

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. V.

JANUARY, 1886.

No. 5.

SUN IMAGES AND THE SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

BY TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,

New York City.

One of the excellencies of the Revised Version of the Old Testament is that it incorporates in the text the correct translation of a number of words which, in the Authorized Version, are misrepresented or are rightly given only in the margin. Instances are *grove, plain, scum, owl, dragon, college*, etc. One of the most conspicuous cases of this kind is found in the plural of the word *image*. It is used in the A.V. to render five distinct Hebrew words, *matssebah* (Ex. XXIII., 24), *tselem* (1 Sam. VI., 5), *atsab* (2 Sam. V., 21), *teraphim* (Gen. XXXI., 10), and *chammanim* (Lev. XXVI., 30). The evil is not of much consequence in regard to the first three of these words, since, although there is a distinction in their meaning, the distinction has no particular significance. It is different with the other two, for one of them (*teraphim*) expresses the Hebrew equivalent for the classic *Lares et Penates*, and shows how rooted in the minds of the people was their attachment to the tutelary household gods, their images being found in the families of Jacob and David (1 Sam. XIX., 13). The remaining term shows the occasional participation of the covenant people in the oldest, the most wide-spread and the most enduring of all the forms of idolatry known to man, viz., the worship of the sun. *Chammanim* is derived from a word signifying *heat*, which is used poetically in the Bible to represent the sun (Job xxx., 28, Song of Sol. VI., 10), and its meaning is now universally admitted to be images of the sun, and not images in general. The places in Scripture where the word occurs are these:—

The first is the passage already referred to, in the last chapter but one of Leviticus, where Jehovah sets forth, with solemn emphasis, the retribution to fall upon Israel in case of disobedience. In verse 30 the abominations of their false worship are threatened with overthrow.

"I will destroy your high places, and cut down your *images*, and cast your carcases upon the carcases of your idols." In Isaiah the term occurs twice, and in each case conjoined with "groves," i. e., Asherim; XVII., 8, "neither shall [a man] have respect to that which his fingers have made, either the groves or the images," (margin, *sun images*); XXVII., 9, "the groves and images (margin, *sun images*) shall not stand up," = shall arise no more. The combination here favors the view that the two words represent, the one Baal, as the god of the sun, the other Astarte, as the goddess of the moon. In Ezek. VI., 4, it is said "your *images* shall be broken," and in verse 6, "that your *images* may be cut down," in both cases, with *sun images* in the margin. In 2 Chronicles mention is made twice, with the same margin, of the removal of this form of idolatry. Asa (XIV., 3) "took away the altars of the strange gods and the high places and brake down the *images*," and more than two centuries afterward, Josiah (XXXIV., 4) ordered the same iconoclasm, "And they brake down the altars of Baalim in his presence; and the *images* that were on high above them he cut down." The interpretation of the term thus used is as old as Kimchi, and was established in modern times by the discovery of many Punic cippi with the inscription to Ba'al Chamman, i. e., Baal the Sun. In the account given in the second Book of Kings of Josiah's reforming measures (XXIII., 5, 11) we are told that he put down "them also that burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven. And he took away the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, and he burned the chariots of the sun with fire."

The universality of this form of idolatry is something remarkable. It seems to have prevailed every-where. The chief object of worship among the Syrians was Baal = the sun, considered as the giver of light and life, the most active agent in all the operations of nature. But as he sometimes revealed himself as a destroyer, drying up the earth with summer heats and turning gardens into deserts, he was in that view regarded with terror and appeased with human sacrifices. Men carried this to the frightful extreme of parents offering their own children as victims to the fire-god. And such is the perversity of human nature that this revolting cruelty was often imported into Israel, notwithstanding the rigid prohibitions against it. "They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons in the fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal; which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind" (Jer. XIX., 5. Cf. 2 Kgs. XVII., 16, 17, and XXI., 5, 6). In Egypt the sun was the kernel of the state religion. In various forms he stood at the head of each hierarchy. At Memphis

he was worshiped as Phtah, at Heliopolis as Tum, at Thebes as Amun Ra. Personified by Osiris, he became the foundation of the Egyptian metempsychosis. It is said in Genesis that Joseph married the daughter of Poti-phera, priest of On. But On is represented in Hebrew by Bethshemesh, and in the Septuagint (Jer. XLIII., 13) by Heliopolis; both = City of the Sun. There is a single red granite obelisk remaining erect on the site of the ancient Heliopolis, not far from modern Cairo, and there is every reason to suppose that the obelisk in Central Park at New York once stood within the temple of the solar god among whose priests was the father-in-law of Joseph.

Another Heliopolis is found in the ancient Cœle-Syria in the large and splendid ruins of Baalbek, as the place was called before its conquest by the Seleucidæ. Here, as would be expected, the most imposing of the huge edifices erected upon a vast substruction, unequaled anywhere on earth in the size of its stones, some of them being sixty feet long and twelve feet in both diameters, is a great temple of the sun, 290 feet by 160, which was built by Antoninus Pius, and indicates how easily the emperors adopted and fostered the solar worship prevalent in all the East.

In Babylon the same thing is observed as in Egypt. Men were struck by the various stages of the daily and yearly course of the sun, in which they saw the most imposing manifestation of Deity. But they soon came to confound the creature with the Creator, and the host of heaven became objects of worship, with the sun as chief. Hence the great majority of the old Akkad hymns were addressed to him as the supreme benefactor of mankind. At times the moon and the planets became rivals, but in the end Shamash (= the sun) prevailed, and temples were erected to him in every province. In Persia the worship of Mithra, or the sun, is known to have been common from an early period. No idols were made, but the inscriptions show ever-recurring symbolic representations, usually a disk or orb with outstretched wings, with the addition sometimes of a human figure. The leading feature of the Magian rites derived from ancient Media was the worship of fire, performed on altars erected upon high mountains, where a perpetual flame, supposed to have been originally kindled from heaven, was constantly watched, and where solemn services were daily rendered. The remnant of the ancient Persians who escaped subjugation by Islam, now known as Parsees, unite with their reverence for the holy fire equal reverence for the sun as the emblem of Ormuzd. And even in our own time they have been known to stop wherever they happen to be at the setting of the sun, and take a posture of adoration, raising both hands and bowing profoundly in hom-

age to the luminous orb. Among the native races of India the same worship continues in another form. There are very few temples or images dedicated to the sun, and yet he is the object of universal adoration. The Gayatri, the most ancient of Aryan prayers, first uttered more than three thousand years ago, is a prayer to the sun, to this effect: "Let us meditate on the excellent glory of the divine vivifier; may he enlighten all our undertakings." This is the most sacred of the Vedic utterances,* and takes precedence, with a Hindu, of all other forms of supplication. It still rises towards heaven day by day from millions of worshippers.

Among the Greeks and Romans solar worship had no such predominance as it enjoyed all through the Orient. Still Helios was a distinct and distinguished member of the Greek Pantheon, and his worship was widely spread, and the more, as after the time of Æschylus, he began to be identified with Apollo or Phœbus, the characteristic divinity of the Hellenic race and the impersonation of their life in its most pleasing and beautiful forms. This identification has been described as proceeding in this way. It is the sun's rays, or the arrows of Apollo, that every-where, as the fields and gardens teach us, quicken life and foster it towards maturity; through them a new life springs all around, and in the warmth of their soft, kindly light, the jubilant voice of nature is heard, and awakens an echo in the human soul. At the same time these arrows destroy the life of plants and animals, since the summer heats produce destructive plagues. All these ideas are reproduced in the myth of Apollo, who is conceived in various ways corresponding to the influence of the sun, sometimes as a Nemesis whose glittering shafts strike down insolent offenders, but more generally as a genial radiance whose influences are all friendly. Hence Helios-Apollo is viewed as the personification of youth and beauty, the source of earthly blessings; the god of the herds and flocks grazing on the fields warmed by him; the god of medicine who provides for the growth of healing plants; the god of music, for every-where are heard happy, joyful sounds when his kindly beams spread light and warmth over nature; and the god of oracles which reveal the secrets of the future, just as the light of heaven penetrates the darkest corners and brings to view every hidden recess. Physicians, poets, musicians and artists were under his immediate guardianship.

* The Rev. H. M. Scudder, D. D., recently told the writer that once on his reciting this prayer in the original Sanscrit before a Brahmin, the man was horror-struck, and mourned that he should have lived to see the day when so holy an utterance was polluted by passing the lips of an unclean person.

Under the Roman emperors the Oriental solar worship was introduced with great pomp. Reference has already been made to the magnificent structure erected by Antoninus Pius at Baalbek. But half a century afterward Heliogabalus put up a similar stately temple on the Palatine mount to the Sun-god, where sacrifices were offered with every circumstance of cost and solemnity. Varus (for that was his real name) was a grand-nephew of the wife of Septimius Severus. In his youth he was made high-priest of the Phœnician Sun-god at Emesa in Syria, and while there, through the intrigues of his mother with the legion stationed at that place, he was proclaimed emperor, and having conquered his rival Macrinus, got possession of the throne. This result he considered to be due to the deity at whose altars he had ministered, and hence, as Gibbon says, the display of superstitious gratitude was the only serious business of his reign. The honored name of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, which he had at first assumed, was exchanged for that of Elagabalus, borne by the Syro-Phœnician god at Emesa. This god was proclaimed the chief deity in Rome, while all other gods were his servants. Of course, this predominance of the sun-worship did not continue, but the worship itself survived. For we find fifty years later, when Aurelian (274 A. D.) celebrated his triumph over the queen of the East, the temple of the sun received the gift of fifteen thousand pounds of gold. This temple was a splendid edifice on the side of the Quirinal Hill, dedicated to that deity whom Aurelian adored as the parent of his life and fortunes. His mother had been an inferior priestess in a chapel of the sun, and he had imbibed in his infancy a peculiar devotion to the god of light, a devotion which appears in his letters and on his medals. So at the end of the second century, when Diocletian would take a very solemn oath in the face of the army, it was by "the all-seeing deity of the Sun." He was still the universal object of worship; to the philosophic as an emblem, to the people at large as the deity himself. And curiously enough, this cult is found in an important sect of the ancient Christian heretics, the Manichæans. They sang hymns to the great principle of light, and addressed prayers to the sun, or at least, when praying, turned their faces to that tabernacle in which as they supposed Christ dwelt. The emperor Constantine, before his conversion, revered all the gods as mysterious powers, especially Apollo, the god of the Sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts, and when he became a monotheist the god whom he worshiped was, as Uhlhorn says, rather the "Unconquered Sun" than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. And indeed, when he enjoined the observance of the Lord's day, it was not under the name of *Sabbatum* or

Dies Domini, but under its old astronomical and heathen title, *Dies Solis*, so that the law was as applicable to the worshipers of Apollo and Mithras as to the Christians. In the eclectic religion of his nephew, the apostate Julian, the same feature appears conspicuous. He revered indeed the one immaterial, inconceivable Father who dwelt alone, but the direct outward object of worship was the great sun, the living and animated, the propitious and beneficent, image of the immaterial Father.

The prevalence of this form of worship among the Teutonic races is sufficiently shown by the name given to the first day of the week, Sunday (German *Sonntag*, Dutch *Zondag*, Ang. Sax. *Sunnen-daeg*, Dan. and Swed. *Söndag*), i. e., the day held sacred to the sun. But the most complete system of sun-worship of which we have any account is that existing in Peru when discovered by the Spaniards. The changes in this luminary were identified with all the feelings and the fortunes of the Peruvian. The dawn was hope to him, the midday brightness was power to him, the declining sun was death to him, and the new morning was a resurrection to him. The Incas, as the monarchs were called, claimed to be children of the sun and his representatives on earth. In the capital was a magnificent temple, in the interior of which, at the western end, was a representation of the sun's disk and rays in solid gold, so placed that the rising sun, as it shone in, fell full upon the image and was reflected with dazzling splendor. In the court before the temple a great annual festival was held at the summer solstice. The multitude, assembled from all parts of the empire, waited in breathless solemnity till the first rays of their deity struck the golden image, when the whole body prostrated themselves in adoration.

Thus universal was the adoration of the sun in both hemispheres, among all races, and in the most divergent civilizations. The only exception was found in Judea. True, as we have seen, it intruded even there, but always under protest and against law. The statute ran (Deut. xvii., 2-7) that if man or woman went aside and worshiped other gods, or the sun or the moon or the host of heaven, they should be brought forth and stoned with stones till they died. And the principle underlying this statute was fully recognized by Job in his passionate assertion of his innocence (xxxix., 26-28).

If I beheld the sun when it shined,
Or the moon walking in brightness;
And my heart hath been secretly enticed,
And my mouth hath kissed my hand:
This also were an iniquity to be punished by the judges;
For I should have lied to God that is above.

Accordingly the prose narrative of the Old Testament records the creation of the heavenly luminaries, and represents them as always under the control of their maker. It is said of God that He

Commandeth the sun, and it riseth not;
And sealeth up the stars.
He appointed the moon for seasons:
The sun knoweth his going down.

A signal illustration of this was given in the conquest of Canaan, when "the sun stayed in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that Jehovah hearkened unto the voice of a man; for Jehovah fought for Israel." Hence the shining orbs on high, instead of being themselves objects of reverence, are summoned to join in the homage of the Creator.

Praise ye Him, sun and moon;
Praise him, all ye stars of light (Ps. CXLVIII., 3).

Nay, this they do continually, whether men hear or forbear, for

The heavens are telling the glory of God,
And the firmament is declaring the work of his hands.
In them hath he set a tent for the sun,
Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber,
And rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.

So completely are the celestial luminaries under the control of their Creator that the common symbol of the prophets,* to set forth great and sudden revolutions in human affairs, is an assertion that "the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood,"—expressions which are repeated by our Lord in the great prophecy recorded by the first two evangelists. The glittering host of heaven, so far from being objects of homage or controllers of destiny, are but images to represent the fearful vicissitudes of men and things on the earth.

It is not often that tradition lends much to enforce Scripture truth, but there is one old story on this point which is worth repeating. It is referred to by Philo and Josephus, and is given at length in the Midrash and the Talmud, and also in the Koran.† It turns upon the way in which Abraham came to escape the idolatries of the primeval world. The Koran puts it in these words.

* Isa. xlii., 10; xxiv., 23; Jer. xv., 9; Ezek. xxxii., 7; Joel ii., 30; Amos v., 8; Micah iii., 6. Cf. Hab. iii., 11.

† In Augustine's Confessions (B. X. sec. 9) may be found an interesting passage, evidently an enlargement of this tradition.

When night overshadowed him he saw a star and said, "This is my Lord." But when it set, he said, "I like not those that set." And when he saw the moon rising, he said, "This is my Lord." But when the moon set, he answered, "Verily if my Lord direct me not in the right way I shall be as one of those who err." And when he saw the sun rising, he said, "This is my Lord. This is greater than the star or the moon." But when the sun went down, he said, "O my people, I am clear of these things. I turn my face to him who hath made the heaven and the earth."

Surely of such a narrative, one may say, *se non vero ben trovato*. Dean Stanley, who quotes it in his Lectures on the Jewish Church, subjoins the words of Ephraem Syrus, another dweller in Ur of the Chaldees, who, gazing upon the heavens, far more brilliant there than in our thicker atmosphere, exclaimed, "If the brightness of these stars be so dazzling, how will the saints shine when Christ comes in glory!"

But the heaven-wide difference between the Pagan and the scriptural view of the sun is vividly shown in the metaphorical applications which are common with the sacred writers.

Instead of the hideous delusion, "the sun is a god," the devout Psalmist transposes subject and predicate, and states the cheering and satisfying truth, "God is a sun." What the orb of day is to the earth, the source of light and heat and fertility and beauty, without which there would be no herb nor fruit nor flower nor song of birds nor voice of man, but only unbroken frost and endless night, all this is the living God to them that know his name.

The same imagery is employed to set forth God manifested in the flesh. The last words of David, the sweet singer of Israel, describing the ideal ruler over men, declare that he shall be (2 Sam. XXIII., 4),

As the light of morning when the sun riseth,
A morning without clouds;
When the tender grass springeth out of the earth,
Through clear shining after rain.

So Isaiah, foretelling the wondrous change to be wrought in Galilee of the nations, uses the same figure (IX., 2).

The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light:
They that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death,
Upon them hath the light shined.

But the illumination is not to be confined to a single people, for it is afterwards said that this personage is to be "a light to the Gentiles," and

Nations shall come to thy light,
And kings to the brightness of thy rising.

The orient beams first fall upon the land of promise, but they cannot

be confined there. They spread and diffuse themselves till they fill the whole earth. The last of the prophets rounds out the full force of the symbol in the promise "the sun of righteousness shall arise with healing in his wings"—a phrase which recalls the disk with expanded wings that occurs so often in the ancient Persian and Assyrian tablets, but immeasurably surpasses them by its association with ethical and humane ideas. What is to come is a sun, but a sun of righteousness, and its influence is not only cheering and animating, but restorative; for its outstretched wings drop healing wherever they go. Hence it is not surprising that the great revealer of God, when he appeared among men, appropriated the saying to himself, calmly declaring "I am the light of the world;" no transient or limited luminary, but shining every-where on land or sea, and giving to all the children of men the light of life.

As is natural, the property of the head passes over to the members. That which God is through his own inherent and uncreated excellence is in measure imparted to his people, and the same expressive figure is used for both. Thus Deborah concludes her triumphal song with invoking destruction upon Jehovah's enemies, adding, "But let them that love Him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might," words which the blessed Saviour converts into an absolute promise when concluding his exposition of the parable of the tares and the wheat, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Matt. XIII., 43). In the exquisite Song of Songs the imagery is poetically used of the present condition of the Bride of the Lamb, as the consentient voice of the historical church in all ages has interpreted the recondite meaning of this oriental idyl.

Who is she that looketh forth as the morning,
Fair as the moon,
Clear as the sun,
Overpowering as an army with banners?

This is striking enough, but it is far surpassed by the bolder symbolism of the Apocalypse, where we are told (XII., 1) of the great sign seen in heaven, viz., "a woman arrayed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." To seek a separate meaning for each of these objects, as do many expositors, is tame and prosaic beside the conception of the church's glory which one gets from this accumulation of all the luminaries that adorn the heavens to do her honor.

This brief recital shows how deep is the gulf which divided pagan worship from the pure and lofty ideal contained in the Scriptures. The whole race went hopelessly astray, and the severe words of the

great apostle are exactly true. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever." It may be, as has been claimed, that there were those who revered the host of heaven simply as symbols or representatives of superior, invisible and spiritual powers. But this was not the case with the great body of the people. To them the deification of nature was real and complete. They identified the material object with the divinity whose name it bore, and fell into the grossest idolatry. This impiety led to immorality, for those who abandon God, He abandons. Yet justly as all men now reprobate the worship which once was universal, that worship has as much to say for itself as any of the modern rivals which men have set up in opposition to the one true and living God, whether it be the impersonal force which lies behind all phenomena, or the uniformity of natural law, or collective humanity conceived of as *Le Grand-Etre Supreme*. These are only abstractions of the mind, metaphysical conceptions, which cannot possibly stir the human soul and meet its craving for something to love and honor and obey. Such divinities are the merest mockery. To seek by them to satisfy the inborn longing of the heart for an object of worship is to offer "well watered chaff to the giant dray horse." Far better than such airy dreams was even the solar worship of antiquity. For as has been well said by a scientist of our own day, "For us practically, and for our earth the sun is all in all; and when its energies expire, all the energies on earth which it animates will expire also." This fact was as well known of old as it is now, and when the Pagan bowed down to the glorious king of day, it was to a concrete object whose beneficent influence he traced every day and every hour. It was exalted infinitely above the earth, and yet its light and heat penetrated every-where. There was, therefore, in those who did it homage, a show of reason for which one looks in vain in the arid and juiceless tissue of mere formulæ. And we may here apply the oft-quoted exclamation of Wordsworth,

Great God! I'd rather be
A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn.

There are in the Greek poets, notwithstanding their idolatry, moral judgments and religious suggestions which could never originate in systems which hand over the universe to unconscious natural law, and so starve man's emotional nature.

But the blessedness of our day is that men are not shut up to either of these rival theories. We are not called to choose between

the worship of nature, even in its loftiest forms, and the empty caricature of worship offered to that which neither does nor can perceive its worshippers. On the contrary, the great revelation of the Old Testament is the existence of a personal God, who knows and is known by his intelligent, moral creatures. He is immanent in nature, yet is transcendently above it as its Creator and its Lord. All its varied array in heaven and earth and under the earth is the expression of his wisdom and power and love, and is summoned again and again to join in his praise. And it is an affecting evidence of the extent of human depravity that generation after generation among the Jews could construct sun-images and bow down in adoration before the orbs in the sky, when their sacred books every-where re-echoed the strains of the noble Psalm (CXLVIII.),

Praise ye Jehovah.
 Praise ye Jehovah from the heavens;
 Praise him in the heights.
 Praise ye him, all his angels;
 Praise ye him all his host.
 Praise ye him, sun and moon;
 Praise ye him, all ye stars of light.
 Praise ye him, ye heavens of heavens,
 And ye waters that be above the heavens.
 Let them praise the name of Jehovah,
 For he commanded, and they were created.

THE AUTHORITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

By REV. J. G. MURPHY, D. D., LL. D.,

General Assembly College, Belfast, Ireland.

II.

5. It is at one with itself on all these themes, notwithstanding that it is a complex volume of the most diversified contents, containing at least seventy distinct pieces, composed by more than fifty authors, and spread over a period of at least 1500 years. The unity of such a collection in relating the past affairs of mankind, revealing the deep things of God, predicting the future destinies of man, and laying down the fundamental principles of eternal rectitude is simply unaccountable on merely human grounds. Moses compiled the book of Genesis not later than 1400 years B. C. John composed the Apocalypse not sooner than the end of the first century of the Christian era. The whole of the New Testament was written in Greek during the last fifty years of the first century. An interval of 450 years sepa-

rated the New Testament from the Old. The Old Testament was written all in Hebrew during the long period of 1000 years from Moses to Malachi. The genius of the one language is very different from that of the other; but the Greek of the New Testament is deeply tinged with the Hebrew of the Old. Besides this great break in the continuity of the literature, there was a great shock given to the constitution of the Hebrew tongue by the banishment of Judah for seventy years, after which the exiles returned so much changed in ecclesiastical and political relations, that the history of the antecedent times had to be recast to suit the new condition of things. Amid all these changes and during all this length of time, the unity of the whole collection of the sacred writings in facts, principles and aims is maintained throughout. This can only be accounted for by the fact that the Spirit of truth guided and illuminated the minds of all the writers.

If it be suggested that the collection is a selection of writers on the condition that they were in harmony with one another, the answer is that no such selection of merely human writers, running over a period of more than a thousand years, is possible. The Greek history of most of these years was simply a mass of incoherent fables. The theology was bound up in these irreconcilable myths. The writings due to the Platonics, or any other school of philosophy, present many and palpable diversities of opinion. They do not pretend to enunciate absolute truth, but only the varying sentiments of the individual writers. If it be objected that there are innumerable discrepancies in the documents which constitute the Sacred Scriptures, it is to be borne in mind that sober men of matured experience in literature and in the workings of the human mind have examined these seeming discrepancies, and have never failed to explain them or to point out a way in which they may be reconciled. The great majority of them arise from ignorance on our part of the whole circumstances, from misconception of the real meaning of the author, and generally from taking the word in a literal, narrow, special or material sense; whereas it becomes obvious, on a little patient consideration, from the circumstances of the times and the habits of the writer, that they should have been taken in another sense, which was quite in harmony with the context and with other passages. A series of writings on a variety of topics, covering more than a thousand years, that can be shown to be uniformly consistent on such reasonable terms is unique in the history of letters, and possible only on the ground that the writers are the spokesmen of the ever-living God.

6. It was commenced when philosophy and science were in the remote future, and it was completed while ancient philosophy was far

away in the distance from Palestine, and science, properly so-called, was scarcely come to the birth; and yet it contains no sentence which, fairly understood, is at variance with either. It says indeed in common parlance, The sun rises and sets; but so does the philosopher, the scientist and the poet, and so must they continue to do as long as metaphysics and imagination have a place in the mind of man. It has been often explained that it was not the Bible but the misinterpreter of it that condemned Galileo, when he asserted that the earth has a diurnal motion. On the other hand there is a curious harmony between stray incidental phrases and sentences of Scripture and some comparatively recent discoveries of science. Thus the phrase "the heavens and the earth" accords with the fact that the heavens are greater than the earth. The order of the six days of creative work corresponds with the facts that light and heat must precede clouds and rain, and that both must precede vegetation, and that all three must precede animal life. The passing sentence of Job, "He stretcheth out the north over the waste, he hangeth the earth upon nothing," is in harmony with the law of gravitation and with the round form and diurnal motion of the earth. The equally incidental verse, "It (the earth) turns itself as on clay the seal, and they (the heavenly bodies) stand as a garment," is at least consistent with the revolution of the earth on its axis, and the brilliant canopy of the heavens standing around it. It is evident that the question, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades or loose the bonds of Orion?" is in keeping with the law of gravitation. The question, "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance?" is in poetical accord with the atomic theory of matter. These and other like sentences and phrases are scattered through a volume which is written in the language of ordinary life, and was finished before the technicalities of science came into existence. Where is the series of writings in any nation, running over 1500 years ending with the first century of Christendom, of which these things can be said?

7. It has a regenerating and comforting effect on the individual who reads or hears it read and expounded, and has had an illuminating, civilizing and elevating influence on human society, wherever it has become known, such as the best human philosophy and the most advanced science have not been able to produce. This is chiefly dependent on three things. (1) *First*, the writers constantly acknowledge the existence, the presence, the personal and spiritual attributes and the supreme authority of the one only God. (2) *Second*, they state

and expound in manifold ways the simple and self-evident principles of unchangeable morality in their relation to God and man. These two characteristics, combined with the example of those who are faithful and true servants of God, have had a quite extraordinary influence not only in civilizing but moralizing mankind. (3) But the *third* and greatest source of Spiritual power is the Gospel, the glad tidings of salvation through the mercy of God in Christ. This Gospel presupposes the fall of man from original innocence into sin against God. This seldom fails to find an echo in the conscience of the hearer. The salvation which the book reveals meets the needs of the self-condemning conscience. It consists of three parts. *First*, there is forgiveness with God for the returning sinner. *Second*, there is redemption made by Christ, the Son of God, on the cross, which makes forgiveness morally possible. *Third*, the Spirit of truth makes use of these two irresistible motives to persuade the soul that is truly conscious of sin to return to God by Jesus Christ. The preternatural effect of the Gospel so presented is truly called regeneration. It is the birth of a new state of mind towards God, the joy of salvation, the hope of glory and the revival of love to God and man. Only the newborn know the full import of this holy and happy change. But outsiders in all ages have been constrained to acknowledge the immediate moral amendment of life that has followed the sincere confession of faith in Christ and repentance toward God.

It is obvious from the nature of the case, as well as from the facts of history, that no book, or definite class of books, but the Bible, has produced this singular effect; no system or school of philosophy but the Gospel of the grace of God in Jesus Christ has thus deeply and vitally affected the human heart, thus effectually and equally met the want and touched the springs of human action in every diversity of tribe, rank and mind in all generations, from the day of the crucifixion to the present hour. And at the very moment when many are supposing that its influence is waning, it is beginning to wield a broader, deeper and milder sway than at any time since the days of the apostles; because the clouds and shadows arising from certain misconceptions of its benign import are passing away, and all the untarnished glory of its grace and truth is about to be unveiled before the eyes of man. The controversies of by-gone days have done good service in promoting a logical method, determining the laws of language, shedding light on the nature of the Gospel, and promulgating the articles of the creed. But they have left some traces of narrowness and one-sidedness even on the best conceptions which have been formed of many doctrines of revealed religion, the removal of which

may be confidently expected from the equity, charity and moderation of a less controversial and more dispassionate age. Hopeful signs of this abatement, if not abolition, of diversity of opinion on the long agitated questions of ecclesiastical polity, of predestination, of the sacraments of the New Testament, of the trinity of persons in the Godhead, of the inspiration of the Scriptures and of the metaphysics involved in these high themes are beginning to appear. There is much need, however, of men of high mind, thorough training and well balanced reason to carry forward this delicate process to a just and unanimous issue. Only the Spirit and the Word of God can produce such men. Let us expect and pray, and throw no hindrance, and endeavor to remove any hindrance, in the way of the coming and the multiplying of such men in the church. Then will the divine origin of the holy Scriptures be fully illustrated and its paramount authority be gladly admitted.

THE REVISION OF THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

BY PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO,

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

In this article we may note the changes in translation made by the Revision of 1885 from that of 1611. It is not unreasonable to assume that the Hebrew text was little, if at all, different. That the article be not unduly protracted, attention will be confined to the body of the text, and no mention will be made of the notes in the margin, or of those of the American Revisers.

The standard for comparison is the Parallel Bible, Oxford edition. Not the entire book is brought into view; but the first ten chapters have been compared, with the intention of noting every change, even to punctuation. In these ten chapters there are 274 verses. Of these, 120 exhibit no verbal change, nor any change in punctuation sufficient to alter the sense. In the 154 verses the following changes are found:—

1. There are five instances of the change of obsolete words. "Wit" is changed to "know" (II., 4); "let" to "loose" (V., 4); "coast" to "border" (X., 4, 14, 19). There are six instances of corrected spelling,—"lothe" to "loathe" (VII., 18); "ought" to "aught" (V., 8, 19); and three proper names in V., 17, 22, 24. Also the archaic "be" is changed to "are" (VI., 4).

2. There is a large number of changes of single words, which are simply lexical. For example, of nouns, "children" is changed to

"sons" (I., 1); "treasure" to "store" (I., 11); "stranger" to "sojourner" (II., 22); "desert" to "wilderness" (III., 1; V., 3); "vain" to "lying" (V., 9); "oxen" to "herds," and "sheep" to "flocks" (IX., 3). Of verbs, the following are illustrations: "grew" is changed to "spread abroad" (I., 12); "spied" to "saw" (II., 11); "borrow" to "ask" (III., 19); "were strangers" to "sojourned" (VI., 4); "is" or "was hardened" to "is" or "was stubborn" (VII., 14; IX., 7). There are four instances where the Hebrew article was wrongly rendered now corrected to "the" (II. 14; III., 12; IV., 21; X., 13). There are eighteen instances where the translation of prepositions is changed,—as "by the way" to "on the way" (IV., 24); "upon" to "over" (VII., 19); this last change makes the verse harmonious to the similar passage (VIII., 5). There are thirteen instances where conjunctions or adverbs are changed,—as "therefore" to "and" (I., 20); "for" to "and" (I., 5; VIII., 17); "but" to "for" (IV., 10); "also" to "moreover" (II., 19). In some of these instances the ground of change is not in the lexicon but in exegesis, and there it comes from contextual interpretation. The changes of nouns illustrated above were thirty-four in number, of verbs thirty-five. The entire number thus noted of changes made in accord with the real or supposed requirements of lexicography is 104.

3. Heretofore the changes noted are those having respect to single words. Another class of changes is grammatical, having respect in part to single words (etymological), and in part to the relation of words (syntactical). Occasionally a lexical change is involved; but the important feature is grammatical, and so the instance is classed as grammatical. There are changes in tense,—"there was none like it" changed to "had not been" (IX., 24); in mood,—"neither would he" to "and he did not" (VIII., 32; IX., 35); "that I may" to "and I will" (VII., 4); in voice,—"he hardened Pharaoh's heart" to "Pharaoh's heart was hardened" (VII., 13); in number,—"was" to "were" (IX., 31). Also there are changes to make manifest an apposition,—"bricks of your daily tasks" to "bricks, *your* daily tasks" (V., 19); "the Lord God" to "the Lord, the God" (III., 15, 16, 18; IV., 5; V., 3; VII., 16; IX., 1, 13; X., 3). Also from or to a circumstantial clause,—"and when she saw the ark among the flags, she sent" to "and she saw the ark among the flags, and sent" (II., 5); "and plucked it out of his bosom, and, behold, it was turned again" to "and when he took it out of his bosom, behold it was turned again" (IV., 7). Of these grammatical changes there have been classed together sixty-five instances. There is one extended passage to be added to the number. It is IX., 15, 16. 1611 reads: "For now I will stretch out my hand, that I may smite thee and thy people with pestilence, and thou shalt be cut off

from the earth. And in very deed for this *cause* have I raised thee up, for to show *in* thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth." 1885 reads: "For now I had put forth my hand, and smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, and thou hadst been cut off from the earth; but in very deed for this cause have I made thee to stand, for to show thee my power, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth." In the fifteenth verse the first clause is changed from the expression of determination to a past condition which was not realized. In Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, § 141, this construction is implied to be the correct one. The sixteenth verse of 1611 adds to the expression of determination to destroy Pharaoh the statement that God "raised up" Pharaoh for the purpose of showing in Pharaoh's person his almighty power, and for the purpose of having his name made known on earth. 1885 gives a different meaning to the verb translated "raised up." It adopts the marginal rendering of 1611, and makes the statement that God had kept Pharaoh alive, in the midst of the terrible judgments, in order to convince Pharaoh of his (God's) power, and to have his (God's) name made known on earth.

4. There is another class of changes which may conveniently be called rhetorical changes. This includes those instances where italicized or unnecessary words have been omitted, where necessary words have been added, where, for elegance or perspicuity, the words in a phrase or sentence have been changed or re-arranged. There are twelve instances where words have been inserted,—“as *white*” (IV., 6); “*the*” (IV., 15). In twenty-seven instances words have been omitted,—as “*even*” (IV., 22, 23); “*do*” (VIII., 8); “*the*” (IX., 23). “*Also*” (I., 10) is transposed so as to emphasize the subject. “*Goest to return*” becomes “*goest back*” (IV., 21); “*against he come*,” “*to meet him*” (VII., 15); “*this rod in thine hand wherewith*,” “*in thine hand this rod wherewith*” (IV., 17). 1611 left the antecedent of “*wherewith*” uncertain; logically it was “*rod*,” grammatically it was “*hand*.” 1885 removes the ambiguity. The total number of instances of this class are seventy-five. This number includes some changes in punctuation.

5. There is also one more class of changes to be noted, and this class is typographical changes. These changes concern the practice of printing words in italics. In these ten chapters, 1611 gave 164 instances where one or more words were printed in italics. 1885 supplies only twelve. That is, there were 152 more instances of italics in 1611 than in 1885. Of these 152, 131 have been changed from italics to common type. Italics are supposed to be words supplied to fill out the sense, when neither Hebrew words nor idiom can supply it. This is not the case with the copula “*am*,” “*art*,” “*is*,” etc.

Such are the changes both in kind and quantity. The value of some of these changes is very great. Few arouse a questioning spirit; still fewer excite opposition. The majority commend themselves at once. One wishes that some changes had been carried out consistently. E. g. (III., 1) "kept" is changed to "was keeping." Equal reason exists for changing "wept" (II., 6) to "was weeping." In Exod. VI., 2, 6-8, "the Lord" is changed to "Jehovah,"—and with good effect. Equally effective would the change have been in a score of other places in these chapters.

Is there any change in the character of the record? No, not in the main features. Yet there are some changes which we gladly welcome. One of these changes relates to the *borrowing* of jewels and clothing from the Egyptians by the Israelites. The fact that this act was done in consequence of divine direction has for generations harassed the soul of the English reader. It has caused the uncircumcised to revile, and the circumcised to resort to mean subterfuges to explain away the dishonor of such a procedure. "Borrow" is changed to "ask." Every student of Hebrew has abundant opportunity, within the first few months of his study, to learn that the Hebrew word used in this passage is *the* word which means to ask. It is used scores of times with this meaning, and a Hebrew would hardly have thought of using another word when he meant simply to ask. Doubtless during the past 270 years this (to us, apparently) stupid mistranslation has caused more labor than has been bestowed on revising the entire Old Testament. Imagine, if you please, the description of a somewhat similar occasion rendered as follows: "And King Solomon gave unto the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she *borrowed*, beside that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty." There is as good reason for giving this translation in 1 Kgs. x., 13, as for the translation which 1611 gives of the same verb in Exod. III., 22. 1611 and 1885 concur in rendering 1 Kgs. x., 13, by "ask."

Another passage is worthy of a second mention in this connection. The radical changes of Exod. IX., 15, 16, have already been mentioned. 1611 makes of the passage a threat; 1885 makes of the passage a reminder of God's mercy and forbearance in the past.

There is a whole class of passages that need be noted here. This class of passages refer to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. Some translations of 1611 permitted and even encouraged the idea that Pharaoh's hardness of heart was brought to pass by God, without any agency of Pharaoh. The Revision has not smoothed away the facts so as to avoid cavils. Indeed the facts are such, and the language is so plain, that those who wish will always cavil, and those whose faith is

weak will stumble. In Exod. VII., 3, "harden" is a literal translation. In VII., 14; IX., 7, for "hardened" is substituted "stubborn." This is a manifest gain. The Hebrew verb is different, the Revisers rendering is correct, and it is a pity that they did not render VIII., 15, 32, and IX., 34, and X., 1, by "stubborn," with an appropriate verb. By the two changes that have been made there is given to the English reader the opportunity to learn the fact that Pharaoh's hardening was in part the manifestation of his own stubborn character.

There are several passages mentioning the hardening of Pharaoh's heart which are very noticeable. Exod. IV., 21; VII., 4, 13, and X., 20. 1611 gives these passages as follows (the italics are for contrast): IV., 21, "But I will harden his heart, *that he shall* not let the people go;" VII., 4, "But Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you, *that I may* lay my hand upon Egypt," etc.; VII., 13, "And he hardened Pharaoh's heart, *that he hearkened* not unto them;" X., 20, "But the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, *so that he would* not let the children of Israel go." 1885 gives these passages as follows: IV., 21, "But I will harden his heart, *and he will* not let the people go;" VII., 4, "But Pharaoh will not hearken unto you, *and I will* lay my hand upon Egypt," etc.; VII., 13, "And Pharaoh's heart was hardened, *and he hearkened* not unto them;" X., 20, "But the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, *and he did* not let the children of Israel go." In these four passages 1611 makes the last clause simply the purpose or result of the preceding clause. This is syntactically possible, if the context demands it. Evidently the Revisers of 1885 thought the context did not require it. The more usual mode of translating Hebrew sentences of this form is simply to add the second action to the first as being co-ordinate to the first. This is done in 1885, as shown above. There is ample proof that the Revisers of 1611 did not regard the Hebrew as necessitating the translation they gave, nor did they think the context required such a translation. The proof is this: Exod. VII., 22; VIII., 15, 19, 32; IX., 7, 12, 35; X., 27, are similar sentences in the Hebrew. Some of these sentences are verbally the same, and they are in the same kind of a context, and in every one of these eight passages the clause, which in the former four was made a clause of purpose or result, is made co-ordinate. E. g., VII., 22, "And Pharaoh's heart was hardened, neither did he hearken unto them;" VIII., 15, "He hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them." IX., 12, "And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh, and he hearkened not unto them." There is just one passage in these ten chapters where a clause of purpose is required by the Hebrew in a similar context. This is X., 1, "For I have hardened his heart and the hearts of his servants, that I might shew

these my signs *before him*" (1885, *in the midst of them*). The Hebrew is different, and expresses purpose.

In one passage (VII., 4) there is a change which has not hitherto been mentioned. 1611, "But Pharaoh *shall* not hearken;" 1885, "But Pharaoh *will* not hearken." It is to be regretted that a consistent use of the auxiliaries *shall* and *will* is not to be found in our English Bible. It is a cause of thankfulness that we meet any recognition of the proper meaning of these words. We have here an illustration. 1611 made the verb an obligatory future, or jussive. It represented Pharaoh as being passive in the hardening, as being under the control of another will. The change of the auxiliary in English makes the passage to state a future fact, not a necessity. The Hebrew does not require the rendering of 1611. In fact the negative here used forbids us to regard it as jussive, or obligatory future.

Thus, while there is no difference in the main features of the record, there is decided modification of some of the colors of the narrative. These are modifications which would have been dishonest if made for dogmatic reasons; but made, as they have been, for the sake of fidelity to the original, they are only the requirement of honesty.

For the sake of more full examination of the changes in the text, the writer has entirely omitted the marginal notes and the recommendations of the American Revisers. From what has been written the reader will rightly infer that the writer regards the Revision of 1885, in these chapters, as a very great gain. These chapters seem a fair sample of the whole book of Exodus, and this book in the Old Testament may be regarded as very much improved. Perfection is not reached at a bound; and the younger students and scholars in Hebrew may rejoice, both that much needless labor of removing misconceptions has been removed from their shoulders, and that there is still further work to be done in securing for the Scriptures the most perfect expression in our mother tongue.

EGYPT BEFORE B. C. 2000.

BY PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D. D.,
Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

II.

THE COURT.

From the first, the king is king of the double crown, of upper and lower Egypt. On reaching the throne he assumed a new name in addition to the one he had borne, and besides he took the titles of Horus, the Son of God, born of Heaven, Lord of the vulture and of the Uræus. He is the *Perao*, "that is, of the great house" (Brugsch, *Hist.*, p. 49), which we translate Pharaoh. "For his subjects the pharaoh was a god and lord (neb) *par excellence*" (*Ibid.*). He is "the vanquisher of his enemies." He is removed far above all the people in his own and in their estimation, and he looks forward and prepares for the formal, priestly worship of himself in his memorial chapel attached to his pyramid.

No court in Europe at the present day, and not even the court of Louis XIV., was ordered with a stricter adherence to the ceremonies that proclaim *procul, procul*, to the profane, than the court of these haughty lords of the vulture and the Uræus. The wife of one pharaoh and the mother of another makes record, on her memorial tablet, of her high privilege of beholding at pleasure the face of her son, the reigning king; a privilege not accorded to all queen-mothers. A prince of the blood royal mentions it as a special favor that he was permitted to smell the ground (prostrate himself) before and touch the knees of the pharaoh. The highest officer under a king of the sixth dynasty writes on his tomb that he was accorded the supreme favor of wearing his sandals in the palace (De Rouge, *Recherches*, p. 123). The pharaoh was addressed as "his holiness," or as "the Son of God," or "by a grammatical construction, which, in the translation, is best rendered by the word 'he'" (Brugsch, p. 49.)

(The pharaoh might marry a lady not of royal blood, but as descent was reckoned especially through the mother, her children might not become pharaohs, though they were princes (Brugsch, *Hist.*, p. 103).)

His queen, the pharaoh calls his dearly beloved; and he pictures her seated with himself, her arm around his neck or in his arm. But dying, he is placed alone in his grandeur in his pyramid, while she is buried in a plain tomb near but outside the pyramid.

"A steward had charge of the king's household, another had charge of his wardrobe, another acted as hair-dresser, and took care of the nails of his holiness, and prepared his bath. One was over the singing and playing, and prepared the means for the pharaoh's pleasures and enjoyments. Other nobles were charged with the administration of the magazines of wheat, dates, and fruits in general, of the cellar; of the store of oil, of the bakery, of the butchering, and of the stables. The court of exchequer was not wanting. The private domains, the farms, the palaces, and even the lakes and canals of the king were placed under the care of inspectors" (Brugsch, *Hist.*, p. 50).

There were many palaces. The younger princes and princesses had their palaces, with governors appointed for them. But there are no remains of these early palaces. We learn the above facts about them from numerous inscriptions. If the pyramid was the mausoleum, and if high officers and nobles could at that age build and decorate such tombs as are found at Sakkarah, and display their homes filled with works of art on the walls of their tombs, certainly the residence of the pharaoh, where it was a crime to wear one's sandals without permission, was something more than a mud hut. When a pharaoh had eight statues of himself cut with superlative art, in one small chapel, and in the tomb of one high officer twenty statues of himself were placed in the wall, it is most probable that the residence of the pharaoh and the houses of his nobles bore some correspondence to this advance in art.

There were multitudes of officials about the court. There were "the chief of the house of gold" (secretary of the treasury), "chief of the house of battle, of the bow and arrow," "chief of the double house," i. e., of peace and war, "chief scribe" or secretary, "chief of the public works," "chief of all the mines," "governor of the royal domains," "chief of the house of writing," "chief commandant of the great hall," i. e., of judgment, "chief of the writings of complaint and request," "chief architect," "governor of the south," etc., etc. Nobles were entitled "hereditary highness," "prince," "illustrious," "the intimate friend," i. e., of the pharaoh (Brugsch, p. 50).

The priesthood was hereditary, and the chief priest was always a prince royal. Even at this time men in office, sacred or secular, had learned the art of being pluralists, and some princes were priests and generals, and governors and judges, all at once.

JUDICIARY.

The law was written out and elaborated to minute points, not only as to the general conduct of affairs of state, but as to inheritance, tithes, rents, taxes, military service, forced labor.

In one picture, the judges are seen sitting on a raised platform and taking notes, while the officers, who would closely resemble our policemen with their locusts, if they only had a little more covering on them, bring the prisoners before the court (Baedeker, *Lower Egypt*, p. 382. Tomb of Ti).

The judges were to be governed by the written law, and an unjust accuser was treated to a variety of punishments (Brugsch, p. 51). Real estate was carefully measured and bounded by stone marks, and the rights of children were guarded.

ARMY.

There was an army, commanded by officers and drilled in the tactics peculiar to their warfare. It would appear, from one inscription, as if the whole population was at times liable to conscription. The army was provided with clubs, axes, bows and arrows. Under a king of the sixth dynasty the army had been assembled by many tens of thousands from all parts of Egypt, from the cataract to the sea; but it was decided to increase it by a contingent drawn from the Negroes of Ethiopia who had been subdued. Before this army set out towards Asia it was found necessary to drill this contingent, which was done by the orders of, and by the officers appointed by, the general-in-chief, Una (Brugsch, p. 100; DeRouge, *Recherches*, p. 124; Maspero, p. 90). To this army there was an orderly distribution of provisions. The army proved itself victorious, and brought home a multitude of captives. The same army was also transported by sea to some foreign dominion, and was again victorious.

LIFE.

We have spoken of the hard metes and bounds which are the necessity of every well regulated state; but we feel a sympathetic interest in the daily life of the people, how they spent their days, how they dressed, what they ate, and the closing scenes of life with them.

Then, as now, the burden of life pressed heaviest on the poorer classes. However moral and pious were their precepts of humanity, written at length on their tombs, for immediate effect on boy, man, or beast, these old Egyptians had the greatest confidence in the short stick. Nobles, priests, warriors, and the innumerable scribes, or literary class, looked with scorn upon all tradesmen, artisans and slaves, whom they called the "mob," the "stinking multitude." These were the phrases of *parvenus*, for there was no caste in Egypt. The poorest might rise to the highest official position, and marry a princess. Some of the very highest officers have been men enough to write on their tombs that their ancestors were unknown, or that they were of

very humble birth; while others simply omit to mention that subject, which they never would have failed to elaborate, if there was any thing to be said.

In the temple-tomb of Ti, at Sakkarah, a pluralist dignitary of the highest grade under the fifth dynasty, we find sculptured and painted in exquisite art the life of a great landed proprietor. He, whose ancestors are not mentioned, stands with his long walking staff in his right hand and his baton of office in his left hand. His wife, a princess in her own right, is at his side, and he calls her "the beloved of her husband," "the mistress of the house," "the palm of amiability to her husband."

He is dressed with his two sticks, a wig, a collar, or necklace, and a short tunic. She is dressed in a single long garment from the neck to the feet. It was fashionable in those days to have the head shaved, and those who could afford it covered the head from the heat or in full dress with a great wig, like the judges in England. Yet it was not a rigid custom, for we also find the hair worn long by some females. The oldest statues in the world are the marvelously lifelike twin representations of Prince Rahotep and his wife, the princess Nefert. He does not wear the wig, but is dressed in a collar from which hangs a jewel, and with the short tunic, but she wears an abundant wig and on it a mood of "ribbon ornamented with roses and leaves." She is also dressed in a garment reaching from the neck to the ankles. Females also wore a shorter garment held in place by appliances which selfish man in later ages has appropriated to himself, suspenders. Princess Nefert wears a splendid necklace (Edwards, p. 711), "of six circles of green and red enamel, from which a row of emeralds and rubies depended."

Linen wholly of flax was the dress of the richer classes. The poorer people needed little dress and often used less. A cloth around the loins was full dress for a workman. Men are also pictured when at work without any clothing at all, and it is sad to say that even women are so represented. For a gentleman of the old school, full dress consisted in a wig, collar and bracelets, a staff and a very short tunic. Sandals were worn, though the foot is generally represented as bare. They were very careful of their nails, and exceedingly neat in their persons. And no doubt they were highly cultured and refined gentlemen, certainly with a higher appreciation of morality than the Greeks or Romans, though even with them there were streaks of coarseness and permission of obscenity in their presence, that moderates our estimate of their purity.

Women were treated as equals. They were not veiled. They

enjoyed as much pride as their haughty husbands. It was no disgrace for a princess to marry a man who had risen to high office from an humble position, and though her husband was not made a prince by his marriage, her sons were princes by the right of their mother (Baedeker, *Lower Egypt*, p. 375).

Ladies delighted in jewels, and the art of the lapidary was carried to high excellence. They had earrings, and bracelets, and necklaces, and fingerrings. There were artists in porcelain, and glaze, and enamel, whose work remains to the present, and who, doubtless, like their successors, gave the ladies much to do and to talk about. These ladies of high degree loved sweet smells, and had their bottles of perfume of all shapes and sizes. They had found the great usefulness of the bronze mirror, and to preserve it in better condition for service they kept it in a leather covering. They had already forgotten that beauty unadorned is adorned the most, and had progressed to the evil invention of a blue or black pigment for the eyes, which they kept in vases of alabaster and of bronze. While they, like us, had jugs and basins of pottery, they exceeded us in having them of bronze also.

An elaborate and animated picture of life in Egypt before 2000 B. C. is found in the temple-tomb of Ti. Before the painter bas-reliefs of Ti and his wife, the princess, are spread out all over the interior walls an amazing number of bas-reliefs (Edwards, p. 88 seq.) cut in a fine and marble-like limestone. "Ranged in horizontal parallel lines about a foot and a half in depth, these extraordinary pictures, row above row, cover every inch of wall space from floor to ceiling, The relief is singularly low." It nowhere "exceeds a quarter of an inch. The surface, which is covered with a thin film of very fine cement, has a quality and polish like ivory" (Edwards, p. 89).

The pictures tell their own story. Ti was a wealthy man. He owned thirty-six estates in many parts of Egypt, and his servants on these estates, which have their appropriate names, are represented bringing in the produce of each. This is carefully counted and noted down by scribes and then put in the granaries or yards. Ti owned large herds of cattle, long-horned or without horns, herds of asses and gazelles and antelopes, and flocks of goats and of geese and of cranes, and his scribes had the count of each herd and flock. He had workmen of all kinds on his estates; they smelted ingots of gold, and blew glass; there were sculptors and masons and potters, and tanners, and furniture-makers and boat-builders. They ploughed his fields and sowed the seed and reaped his harvests. He had his sailors and huntsmen and fishermen. The whole process of building vessels is before us, from the squaring of the timber to the caulking

of the seams. He had boats of burden and pleasure-boats. These boats were built of cedar (chiefly) and of acacia and papyrus. They had keels and ribs and gunwale. The sails were of linen, square, and were hoisted as sails are now. The mast was stayed fore and aft.

Ti evidently looked back upon a long life of good living, and intended giving Osiris a hint of what he expected in the land of bliss. His servants stuff whole flocks of geese and cranes, as the inscription tells us, "in order to fatten them." His bakers were artists in bread or cake of fanciful form, and his cooks understood how to truss geese and ducks and to prepare all sorts of delicacies. His fishermen caught and spread and salted fish.

Ti was a sportsman, and we see him spearing the hippopotamus and crocodile, and hunting birds, and fishing. He had hunting dogs for the gazelle and mountain goat. He speared fish or caught them with hook and line or in nets or in wickerwork pounds, like our eel pots. His servants caught lions and other wild animals and brought them to him alive in cages. They milked the cows on Ti's farm in just the same way and under as many difficulties as are found now with the Jerseys. Sometimes they tied the legs of those that kicked, and sometimes one held the troublesome calf while another milked. Again they tie cow and calf separately to well-made staples fastened in the ground. They prove in their tying up the forefoot of an ox by a strap over the back that they antedate Mr. Rarey's re-discovery by about 4000 years. The donkey then was the faithful ancestor of the present race. The inscription tells us how the servants argued with him to no purpose, until it came to blows, first with his heels and a Bray, and then with their stick.

The plough, the hoe, the sickle, the head yoke, the three-pronged threshing fork, the sacks for grain, the saws, axes, mallets, hammers, drills, baskets, work-bench, tables, chairs, all the tools of the workmen, the workmen at work, cutting stone, building walls, making furniture, etc., etc., are all set out with marvelous clearness and with a description of the pictures.

Men and women of wealth sat at tables of bronze or alabaster, on low-backed or high-backed chairs of artistic shape and carving. A large and generous variety of food was offered to them, fish fresh and salted, beef, veal, goat (not sheep), antelope, ibex, gazelle, cranes, geese, ducks (no hens), cucumbers, onions, bread of wheat and barley, grapes, figs, dates, pomegranates, olives, melons, milk, and wine of upper and lower Egypt.

Games for amusement, very much like our chequers or chess, delighted their leisure hours. Men singers and women singers were

among the appurtenances of great houses. Dwarfs and monkeys were kept to make sport. There was the same chaffing between servants and boatmen as one hears on the Nile to-day. Wrestlers tried their skill and strength as they learned to do afterwards in times ridiculously modern in the Athenian or Corinthian gymnasium or palæstra.

LITERATURE.

It would be contrary to all the laws of the human mind to find such a development in political, legislative and social order where literature was unknown. But we are not left to inference on this point or even to the later copies of works, still extant, which are referred, by their copyists, back to this early time.

The more than fifty steles and numerous inscriptions cut in the hardest of all stone, proves that the hieroglyphics were fully developed and equal to any demands upon them. The class of scribes was on a par with that of the priests and warriors. They were secretaries and accountants in the palace and in offices of state and courts of justice and on the farm and boats, till it would seem as if every word spoken and deed performed was written down by the scribe, ever present with his reed pen and ink and writing-tablet.

That the people had made some progress in geometry and mensuration and testing the quality of stone is proved by the pyramids and tombs.

There were at this time not only scribes and a fully developed written language, but there were libraries. There was a literature, and this literature was large enough and sufficiently prized to be kept in libraries, and the importance of the library was such that it was a high honor to be appointed chief of the royal library. On the tombs we find the title, "royal scribe of the palace, doctor, chief of writing, who serves as a light to all the writings in the house of pharaoh," "chief of the royal writings," etc.

From the earliest times, according to the inscriptions, *Saf*, the goddess of libraries, was worshiped at Memphis (*DeRouge*, p. 43). It is a very curious and instructive fact that, both in Chaldea (and Palestine), at dates but little lower than B. C. 2000, we find the proof that certain cities were designated as library cities, and some of the records of those ancient libraries are now in the British Museum.

Did these people live in the last century or about four thousand years ago?

THE VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A CORRECT KNOWLEDGE OF THE NEW.

BY PROFESSOR S. BURNHAM, D. D.,

Hamilton Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.

II.

2. The second element of value in the worth which the Old Testament has as an aid for the correct understanding of the New, is the fact that the meaning of many terms in the New Testament is only to be rightly apprehended by a study of the usage of words in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Septuagint version of it.

This is at once obvious, if we call to mind that the New Testament is Hebrew thought in a Greek dress. The garments, and the garments only, are Greek. The body and soul within, which they cover, are Hebrew. The Hebrew element in the New Testament is not merely a few Hebraistic modes of expression and syntactical construction. Such Hebraisms, indeed, the New Testament does contain, and a knowledge of the Old Testament and of Aramaic usage is needed that the interpreter may correctly deal with them. But if this were all, it would be but comparatively little. There would be a few Hebrew threads, more or less, woven into the Greek robes; but essentially, that is in its thought, and in the signification of its terms, as well as in its grammar, the New Testament would be Greek. But such, in the New Testament we have, is not the case. The New Testament is as much a Hebrew book in its inner nature and its real substance, as the Old. Such thought in general, and such meanings as belong to its individual terms, are to be found in no Greek writer. All its great and central terms, those which are the moulds of its thoughts, and which are the keys to unlock to us the doors of its grand doctrines, would have been as unintelligible, in their New Testament import, to the best Greek of them all, as if they had been Hebrew itself. For Hebrew after all they were. The words for sin and righteousness, for example, the foundations on which all the New Testament usage and meaning of words rest, are not to be found in all Greek literature in their New Testament sense. It is possible, indeed, to find in the classic Greek words that are spelled and accented just as are the New Testament terms for sin and righteousness. The grammarian and the etymologist may, therefore, call them the same words. To him they are the same. But, to the interpreter, they are as truly other words as if written in another tongue. For the ideas they express never entered into Greek thought, nor sought expression in a single Greek soul. Something of the same sort is to be found within our own language. Equivalence was an English word before the days of the modern chemistry; but, in its present chemical use, it is as new a word in all but form, as if it had fallen down from the stars. But, for knowing the teaching of a book, the forms of its words are nothing; the thought that is in them is every thing.

Thus it cannot be that the thought of the New Testament should be any thing else than Hebrew. For the Greek thought was pagan. The Greek words, therefore, cannot come into the New Testament bearing in them their contents of

pagan thought. This could only be possible so far as pagan thought and Christian thought could be identical. To how great an extent that could be, it is not difficult to see. Certainly this identity could not reach so far as to include any of the central and important terms of the New Testament, least of all those that present its peculiar Christian doctrines. The contents of all these must be purely and only Christian.

But what is Christian thought? We have already seen that it is either identical with Hebrew thought, or is an outgrowth and complement of it. As its outgrowth and complement, moreover, it arose in Hebrew minds and took shape in Hebrew thinking, in the thought of Hebrew thinkers. The New Testament writers were Hebrews, who took the old Hebrew thought, modified and complemented it, but never renounced or broke away from it, and expressed the results in words which, consequently, while they were Greek in form, were, in all that really makes a word of any value, or gives it a reason for being, Hebrew. Thus it comes to pass that not only is the thought of the New Testament, in all its determining elements and outlines, the thought of the Old; but that the meanings of all its central and distinguishing terms are, in origin and substance, Old Testament conceptions.

The Old Testament, therefore, and not the dictionaries of Classic Greek, is the lexicon for the New.

There is still another point to be considered if we would judge rightly of the real character of the Greek words that are used to express the New Testament thought. This is the origin of the terms that are used by the writers of the New Testament. When they had the Christian thought to express, where did they look for the Greek word with which to express it? Not, surely, to Plato or Socrates, to Demosthenes or Homer. For, to say nothing of the fact that they could not have found, in these writers, the word they wanted, as they wanted it, it may well be doubted if they were thoroughly at home in the vocabulary of the Greek philosophers, orators and poets. We cannot certainly suppose it of the most of them. But there was a Greek vocabulary in which they were at home. "From a child," its terms had been familiar to them. The "Bible of the People" had shaped for years their thought and their speech. To the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Scriptures, therefore, they would naturally turn for the Greek word that was needed. Nor would they fail to find it. For the Septuagint reproduces in all essentials the thought of the Hebrew text. However defective it may be as a reproduction of the exact text of the original, however much it may be possible to criticize it as a faithful translation of the very words of the Hebrew, it is yet not to be denied that, in thought, it is the Hebrew Old Testament, and only this. Its terms, therefore, are only the Hebrew words in a Greek form, Hebrew thought in a Greek dress. But it was Hebrew thought, only Hebrew thought in all elements and outlines, which the New Testament writer had to express. Here he found, therefore, the terms he wished for, ready at his hand. Even a slight comparison of the Septuagint and the New Testament will show that it was these terms thus ready to his hand, that formed the vocabulary of the New Testament writer. The Old Testament word thus determined the contents of the Septuagint word, and the Septuagint word in turn determined the contents of the New Testament word. Again have we found that the Old Testament is the lexicon for the New.

It is now not hard to see that the New Testament student who comes to his work of interpreting the writings of the apostles, without a knowledge of the exact contents of the related Hebrew terms, and their Greek equivalents in the Septuagint version, is of necessity doomed to failure in his endeavor. How utter and how fatal that failure will be, will depend on many conditions; but failure, more or less, is sure. If one is to judge by the results that appear in the character of not a little of the pulpit teaching of our time, and in the resulting church life, the failure is likely to be more rather than less. If there were no other reason, then, why one should seek to know the Hebrew language, and to be well informed in the teachings of the Old Testament, and in the meanings of its terms in the original and in the Septuagint version, it would be enough that only in this way can we hope to be successful ministers of the New Testament. The preacher who, with a joke, puts away his Hebrew Bible and his Hebrew lexicon on the shelf, is simply shutting up to himself and to the church of God, so far as lies in his power, the gate to that knowledge which is eternal life,—to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

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

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

The wars which ended in the superseding of the Assyrian empire by the Babylonian must have had an important indirect influence on Judean affairs. Probably it was owing to them that Josiah was left at leisure for prosecuting his schemes of reform; and that he was able to exercise authority over the territory to the north of Judah, as well as over Judah itself. It was in part due to the same causes that Egypt was able to throw off whatever yoke Esar-haddon and Sardanapalus had imposed upon her, and to become again, for a little time, what she had anciently been, an aggressive power, contending against the Mesopotamian kings for the empire of Western Asia. While Pharaoh-Necho of Egypt was engaged in an expedition for this purpose, Josiah met him in battle at Megiddo, and was slain; and Judah became for a few years dependent on Egypt. Then Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, acting at first as the general of his father Nabopolassar, and afterward in his own right, defeated the Egyptian monarch, and reduced Palestine to subjection. Then after some twenty years of successive rebellions, bloody defeats, and deportations, Jerusalem and the temple were at length destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and the land left desolate. After about fifty years more, during which the Jews lived in exile in various countries, the Babylonian empire was overthrown by the Persians, and a few of the Jews, by the permission of Cyrus, returned to Jerusalem. The first four lessons of the month, and perhaps the fifth also, belong to the first twenty of the seventy years of the Exile, as thus counted. I say "as thus counted," because various other views of the matter are more or less prevalent.

In treating the lessons, I will take the liberty to arrange them in the order of time in which they probably belong, instead of that in which the International Committee give them.

JAN. 10, 1886. JEREMIAH PREDICTING THE CAPTIVITY. Jer. VIII., 20—IX., 16.

Jeremiah began to prophesy in the thirteenth year of King Josiah, five years before Josiah's great reform, and continued his career till after the burning of Jerusalem (Jer. I., 1-3; XLIII., 5-7, etc.). If the tradition which ascribes to him the writing of the Books of Kings be true, he survived the thirty-eighth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin (2 Kgs. XXV., 27-30), living some sixty-five years or more after he began to prophesy, and rivalling Elisha, Isaiah, Daniel, and other prophets in the length of his career. The prophetic discourses which compose the Book of Jeremiah are put together in an order which sometimes differs from the order of time of the events with which they are concerned. In the order of the discourses, and in other points, the Septuagint text differs quite remarkably from the Hebrew.

Our first lesson is taken from what seems to be a continuous discourse, extending through chapters VII.—X. The most salient item in the proof of this is the fact that the seventh chapter begins with a title, and the eleventh chapter with a fresh title. If any one will read these four chapters through, will then carefully read again the first part of the seventh chapter, and will then read the twenty-sixth chapter, he will see strong reasons for holding that the prophecy contained in these four chapters is the one for which Jeremiah was brought to trial for his life, as related in the 26th chapter; and therefore for holding that the prophecy was uttered in the early part of Jehoiakim's reign, just before Nebuchadnezzar conquered Palestine from Egypt. The situation of things, as implied in this prophecy, and in Jeremiah's other prophecies of about the same date, is a striking comment on the powerlessness of political reform to reach the hearts of men. Josiah had perhaps accomplished as much as any government ever can accomplish, in the way of reforming men; but the moment Josiah died, the nation, headed by its priests and prophets, made haste to return to the practices of idolatry, judicial injustice, dissipation, and bloodshed, which had characterized the bad part of the reign of Manasseh. Less than three years has elapsed since Josiah's death, and not more than about fifteen years since Josiah's great reform, and the land is already deluged again with the old iniquities, and Jeremiah's life is in danger for rebuking them. This does not show that Josiah was wrong—that reform should not be attempted by statute; but it does show, and with emphasis, that reforms must be mainly accomplished by changing men's hearts, and not by changing the civil regulations under which they live.

Practically, the rejection of the warning contained in this prophecy, and in others of even date with it, was the close of Israel's probation, so far as his going into exile is concerned. The armies of Babylon were already in the field for attacking Judah and Egypt. A few months later, the series of deportations which constituted the final exile had actually begun. In the discourse from which the lesson is taken, a last opportunity is offered to escape a fate which has been threatened against Israel for ages, and which is at last impending (Jer. VII., 3; XXVI., 3). From these circumstances of its historical connection, the golden text of the lesson may be made to derive great emphasis: "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."

JAN. 17, 1886. THE FAITHFUL RECHABITES. Jer. XXXV., 12-19.

The prophecy containing this lesson is of about the same date with the one containing the previous lesson. It belongs to the early years of Jehoiakim, when

the armies of Nebuchadnezzar are threatening Palestine, but have not yet made their first capture of Jerusalem (Jer. XXXV., 1, 11). If we press the fact that, in the last verse cited, the Rechabites speak of Nebuchadnezzar as already king of Babylon, it will give us a yet more precise date, namely, the accession year of Nebuchadnezzar, that is, the third year of Jehoiakim, earlier in the year than the siege of Jerusalem and the carrying away of Daniel and his companions. Something further concerning this date is to be said when we reach the next lesson.

If one will take a concordance, and look up in the Bible what is said in connection with the proper names Jonadab, Rechab, Rechabite, Kenite, he will have a much fuller and more interesting account of this remarkable family than he can find in the ordinary books of reference.

For my own part, I hold that the duty of totally abstaining from all intoxicating drinks, as beverages, and the duty of going a great deal farther than safety requires, rather than not quite far enough, in avoiding all other internal use of alcohol, can be fairly taught from this passage; but not in the way in which it is often actually taught. The total abstinence of the Rechabites was from agriculture, and from building houses, as well as from wine; and was, in these and other respects a very different thing from the total abstinence which is now advocated as being the truest temperance, in the matter of alcoholic beverages. The thing commended, in their case, is not particularly their abstaining either from wine or from civilization, but their prompt, unflinching obedience in the face of temptation in its most plausible form. If we let the mention of wine in the lesson serve to call especial attention to the question of alcohol-drinking, and our duty in the matter; and then enforce the principle of unhesitating faithfulness to duty, in this as in other matters, even in the face of the most plausible temptations; we shall thus make of it, at least for most men, a total abstinence temperance lesson.

JAN. 31, 1886. DANIEL IN BABYLON. Dan. I., 8-21.

We carelessly allow ourselves to form the habit of speaking of the date when the Jews were carried captive to Babylon, as if the deportation were a single event, which took place at a particular date. We all know, if we will take the trouble to think, that such was not the case. The biblical records, and still more abundantly the Assyrian records inform us that repeated deportations were made, at least from the times of Tiglath-pilezer, whose accession was 140 years earlier than that of Nebuchadnezzar. The date proper to be given for the carrying of Samaria into exile is the year when Samaria ceased to be a political power; but the actual process of changing the inhabitants, by exportation and importation, extended over many years both before and after that date. If Sennacherib tells the truth, he carried into exile from Judah an immensely larger number of people than Nebuchadnezzar afterward carried away. There are traces of Esarhaddon's having carried on the same business, on a large scale, in the times of Manasseh. The Palestine which Nebuchadnezzar invaded was a Palestine which had already, thanks to his predecessors, become largely a depopulated country.

The deportations made by Nebuchadnezzar himself constitute a series and not a single event. The accounts given in Jeremiah, Kings, Chronicles, and Daniel show that they began at the date mentioned in the lesson, nineteen years before the burning of the temple, and were repeated at various dates, till after the burning of the temple.

Much difficulty has been found in the date given in the first verse of Daniel. This affirms that Nebuchadnezzar carried away Daniel and his companions in the third year of Jehoiakim; while the dates given in Kings and Jeremiah make the first year of Nebuchadnezzar to be the fourth of Jehoiakim. The difficulty spreads itself out into a great number of specifications. They all vanish when we take notice that the third year of Jehoiakim, though the twenty-first and last of Nabopolassar, was the accession year of Nebuchadnezzar. He was actually on the throne for a good part of the year, though the year which is counted as his first began with the following new year. There is no need, in this case, even to suppose that he may have been called king by anticipation.

If we accept as historical the statement that in this year, (605 B. C.) the Babylonian exile began, with the carrying away of Daniel and his companions, then the first year of Cyrus, whether reckoned as 538 or as 536 B. C., is near enough to the seventy years commonly mentioned as the duration of the exile, for all purposes of accuracy in a round number; and the difficulties concerning this number seventy vanish at once.

Nebuchadnezzar is one of the historical characters that grow larger, instead of dwindling, as we come to know more of him. He was a successful conqueror. He knew how to consolidate and administer the empire which he created. He was a magnificent builder and patron of art and literature. But there is nothing on record concerning him which sets out his wisdom and his other excellencies of character in a better light than this account of the *civil service training school* in which Daniel and his companions were placed. The gifted young monarch, at the very outset of his reign, took measures to surround himself with a corps of young men, illustrious by blood, by personal beauty, by mental and moral gifts, carefully trained with reference to efficiency in the public service, and educated to personal attachment to the king and his interests. No wonder that in the hands of such assistants, the administration was a success. The more one studies the details of this training school, the more he sees how admirable it was.

As we have seen, the carrying away of Daniel occurred but a few months, perhaps but a few weeks, after the date of the two previous lessons. It suggests to us that there was a very bright side, even to the dark pictures drawn by Jeremiah. In the midst of the prevailing wickedness in Judah, there were families in which children like Daniel and his friends were reared. The Reformation under Josiah was not all external. There were Israelites whose hearts had been reached by it, and by the faithful teachings of the prophets. And especially there were children, born and nursed in the very atmosphere of the great revival, when the book of the law was found in the temple, who possessed the germs of the purest piety and the loftiest manliness.

It is to be hoped that the temperance teaching in this lesson will not be neglected. It is equally to be hoped that it will not be taught in untrue statements and incorrect reasonings. The mere fact of Daniel's abstinence from the king's wine, and his being divinely approved for it, would not be a sufficient ground for a like abstinence on our part; for the circumstances are different with us. But with Daniel, in the circumstances in which he was placed, true temperance included abstinence from wine-drinking; and with us, in the circumstances in which we are placed, does it not include the same? Nearly all thoughtful and earnest persons, in America, with all charity to those who differ with them, answer this question in the affirmative.

JANUARY 24, 1886. CAPTIVITY OF JUDAH, 2 Kings XXV., 1-12.

In the course of a year or two after Daniel was carried to Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar gained decisive victories over his Egyptian rivals, and afterward gradually reduced to subjection all who opposed him in Western Asia. Judah was in a state of alternate revolt and submission. At the end of eight years, her king, Jehoiachin, was carried captive to Babylon, with a large number of his nobles and subjects. His successor, Zedekiah, reigned eleven years. The last three years of his reign are those of the events of the lesson.

It should not escape notice, in reading the accounts given in Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah, that, besides the Jews who were taken to Babylon, many also are said to have gone to Egypt, and others to have been scattered among the peoples near Palestine. Those who were taken to Babylon were more or less scattered in different parts of the empire, and wherever they went, they must have found remnants of their compatriots of all the twelve tribes, who had been removed in previous deportations.

The central historical fact of the lesson is the downfall of the Jewish state. It would be profitable to study the writings of the prophets of the times, with reference to the causes of this downfall. They rebuke certain sins, and represent that, up to the very last, God was ready to have spared the nation, on condition of reformation from those sins. It would be easy, for example, by using a concordance on the leading words, to form Bible-readings, bringing out the following points:

1. The great sin rebuked was the deficiency in genuine religious character, the lack of a heart that was right with God.

2. This was exhibited in the matter of public worship, in the worship of false gods, in the false worship of Jehovah, in mere formalism of worship, in indifference to worship, in Sabbath-desecration. Reform in the matter of Sabbath-keeping, and of careful, reverent ministrations in public worship, would have tended to perpetuate the life of the nation.

3. It was further exhibited in the matter of the administration of government and of justice. Bribe-taking, indifference to the legal claims of the widow, the orphan, the oppressed, are among the most frequent objects of prophetic rebuke. Reform in the administration of civil and judicial affairs would have helped prolong the life of the nation.

4. Greed on the part of the wealthy, and less prominently, unfaithful service on the part of the working classes, are matters continually on the lips of the prophets. Reform in the relations between labor and capital would have done something toward saving the nation.

5. Next to idolatry and misgovernment, the prophets insist most on sins of intemperance, that is, of drunkenness, riotous living, licentiousness. Reform in these matters was needed to save the nation.

6. The violent deaths of the kings Joash, Amaziah, and Amon, the judicial murder of Urijah the prophet, the persecutions suffered by Jeremiah, and other like facts in the history constitute a series of exhibitions of sins of lawlessness; often of lawlessness undertaken for the purpose of righting real or fancied wrongs. Reform from violent practices, even as a remedy for existing evils, would have been effective in preventing the overthrow of the nation.

For instruction in great matters pertaining to national life and prosperity, the

history of Israel found in the Bible is worthy of a broader and more thorough study than most men are accustomed to give it.

In the schemes of human history devised by some scholars, it is put down that Israel, having accomplished his destiny, ceased to be a power in the world, when he was carried to Babylon. It needs but little reflection to enable one to see that this is not the case. Saying nothing in regard to the influences that have come from Israel through Christ and Christianity, the mere influence of Israel as a race was widened by his dispersion among the nations; and is probably larger to-day than it ever was before.

‘FEBRUARY 7, 1886. THE FIERY FURNACE, Daniel III., 16-27.

We have no means of dating the event here recorded. The three persons who were thrown into the furnace were not, as many seem to imagine, mere lads. Since they were brought from Judea with Daniel, they had graduated from the king's training school, had received appointments in the public service, and had filled them long enough to gain a reputation in them. Beyond this, we have no trustworthy information as to the date. We may conjecture that it was not much later than the burning of the temple at Jerusalem, possibly earlier than that event.

For some years previously, therefore, the Israelite people had existed mainly in three parts. One portion of them were in Palestine under King Zedekiah. Jeremiah and other good men were among them, urging them, since the Babylonian conquest over them was an accomplished fact, to be submissive to their conquerors, to turn from their sins, to live as good citizens, to seek that Jehovah's wrath might be averted from them before their punishment was carried to further extremities. They refused the advice of the prophet, and persisted in bringing utter destruction upon themselves. A second portion of the people are represented to us by Ezekiel and his fellow-captives at the River of Chebar. Such bodies of Israelites existed in more than one part of the Babylonian empire. Their ranks had been largely re-enforced by the fresh deportations of the times of Jehoiachin. To some extent, they were massed together in their new settlements, and were not without resources and influence; but their standing in these respects, or in respect of culture or character, as we catch glimpses of it through the writings of Ezekiel, was not remarkably high. They were in danger of degenerating, and were in need of influences coming from some direction, to stimulate religious and patriotic feeling among them. The third section of the Israelite people was that represented by Daniel and his friends. They cannot have been numerous, but they were men of high culture, of yet higher moral and spiritual character, occupying prominent positions, which they had won by personal merit, and wielding very great influence. On the men of this class their countrymen were dependent, in an almost unlimited degree, both for political protection and for moral stimulus. Long before Jerusalem was captured the fame of Daniel had spread. Among the Jews of the captivity, who thought of the rising young statesman as worthy to be compared with Noah and with Job (Ezek. xiv., 14, 20; xxviii., 3). Immense, therefore, was the responsibility resting upon these men. It was fortunate for Israel and for the world that God's grace made them, at each trial, equal to the occasion.

The chapter containing the lesson presents us with four types of human character, the comparison of which must be instructive. First, we have the accusers, practitioners of a sham art, men who maintained a high position by practices which were of no real benefit to society. As a class, doubtless, they were cultured and kindly; but they were cruel and unjust as only such men can be, in regard to any thing that endangered their position. Then, secondly, there were men among the attendants of the king, who were eager to become the tools of the wickedness of the accusers, and of what they saw to be the unreasonable anger of the king, doubtless expecting to reap personal advantage from their undue alacrity to help the great men in doing wrong. It is a typical fact that it was these accomplices, and not the principals in the wrong, who perished at the mouth of the furnace. Thirdly, there was Nebuchadnezzar, lordly and great, but uncontrolled, ready to sacrifice his own best interests to the passion of the moment. He is here exhibited as having his weaknesses, as well as his strength. And fourthly, we have the three Hebrew men, unobtrusive, competent, conscientious, with supreme faith in God; and they, as against the others, command our verdict of approval.

Certain questions as to the historicity and the literary character of the Book of Daniel may best be discussed in connection with the next lesson.

STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

XII.

THE IDEA OF REDEMPTION.—FIRST ARTICLE.

In reading, lately, an account by Prof. Max Müller of the life of Rammohun Roy, founder of that society in Brahmanic reform called "the Brahma Samaj," my attention was arrested by an incident illustrative of some things in pagan sentiment which in a study such as is now proposed we may do well to take along with us. Rammohun Roy, Debendranath Tagore, and Keshub Chunder Sen were leaders in the same effort at reform of the prevalent religion of India; Chunder Sen, however, having come somewhat farther in the direction of Christianity than either of the others. The first of the three, Rammohun Roy, renounced idol-worship when a boy of sixteen, and from that time until his death in 1833 devoted himself in efforts to bring back the religion of his country to that which he believed to have been its most ancient form, a simple monotheism. He sought to unite with this monotheism various features of Christianity, especially its moral system, and thus to frame a religion which, based upon the ancient Hindu faith, with due reverence retained for the Hindu sacred books, should be freed from the oppressive inventions of Brahmanic priestcraft, including that of caste, and to add some at least of the salutary elements of the religion of Christ. He suffered, in consequence, we are told, "the loss of all things." His course, says Prof. Max Müller, "entailed not only censure and punishment, and the loss of the love of his parents: it entailed loss of caste, expulsion from society, loss of property. All this Rammohun Roy was prepared to face: and he had to face it.

He was banished from his father's house once or twice; he was insulted by his friends; his life was threatened, and even in the streets of Calcutta he had to walk about armed. Later in life his relations (his own mother) tried to deprive him of his caste, and indirectly of his property, and it was a mere accident that the law decided in his favor."

In the last year of his mother's life her heart seems to have softened toward him. She even listened to him, and almost consented to accept his faith. Yet not quite. "Son," she said to him, "you are right. But I am a weak woman, and am grown too old to give up those observances which are a comfort to me." It seems strange to us that, intelligent as she must have been, and almost persuaded as she really was, she should as the last religious act of her life, set out upon a pilgrimage to the temple of that hideous and bloody idol, Juggernaut, at Puri, and there, although a high-caste woman, engage in menial offices at the shrine of this hateful deity, counting it a privilege to die under the shadow of the temple in which such horrid rites had been performed during centuries. "Perhaps," says Max Müller, her son "knew that the hideous idol which she worshipped in the fetid air of his temple, Juggernaut, as we call it, was originally called Jaganatha, which means 'Lord of the World;' and that He, the true Lord of the World, the true Jaganatha, would hear her prayers, even though addressed to Juggernaut, the uncouth image."

Whether or not we share the hope in this respect which the Oxford scholar seems to feel, we can at least be touched by the evident sincerity, in her way, of the aged devotee, clinging thus to the faith which had been for her the true one during a long life, and resorting for comfort to this idol's shrine, and perhaps in some degree finding it there, strange as it may seem to us.

It is easy for those educated in Christianity to dismiss any heathen faith as a falsehood and a deception; and it is hard for such to speak with patience of those who with motives of selfish ambition, or whatever other, have built up in past ages those huge systems of oppressive idolatry which century by century have been at the same time a tyranny and a lie. But let us consider, meanwhile, how many there must have been among the devotees of such faiths, to whom their paganism was the only religion they knew or could know, and who under an impulse that has in it some semblance of piety, reached out into that darkness for comfort under a hard lot, and some shred of hope to console their despair. Even where, as in the case of the mother of Rammohun Roy, we see them cling to their pagan faith while offered a better one, we remember that there are ties, other than those of mere superstition, by which every religion holds its devotees.

DEFINED.

The idea of redemption, in one sense or another, is common to all religions. While using the word, however, in such applications, we should have to qualify, very much, its Christian meaning. The idea of evil and the idea of redemption must of necessity, in any religion, be closely related. We find it so in our own Christian teaching. For we perceive that what is recovered in Christ is rightly apprehended only as what was lost in Adam is so. He who has a slight or mistaken view of sin is almost certain to err as to the nature and method of salvation; while conversely, if we find atonement, regeneration, the whole doctrine of grace rejected by any one, we are sure to find also, on inquiry, the Christian view of original sin, the depraved and lost condition of man by nature, equally denied.

The two ideas are in like manner related in all pagan religions, and in all the centuries of man's religious history; so that, in using the word "redemption" in such a way as is now proposed, we must expect to find in it a sense as wide and various, and in the main as mistaken, as we saw to be the case in the related idea discussed in the last two of these papers. We must understand by the word, then, that method and hope of relief, under the pressure of felt evil, and sorrow, and dread, which pagan peoples have found, or tried to find, in their religion. It may have reference to a future life; it may concern simply the evil of the present; it is just the operation of that impulse so universal and so strong in human nature to seek for comfort, and help, and hope, in religion. Some of the manifestations of this we are now to study.

CLASSIFIED.

With a view to some classification of material in this connection, we will examine this idea of redemption in such religions as are now in view under these three as the principal forms: the *ascetic*, the *judicial*, and the *propitiatory*. This classification may not be in all respects exact, yet it is perhaps sufficiently so for the present purpose.

ASCETICISM.

The ascetic idea in pagan religions has a form and a meaning in a good degree peculiar to them. In one of the Buddhist books, we are told how, early in his career, the founder of that religion, having before him a great crowd of persons who had come to him for instruction, proceeded to teach them that which, as the book states, "is the special doctrine of the Buddhas, that is to say, Suffering, its Origin, its Cessation, and the Path;"—in other words, that what this system proposes to teach is the origin of suffering, how it may be made to cease, and the "path" or the manner of life in which one must walk in order to reach that end. If we recall the circumstances, as briefly touched upon in the last paper, under which Buddha was led to turn his back upon the palace and the throne to which he had been born, in order to become a religious reformer, we shall see how it came about that the central idea of his system is what we there find it. The sight of what men suffer in the forms of disease, old age and death—this with what he knew of the Brahmanic teachings under which he had been reared, as to the doctrine of repeated births, or transmigrations, with all the frightful possibilities of such a lot; the account given of him shows that it was the sense of all this that put him upon the idea of finding out some remedy for this sad human condition. Now a study of the books of that religion makes it clear that this is really the central feature of the whole system. Even where sin is warned against, it is because if you sin you suffer pain. How to escape suffering, is the question always. And the answer is, always, strange as in one view it might seem, the answer of the ascetic. Find out what are the occasions of suffering in the various conditions of human life, and then make yourself so independent of these as that it shall be all the same to you whether they exist or not.

In Buddhistic phraseology, this would be termed the repression of "desire." The root of all that we have most to dread, and most reason to shun, according to these teachings, is "desire;"—that is to say, the natural tendencies, choices, likes, appetites, longings which belong to us as human beings. One can see, readily enough, how an observer, having no outlook in any other direction, and studying human life just at that point of view, *might* infer from what he sees, that men are

miserable chiefly because they make themselves so by desiring so *much*, by desiring it so *eagerly*, and by seeking its attainment in ways so sure to be *disappointing*. The ascetic theory of dealing with the question how to escape all this is, in that aspect of it which we find in Buddhism, to just regulate your desires, and regulate them so thoroughly that in the end all these things which mean so much to human beings in general shall be to you matters of pure indifference. One who makes this his rule will *choose* poverty, since it is the fact that the more men have the more they want; he will avoid all close ties with his fellow-beings, inasmuch as his love for others will just load him with their burdens and sorrows in addition to his own; he will teach himself to despise even bodily comforts, since by thinking much of these and seeking them earnestly he may pamper himself to that extent that the slightest deficiency of ordinary provision may be to him intolerable. He will rid himself of all fear of death in making the discovery that it is possible for him to have that "beyond" all the same to him as if it did not exist; and disease and pain he will master by rejoicing in them as that merited flagellation by which this body, which he despises, and in which all the evil of his lot concentrates, is being chastised as it deserves.

One may say that there is very little of religion in all this, and that is true; but what we are discussing is, if we go by the books, a very large part of Buddhism. You may say, besides, that the hundreds of millions of Buddhists in the world to-day are surely not living up to the rule of an ascetic system like this. That also is true. But this is the ideal Buddhism, and any adherent of the system who should do and be what his sacred books teach him would be and do all this and much more of the same kind. Very naturally, it was in carrying out this rule that the Buddhist monasteries grew up, so strikingly similar in many things to those of the various Romanist orders, although antedating them by many centuries.

RESEMBLANCES AND CONTRASTS.

The Buddhist and the Brahman religions are both ascetic, although with material differences. Against one feature of Brahmanism Buddhism was in fact a form of revolt. In the lives of Buddha there is a passage which tells how, after he had determined to abandon forever all his expectations and prospects as a prince and the heir to a throne, and to devote himself to a religious life, he kept company for a brief period with certain Brahmans who were subjecting themselves to all the minute and painful observances of their ritual. After a little time he became convinced of the uselessness of such observances; and it is mentioned, by writers, as one evidence of the fact that he was in his ideas in advance of his contemporaries, that he cast away all such, and began to teach views of the efficacy of mere observance with which a Christian finds it easy to sympathize. In one part of the teaching attributed to him we find this: "To walk religiously, and afterwards to receive happiness, this is to make the fruit of religion something different from religion; but bodily exercise is but the cause of death, strength results alone from the mind's intention." The translator uses here, as you see, a phrase, "bodily exercise," which is identical with that used by translators of the New Testament in rendering a passage in one of Paul's epistles. "Bodily exercise," says Paul, "profiteth little, but godliness is profitable for all things." Buddha and Paul are at one as respects this which is meant in "bodily exercise," mere outward observance, rituals, and rules in themselves alone; although as to what is beyond they are as wide apart as possible. Paul can speak

of "godliness" as that which he will recommend in contrast with all such "bodily exercise;" that work of divine grace in which the regenerated soul recovers the lost image of God. Buddha can only speak of the man's own self-discipline in accordance with "the mind's intention." "If you remove," he says, "from conduct the purpose of the mind, the bodily act is but as rotten wood; wherefore regulate the mind, and the body will spontaneously go right." The general thought is very strikingly expressed in another of the sayings attributed to Buddha: "If a man for a hundred years worship Agni (fire) in the forest, and if he but for one moment pay homage to a man whose soul is grounded in true knowledge, better is the homage than sacrifice for a hundred years."

Buddhism and Brahmanism were alike in this—that both held man's triumph over evil, and so his redemption, to consist in a self-chastening, in which there should be systematic and inexorable *repression* of what is natural to man, and what both alike call "desire" shall be killed. But they differ in this, that Brahmanism places great stress upon *outward* ascetic observance, upon ritual forms, upon a list of "shalts" and "shalt-nots" that run on without end. Buddhism would put each individual man upon doing this whole work for himself, with no ritualistic system fastening its claims on him; and he would have it for him especially an inward work. In one place Buddha exclaims, indignantly, "What is the use of platted hair, O fool? what of the raiment of goat-skins? Within thee there is ravening, but the outside thou makest clean." Much like the words of Jesus where he reproved those who made clean the outside of the cup and the platter and whitened their sepulchres. This, in fact, is one of the points at which Buddhism and Christianity approach each other; though they are still heaven-wide apart, in their conception, respectively, of what a man needs, in order to his redemption, *other* than this mere attention to what is outside.

ESSENTIAL DEFECTS.

The vice of Buddhism, in this respect, is the same as that of Brahmanism. The two systems aim at the same thing, though they would reach it by different roads. Faushöll, the translator of one of the Buddhistic books, the *Sutta-Nipata*, answers the question, "What is sin, according to Buddha?" as follows: "Subjectively, sin is desire, in all its forms; desire for existence generally, and especially for name and form, that is, individual existence." The way in which desire for existence thus becomes sin, seems to be that it puts us upon so many expedients, not always right ones, for preserving existence, for making it happy, according to our notion of happiness, and makes us shrink from what, according to that system, is the highest good, that is, non-existence. "But desires," the writer I am quoting continues, "originate in the body; sin lies objectively in embodiment, or matter, and consequently the human body is looked upon as a contemptible thing." To what this leads is clear. Sin is not of the soul, but of the body. Redemption is not regeneration; it is *repression*, ultimately, virtual destruction. Not to become the sons of God, in the likeness of God, but to become nothing; as nearly that as possible now, wholly that hereafter.

There is a curious colloquy in one of the Buddhist books, in which the ascetic idea is set over against what is more like the common experience of common men. Buddha and a rich herdsman, named Dhaniya, are conversing together; Dhaniya, rejoicing and boastful in his prosperity, like the rich man in our Lord's parable, Buddha insisting that he is himself much the happier man, though but a wandering beggar, with his shoeless feet, his alms-bowl, and his yellow robe.

Dhaniya says: "I have boiled my rice, I have milked my cows, I am living together with my fellows on the banks of the Mahi river, my house is covered, the fire is kindled; therefore, if thou like, rain, O sky."

Buddha says: "I am free from anger, free from stubbornness, I am abiding for one night near the banks of the Mahi, my house is uncovered [meaning the open heaven], the fire of passion is extinguished; therefore, if thou like, rain, O sky."

Then Dhaniya: "Gad-flies are not to be found with me, in meadows abounding with grass the cows are roaming, and they can endure the sun when it comes; therefore, if thou like, rain, O sky."

Buddha again: "By me is made a well-constructed raft [meaning his ascetic habit and life], I have passed over (to nibbana), I have reached the further bank, having overcome the torrent of passions [he has made himself what he had aspired to become—one to whom all outward conditions are matters of pure indifference]; there is no further use for a raft; therefore, if thou like, rain, O sky."

The thought, of course, here is, that the ideal condition for man is to have no ties, no earthly interests, no care for any thing; to have repressed every manner of natural desire, so that good and evil are alike indifferent to him. This is the nibbana, or nirvana, of the present; a foretaste of that which is to come. You have the same thing in these singular points of instruction for those who would attain to this highest good:

"In him who has intercourse with others affections arise, and then the pain that follows affection; considering the misery that originates in affection, let one wander alone like the rhinoceros.

"He who has compassion on his friends and confidential companions loses his own advantage; seeing the danger in friendship, let him wander alone like the rhinoceros.

"Just as a large bamboo tree with its branches entangled in each other, such is the case with the children and wife; like the shoot of a bamboo not clinging to any thing, let one wander alone like the rhinoceros."

A kindred utterance of Brahmanism is as follows: "The self of one who has subjugated his self and is tranquil, is absolutely concentrated (on itself), in the midst of cold, and heat, pleasure and pain, as well as honor and dishonor. The devotee whose self is contented with knowledge and experience, who is unmoved, who restrains his senses, and to whom a sod, a stone, and gold are alike, he is said to be devoted. And he is esteemed the highest, who thinks alike about well-wishers, friends, and enemies, and those who are indifferent, and take part with both sides, and those who are objects of hatred, and relatives, as well as about the good and the sinful."

It may be as well to note, before we pass, one point of difference between the ascetic idea in these pagan religions, and this idea as we find it in historical Christianity. The thought of acquiring *merit* by such means does not appear to be equally prominent in the pagan asceticism. Buddhism calls it "the Path"—it is the road by which a certain end is reached. Brahmanism views it in much the same way, although in it there is considerable appearance of the notion that merit is acquired in these ways. Even in Brahmanism, however, the ascetic life is a means by which to achieve that ultimate union with the universal being, the divine Brahman, which is the goal of highest attainment. How the Christian ascetic was accustomed to view the matter we know well. By so much as he tormented himself, by so much was he richer in that kind of merit which should open heaven to him, and enrich him forever with heavenly felicity.

The *judicial* and the *propitiatory* elements in the pagan idea of redemption will be noticed in another paper.

✦ EDITORIAL NOTES ✦

The Duty of the Theological Seminary in reference to Bible-Study.—The seminary is intended to fit men for active ministerial labor. Exactly that preparation is to be furnished which is needed for the work of the Gospel ministry. Of the many things needed by the man who is to preach, a true and clear and full knowledge of Bible-history, Bible-literature, Bible-thought stands *first*, after a renewed heart. Two statements about preaching are indisputable: (1) There is nothing outside of the Bible which the minister ought to preach; (2) There is nothing in the Bible which, as interpreted in connection with other Scripture, the minister ought not to preach.

The theological seminary is under obligation to furnish the student an opportunity for obtaining this knowledge. Nay, more; it is under obligation to require this knowledge of its students before graduation. If this be true, the responsibility imposed is a great one. To the seminary alone this work has been assigned. The college and university refuse to share any responsibility in the matter. The American university is ready to teach any language but the biblical languages; any history, but biblical history; any literature, but biblical literature. The ignorance of the Bible characteristic of the average applicant for entrance to the first year of the theological seminary is at once amazing and lamentable. Bible-instruction, if it is to be enjoyed, must be furnished the student while in the seminary. He has no opportunity for it before reaching the seminary. He has little courage to take hold of such work, if, when he leaves the seminary, he discovers that he has scarcely made a start.

It would seem true, therefore, that the theological seminary must, whatever else it may do,— (a) imbue young men with a deep interest in that book the study of which is to play so important a part in their subsequent lives; (b) carry them at least through the fundamentals of the several lines of work preparatory to or connected with the Bible; (c) teach them correct methods of Bible-study, and of Bible-interpretation; (d) store their minds with the largest possible amount and variety of Bible-information.

In the accomplishment of this purpose there ought to be included (1) the study of the Bible-languages, and so far as practicable, the cognate tongues; (2) the study of the history of the nations referred to in the Bible, together with the geography of these countries and their antiquities; (3) the study of the principles of textual and literary criticism, with the application of these principles to different portions of the sacred text; (4) the study of the principles of interpretation, and of the history of interpretation; (5) the study of the religious doctrines as developed in each book; (6) the study of the divine element in Scripture, of prophecy, of inspiration; (7) the study of the Bible as a whole, and of the different books as related to the whole; (8) the study of the special difficulties, moral, historical, and scientific, which present themselves to the Bible-student.

□ For the best work, or for even good work, the man called to preach cannot afford to be ignorant of these matters. The seminary, therefore, must furnish opportunities for their study, must require that their opportunities be improved. By so much as it falls short of doing this, it falls short of accomplishing its

mission. In so far as it succeeds in imparting this instruction, it is doing what it was originally intended to do. Nor is it to be supposed that, in these statements, sight has been lost of the fact that the seminary has other needs to supply, other duties to perform, and that neglect to perform any one of them would subject it to the same criticism. The seminary would fall short of accomplishing its purpose, if proper work were not done in Homiletics. The same is true of any one of the great theological departments. But in view of the absolute necessity of Bible-knowledge, the duty, so far as it relates to the study of the Bible, seems paramount to all others. The seminaries owe it to the cause of the religion whose interests they profess to serve, to the churches through whose instrumentality they have been founded, to the student for whose training they are held responsible, to make provision for the most thorough, the most extensive and the most comprehensive study possible of the Divine word, and to see to it that their students avail themselves of the opportunities offered.

Are the Results Accomplished by our Theological Seminaries Satisfactory?—

There is a growing belief that our theological seminaries do not, in every respect, accomplish the work for which they were intended. This thought is entertained as largely by those who have at heart the interests of the seminaries, as by those who are hostile to these; for it must be confessed that even in this nineteenth century there are some so-called Christians who do not believe in theological schools. The existence of this feeling furnishes no substantial reason why these institutions should be done away with; for even if the seminaries do not accomplish all that is expected of them, few men, outside of the class just mentioned, would have the hardihood to assert that they do not accomplish a great deal. The time has past when the right of the theological seminary to exist may reasonably be questioned. The denomination which fails to provide good schools for the training of those who are to be its ministers, does not and ought not to prosper. True, there was a time when the churches had no seminaries worth speaking of, and felt no need of them. So also there was a time when the world had no railroads, no telegraph-wires, and strange as it may now seem, felt no need of them. If, therefore, dissatisfaction exists in reference to the results accomplished, or if doubt is entertained as to the kind of work which is being done, the thing needed is investigation and discussion. If the charges made, the apprehensions felt are well-founded, let the evil be made known and corrected. If these charges have no basis, if these misgivings are purely imaginary, let it be shown that such is the case.

We believe that there is just ground for dissatisfaction in the matter. The theological seminaries are not doing for the churches, and for the students committed to their care by the churches, either what they ought to do, or what they might reasonably be expected to do. This sentiment is shared by a large number of men engaged in the work of theological education, and by a still larger number of men who, within a score or more of years, have passed from the theological seminary into the work of the ministry, only to learn that they are weak just where, as teachers of the Word, they were expected to be strong.

The seminaries, at least many of them, fall short in several particulars, but that, in reference to which there is most just ground for complaint, is the unsatisfactory character of the results achieved in the line of BIBLE-STUDY.

↔BOOK NOTICES.↔

[Any publication noticed in these pages may be obtained of the AMERICAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF HEBREW, Morgan Park, Ill.]

DR. SCHLIEMANN'S "TIRYNS."*

The four splendid volumes, "Mycenæ," "Ilios," "Troja," "Tiryns," not to speak of other works in a similar field, which Dr. Schliemann has now given to the world, are a contribution both to archæology and to history of the highest value. Whatever may be thought of some of his theories; whether his identification of the Hill of Hissarlik as the site of Homer's Ilium, and his strong conviction of an historical basis for the Trojan legends, be accepted or not; whether on various points of archæological detail students of the world's prehistoric ages agree with him or dissent from him, the value of his work as a courageous, indefatigable and singularly successful excavator on the sites of ancient cities, and of the books in which he records the results of his labor, will surely never be called in question.

Tiryns offered to Dr. Schliemann for excavation some peculiar attractions. Although less a center of heroic legend than Troy, and less noted in Grecian history than Mycenæ, it has long been a subject of legendary and historic allusion in a way to make a more intimate knowledge of it an object of desire for those interested in antiquarian study. According to Greek mythology it was here that Hercules was born, and in its neighborhood—the marshes of Lerna and the woods of Nemea—that some of the most notable of his "twelve labors" were done. The walls of its citadel were from the earliest times renowned as of Cyclopean structure, and said by such writers as Pausanias to rival in stupendousness even the pyramids of Egypt. The city was not without its place in Grecian history, while questions as to the date of its origin and the time and circumstances of its destruction have much interested historical students.

The city, or rather the citadel, of Tiryns was built upon a hill of moderate elevation in the Argolic plain, southward from Corinth and south-eastward from Athens. At one time the kings of Tiryns were independent princes, ruling over a small territory which afterward, like that of which Mycenæ was the center and sovereign, was conquered by Argos, a stronger city in the vicinity, and its citadel and palace destroyed. This event is believed by Dr. Schliemann to have taken place in pre-Homeric times, although other writers place it later. Of the prehistoric *origin* of the city there can be no doubt. Nor is it surprising that legend should have attributed the building of its walls to that fabled race of giants, the Cyclopes, when the enormous size of the stones and the breadth and strength of the walls themselves are considered. Blocks of stone from eight to ten feet in length, three or more in breadth and the same in thickness, could be put in place by no ordinary human strength; and when one looks upon walls thirty feet in breadth, built of such masses, and thinks of them as probably reared to the height of fifty or sixty feet, he ceases to wonder that Tiryns should by admiring ancients have sometimes been compared even with the pyramids.

* TIRYNS. The Prehistoric Palace of the Kings of Tiryns. The Results of the Latest Excavations. By Dr. Henry Schliemann, author of "Mycenæ," "Ilios," etc. The Preface by Prof. F. Adler, and Contributions by Dr. William Doerpfeld. Illustrated. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Sold by Jansen, McClurg & Co. Price, \$10.00.

All that could have been anticipated, in the particulars just noticed, is realized in the discoveries made in the excavations; but other results greatly surpass expectation. The citadels on this acropolis of Tiryns appear to have been three in number; an upper citadel at the southern and highest point of the hill; a middle one, where it begins to slope to the plain; and another, still lower down. These are all connected; but within the upper one was the palace of the king. Dr. William Dörpfeld, an eminent German architect, associated with Dr. Schliemann in some part of his work, has succeeded in reproducing with surprising completeness the plan of the palace, guided by the foundation walls of its several courts, halls and chambers, which still remain. In the result a prehistoric royal abode comes to light with a distinctness hitherto unattainable, and almost as if the palace of Priam or Odysseus had suddenly sprung out of the ground.

The description given of the several parts of the palace, as thus in a sense reconstructed, is the central matter of interest in this splendid book, as its title implies. The gate-way, the propylæa, the exterior and interior courts, the hall of the men and the hall of the women, each with its circular hearth which was made the centre of the household life, the altar in the interior court of the men's apartments, the bath-room, the treasure-chamber—these are reproduced in the plan drawn by Dr. Dörpfeld, and described by him with an exactness which enables the reader to see "as with eyes." Fragments of painted plaster, in many patterns, show that the walls were ornamented in rich colors, the tints of which remain even to this day. In view of all, one finds himself revising his original impressions of prehistoric men and their environment, and deciding that neither the men nor their way of living can have been so different from those of later times, as it is perhaps natural to suppose.

The plates, map, plans, and other engravings in the book illustrate vividly the results of the excavations. They amount in all to 188; many of them being pictures of prehistoric pottery, implements and weapons found in the debris of the ruins. Many of the plates are colored so as to be *fac-similes* of the figures and patterns adorning the walls; while the map of Argolis in the frontispiece and the plans representing the palace and fortress are a great help to the reader. In its way "Tiryns" must command an interest little, if at all, inferior to that which the former works of this author have awakened.

EGYPT AND BABYLON.*

Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old. This is what Professor Rawlinson has done in the book before us. He has taken up seriatim the notices of Egypt and Babylon found in the Old Testament, and has proceeded to show what may be learned in regard to the same events from profane history, whether from ancient books or from the monuments.

Outlines of a few of the discussions will be in place. From 2 Chron. xxxiii., 10-13, we learn that Manasseh, after a long course of wickedness, (1) was attacked and captured by Assyrian generals, who took him with hooks [not

* EGYPT AND BABYLON FROM SACRED AND PROFANE SOURCES. By George Rawlinson, M. A., Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885. Pp. 320. Price, \$1.50.

among the thorns, as mistranslated in King James' version] and carried him in fetters to Babylon; (2) was restored to his kingdom after a period of captivity, during which he repented of his wickedness. The author calls attention to three remarkable things: (1) that Manasseh, though captured by Assyrians, is carried to Babylon, and not to Nineveh; (2) that he is taken away with hooks, and fettered; (3) that he meets with treatment unusually mild in the Orient, in being restored to his kingdom. From the monuments we learn (1) that Esar-haddon, son and successor of Sennacherib, and therefore contemporary of Manasseh, began a new policy, in order to hold Babylon in subjection. Instead of keeping his court continually at Nineveh, he held it alternately at Nineveh and at Babylon, ruling the latter not by viceroy, as his predecessors had done, but in person. (2) We learn that it was customary with those barbarous old warriors to bring captive prisoners of rank into the presence of the conqueror led like brutes with rings or hooks through their lips. Pictures of prisoners being thus led are found on the monuments. (3) Merciless as these oriental monarchs were ordinarily, it is found on record that Esar-haddon was remarkably mild in his administration, as is shown by his treatment of other princes than Manasseh. Thus there is shown an exact correspondence between the Scripture record and profane history.

To know how to put this and that together properly is really the problem of the man who would reconstruct history from the scattered and fragmentary data which remain and are all that we now have concerning many important periods. The author has certainly done this with great skill in his discussions of some of the historical problems which have confronted scholars on the pages of the Bible. King Belshazzar, whose feast became such a tragic scene on the night of the capture of Babylon, has been, until a comparatively recent date, without identification from profane history. The careful argument of Professor Rawlinson makes it exceedingly probable that Belshazzar was the Bel-sar-uzur who is named in an inscription of Nabonidus, the last nominal king of Babylon, as his eldest son. The inscription was discovered by Sir Henry Rawlinson in 1854. Fact and inference are plainly discriminated, and no conclusions are drawn arbitrarily; but the facts are so clearly set forth, that the reader can see in every case how much ground there is for the inference. This is characteristic of the book. There seems to be no anxiety to make out a case, no special pleading, but rather a clear and concise statement of what is known of the matters in question.

The same method of treatment is followed in discussing the notices of Egypt. A comparison of Biblical records and the other sources of information seem to point to Apepi, the last of the Hyksos, as the Pharaoh of Joseph's time. It seems also more than probable that Seti I. was the first, and Rameses II. the second Pharaoh of the oppression, and the son of Rameses, Menephtah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. That the historical conditions stated or necessarily implied by the biblical narrative are fulfilled by the reigns of these monarchs, is shown by the concurrent testimony of tradition, Manetho and the monuments.

The latter part of each study is devoted to the prophecies concerning Babylon and Egypt, and the fulfillment of them.

The book is certainly a very valuable one; it comprises the results of a vast amount of painstaking research, and puts them forth in clear statement with candid spirit. This is all given in such simple and lucid style, that the casual reader would hardly think of the mass of material which must have been sifted to get these results.

◆SEMITIC◆AND◆OLD◆TESTAMENT◆BIBLIOGRAPHY.◆

FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- BERCHTER, G. A. Das Evangelium d. Alten Bundes. Betrachtungen üb. Jesaias XL.-LXVI. Mülheim: *Buch. d. Evang. Ges.* 8vo, pp. 282.... M. 1.80.
- BERGMANN, F. Jonah (e. alttestamentl. Parabel), aus dem Urtext übers. u. erklärt. Strassburg: *Treuttel & Wuertz.* 8vo, pp. iv, 110.....M. 3.20
- EDERSHEIM, ALFRED. The Bible History. 6 vols. 1. The World Before the Flood. 2. The Exodus and Wanderings in the Wilderness. 3. Israel in Canaan under Joshua and the Judges. 4. Israel under Samuel, Saul, and David, to the birth of Solomon. 5. Israel and Judah from the death of Solomon to the reign of Ahab. 6. The History of Israel and Judah from the Sacrifice in Carmel to the death of Jehu. London: *Religious Tract Society.* Each 2s. 6d.
- GUNNING, J. H. De Godspraken van Amos, vertaald en verklaard. Leiden: *Brill.* Large 8vo, pp. xi, 200.....M. 5.
- KUENEN, A. Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher d. alten Testaments hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung u. Sammlung. Autoris. deutsche Ausg. v. Th. Weber. 1. Th. 1. Stück. 1. Hft. Leipzig: *O. Schulze.* Large 8vo, pp. iv, 96.....M. 2.50.
- LUNDBORG, G. R. Profeten Esaias. Kap. XL.-LXVI. I metrisk öfversättning med nödiga inledningar och förklaringar efter bästa källor. Stockholm: *A. V. Carlson.* 8vo, pp. 144.....1 kr. 50 öre.
- MUELLER, J. Kritischer Versuch über den Ursprung u. die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Pesach- u. Mazzothfestes. (Nach den pentateuchischen Quellen.) Inaug.-Diss. Bonn: *E. Webber.* 8vo, pp. viii, 86.
- PALMER, E. H. A History of the Jewish Nation from the earliest times to the Present day. London: *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* Crown 8vo, cloth boards.....4 s.
- RADENHAUSEN, C. Die echte Bibel u. die falsche. Hamburg: *O. Meissner.* Large 8vo, pp. 166.....M. 1.50
- SIMON, D. W. The Bible an Outgrowth of Theocratic Life. Edinburgh: *T. & T. Clark.* Crown 8vo.....4s 6d
- Studia Biblica.* Essays in Biblical Archæology and Criticism and kindred subjects, by members of the University of Oxford. Oxford: *Clarendon Press.* Large 8vo, pp. viii, 263.....10s. 6d.

AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS.

- CRAFTS, W. F. Pocket Lesson Notes on the International Lessons for 1886. Issued quarterly. New York: *Funk & Wagnalls.* Pp. 96 each part....15c., 5c.
- FISH, HENRY C. Bible Lands Illustrated. A complete handbook of the antiquities and modern life of all the sacred countries. New York, Chicago and New Orleans: *A. S. Barnes & Co.* 12mo, pp. 920.....\$3.00
- HAZARD, M. C. The Pilgrim Handbook on the International Lessons for 1886; with questions. Boston: *Congregational S.'S. and Pub. Soc.* Pp. 231. Bds., 15c.

- MILLS, ABRAHAM. The Ancient Hebrews: with an introductory essay concerning the world before the Flood. New York and Chicago: *A. S. Barnes & Co.* 16mo, pp. 443.....\$1.25
- MONDAY CLUB. Sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1886. Boston: *Congregational Publishing Society.* Pp. 459.....\$1.50
- PELOUBET, F. N. & M. A. Notes on the International Lessons for 1886. Boston: *W. A. Wilde & Co.,* Pp. 330.....\$1.25
- Senior Lesson Book on the International Lessons for 1886. New York: *Phillips & Hunt.* pp. 208. Bds.....15c.
- The Berean Question book on the International Lessons for 1886. New York: *Phillips & Hunt.* Pp. 184. Bds.....15c.
- VINCENT, J. H. and HURLBUT, J. L. The Lesson Commentary on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1886. New York: *Phillips & Hunt.* Pp. iii, 309. Cloth.....\$1.75

RECENT ARTICLES.

- ENGELHARDT. Die richtige Würdigung der alttestamentlichen Institutionen. *Beweis des Glaubens,* Aug., Sept., Oct., '85.
- MOORE, W. W. The New Method in Hebrew. *Christian Observer,* Nov. 25, '85.
- MUELLER, K. Betrachtung über die ‚Anmerkungen zur biblischen Schöpfungsgeschichte.‘ — W. Buff, Gegenbemerkung. *Ibid.,* Juli, Sept., '85.
- FLOSS, H. Geschichtliches u. Ethnologisches über Knabenbeschneidung. *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. d. Medicin u. Medicin. Geographie,* VIII. 3, pp. 312-343.
- DEWITT, JOHN. Studies in the Psalms. No. II. *Homiletic Review,* Dec., '85.
- The Old Testament Revision. *Methodist Pulpit and Pew,* Oct., '85.
- HART, H. CHICHESTER. A Naturalist's Journey to Sinai, Petra, and South Palestine, *Palestine Exploration Fund,* Oct., '85.
- WALSH, W. PAKENHAM. The Will of Sennacherib. *Pulpit Treasury,* Dec., '85.
- HART, B. A. Report on the Botany of Sinai and South Palestine. (Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy.) *Science,* xxviii., 19, pp. 373-452.
- GEIKIE, CUNNINGHAM. Jeremiah and his Times. *Sunday School Times,* Dec. 19, '85.
- BEHAGHEL, OTTO. Zur Probebibel. *Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Nov. 14, '85.
- CASPARI, C. P. Spaadommen i Mich. iv., 1-5, og Jes. II., 2-4, populaert udlagt. *Theol. Tidsskr. f. d. evang.-luth. Kirke i Norge,* N. R. X., 3, pp. 347-378; 4, pp. 490-504.
- STEINER, H. Davids Rache an den Ammonitern, 2 Sam. xii., 31. *Theol. Ztschr. aus d. Schweiz,* 1885. IV., pp. 303-305.

REVIEWS.

- WELLHAUSEN, J. Prolegomena zur Gesch. Israels (A. Kamphausen). *Hist. Zeitschr.,* 1885, V.
- TILING, W. Das Wort Gottes, 1. u. 2. Aufl. (J. H.) *Mitthgn. u. Nachr. f. d. ev. Kirche in Russland.* Juli u. August, 1885.
- GUNNING, JH., J. H. De Gódspraken van Amos, vertaald en verklaard. (Smend.) *Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Nov. 28, '85.
- Studia Biblica.* (H. Holtzmann.) *Ibid.*
- WEIDEMANN, A. Aegyptische Geschichte I. (R. Pietschmann.) *Ztschr. d. Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellsch.* 39, I., 1885.