. The original import is not *diatheke* a putting apart (in its primitive sense, *monopleuros*, one-sided) but *syntheke* a putting together. Thus *berith* comes from the mutuality (compare Delitzsch *On Hebrews*: also same writer *On Job*, XXXI., 1). This is proved by the frequent construction with the prepositions *with* and *between*. The conception *diatheke*, usually distinguished by the construction with *le*, sets out from the fact that every covenant includes individual stipulations. To that is added the special nature of this covenant, in which God as a superior proffers and imposes the obligations without which no covenant can be thought of. Hence also there is little said of Jehovah's performance of the covenant. His faithfulness makes it certain that he will keep his pledges, and the other party only needs admonition. Doubtless the customary form *karah berith* corresponding to the parallel expressions Gr. *horkia temnein*, Lat. *focdus icere*, shows that the first and oldest sense of *berith* is a covenant confirmed by sacrifices. And this primary meaning still appears in *berith* which is precisely *cutting in pieces* [see Koehler on Zechariah IX., II.]

It lies in the conception of a covenant that it constitutes a legal relation bringing with it obligations and rights for the parties. Jehovah pledges himself to be a faithful covenant God to his people, and in return demands their obedience. It is for this that in the prophets Jehovah so often appears remonstrating and reasoning with his people. Israel on the other hand may expect the fulfilment of the divine promises in case the people keep the covenant pledges. The question arises whether with these covenant pledges was united the element of public worship. Everywhere in the olden time covenant and sacrifice are kept close together. Not merely the usual form *karah berith* and the derivation of *berith*, but also Gen. xv., and especially the account in Exod. XXIV., demonstrate that the same is true of Israel. The oldest account of the Mosaic covenant represents it as confirmed by sacrifices, the book of the covenant includes the sacrifice as the binding force; there can be no doubt that the Mosaic covenant is most closely connected with sacrifice. It is therefore readily understood that Wellhausen seeks to eliminate the idea of the covenant from the earlier prophetic literature. But that is a battle with windmills. "The knowledge," says Kuenen, "that a new and peculiar relation existed between the God in whose name Moses appeared and the tribes of Israel, this knowledge never died out." So, indeed, we find

it. All the prophets base their messages on the condition of things ordained by Moses at Sinai. In the "blessing of Moses" it is appointed as the chief duty of the priesthood to keep God's covenant with his people (Deut. xxxiii., 9). And the "blessing of Moses" as well as the song of Deborah (Judg. v.) begins with a reference to the manifestation of God upon Sinai. Instead of looking at this Wellhausen holds that the narrative in Ex. xxiv., 3-8 seems to have remained without influence upon the older prophets. Strange, how little he is concerned for the latent character of the book of the covenant to whose environment the account in Ex. xxiv. belongs, while he presents the similar character of the Priest Codex as most improbable. But grant even that the book of the Covenant with its historic environment and the "blessing of Moses" were unknown to the older prophets, or not recognized by them, an assumption in the highest degree unlikely, do we not find the same idea in these prophets? If in Amos the name chance to be wanting, is not the fact there? Am. iii., 1: "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, you only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities" (the prophet plainly has Ex. xix., 5 in view). The inference is easy and unavoidable that Amos has knowledge of a close relation between Jehovah and Israel, a covenant whose violation he makes the occasion for the divine punishment. Hosea compares the relation between Jehovah and his people to a marriage. Again he puts the thing itself in place of the symbol Hos. viii., 1 and vi., 7. Does he not know the idea of the covenant? To his view in viii., 1 the entire guilt of the people is comprised in the transgression of the covenant. And when according to Isaiah, Jehovah is king or father or lord of the vineyard, these figures are only paraphrases of the same covenant relation. The king loves and protects his people, the father his children, the vine-dresser his vineyard, so long as they perform what he is entitled to claim, but otherwise dissolves his relations to them and visits them with judgment and penalty. It is not that the word was the source of the idea, as Wellhausen thinks. The very opposite is true, the idea is clothed not in a word alone, but in varied and popular symbols.

Just in the all-controlling idea of the covenant is involved the truth of what Duhm observes, that to the old prophets Israel as a people is the object of their preaching. Yet it is too narrow a view to deny entirely the reference to individuals. At all events the covenant is to be regarded in the first place as a covenant of the whole people. In fact, upon unprejudiced examination there is no difference

between earlier and later prophets in their understanding of the covenant. Indeed the stability of the Old Testament ideas is much greater than some would have us believe. Guthe's remark is correct, that all the forces of Jeremiah's preaching meet in the idea of the covenant and that the idea is most prominent in this prophet. But if his whole ministry is embraced in the *berith*, it is only because the significance of that idea is so central, not only "with the authorities on biblical theology," but in the Old Testament religion itself. And in principle the same is true of the older prophets. Jeremiah never uses *berith* metaphorically (of a covenant with beasts, stones, as in Hos. II., 20; Job V., 23 or with death, Is. XXVIII., 15). He never uses it except in a distinct religious sense. From this fact some draw the conclusion that Jeremiah was the first to confine the covenant to the purely religious domain and therefore that he has an idea of the covenant peculiar to himself. This is too external a treatment. Why could he not make use of the idea that was so current, as in Zech. XI., 10 or Mal. II., 14? Wellhausen makes the same mistake, when from the covenant with the beasts, Hosea II., 20, he infers the absence of the specific idea of the covenant from Hosea. With such precarious proofs this one fact cannot be disproved: all the prophets take their stand upon the covenant established through Moses. Or is it true that to these prophets the covenant relation is something not negotiated through Moses? It might certainly seem singular that the name of Moses occurs so little in the older prophets. But why need one say what is known by all? The argument "from silence," which plays so important a part in the latest criticism, often proves merely mechanical. Amos mentions the special choice of Israel to a peculiar relation with God and connects this choice with the leading out from Egypt (Am. III., 1.) Yet he does not make merely the leading out from Egypt by Moses the obligation—for Ethiopia, Syria and Philistia have also been led (Am. IX., 7).

Besides this the prophet must know other works done in the very beginning of the nation's history and by the same agent. But when Hosea (XII., 13) compares Moses with Jacob, is it not as a prophet only that Moses appears? "And Jacob fled into the country of Syria, and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep. And by a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt; and by a prophet was he preserved."

The contrast is plain: while Ephraim boasts of Jacob and Bethel, he forgets the greater person by whom God has led him out of Egypt and preserved him. Is a prophet more exalted than a serving shepherd? So much higher stands Moses than the poor, lowly Jacob keep-

ing sheep for a wife. It is urged (Ewald) that this historical review is to show God's wondrous protecting care in dangers. Of Jacob no deliverance from danger is here recorded, but with Jacob's poor shepherd-life is contrasted the grand prophetic office of Moses. One kept flocks for a wife and the other kept the people.

That Ephraim has provoked bitter anger is so much the worse (v. 15); he has spoken trembling and sedition, exalted himself in Israel (XIII., 1), and continued this from the very beginning to the present. It will be seen how groundless is the talk about Hosea's laying the first foundations of Israel's religion. To the prophet Ephraim's sin is an apostasy from the Mosaic past. For this relation is clearly present in his thought. The Mosaic time is the time of the first young love (Hos. XI., 1). Thus are the older prophets based entirely upon the covenant concluded by Moses. Amos v., 26 does not teach that Israel's religion was developed from an originally Sabæan form.

The prophets appear everywhere and entirely, not as preaching new doctrines. They do not present arguments that the people should comply with their requirements in religion and morals; they presume that the sin of the people is an offence against old and long known truths. They live and move in the covenant; they charge the people with breaking the covenant. And in this understanding the people are agreed with the prophets. One thing every child in Israel knows, that God, through Moses, has put himself in a covenant relation to the people. Smend's remark is fully sustained: "That a covenant was once established on Mt. Sinai through Moses, was evident from the certain and unanimous tradition of antiquity."

SOME ASTRONOMY IN THE BOOK OF JOB.

CH. XXXVIII., 31, 32.

BY PROFESSOR R. V. FOSTER, D. D.,

Theological School Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

31 *Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades,
Or loose the bands of Orion?*

32 *Canst thou bring forth Mazzoroth in his season?
Or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?*

1. *Pleiades*.—The Hebrew is *Kimah*, a well known group of stars located in the shoulder of Taurus. It is not certain, however, that these are the stars referred to in our passage. The same word occurs in ch. IV., 9, and in Amos v., 8, in which latter instance it is rendered "seven stars" in our King James's Version.

The Vulgate renders the word "Hyades" in Job IX., 9, "Pleiades" in ch. XXXVIII., 31, and "Arcturus" in Amos v., 8. In other ancient versions, and by Jewish commentators, the same word, *Kimah*, is variously rendered. Some render it "Pleiades" in one passage, and "Arcturus" in another, whereas, Arcturus and the Pleiades are not in the same part of the heavens. Others render it *seven stars*, located, however in Aries instead of in the Taurus; while Aben Ezra thinks it designates only a "single star and that a great one," viz., Aldebaran, which he located in the Hyades. The truth is, no one knows to what star, or group of stars, the Divine Speaker referred when he said *Kimah*. That he referred to some star, or stars, it is generally agreed.

Kimah was supposed to have influence on earthly phenomena. As to the kind of influence which it exerted, ancient Jewish opinions differed. One class of Rabbis seem to have attributed to it great cold and the property of retarding vegetation. Another class held just the opposite. It hastens, they say, the ripening of the fruits. According to this view, Job XXXVIII., 31, would mean, "Canst thou bind the fruit which *Kimah* ripeneth?" That is, canst thou restrain its ripening? I can; therefore I am more powerful than thou art. That is a good meaning, for it intensifies the impression of the almightiness of the Divine Speaker and the littleness and weakness of Job by setting them over in antithesis to each other—and that is what he was aiming to do. But he does it, according to this view, by accommodating himself to the supposed popular belief that the stars had an influence on the seasons—or, in other words, that they had something to do

with the weather. The principal evidence we have that such a superstition was prevalent in Job's day is the fact that it exists, to some extent, at the present day in the shape of a sort of weather-moon theory—which could hardly be treated seriously, even in poetry; especially not so on so grand and solemn an occasion as that when the Almighty addressed Job.

The word *Kimah* means a "little crowd," or group. The group of stars which we call Bo-otes, or Hyades, or Pleiades, as the case may be, the Hebrews and cognate nations called the "Little Group;" it is also so called by at least one modern people—the Greenlanders. But a group is something, the members of which are bound together by a real or ideal cord fastened into a knot. Hence the passage may be read, "Canst thou bind the cord which fastens the members of the Little Group together?" "I do it, therefore I am mightier than thou." And perhaps in the mind of the poet, as the Divine Speaker said this he pointed Job to the brilliant star-group in the heavens. "I hold them together." The *Ma'dhabboth* is in this passage rendered "sweet influences" in King James's Version. It is a poetical rendering; it yields a good impression to the reader. But it is vague. What is "the sweet influence" of Pleiades? No one can say, unless he revert to the supposed belief in moon- and star-influence on vegetation, or human life, or something of that kind. The word means a fetter, or cord, fastened into a knot. So say the Septuagint, the Targums, and the Jewish interpreters Rashi and Kimchi; it is also so defined in Fuerst's Hebrew Lexicon, and in Gesenius, Bresslau, Davidson, and others. It is a rare word. It is translated *delicately* in 1 Sam. xv., 32 of the King James's Version, but doubtless it should be *fetters*. "Agag came to him in fetters"—which is very probable under the circumstances, and much more likely to have been the statement of the writer. The construction and the circumstances are different in Lam. iv., 5; the word there comes from a different root and means "sumptuously."

Canst thou bind the cord, or knot, which holds the Pleiades together? Why did our translators say: Canst thou bind the "sweet influences" of the Pleiades? It may be a matter of some interest to revert to the question. Three answers may be given. 1st, They may have taken one Hebrew word for another which resembles it, but which is not identical with it. Or, 2d, they may have regarded the the cord which binds the seven stars together as ideal rather than real or tangible, a "sweet influence," as the influence of attraction, for instance. In this case, the rendering well preserves the poetic beauty of the original. The Pleiades move in harmony with each other,

always preserving their relative position, being bound together by a cord, or sweet influence, which none but an Almighty hand could fasten. Or, 3d, the translators might have been under the influence of the ancient, and to some extent still existing belief, that the stars exerted a power over human destiny. The power, or influence, of the Pleiades was altogether good; hence the phrase, "sweet influence of the Pleiades." If this view be the true one, and if the translators were true to their own exegesis, it follows that not only did they suppose the stars to have an influence on earthly matters, but that Job was of the same opinion, and that the Almighty appealed to this superstition in his address to Job. A marginal note on the word "Pleiades" in the old Genevan version, made as we know, prior to King James's, reads: "Which starres arise when the sun is in Taurus, which is the spring tyme, and brings flowers," which is testimony as to the view held at the time the note was written. A copy of the Cranmer Bible of 1575 in my possession reads, "hynder the sweete influences," etc., which points to the same view.

Of the possible ways of harmonizing the rendering in King James's version with the original, the first above given is the least tenable; the second, while true to the poetry of the original, is the most astronomical, the most consistent with the dignity, and power, and knowledge, of the Divine Speaker, and at the same time does neither grammatical nor lexical violence to the Hebrew; the third is the most astrological, having in it, however, a sound astronomical element, but is least consistent with the dignity, etc., of the Divine Speaker.

"Is it *thou* who canst, and doth, bind the cord which holds the Pleiades together?"—a strong way of affirming the negative. "It is I." Hence the impression on Job's mind of the Speaker's almightiness and his own littleness.

2. *Orion*. The Hebrew is *K'esil*. The same word is translated *Orion* in Job IX., 9, and Amos V., 8. In Isaiah XIII., 10, occurring in the plural form, it is translated "constellations."

The word means *a strong one, a hero, a giant*, and, as in the case of *Kimah*, there is nothing in the word itself requiring to designate one group of stars rather than another. The Hebrews, Arabians, Persians and other oriental tribes, it appears, conceived of the group of stars to which was transferred the name *K'esil*, as a giant, or mighty hunter, walking along the heavens. Nimrod, the mighty Babylonian hunter, says an ancient oriental myth, was deified and placed among the stars of heaven. Whether this be the origin of the name of the constellation or not, it at least shows the very early propensity of the Orientals to hero- and nature-worship. The Greeks

borrowed the myth and called the name of the giant hunter Orion. The group of stars, to which the name was transferred, is mentioned by both Hesiod and Homer as early as 900 B. C. ; and by the well-known Greek astronomer, Eudoxus, 366 B. C. ; and 277 B. C. by Aratos the Greek astronomical poet whom St. Paul quotes, and by various others, Ptolemy assigned to it thirty-eight stars—less than half the present number. The Septuagint translators substituted in the Greek Bible the Greek name of the constellation for the Hebrew, which was merely transliterated in our English Bible ; hence the name *Orion* instead of *K'esil*.

The word *Mosh'khoth* also means *bands*, or *fetters*. Some ancient Jewish and some modern Christian commentators think that the Divine Speaker has reference to the influence which Orion was popularly supposed to have on human affairs, particularly on vegetation and the seasons—as in the case of *Kimah*. The rising of Orion shortly after sunset betokens the approach of storms, when vegetable life is bound or restrained by cold. "Canst thou loose the bands of Orion" might in this case mean, "Canst thou loose the restraining influence of winter and cause vegetation to green before the time?"—which implies that the Almighty spake in the astronomical poetry of Job's day.

According to Fuerst, Gesenius, and other Hebrew lexicographers, the idea is, "Canst thou loose the fetters which bind the impious giant Nimrod in the sky?" In which case the Almighty Speaker, for the purpose of making Job realize his own littleness, accommodates his form of expression to a popular myth already current in Job's day. According to a modified form of the same view "the *band* of Orion" is the *girdle* which the astronomers in Job's day already conceived the heavenly giant as wearing about his waist, and to which fancy the Almighty accommodates himself as before.

None of these views, it seems to me, is to be preferred ; not because any violence is done to grammatical or lexical requirements, but because according to none of them would the Almighty be so likely to make on Job's mind the impression which he obviously desired to make. May not "the bands of Orion" rather mean the mysterious attractive influence, or invisible cord, which binds the several stars of the constellation into one group? Canst thou loose or snap this band asunder, causing the stars to fly hither and thither? This seems to me to be the preferable and more striking interpretation. As do the others, it does not imply a playing upon the credulity of Job, which under circumstances so awful would be out of place even in poetry. The only question is, could Job have understood the language of the Almighty in this sense? Perhaps so. Nor does this imply

that Job was well acquainted with the modern doctrine of the attraction of gravitation. With him the attractive influence may have been, and doubtless was, the immediate power of God; in which case he would understand the Almighty's question to mean, "Canst thou hold the stars together, as I do?" The question needed only to be asked in order to impress Job with his own littleness and with the Divine Speaker's almightiness—and that is what was intended to be done.

3. *Mazaroth*. The Hebrew word is the same, being simply transliterated. Its meaning is uncertain. The Vulgate renders it Lucifer, or the Morning Star. The Septuagint avoids an opinion by simply transferring the word as does our King James's version. Rosenmuller, Herder, Umbreit, Gesenius, Noyes, and others, think it means the Zodiac. It is supposed to be identical with *Mazaloth* of 2 Kgs. XXIII, 5, where the Septuagint has *Mazaroth*. The Vulgate agrees that *Mazaloth* means *duodecim signa*, but it does not seem to agree that *Mazaloth* and *Mazaroth* are identical. On the other hand, J. D. Michaelis, on etymological grounds, thinks our word means the Northern and Southern crowns. Fuerst thinks it may designate a special group of stars which was afterwards forgotten; but he inclines rather to the view that the root meaning of the word is *ruler*, and that it here refers to the planet Jupiter, which among the ancients was the supreme god of good fortune. In confirmation of his view he refers to ancient Cilician coins which bear upon their face the words "thy lucky star," in the Hebrew, which word "star" is the singular form of *Mazaroth*. The truth is, no one knows, and at present no one can know, what the word means. The balance of opinion is in favor of "the signs of the Zodiac," and of the identity of *Mazaroth* and *Mazaloth*. It is admitted that a zodiac was known in the astronomy of the most ancient oriental nations.

But in any event, the sense of the expression in which alone this word occurs evidently is, "Canst thou cause that brilliant star, which you see, or that group of stars which you call *Mazaroth*, or all the signs of the Zodiac, to rise just at the moment when they ought to rise? I can." It needed only to ask the question to enable Job to realize the infinite distance between him and the Divine Speaker—and this, again, is what he aimed to do.

4. *Arcturus*. The Hebrew word is *'ayish*. It means simply a group or crowd of stars. What group is meant is not quite certain; nor is it quite certain that the word does not designate a single star. Some Jewish commentators make it mean the "tail of the Pleiades;" Aben Ezra makes it mean the seven stars. The Septuagint renders it *Pleiades*, and the Vulgate, *Arcturus*, the principal star in Bootes.

This latter is the generally accepted designation of the word. "Canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?" is rendered by Herder and Umbreit, "Canst thou lead forth the Bear with her young?" The pronoun *his* in our English version is *her* in the Hebrew, and to this extent, at least, Herder and Umbreit are right. But the question, whether the Arcturus of the text is the Great Bear, or in the Bear Driver, can not be decided with certainty. "His sons," or rather, "her young," refers to the few smaller stars in the immediate vicinity. The import of the Almighty's question is, "Canst thou cause the group of stars of which Arcturus is the principal one, to move round the Pole everlastingly, never setting? I can; and I do." It needed only, as in the preceding instances, to ask the question to enable Job to realize his own exceeding littleness, and the exceeding almightiness of the Divine Speaker—and that, again, is what he meant to do.

NOTES FROM ABROAD.

BY IRA M. PRICE, M. A.,

Leipzig, Germany.

The time of the beginning and closing of a semester's lectures is an uncertain quantity. Nominally this semester began October 15th, practically, ten days later; it should close, by announcements, March 15th, but most of the lecturers are now done, and all will be through by the 5th inst. Out of the two semesters of the year, nominally nine months, lectures are delivered but seven months. Each professor manages his own department and his own time, and begins and closes according to his own free will. Liberty in education, if in nothing else, seems to be the watchword.

Already the announcements for the summer-semester (April 15-25 to August 15-30) in most of the German Universities have appeared; and so far as possible are collected and epitomized below the lectures in the Old Testament and Semitic, and related departments. The trend of work may in part be judged by the selected topics; and each institution may speak for itself.

BERLIN: *Dillmann*, 1) Old Testament Theology, 2) Genesis, 3) Deuteronomy xxxii. and xxxiii. *Kleinert*, 1) Isaiah, 2) Isaiah xv.-xxvii. *Strack*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Job, 3) Pirke Aboth.—**Barth*, 1) Comparative Hebrew Grammar, 2) Syriac, Martyr's Acts and Targums, 3) Introduction to reading Arabic Philosophy, 4) Themânia Fusûl. *Dieterici*, 1) Quran and Arabic Syntax, 2) The soul in the writings of Ichwan-es-Saga. *Erman*, 1) Egyptian Archæology and the most of the Egyptian Monuments in the Royal Museum, 2) Grammar of Late-Egyptian and reading of Hieratical Writings, 3) Egyptian Epitaphs. *Jahn*, 1) Arabic grammar compared with Hebrew. *Sachau*, 1) Old-Semitic Epigraphs, 2) Grammar of modern Arabic, 3) Hamâsa, 4) Geography of Palestine according to Elmûkaddesî. *Schrader*, 1) Selected Assyrian Inscriptions, 2) Ethiopic.

BONN: *Budde*, 1) Hebrew, 2) Job. *Kamphausen*, 1) Old Testament Theology, 2) Genesis.—*Gildemeister*, 1) Elements of Syriac, 2) Arabic Authors, 3) Hariri. *Prym*, 1) Syriac, Course II., 2) Quran. *Wiedemann*, Old-Egyptian.

BRESLAU: *Rübiger*, Psalms. *Schultz*, Genesis.—*Fränkel*, 1) Quran and Arabic Syntax, 2) History of Targumistic Literature, 3) Targum II. of Esther, 4) Elements of modern Persian. *Grütz*, Elements of Hebrew. *Prætorius*, 1) Syriac continued, 2) Hamâsa, 3) Ethiopic Grammar.

ERLANGEN: *Köhler*, 1) Messianic Prophecies, 2) Job, 3) Exercises in Old Testament Exegesis.—*Spiegel*, 1) Old-Persian Grammar with Interpretation of Cuneiform Inscription, 2) Syriac Grammar.

FREIBURG: *König*, 1) Biblical Hermeneutics in connection with the History of Exegesis, 2) Isaiah.

GIESSEN: *Stade*, 1) History of Israel, 2) Psalms.

* The Dashes stand between the Theological and Philosophical Faculties.

- GOETTINGEN: *Bertheau*, 1) Genesis, 2) Chaldaic Portions of Daniel. *Duhm*, 1) History of Israel, 2) Isaiah, 3) Society for Oriental Languages. *Schultz*, Old Testament Theology.—*De Lagarde*, 1) Syriac, 2) Selections of Arabic, 3) Makamen of Harizi. *Haupt*, 1) Elements of Geez, Ethiopic Chrestomathy of Dillmann, 3) Assyrian, Bilingual Texts in IV. Rawlinson, 4) Assyrian Grammar and reading of easier texts.
- GREIFSWALD: *Bredenkamp*, 1) Genesis, 2) Old Testament Theology, 3) Exercises in Old Testament Interpretation. *Giesebrecht*, 1) Messianic Prophecies, 2) Hebrew Grammar, 3) Holy Land described. *Meinhold*, 1) Value of Assyrian to Old Testament Interpretation, 2) Job.—*Ahlwardt*, 1) Arabic Grammar, 2) Poems of Moallaqât, 3) Persian Grammar.
- HALLE: *Riehm*, 1) Job, 2) Hebrew Archaeology, 3) Geography of Palestine. *Schlottmann*, 1) Psalms, 2) History of Israel, 3) Exercises in Old Testament Exegesis.—*Gosche*, 1) Arabic Grammar, 2) Turkish Grammar. *Wellhausen*, 1) Elements of Syriac, 2) Selected portions of the Quran, 3) Daniel.
- HEIDELBERG: *Kneucker*, 1) History of Pentateuch Criticism, 2) Exegetical Exercises. *Merz*, 1) Psalms, 2) Ancient Cultus of Israel, 3) Old Testament Exegetical Society.—*Eisenlohr*, 1) Selected Egyptian Texts, 2) Photographic Exercises for Archaeology. *Thorbecke*, 1) Arabic Grammar, 2) Buchârî, 3) Persian Grammar. *Weil*, 1) Arabic Language, 2) Hariri or Moallaqât, 3) Gülüstan, 4) Turkish Language with Chrestomathy of Wickerhauser, 5) Concerning Hebrew, Arabic, Persian and Turkish Languages.
- JENA: *Schmiedel*, 1) Elements of Hebrew, 2) Old Testament Exercises. *Siegfried*, 1) Genesis, 2) System of Hebrew Grammar, 3) Introduction to Hebrew and Phœnician Palæography, 4) Makomen of Harizi.—*Stickel*, 1) Hebrew Exercises, 2) Chaldee, 3) Syriac, 4) Arabic Grammar. *Wilhelm*, 1) Old-Persian cuneiform writing compared with cognates, 2) Modern Persian Authors.
- KIEL: *Baethgen*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Deuteronomy. *Klostermann*, 1) Books of Kings, 2) Isaiah I.—XXXIX.—*Hoffmann*, 1) Hebrew of Minor Prophets, 2) Elements of Syriac, 3) Elements of Arabic.
- LEIPZIG: *Baur*, Old Testament Introduction. *Delitzsch*, *Frz.*, 1) Psalms, 2) Messianic Prophecies, 3) In Gesellschaft, History of Joseph, Gen. xxxvii.—L., 4) Kimchi on the Psalms according to Cambridge edition (Institutum Judaicum), 5) Anglo-American Exegetical Society. *Guthe*, 1) Isaiah I. (chaps. I.—XXXIX.), 2) Selections from Isaiah II. (chaps. XL.—LXVI.), 3) In Old Testament Gesellschaft. Selected Themes in Old Testament Theology. *Hälemann*, Song of Solomon philologico-theologically interpreted. *König*, 1) Hebrew Grammatical Exercises, 2) In Society of Old Testament Exegesis and Biblical Theology: most important Old Testament passages bearing on the History of Religion. *Ryssel*, 1) Genesis, 2) Belief in Immortality in the Old Testament.—*Delitzsch*, *Frdr.*, 1) Hebrew Grammar (according to a new method), 2) Assyrian, Course II., 3) Assyrian, Course III., The Original Dictionaries in II. and V. Rawlinson. *Ebers*, 1) Hieroglyphic Texts and Syntax of Old- and Late-Egyptian, 2) Coptic Grammar. *Fleischer*, 1) Firdusi's Schachname, 2) Quran according to Beidhâwi, 3) Fifth part of Hamâsa (Satires), 4) Turkish Discourses (Gespräche), 5) Arabic Gesellschaft. *Krehl*, 1) Spicilegium Syriac of Cureton, 2) Buchârî's Traditions, 3) Ethiopic, Book of Enoch.

- MARBURG: *Baudissin*, 1) Psalms, 2) Hebrew Archæology. *Cornill*, 1) Job, 2) Pirge Aboth. *Kessler*, 1) Old Testament Theology, 2) Elements of Hebrew, 3) Syriac, unpointed text, 4) Quran.—*Justi*, Modern Persian.
- MÜNICH: *Schönfelder*, 1) Pre-exilic minor Prophets, 2) Hebrew Syntax, 3) Biblical Aramaic in Daniel. *Schegg*, Biblical Archæology.—*Lauth*, Egyptian Mythology. *Hommel*, 1) Persian Grammar, 2) Moallaqât or Quran, 3) Sumerian Texts. *Bezold*, 1) Arabic continued, 2) Assyrian: Salmanasar II., 3) Syriac or Ethiopic.
- STRASSBURG: *Kayser*, 1) Geography of Palestine, 2) Psalms. *Nowack*, 1) Old Testament Theology, 3) Old Testament Introduction.—*Euting*, Aramaic Inscriptious. *Duemichen*, 1) Old-Egyptian Grammar and translation of Hieroglyphic texts, Course I., 2) Selected Hieroglyphic and Hieratic Texts, 3) Egyptian Temple building in times of Ptolemies and Kings. *Huebschmann*, 1) Modern Persian Grammar, 2) Firdusi. *Nöldeke*, 1) Syriac, 2) Arabic: Hamâsa, 3) Beladhori, 4) Ethiopic.
- TUEBINGEN: *Kautzsch*, 1) Psalms, 2) Biblical Aramaic, and Interpretation of those portions of Daniel and Ezra, 3) Old Testament Gesellschaft. *Kuebel*, Isaiah II. (chaps. XL.-LXVI.).—*Socin*, 1) Elements of Arabic, 2) Arabic Authors, 3) Modern Persian.
- WUERZBURG: *Scholz*, 1) Isaiah XL.-LXVI., 2) Syriac Grammar with reading Exercises, 3) Exegetical Exercises.

Volume XVIII. (ORN-PHT) of the Encyclopædia Britannica, under the editorship of Professors T. S. Baynes, LL. D., and W. Robertson Smith, appeared last Tuesday, 24th ult., and contains the following articles, interesting for Semitic scholars, by the authors whose names follow:

Pahlavi, Persepolis by Nöldeke; Ancient Persia by Nöldeke and A. von Gutschmid of Tübingen; Palmyra, Passover, Petra, Philistines by W. Robertson Smith; Pentateuch by Wellhausen; Palestine by A. Socin; Phœnicia by Socin and von Gutschmid.

Of Kuenen's "Historisch-kritisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan von de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds," "Historico-critical examination concerning the Origin and Composition of the books of the Old Testament" has appeared the first half of Vol. I. of a completely revised second edition. It will be completed in three volumes.

Trübner & Co. have just issued "Egyptian Exploration Fund: The store-city of Pithom and the route of the Exodus," by Edward Naville, with 13 plates and 2 maps.

The Royal School for Oriental Languages at Vienna has just issued "Paradigms of the written Arabic Language." It is a comprehensive method with an introduction to reading and understanding the spoken Arabic of to-day.

Of the 1052 Arabic MSS. of the Swedish Orientalist, Landsberg, which the Royal Library in Berlin purchased last year for the sum of about \$1700, there will appear in a short time a complete catalogue by Professor Ahlwardt of Greifswald. In this collection are found scientific works of all kinds. The largest number embraces Theology in its different departments, then follow Law, Philosophy, particularly Logic, Philology, etc. With the collections of Wetzstein, Petermann and Sprenger, acquired in 1852-1862, the treasure of Arabic MSS. in the Royal Library in Berlin is the richest in existence.

Professor H. O. Fleischer has in press another volume of his "Arabische Studien."

Professor Krehl has a new work in press entitled, "Die Lehre Muhammeds," which may be regarded as a supplement to his "Leben des Muhammed."

Clermont-Ganneau has a timely work about ready for print dealing with the Archæological Frauds in Palestine, spurious Moabite in Berlin, Schapira's Deuteronomy and other doubtful antiquities.

The Prussian Government will publish this year or next M. Naville's copy of the Egyptian Hieroglyphic Ritual.

The New Testament will soon appear in another Hebrew translation, this by a Mr. Salkinson, and edited by Dr. Ginsburg.

Carl Bezold is preparing a German translation of Sayce's "Fresh Light from Ancient Monuments" with notes.

"Lösung des Paradies-Frage" is the title of a new work by Mr. Engel.

Professors H. O. Fleischer, the Arabist, and Franz Delitzsch, the exegete, celebrated on February 21st and February 23d respectively their 84th and 72d birthdays. Few are the men who have accomplished so much, who to-day carry so much, who maintain in the midst of all of their labor almost the elasticity and vigor of early manhood, and who yet have the prospect of giving us some of the most valuable results of the work of their lives.

Leipzig, March 2, 1885.

→CONTRIBUTED NOTES.←

Adam's "Help-meet."—Will men who ought to know better ever cease misquoting the eighteenth and twentieth verses of the second chapter in Genesis by putting a hyphen between *help* and *meet*, making it a compound word, instead of a noun and its adjective, as our A. V. has it, and as the Hebrew 'ezer *K'negdo* requires? Yet this blunder, involving a radical misapprehension of the meaning of the words, is inexcusably frequent both in the pulpit and in general literature. It is a little remarkable that it should occur in the otherwise intelligent passage from White's "Third Genesis," quoted in the December number of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT. The adjective *meet* has here the same meaning as in other passages, e. g., "fruits meet for repentance," "vessels meet for the master's use," "herbs meet for them," etc. The smuggling in of the hyphen is due to the popular notion that the alleged inferiority and subjection of women was a part of the divine purpose in her creation. But the record certainly contains no hint of any purposed and original inferiority, whatever inequalities might have been subsequently introduced in consequence of the fall. The helper provided for man was not a "help" in the modern kitchen-sense of the word. She was not created to be his slave, his drudge; but his corresponding opposite, the complementary hemisphere in the orb of humanity, his *alter ego*, one ἑμῶς αὐτῶ, *like himself*, as the LXX happily translate it. The Edenic conception of woman's relation to man is well expressed in Tennyson's "Princess:"

"She that out of Lethe scales with man
The shining steps of Nature, shares with man
His nights, his days, moves with him to one goal."

She was

"To set herself to man
Like perfect music unto noble words;
And so these twain, upon the skirts of Time,
Sit side by side, full summ'd in all their powers."

This entire conception is destroyed by the hyphen, which by its presence projects upon the simple beauty of the inspired record a false and unworthy idea of woman's essential inferiority, begotten of "barbarous laws," and the "rough ways of the world till now." Brethren, save your hyphen for a worthier use than thereby to degrade the biblical conception of womanhood, and in public forbear to speak of Adam's "help-meet."

P. A. NORDELL,

New London, Ct.

The Old Testament in the Sunday School.—Nearly fifteen hundred years ago, the word was uttered *Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet, Novum in vetere latet*. It was Augustine who thus spoke. In our days the Old Testament is to be banished from the place where it is needed the most. Whatever may be the objections against some parts of the Old Testament, certain it is, that no one can stand up and say that he became any worse by reading those parts. I think that a fair

and judicious selection of Old Testament passages will be a great blessing to scholars in the Sunday School. For practical purposes I find that the American Sunday School scholar is far behind the German. In the German parochial schools, both the Old and New Testaments are read and studied; the same is also the case in all German Sunday Schools where the international lessons are not used. When a German pastor meets his catechetical class, he sees at once which of the scholars comes from an English and which from a German Sunday School. He is surprised that boys and girls of fourteen and fifteen years of age have no idea of the first elements of the Christian religion. They know not the decalogue or the creed, not to speak of the history of the patriarchs. The books of the Old Testament are often looked for in the New Testament.

A statement like this may look disparaging, but it is nevertheless true. It has been my experience for the last seventeen years. The Old Testament must be studied systematically, if it is to be advantageous; so I consider it a great mistake merely to select passages from the Book of Proverbs for the children in Sunday School to read, like "be not among wine bibbers," etc. I fully agree with Dr. Crosby when he says "The Old Testament is God's revelation to man, and therefore demands every man's study." The late Dean Stanley has the following words in the preface to his Lectures on the Jewish Church: "There are some excellent men who disparage the Old Testament, as the best means of saving the New. . . it is true that the Old Testament is inferior to the New, that it contains and sanctions many institutions and precepts (polygamy, for example, and slavery) which have been condemned or abandoned by the tacit consent of nearly the whole of Christendom. But this inferiority is no more than both Testaments freely recognize; the one by pointing to a future greater than itself, the other by insisting on the gradual, partial, imperfect character of the revelations that had preceded it. It is true also that the rigid acceptance of every part of the Old Testament, as of equal authority, equal value, and equal accuracy, is rendered impossible by every advance made in biblical science, and by every increase of our acquaintance with Eastern customs and primeval history. But it is no less true that by almost every one of these advances the beauty and the grandeur of the substance and spirit of its different parts are enhanced to a degree far transcending all that was possible in former ages." And Robertson Smith says, "Christianity can never separate itself from its historical basis on the religion of Israel; the revelation of God in Christ cannot be divorced from the earlier revelation on which our Lord built. In all true religion the new rests upon the old. No one, then, to whom Christianity is a reality, can safely acquiesce in an unreal conception of the Old Testament history; and in an age when all are interested in historical research, no apologetic can prevent thoughtful minds from drifting away from faith, if the historical study of the Old Covenant is condemned by the Church and left in the hands of unbelievers. . . The history of Israel, when rightly studied, is the most real and vivid of all histories, and the proofs of God's working among his people of old may still be made, what they were in time past, one of the strongest evidences of Christianity. It was no blind chance, and no mere human wisdom, that shaped the growth of Israel's religion, and finally stamped it in these forms, now so strange to us, which preserved the living seed of the divine word till the fullness of the time when he was manifested who transformed the religion of Israel into a religion for all mankind." It is related that Frederick the Great, of Prussia, the friend of Voltaire, once asked his court-

preacher for a proof as to the truth of the Bible. The Court-preacher replied: "The Jews." Our advice is therefore *tolle lege*, *i. e.*, take and read the whole Bible.

BERNARD PICK, Ph. D.,

Allegheny, Pa.

There are not many so discouraging features in the aspect of our times as the opposition shown by some to the study of the Old Testament by the young. It indicates a great lack of clearness and comprehensiveness of view in relation to the nature and claims of the Scripture. And all experience shows that a failure here is far reaching in its results. Any disparagement of the older Scripture reacts fatally upon the later. Often men do not dream of such a thing, but all the same the effect follows.

1. The Old Testament should be taught in the Sunday School because it is a constituent part of the Word of God, resting upon precisely the same authority as the rest of the volume. If men are to learn the whole counsel of God, they must study the whole record of that counsel. Is there any arrogance equal to that of separating that which God has joined together?

2. All the encomiums of Scripture in the New Testament refer to the Old. Paul called it the sword of the Spirit, and said that as being inspired it was profitable for teaching and training so as to furnish the man of God completely for every good work (Ephes. VI., 17; 2 Tim. III., 16, 17). Our Lord used it to repel the Tempter, to rebuke the Sadducees, to instruct the disciples and to utter his own last words on the cross.

3. The Old Testament is as much needed to understand the New as the New is to illumine the Old. The later presupposes the earlier and builds upon it at every step. Borrow at first distributed the New Testament alone in Spain, but afterwards found this to be a mistake, for people previously ignorant of the Bible could not get hold of the force and meaning of the gospels and epistles without the aid of the antecedent disclosures. And what becomes of Christ's references to the fathers, and Paul's appeals to Abraham and David, and the priestly argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, if the Old Testament be not read and considered?

4. A chief peculiarity of the Bible is that it records a *progressive* revelation, all the stages of which are closely interlocked together. Its completeness and glory are seen only when this fact is recognized and receives its due weight. Are our children to be trained in studious ignorance of this capital truth?

5. The Old Testament is peculiarly fitted to interest and please the young. So much of it is history, or rather chronicles, annals, which tell their own story and possess the advantage which the concrete has over the abstract. More than once I have seen lads reading in turn at family worship lose the place because interested in the narrative they had read on to see the issue. Again, the biographies of the older Scripture are very fascinating. From Abraham to Daniel there is a long list of worthies, wonderfully varied in character and circumstances, but all attractive by the power inherent in an absolutely truthful memoir, which furnish an inexhaustible mine of interest and suggestiveness. What Christian mother could get along without the story of Joseph, of Samuel, of David? Further, the element of the marvellous so prominent in the Hebrew records seems exactly adapted to meet youthful tastes. The Creation and the Deluge, the plagues of Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea and the Jordan, the hailstones on

Gibeon, the exploits of Samson, the narrow escapes of the son of Jesse, the miracles wrought by Elijah and Elisha, the story of Esther, of Jonah and of Daniel and his friends,—are all adapted to meet the natural craving of the young for the abnormal and supernatural. But they meet it with truth, and with truth intimately associated with moral and religious ideas, so that the effect is as wholesome as it is gratifying. Once more, the poetical portions of the Old Testament are indispensable, whether it be the didactic or gnomic utterances in the Book of Proverbs which sum up the wisdom of all ages and exhibit the insight and shrewdness of "Poor Richard" without his narrowness and sometimes questionable morality, or the Psalms of David, so sweet, so rich, so varied, so adapted to the nature of man as man always and everywhere. What injustice to a child can be greater than to cut him off from the study of compositions like these, the models of their kind? Instead of lessening the attention given to the Old Testament we ought to increase it, make it more intelligent and searching, and above all bring to view its manifold close and intimate relations to the New, so that the young shall see and feel that the two Testaments combine to make one whole, and that whole is the Word of God.

TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,

New York City.

The Hebrew Language.—A knowledge of the Hebrew language is indispensable to the theologian.

1. It is necessary as a means for the genuine study of the Old Testament. There is perhaps no language of equal importance whose contents are more imperfectly reached by translations than the Hebrew.

2. It is likewise indispensable to the proper exegesis of the New Testament.

a) For the New Testament idiom largely rests on the Hebrew. It is a Hebraizing Greek. The *Aramaic*, which was probably the early domestic vernacular of our Lord, and of most of the New Testament writers, is closely cognate with the Hebrew, and through it as well as through the Old Testament writings and the Septuagint, which is a Hebraizing Greek, the New Testament receives its Semitic impress. The New Testament, therefore, to use Luther's expression, "is full of the Hebrew mode of speaking."

b) The citations from the Old Testament can only be properly understood after being compared with the original.

c) The New Testament itself is to some extent, we know not how largely, a translation of what was uttered in the Aramaic dialect. It is quite possible and indeed highly probable that both our Lord and his Apostles used both languages. That both languages were in general use, is universally admitted; the question, however, whether our Lord spoke for the most part in Greek, or in Hebrew (Aramaic), is not so definitely settled. Of our Lord himself it is expressly stated that on four occasions he made use of the Aramaic: When he raised the daughter of Jairus (Mark v., 41); when he opened the ears of the deaf man (Mark vii., 34); when upon the cross (Mark xv., 34); and when he manifested himself to Paul near Damascus (Acts xxvi., 14). We are also definitely informed that St. Paul on certain occasions spoke in the Hebrew language (Acts xxi., 40; xxii., 2).

The Hebrew language is also of especial value to the philologist, as it is a prominent member of the large family of languages known as the *Semitic*. The Semitic languages are indigenous to hither Asia, and confined to Palestine, Syria, Phœnicia, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Arabia and Ethiopia.

The name Hebrew is usually derived from *Eber* or *Heber*, the ancestor of Abraham (Gen. x., 24, 25; xiv., 13). Hebrew was the language of the Jewish people during the time of their national independence, and, with some modification, down to the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70). It has continued to be their sacred language, and is used in the synagogue, more or less, to this day, and by a few of them, chiefly the older orthodox bodies in Germany and Austria, it is to some extent still written and spoken.

Everything seems to indicate that the Semitic people emigrated from a common centre in the desert on the south of Babylonia, the Arabic group separating first, next the Aramaic, then the Hebrew, while the Babylonian gained ultimately the mastery of the original Akkadian of Babylonia, and the Assyrian founded the great empire on the Tigris. The Book of Genesis (xii., 31) represents Abram as going forth from this central seat of Ur of the Chaldees, at first northward into Mesopotamia, and then emigrating to Canaan. The monuments of Ur reveal that about this time (B. C. 2000), it was the seat of a great literary development. Whether Abraham adopted the language of the Canaanites, or brought the Hebrew with him from the East, is unimportant, for the ancient Assyrian and Babylonian are nearer to the Hebrew and Phœnician than they are to the other Semitic families. Thus the Hebrew language, as a dialect of the Canaanites and closely related to the Babylonian, had already a considerable literary development prior to the entrance of Abram into the Holy Land*. Jacob and his family carried the Hebrew language with them into Egypt, and their descendants preserved it as the medium of communication among themselves, and after their sojourn carried it back again to its original home in Canaan.

The Hebrew language remained substantially unmodified, either by accretion from other languages or by growth and development within itself, during the whole period of its literary period. Its literature may be properly divided into three periods:

1) The Mosaic writings. These contain archaic and poetic words and forms seldom found elsewhere.

2) The Davidic or Solomonic period, the golden Age, extending from Samuel to Hezekiah (B. C. 1100-700). Here belong the older prophetic and poetic writings and all the Davidic Psalms. This period includes the lives and writings of David, Solomon, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jonah, Amos and Hosea.

3) The third period includes the interval between the Babylonian exile and the times of the Maccabees (B. C. 600-160). Its marked feature is the approximation of the Hebrew to the kindred Aramaic and Chaldee. This may be seen to a greater or less extent in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther, Haggai, Zachariah, Malachi, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and the later Psalms. Gradually the Aramaic or Chaldee superseded the Hebrew as the spoken language of the people. When the New Testament speaks of Hebrew as the then current language in Palestine, we must understand it to mean the Aramaic dialect.

* See an excellent presentation of this subject by Prof. Charles A. Briggs in his *Biblical Study*, pp. 46-50. Prof. Briggs also discusses some of the most prominent characteristics of the Hebrew language: 1) its simplicity and naturalness, 2) the striking correspondence of the language to the thought, 3) its majesty and sublimity, 4) its richness in synonyms (having 55 words for *destroy*, 60 for *break*, and 74 for *take*, etc.), 5) its life and fervor, etc.

The history of the critical study of the Hebrew begins with the Jewish grammarians and scribes, the Talmudists and Massorettes, who carefully collected all that pertains to the text of the Hebrew Scriptures. The Christian Fathers with the exception of Origen, Epiphanius, and especially Jerome, were ignorant of the Hebrew language, and derived their knowledge of the Old Testament from the Greek Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate. During the Middle Ages, Hebrew was almost exclusively cultivated by learned Jews, especially in Spain during the Moorish rule, such as Aben Ezra (*d.* 1176), David Kimchi (*d.* 1235), and Moses Maimonides (*d.* 1104). After the revival of letters some Christians began to learn it from Jewish Rabbis, Reuchlin (*d.* 1522), the uncle of Melanchthon, is the father of modern Hebrew learning in the Christian Church. The reformers cultivated and highly recommended the study of Hebrew, and the Protestant translations of the Bible were made directly from the original languages, and not from the Vulgate. Luther, the greatest master perhaps in the annals of the race as a translator, almost despaired at times of giving German equivalents for parts of the Old Testament. He speaks of the Book of Job and of the other parts of the Old Testament as if their writers were resolutely determined not to speak in German, and to the last year of his life, Luther labored in giving greater perfection to the whole translation. The characteristic difference between Luther's German version and the Authorized (and Revised) English version, is that the English more closely follows the words of the original, while Luther's reflects more perfectly the spirit and thought. The one is a splendid illustration of the mechanical, the other of the artistic. The English often reads like an interlinear translation, Luther's version almost constantly reads as if the translation were an original, as if the holy writers were speaking in German as their own vernacular. Luther's translation was at once the most spirited, the most dramatic, the most lucid ever given of the Old Testament, but when we see that even it fails very often to convey perfectly the exact sense of the Hebrew, we feel the importance of a thorough study of that language.

During the seventeenth century, Johann Buxtorf, the Elder (*d.* 1629), and his son, Johann Buxtorf, the Younger (*d.* 1664), both of Basel, Louis Cappel (*d.* 1658), of Saumur, and Salomon Glassius (*d.* 1656) of Jena were the most prominent Hebrew and Talmudic scholars. Johann David Michaelis (*d.* 1791), gave a great impetus to the study of the Oriental languages, especially through his *Oriental and Exegetical Library*, begun in 1771. In the present century, Wilhelm Gesenius, professor in Halle (1786-1842), and Heinrich Ewald, professor in Göttingen (1803-73), created a new epoch in the study of Hebrew. Rödiger, Hupfeld, Hitzig, Fuerst, Delitzsch, Böttcher, Olshausen and Bickell of Germany, Ginsburg, Cheyne, Davidson, Driver, Perowne and Davies of Great Britain, Moses Stuart, *d.* 1852), Edward Robinson, (*d.* 1863), Bush, Conant, Tayler Lewis, Green, and others of our country, deserve special mention as Hebrew scholars.

R. F. WEIDNER,

Rock Island, Ill.

→GENERAL NOTES←

Letters and Posts of the Ancients.—There is reference in the Book of Esther to the first postal service worthy of the name concerning which we have any definite knowledge. (See I., 22; III., 13, 15; VIII., 10, 14; Rollin's Anc. Hist., Bk. 4, chap. 4, art. 1, sec. 4.) Jeremiah (LI., 31) refers to some such system among the Assyrians, and it is likely that from the earliest ages kings and men of power made provision for the rapid conveyance of their messages.

In Palestine and other mountainous countries this was done by fleet footmen. Some rulers provided themselves with a corps of those who were qualified by nature and practice to become such messengers. Pliuy (as quoted in Dunglison's Physiology, Vol. II., p. 249) says that excision of the spleen was performed on runners as beneficial to their wind.

There is record of those who traveled on foot from Tyre to Jerusalem, one hundred miles, in twenty-four hours; and we read that some could accomplish so much as one hundred and fifty miles during the same period of time. (Barnes on Job IX., 25.) These professional footmen were well known in the time of Job, whose language is: "Are not my days swifter than a post (lit. *runner*)?" Saul, the first Hebrew king, had an organized body of "footmen" (margin, as original, *runners*), in which respect he doubtless followed the usual custom of kings. Under our English reading "guard" we find these runners to have been a regular corps in the armies of succeeding Hebrew monarchs. Hence the allusion of Jeremiah: "If thou hast run with the footmen, and they have wearied thee, then how canst thou contend with horses?"

Among nations richer in swift beasts, and dwelling in a less mountainous country than the Jews, the runner, doubtless from earliest times, ran with other legs than his own. But the only word used in the Bible for such couriers, whether mounted or not, is the one of which we have spoken, and which is often translated "posts." This latter English term, coming from the Latin, originally meant the house or station whence relays of horses were obtained, and where couriers might lodge. Such an original meaning of the word is almost lost to us, though remaining in the expression "military post."

The Persian postal system was established by Cyrus the Great during a reign continuing from 559 to 529 B. C. It was greatly improved by Darius, to whom some even ascribe its origination. (Rawlinson, Anc. Mon., Vol. III., p. 426.) Herodotus (VIII., 98) gives the credit to Xerxes. This latter monarch in the earlier years of his reign devoted himself to the thorough organization and the general improvement of his realm. He perceived that the peace and permanency of his rule would be greatly enhanced by quick communication between himself and all parts of his vast empire, that he might thus have prompt and frequent reports from every officer of his government, and be able speedily to transmit his own directions and decrees. Thus only he could have "well in hand" an empire of twenty satrapies and one hundred and twenty-seven districts, extending from India to Ethiopia.

Accordingly, he established post-houses along the chief lines of travel at intervals of about fourteen miles, according to the average capacity of a horse to gallop at his best speed without stopping. At each of these there were maintained by state a number of couriers and several relays of horses. One of these horsemen receiving an official document rode at utmost speed to the next post-house, whence it was taken onward by another horse, and perhaps by a new courier. Ballantine states that at the present day a good horseman of that country will often travel one hundred and twenty miles or more each day for ten or twelve days consecutively.

Such was the method of transmitting messages existing in the time of Xerxes and Esther, and in our day still employed by the government of Persia, and, under substantially the same form, in thinly settled regions of Russia, and other countries. This system was adopted with some improvements by the Greeks and Romans, and transmitted to the nations of western Europe, with whom in the course of centuries it developed into the inexpressibly useful form in which it has been enjoyed by us.

But in ancient times the postal system was intended only for the monarch and those "whom he delighted to honor," and not for his people, who derived no direct benefit from it. It is true that good roads, bridges, ferries, and inns were established; that by guard-houses these routes were kept free from brigands which infested the empire (Herod. v., 52); and that travelers might journey upon these highways; but it does not appear that they could obtain the use of the post-horses, even when the government was in no need of them. And above all, the post itself was only for the king. It soon became a law of the system that a courier might impress man or beast into his service, and it was regarded a serious offence to resist such impressment. This privilege of couriers was subsequently, as is well known, a part of the Roman system, reference to which is found in the familiar instruction of our Savior, "Whosoever shall *compel* thee to go a mile, go with him twain" (Matt. v., 41; xxvii., 32; Mark xv., 21). The messages of the king were thus "hastened and pressed on" at any inconvenience to the people; but common men must send their letters by caravans, by special messengers, or in any way they might.

The main post-road in Xerxes' day was that from Susa to Sardis, a distance of about fourteen hundred miles (Herod., *ibid.*). Besides, there was a branch to Ecbatana, and a main line to Babylon, with less important routes to all the localities of the empire.—*Rev. Wm. P. Alcott in the Lowell Hebrew Club's Book of Esther.*

The Prophetic Order.—The Egyptian hierarchy, the paternal despotism of China, were very fit instruments for carrying those nations up to the point of civilization which they attained. But having reached that point they were brought to a permanent halt for want of mental liberty and individuality,—requisites of improvement which the institutions that had carried them thus far entirely incapacitated them from acquiring; and as the institutions did not break down and give place to others, further improvement stopped. In contrast with these nations, let us consider the example of an opposite character, afforded by another and a comparatively insignificant Oriental people—the Jews. They, too, had an absolute monarchy and a hierarchy. These did for them what was done for other Oriental races by their institutions—subdued them to industry and order, and gave

them a national life. But neither their kings nor their priests ever obtained, as in those other countries, the exclusive moulding of their character. Their religion gave existence to an inestimably precious unorganized institution—the *Order* (if it may be so termed) of Prophets. Under the protection, generally though not always effectual, of their sacred character, the Prophets were a power in the nation, often more than a match for kings and priests, and kept up, in that little corner of the earth, the antagonism of influences which is the only real security for continued progress. Religion consequently was not there—what it has been in so many other places—a consecration of all that was once established, and a barrier against further improvement. The remark of a distinguished Hebrew, that the Prophets were in Church and State the equivalent of the modern liberty of the press, gives a just but not an adequate conception of the part fulfilled in national and universal history by this great element of the Jewish life; by means of which, the canon of inspiration never being complete, the persons most eminent in genius and moral feeling could not only denounce as reprobate, with the direct authority of the Almighty, whatever appeared to them deserving of such treatment, but could give forth better and higher interpretations of the national religion, which thenceforth became part of the religion. Accordingly, whoever can divest himself of the habit of reading the Bible as if it was one book, which until lately was equally inveterate in Christians and in unbelievers, sees with admiration the vast interval between the morality and religion of the Pentateuch, or even of the historical books, and the morality and religion of the Prophecies, a distance as wide as between these last and the Gospels. Conditions more favorable to progress could not easily exist; accordingly, the Jews, instead of being stationary, like other Asiatics, were, next to the Greeks, the most progressive people of antiquity, and, jointly with them, have been the starting-point and main propelling agency of modern cultivation.—*John Stuart Mill, in Representative Government.*

Luther and the Old Testament Canon.—In order to bring out more clearly the high value he attributed to his theological criterion, I ought further to mention here some of his opinions regarding different books of the Old Testament. These latter were positively better defended, as a whole, by that same tradition which did not afford equal protection to all the writings composing the apostolic canon, and it was generally thought that, after eliminating the Apocrypha, the canon of the Synagogue was raised above all criticism. But Luther's exegesis was skilful in discovering the evangelical element in the documents of the Old Covenant, and he did not hesitate to acknowledge his disappointments in this respect when his sagacity was deceived, and at once to draw from this fact conclusions similar to those he had uttered regarding the four deutero-canonical books of the New Testament. On this point I shall quote from the interesting collection of *Table Talk* some examples which so clearly carry the stamp of his genius, and owe so little to the spirit of his ordinary surroundings that their authenticity cannot be doubtful. They will show how far his intelligence, more practical than learned, was able sometimes to grasp the meaning of the facts, or decide beforehand questions which had not yet arisen in his day. Thus, speaking of Ecclesiastes, he says: "This book ought to be more complete: it wants many things; it has neither boots nor spurs, and rides in simple sandals as I used to do when I was still in the convent. Solomon is not its author," etc. Evidently this

criticism applies to the theology of the book in which Luther, with justice, did not recognize the spirit of his own—i. e., of the theology of the Gospel. "The Proverbs of Solomon," he continues, "are a book of good works; they are collected by others who wrote them when the king, at table or elsewhere, had just uttered his maxims. There are added the teachings of other wise doctors. Ecclesiastes and Canticles, are, besides, books not of one piece; there is no order in these books; all is confused in them, which fact is explained by their origin. For Canticles, too, were composed by others from the sayings of Solomon, who therein thanks God for the obedience which is a gift of heaven, and the practice of which at home, or in public, brings peace and happiness, like to conjugal harmony." "As to the second book of Maccabees," he says elsewhere, "and that of Esther, I dislike them so much that I wish they did not exist; for they are too Jewish and have many bad Pagan elements." "The preachings of the prophets were not composed in a complete fashion. Their disciples and their hearers from time to time wrote fragments of them, and thus what is now found in the Bible, was formed and preserved." "The books of Kings are a hundred thousand steps in advance of those of Chronicles, and they also deserve more credit. Still they are only the calendar of the Jews, containing the list of their kings and their kind of government." "Job may have thought what is written in his book, but he did not pronounce these discourses. A man does not speak thus when he is tried. The fact at bottom is real; but it is like the subject of a drama with a dialogue in the style of Terence's comedies, and for the purpose of glorifying resignation." "Moses and the prophets preached; but we do not there hear God himself. For Moses received only the law of angels and has only a subordinate mission. People are not urged to good works by preaching the law. When God himself speaks to men, they hear nothing but grace and mercy. The intermediate organs, angels, Moses, emperor, or burgomaster, can only command; we ought certainly to obey them: but only since God spoke by the Son and the Holy Spirit, do we hear the paternal voice of love and grace."—*Reuss, Canon of the Holy Scriptures.*

→EDITORIAL NOTES.←

A Continuation of our Symposium.—We publish in this number, under the head of "Contributed Notes," two contributions to the Symposium on the Old Testament in the Sunday School, which arrived too late for publication in the March number. The names of Bernard Pick and Talbot W. Chambers are known to all Bible students. These writers have done much to help those desiring to know better the meaning of the Divine Word. Their words are worthy of careful consideration. We believe that this question is an important one. While much may seem already to have been said, much still remains.

Is Rawlinson a Reliable Authority?—In *The Athenæum* of February 14, there appears a review of Canon Rawlinson's late book "Egypt and Babylon from Scripture and Profane Sources." The book, as those who may have seen it know, consists of extracts from the Bible and of translations of Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions. These inscriptions are intended to throw light upon difficulties in the biblical account. It will be seen at a glance that such a book, if reliable, is one of great value. But if unreliable, what is it worth? The writer of this review criticises the book unsparingly. It is, he says, full of glaring errors. Rawlinson's attempt to make "Babel" mean either "gate of God" or "confusion" is an effort to pervert philology. The translation of a line supposed to contain a reference to the confusion of tongues, "he gave command to make strange their speech," instead of "he made strong the decree, he annulled their counsel," is an example of the inaccuracy of the book. The critic is particularly dissatisfied with the notices of Babylon in Daniel. Rawlinson's view, that "we have a considerable body of Babylonian history in this so-called prophetic book" is treated as erroneous, since "Daniel was not written under the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II., nor even by a man who knew much about the times of this king." That part of the book which is devoted to Egypt suffers at the hands of our critic in a similar manner. His closing words are: "The material should have been more carefully selected, the mistakes of earlier writers should have been corrected, the facts on both sides of a case should have been stated."

Now the question arises, and it is a question in which all who desire to know the truth are interested, is this book so full of errors, so misleading, so valueless? Nor is the question one of slight importance. Every Christian student believes to-day that from Assyria and Egypt there are coming a multitude of facts to corroborate the truth of the biblical narratives. Commentators, when they come to an unintelligible passage, do not now force a meaning upon it. They say, Let us wait; perhaps some light may be thrown upon this from the monuments. In our age, the great source of Bible help, so far as unsolved difficulties are concerned, is Oriental history and philology. One of those who have stood up most valiantly on the side of so-called orthodoxy has been Canon G. Rawlinson. If, however, in this book which claims to establish the truth of the Bible from outside sources, there are to be found false philology, misstatement of facts, and

inaccurate translations, one of two things must be true: either Canon Rawlinson is not fitted to prepare such a book, or he felt it necessary to bolster up the Bible by the statement of what he knew to be false. In either case the book is worthless and the writer not to be trusted.

But is all this to be accepted merely upon the authority of this critic? Is a scholar to whom the world owes so much for his staunch support of the truth as accepted by most Christians, to be cast aside without a hearing? Is Canon Rawlinson reliable? Let those speak who are in a position to speak with authority.

Semitic Work in the German Universities.—Under "Notes from Abroad" will be found in this number a very complete list of those professors in all the German universities who are devoting themselves to Semitic studies, together with the topics on which lectures are to be delivered during the coming semester. This list is an interesting one, and full of suggestions. We learn from it, that while in other countries Semitic studies may not be receiving the attention they deserve, this is not the case in Germany. Germany is the headquarters for all study in this line. One cannot but feel, too, as he reads this list, that the work accomplished by so large a number of specialists must be very great; for the German professor is not so much a teacher as an investigator. He studies, and places the results of his study before his pupils. He does not aim directly to help the student, but to discover truth. Perhaps in this respect he goes much too far. However that may be, is it not true that our American professors go to the other extreme? We believe that the reading of this schedule will give us a broader view of what goes to make up in the widest sense the Old Testament department; for the department includes much more than is generally supposed.

Optional Studies in the Seminary.—The time is now at hand when the question of "optionals" in the theological seminary must be considered. The introduction of "optionals" in college is to be followed by the introduction of optionals in the divinity school. It may be presumed that the study of Hebrew will, first of all, be made optional. We cannot here enter into a discussion of this subject, but we would ask one or two questions:—

Is it or is it not the chief business, the divinely appointed business of every minister to interpret the Bible? Is he or is he not under obligation so to fit himself that he may perform this duty in the most reliable manner? Will any man claim that he can reliably interpret Scripture upon any other basis than upon that of the original text? Is there anything outside of the Bible so important as that which is in it? Is there any study which will throw more light upon the Bible, than the study of the Bible? Has the Bible been studied too much in our seminaries, that now its study is to be made optional? Is not the cry already raised, that in the seminary everything is studied but the Bible? Shall now the candidate for the ministry be declared ready, who knows next to nothing of three-fourths of the Divine Word? Where is the wisdom of all this? What a fearful responsibility is assumed in the position that a man may elect to give up the critical study of the Bible, in his preparation for the ministry? There is here no confusion of terms, for while there may be study of the Bible through the original languages which is not critical, there can be no critical study, except through the original languages.

→BOOK : NOTICES.←

HOSEA.*

This little book in the Cambridge Bible series contains a brief, succinct introduction to the prophecy, the text adopted in the Cambridge Paragraph Bible, and quite full notes, being about three times as extensive as the text.

Hosea, a "native of the northern kingdom," as is shown by his intimate familiarity with the land and the tone of his utterances, and a "devoted patriot," was the "prophet of the decline and fall of Israel." Chapters I.-III., which are complete in themselves, are referred to the reign of Jeroboam II., and chapters IV.-XIV. to that of Jotham, king of Judah probably.

The events described in chapters I. and III. are more easily and satisfactorily explained as fact than as allegory. The prophet's domestic life begins under happy auspices, but the outcome is a most bitter disappointment. A man of loving, forgiving heart, he does not cast off the sinning wife, but strives to win her back to purity of life. He becomes thus the representative of Jehovah in his dealings with the faithless Israel.

The "second book," chapters IV.-XIV., are a reproduction by the prophet's pen of the messages which his lips had uttered to the backsliding nation.

Five leading ideas characterize the prophecy: (a) "lamentations over the general immorality of the Israelites," (b) denunciation of the worship of the bulls (calves) set up by Jeroboam I., (c) warnings against alliance with Assyria or Egypt, (d) a yearning for the healing of the schism between Judah and Israel (e) a proclamation of the great truth "that love is the highest attribute of God; so that a man should love God, and from love to Him keep all his commandments because God first loved him." This last thought is the prophet's fundamental idea, and from it, with more or less directness, flow all the other conceptions.

Hosea possesses the genius of a lyric poet, and this appears in the general style, the "bold poetic flight," and the figurative language of his prophecy. The passion of sorrow, however, is too great to allow regular and strophic arrangement, and has "choked his utterance and brought confusion into his style."

Our author's notes on the text are exceedingly instructive. The numerous, and often obscure local and historical references are so treated as to give much light to the student, and the variations in rendering add quite as much if not more. Indeed it seems that it would have been better to incorporate them into the text so that their force could be appreciated in connected reading.

Without entering into a discussion of the views of the book set forth by Dr. Cheyne, we commend the method of treatment and the clearness and definiteness with which it has been carried out.

* THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. HOSEA, with Notes and an Introduction by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M. A., D. D. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1884. 8vo. Pp. 132.

ECCLESIASTES.*

The Book of Ecclesiastes may be called the most human of all the writings of Scripture. It not only portrays the thoughts and feelings of man, and assumes to give no direct divine revelation, but also gives the experience of one who had been a worldling and a doubter, and though at last arriving at the true solution of the problem of living, yet never entered into a high spiritual state of fellowship and communion with God. A successful commentary on this book must be written then in full sympathy with the struggling, doubting side of human nature. This Dr. Plumptre has done. Indeed, rejecting rightly the Solomonic authorship, he has boldly endeavored to give an ideal biography of the author. The Koheleth, the preacher or debater, as Dr. Plumptre prefers to call him, was born in Palestine about 230 B. C., the son of wealthy Jewish parents. In his own land he enjoyed all the advantages of Jewish education and training, not excepting labors in the cornfield and vineyard. But in early manhood he betook himself to Alexandria. There he passed his life, a courtier, a reveler, a lover, a philosopher or debater of the schools of the Epicureans and Stoics, a benefactor, until at last having tried and experienced all things, a weary, worn-out man he wrote the results of his experience, Ecclesiastes. No modern was more like him than Heinrich Heine; and Shakespere's sonnets and Tennyson's *Two Voices* give us the same lessons. This is Dr. Plumptre's view, and hence in addition to the simple explanation of the text he has brought together echoes of the same thoughts wherever found in ancient and modern literature. On a single verse we find quotations from Lucretius, Virgil, Horace and Shakespere. Three appendices are given to illustrate more fully than could be done in the commentary proper the parallelisms between the thoughts which have found expression in the writings of Shakespere, Tennyson and the Persian poet Omar Khayyam and those found in the Book of Ecclesiastes. For the reader who delights in such literary comparison, we know of no richer commentary of the same size.

But Ecclesiastes, though having so many points of contact with the writings mentioned, is not, according to Dr. Plumptre, without a place in the divine economy of Revelation. It is especially designed to meet certain tendencies of skeptical thought, and may become to those using it rightly a schoolmaster leading them to Christ.

We dissent from the late date to which Dr. Plumptre assigns the work, and think he errs in supposing that the writer must necessarily have been acquainted with the Greek literature of the third century B. C. The Koheleth may discuss the same peculiar problems as the Greek philosophers, but he does so in the distinctive Hebrew spirit of the Chokma literature. Yet we commend this commentary as the freshest and in the main the most helpful to the ordinary student on Ecclesiastes we have seen.

THE SCRIPTURES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

The following announcement deserves special attention. G. P. Putnam's Son's (27 W. 23d St.) New York, are about to publish "The Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian, edited and arranged for Young Readers," prepared by Dean Bart-

* THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS. General Editor J. J. S. Perowne, D. D. Ecclesiastes edited by E. H. Plumptre, D. D., Dean of Wells. Cambridge: *University Press*. Pp. 288.

lett and Dr. Peters of the Episcopal Divinity School, in Philadelphia. The editors make the following statement in the Prospectus :

Our object is to remove stones of stumbling from the path of young readers by presenting Scripture to them in a form as intelligible as we can render it. This plan involves some re-arrangement and omissions, before which we have not hesitated, inasmuch as our proposed work will not claim to be the Bible, but an introduction to it. That we may avoid imposing our own interpretation upon Holy Writ, it will be our endeavor to make Scripture serve as the commentary on Scripture.

In the first volume, it is intended to include Hebrew story, from the creation to the time of Nehemiah, as in the Hebrew canon. For this, it is proposed to draw, not only upon the professedly historical books, but also upon the poetical and prophetic writings; for example, to connect with the life of David, a few Psalms, to illustrate the manner of wisdom for which Solomon was famous, by a small number of chosen Proverbs, to introduce certain portions of chapters from Isaiah and Hezekiah. In this way, some portions of most of the prophetic books will be woven into the narrative, as an integral part of the story of the life of Israel. The legislation of the Pentateuch it is proposed to treat, not with the history, but in a section by itself, at the close. The aim of this section will be to codify the Pentateuchal laws, and, so far as practicable, illustrate them both from the Old Testament and the New Testament. This may also involve some use of the Talmud, probably in the form of an appendix. It is, further, proposed to add as appendices, translations from contemporary inscriptions of other nations, chiefly the Assyrians, bearing on the events of Hebrew history.

The second volume will be devoted to Hebrew poetry and prophecy.

It is intended to include among the poetical selections, not only selections from the distinctively poetical books, such as Psalms, Ruth, Lamentations, Job, and the Wisdom literature, but also such poetical inscriptions and fragments as are found in the historical and prophetic portions of the Old Testament, like the Song of the Well, in Numbers, the Song of the Sea, in Exodus, Deborah's Song, the Blessing of Jacob, etc.

It is proposed to arrange the prophecies, where possible, around the persons of individual prophets, telling the story of the prophet by and with his prophecies, making use of paraphrases in the case of a few difficult passages, and connecting the parts by occasional explanatory paragraphs. Other prophecies and parts of prophecies, which are not amenable to this method of treatment, it is proposed to arrange in topical and chronological order, with a view to exhibit the religious concepts of the prophets and their hope of Messianic deliverance. It is not intended, in these selections, to use every word of any one of the present books or of any individual prophet.

As an appendix to this volume, the editors propose to add a section covering the history and intellectual development of the period intervening between Malachi and Jesus. For the narrative of this period, they intend to utilize, besides the books of the Maccabees, historical material gathered from other than biblical sources. For the history of the Hebrew thought of this time, it is their design to make use, not only of such of the Apocrypha of our Bibles as Esdras, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch, but also of other apocryphal works, as the Psalter of Solomon and the book of Enoch, the object being to show the preparation in the thought of the people for the coming of Messiah.

The third volume will contain selections from the Christian Scriptures.

Brief notices of the lives of the Apostles and other writers, sketches of the historical connection of their writings, etc., may be given as shall seem most conducive to the interest of the volume.

↔SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.↔

AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS.

HAMMOND, JOS. Pulpit Commentary: 1 Kings. New York: *A. D. F. Randolph & Co.* Pp. 564.....\$2.00

FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- BARHEBRAEI, G. Scholia in Duodecim prophetas minores. Ad trium codicum fidem recensuit B. Moritz. Leipzig. Pp. 32.....\$.95.
- BERGEL, JOS. Die Medizin der Talmudisten. Nebst einem Anhang: Die Anthropologie der alten Hebräer. Leipzig. Pp. 96.....\$.80.
- Expository Sermons and Outlines on the Old Testament. (Clerical Library.) London: *Hodder & Stoughton.* 8vo, pp. 306.....6s.
- FUNCKE, O. The School of Life: Life Pictures from the Book of Jonah. Authorized translation from 5th German edition. London: *Kingsley.* 8vo, pp. 290.....2s. 6d.
- GEIKIE, C. Old Testament Characters. New edition, enlarged, with 58 illustrations. London: *Hodder & Stoughton.* 8vo, pp. 488.....6s.
- HENDERSON, A. Palestine. Its Historical Geography. With topographical Index and Maps. New York: *Scribner & Welford.*.....\$1.00.
- HOPPS, J. P. The Bible for Beginners: The Old Testament. London: *Williams & Norgate.* 8vo, pp. 270.....2s.
- HUNTER, P. H. The Story of Daniel: His Life and Times. 2d ed. Edinburgh: *Gemmell.* 8vo, pp. 360.....5s.
- KENNEDY, J. The Pentateuch: Its Age and Authorship. With an examination of some modern theories. London: *Sunday School Union.* 8vo, pp. 90.....1s. 6d.

RECENT ARTICLES.

- NEUBAUER, A. The God **עלם**. *Athenæum*, Feb. 28, '85.
- Zoan-Tanis still at San. *Christian at Work*, Feb. 12, '85.
- KAMPHAUSEN. Drei Textfehler im Alten Testament. 2 Sam. xv., 7; 1 Sam. xiii., 1; 2 Sam. xii., 31. *Ev. Gemeindefl. f. Rheinland u. Westfalen*, 1884, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
- STRACK, H. L. Recent Foreign Literature on the Old Testament. *Expositor.* Jan., '85.
- NELSON, H. A. Baalbek. *Herald and Presbyter*, Mar. 4, '85.
- Confirming the Scriptures. *Journal and Messenger*, Mar. 4, '85.
- FIELD, F. Note on Jer. viii., 22. *Journal of Philology*, 1884, No. 25.
- SMITH, W. R. Old Testament Notes. I. **נעתם** Is. ix., 18; II. Is. x., 27, 28; III. **תפוח** Canticles ii., 3, 5; vii., 9. *Ibid.*
- WRIGHT, W. A. Note on Joshua xxii., 10, 11. *Ibid.*
- LANSING, J. G. Tabret or Tofet. *Sunday School Times*, Mar. 11, '85.

- BUDGE, K. Antwort auf König's "Seth und die Sethiten." *Ztschr. f. d. alt-test. Wiss.*, 1885, No. 1.
- KOENIG, F. E. Seth und die Sethiten. *Ibid.*
- NESTLE, E. Zu Daniel. Dan. IX., 26; IX., 27; XI., 31; XII., 11. *Ibid.*, 1884, No. 2.
- SMEEND, R. Anmerkungen zu Is. XXIV.-XXVII. *Ibid.*
- STADE, B. Wie hoch belief sich die Zahl der unter Nebucadnezar nach Babylonien deportirten Juden? *Ibid.*
- STADE, B. 1 Könige XXII., 48. *Ibid.*, 1885, No. 1.
- STADE, B. Is. XXXII., 33. *Ibid.*, 1884, No. 2.
- STADE, B. Jer. XXXII., 11-14. *Ibid.*, 1885, No. 1.
- DELITZSCH, FRIEDR. Assyriologische Notizen zum Alten Testament. I. Das Land Utz. *Zeitschrift f. Keilschriftforschung*, Jan., '85.

REVIEWS.

- The Book of Esther. (By J. F. Moore.) *Andover Review*, Mar., '85; *Congregationalist*, Mar. 5, '85.
- BUDGE, E. A. W. Babylonian Life and History. *Jewish World*, Feb. 14, '85.
- CHEYNE, T. K. Hosea. (By S. R. Driver.) *Academy*, Feb. 24, '85.
- COLVILLE, H. E. The Accursed Land; or, First Steps on the Water-way of Edom. (By G. F. Hooper.) *Academy*, Feb. 24, '85.
- HULL, E. Mount Seir, Sinai and Western Palestine. (By G. F. Hooper.) *Ibid.*
- JOHNSON, S. Oriental Religions. (By G. Batchelor.) *Unitarian Review*, Mar., '85.
- NAVILLE, E. The Store-city of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus. (By R. S. Poole.) *Academy*, Feb. 28, '85.
- RAWLINSON, G. Egypt and Babylon. (By C. J. Ball.) *Ibid.*, Feb. 14, '85.
- REVILLE, A. Prolegomena of the History of Religions. (By T. K. Cheyne.) *Ibid.*, Mar. 7, '85.
- SMITH, W. ROBERTSON. The Prophets of Israel. (By B. Stade.) *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, Feb. 21, '85.
- WRIGHT, G. F. The Divine Authority of the Bible. *New Englander*, Mar., '85.