THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

VOL. V. FEBRUARY, 1886. No. 6.

THE following sentence occurs in a letter recently received from a student in Princeton Theological Seminary: "I hope, God willing, to initiate in my charge a more thorough and systematic course of congregational Bible-teaching; and to that end I shall need all the facility in Hebrew I can attain." Some questions are at once suggested. How many young men will leave the theological seminaries during the coming spring, resolved to carry out a systematic plan of congregational Bible-teaching? How many men, to-day in the ministry, have endeavored to do this thing? There is Dr. Boardman in Philadelphia; Dr. Taylor in Brooklyn; Dr. Duryea in Boston. Yes, but how many Boardmans, Taylors and Duryeas are there in the entire country? *Too few.* Where is the error of the policy pursued by the great majority of ministers? It is that their teaching is outside-teaching, surface-teaching, temporary-teaching, whereas it should be inside, deep, permanent. Our church members are not taught the Bible, though they are hungry for it. This idea of systematic congregational Bible-study should grow; let it be introduced and tried for ten years in any church, and what a revolution will be worked in that church! It is not to the point, to say that this is the work of the Sunday School. It is rather the work of the preacher, the divinely authorized interpreter of God's Word.

IT is possible, we suppose, to exaggerate the results which may be reasonably expected from the study of the Assyrian monuments, in relation to biblical history and literature. It is easy to imagine that the time has now come when the difficulties which have baffled the learned of all centuries shall be settled, when the differences of opinion which have existed concerning these writings, from the very

time of the writings, shall cease. The danger of expecting too much is greater than that of expecting too little. For at least two reasons we must guard against it: (1) because there is sure to come disappointment; and he who, having expected much, receives little, is in no mood to appreciate or use well the little received; and (2) because exaggerated expectations can result in nothing but injury to the cause of truth. There is danger also that, in our zeal for the Word, we shall be led to *twist* this or that historical narrative into harmony with the sacred account, or, perhaps, endeavor to *twist* the sacred account of a given event so as to make it harmonize with the profane account. Such work will blind some, will please some; but it cannot be lasting. Two qualities must characterize the Bible-student in all his investigations—accuracy, patience. He need not expect to see all difficulties removed. He is called to go forward only so far as the *facts* warrant. There will then be no bad results, no disappointment.

ANOTHER step toward stimulating Old Testament study has been taken by *The Institute of Hebrew*. As the *Institute* is organized, only those who are Instructors in Hebrew or Old Testament subjects can be *members*. At the recent meeting held in New York, arrangements were made for electing as *Fellows* of the *Institute* those who should (1) successfully pass examinations in (*a*) one-half of each of the three grand divisions of the Hebrew Bible (history, prophecy, poetry), (*b*) Hebrew grammar,—etymology and syntax, (*c*) two cognate languages, e. g., Aramaic and Arabic, or Assyrian and Arabic; and (2) prepare an original thesis on some subject connected with Old Testament study. The examinations are to be held at the various Summer Schools, and the papers submitted for decision to the Executive Committee of the Institute. This honor will be a fitting public recognition of attainment made by earnest students. The work will be equivalent in amount to that required, even in the best institutions, for the degree of Ph. D. The organization which confers the honor is made up of men representing the leading institutions of the country. No one, of course, will undertake such a course of study merely for the honor its successful accomplishment may bring. The work will be prosecuted for the good results which will follow it. The honor, however, may stimulate some who otherwise would not work.

"BIBLICAL theology! Is not all theology biblical?" This question is often asked in that tone characteristic of a desire to frown down a thing that is new.

It is true that the study called biblical theology—Old Testament theology and New Testament theology—is new in its methods, though not in its materials. It is not many decades since historical theology won for itself a place as a distinct department of theological study. This department is commonly treated as embracing the history of the Christian church, its doctrines, institutions and life since the days of the apostles. If the department were to embrace what the name implies, it would include the whole history of revealed religion. The biblical part of historical theology is what is known as biblical theology. Historical theology is necessary for a thoroughly judicious interpretation and application of Christian truth to human life. It reveals numberless mistakes made in Christian life and doctrine; it records the origin and rise of many beneficent institutions and practices in the Christian church. Subordinated to the Bible, it is indispensable also in forming a systematic statement of Christian doctrine. Important as is historical theology, biblical theology is none the less important. Biblical theology presents the truths of revealed religion as they were progressively revealed to men and appropriated by them. In the study of biblical theology, better than in any other study, may be learned the method of divine education by revelation, and the divine patience with the slowness of progress by human pupils. Religious thought or beliefs, institutions and life are the subjects of biblical theology as of historical theology. All must contribute to the decision of the questions of literary criticism. Institutions alone afford the very weakest basis for a structure raised by criticism,—i. e., when criticism is constructive. The truths revealed by God and grasped by men, studied in their progressive character, would give a much better basis. We are, however, not confined to so narrow a field. It may be said that biblical theology is dependent upon literary criticism. This is true. The converse is also true. If either of the two can stand alone, that one is biblical theology. Literary criticism has its place; historical investigation may not safely be omitted; but to undertake to determine the course of Old Testament history without supreme regard to the course of religious thought and belief is hopeless. This chief factor in answer to the questions of the day is offered by Old Testament theology. Until this contribution is received it will be too soon to pass any thing but a tentative judgment on the controversy of literary criticism.

HOW few men accomplish any thing outside of the routine of their profession. But are professional duties, however arduous, to be accepted as an excuse for abandoning all other pursuits? Should any

man, however ambitious he may be in his profession, wholly confine his thought, his work, his energy to that profession? The answer comes, One *must*, in our day, so confine himself, if he would grow, or even *live*, in his profession. The statesman, so vast and varied are his responsibilities, can do nothing but the duties of his office. The editor, a slave bound fast by merciless routine, must be *only* an editor all his life. The minister, burdened with the practical cares of a pastorate, must relinquish all hope, for instance, of being a student, or a scholar. This, we say, is the prevailing idea. Is it a true one? The religious press, not to speak of the daily, is commenting with exultation upon the fact that the greatest statesman living, at an advanced age, and in the midst of a great political crisis, has taken issue with a celebrated scientist upon the question of the credibility of the Mosaic account of creation. Here is a statesman whose duties have not prevented study and research in many lines of linguistic and scientific inquiry.

No portion of the material furnished by THE STUDENT to its readers, has given greater satisfaction, and no other articles have called forth more expressions of appreciation and profit than those which, during two years, have appeared under the title "Studies in Archæology and Comparative Religion," by Dr. J. A. Smith. They have evinced wide reading, deep study, close investigation. Back of them lie years of patient, scholarly, persevering labor. The professional oriental students capable of performing this work, as it has been performed, are few. But these articles have been prepared by an editor,—one, too, who by his position has been called to bear more than the usual number of this life's cares. Here, then, is an editor whom the routine of his profession could not keep from delving into the hidden things of the past, with results beneficial to others as well as to himself.

How is it with ministers? Is it necessary to cite instances from the great multitude, who, while engaged in the active work of their profession, have been able to do work in one line or another for which even the critical world holds them in kind remembrance?

There is a great lesson here, if we would but heed it,—a lesson which our ministers need to ponder. There is too much of the easily satisfied, the self-satisfied feeling abroad. Two sermons, and a prayer-meeting talk, with the necessary pastoral visiting, should not be the *end* of a minister's work. There is much besides which he might do, the doing of which would make this work far more easily done.

THE REVISED PSALTER.

By Professor Edwin Cone Bissell, D. D.,

Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

II.

Resuming the work, begun in the December number, of giving some illustrations of what the Revisers have done for the English Psalter, we next take up Psalm XXXIII., 4. To say of Jehovah that all his work is "*done* in truth" (AV.), while quite correct in itself, conveys a wrong impression of what is affirmed by the psalmist. The thought rather is that all Jehovah's work is done "in faithfulness" (RV.). He is true to himself, and faithful to his servants and to his word. So in verse 15 there is a like ambiguity or falsification of the thought: "He fashioneth their hearts alike; he considereth all their works" (AV.). One might suppose that the essential homogeniousness of human nature were the thing in mind, and that the passage were parallel to Prov. XXVII., 19. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The inspired singer is simply enlarging upon the omniscience of Jehovah. He is One who "fashioneth the hearts of them all, That considereth all their works" (RV.).

Psalm XXXV., 1.—The opening lines of this Psalm seem to be an echo of the words found in Exod. XV., 3, "The Lord is a man of war." It is but one of many reminiscences of that remarkable production to be found in the subsequent literature of the Bible. Hence, the feeble "Plead my cause" (AV.) is wholly out of harmony with the martial sentiment of the author which utters itself in the ringing words, "Strive thou, O Lord, with them that strive with me: Fight thou against them that fight against me" (RV.).

Ps. XXXVI., 2.—It would require somewhat extraordinary exegetical talent to determine what is meant by the declaration that the wicked man "flattereth himself in his own eyes, until his iniquity be found to be hateful" (AV.). Hateful to whom? To himself? Such a thought would not agree with the context, and if it did, it would be a truism. Hateful to God and his people? When was it any thing else? The statement of the original is that the wicked man flattereth himself . . . . "That his iniquity shall not be found out and be hated" (RV.).

Ps. XXXVII., 4.—If there is the loss here of a precious text that has given comfort to many, and a promise has been changed to a pre-

cept (AV.), "Trust in the Lord, and do good; *so* shalt thou dwell in the land and verily thou shalt be fed" ("Dwell in the land, and follow after faithfulness," RV.), the loss is fully made up by the breadth of the promise which follows, and which in the Revision is made far more perspicuous than before. Be steadfast, occupy the place assigned you. Cherish (lit., "feed on") faithfulness. "And he shall give thee the desires of thine heart." Verse 8: "Fret not thyself in any wise to do evil" (AV.) might be considered as a sentiment worthy to figure among the prohibitions of the Bible. There are many persons who desire to be thought good who do actually fret themselves because they cannot do evil. But this is a far more comprehensive and a nobler injunction, to say nothing of its greater force and pertinency, "Fret not thyself, *it tendeth* only to evil-doing" (RV.). Fretting is an evil friction, introducing derangement into the whole mental and moral organism. Verse 20: The majority of votes seem to have been in favor of the rendering, "And the enemies of the Lord shall be as the excellency of the pastures" (AV., "the fat of lambs"). There are apparently two distinct figures employed, as the Revisers have indicated by a semicolon. There is, first, that of the withering grass, and, second, that of the consuming of any substance, possibly the same grass, in fire and smoke. It is hardly possible to suppose that, in such a connection, there can be a reference to the rite of sacrifice.* Verse 35: The "green bay tree" as an image of a prosperous wicked man is likely soon to disappear from the English Bible along with the "unicorn" (Ps. XCII., 10) and many another fancy of the older interpreters.†

Ps. XLII., 5.‡—There can be no just objection offered to the change from "help of his countenance" (AV.) to "health of his countenance" (RV.), as a change, since the common version has itself so rendered

---

* In verse 24 I would much prefer the rendering of Delitzsch to that of the AV., which the Revisers have left unchanged: "Wenn er faellt, wird er nicht hingestreckt, Denn Jahve stuetzt seine Hand:" "Though he fall, it shall not be at full length; For Jehovah supports his hand." To speak of a man as "cast down" is now understood to mean that he is despondent, has lost hope. But as the verb and the parallel member show, the figure with which the psalmist begins is carried through to the end.

† Ps. XL., 7. The second member of the parallelism, as I cannot but think, is best rendered in the margin, "In the roll of the book it is prescribed to me." The words are parenthetic. They refer, it would seem, to the law concerning the king found in Deut. XVII., 14-20. The preposition *'al* may well be so rendered both here and in 2 Kgs. XXII., 13, where it is used in a similar connection. The verb has a pregnant sense and is used with the meaning of *written for and laid upon* me.

‡ Ps. XII., 3. It might fairly have been expected that at least two-thirds of our Revisers would see the necessity of a change here, at whatever cost of sentiment. The verb *haphak* could hardly mean "to make" as applied to a Jewish bed. And the addition of *kol* (all) shows that not the bed, but the state of being confined to it, is what is to be *turned, changed*. So De Witt has well rendered (*Praise Songs of Israel*, p. 60): "His bed of sickness Thou wilt wholly transform."

the same Hebrew in the immediate context (XLII., 11; XLIII., 5). There is, therefore, a gain in the direction of uniformity.*

Ps. XLIV., 2.—"Thou didst afflict the people, and cast them out" (AV.), "didst spread them abroad" (RV.). The Revision refers the second clause to Israel. The parallelism certainly favors the change, and the Hebrew verb involved readily admits of it. Cf. Ps. LXXX., 11; CIV., 30. Verse 20: "Or stretched out our hands (RV., spread forth our hands) to a strange god" (AV.). The alteration would appear almost trivial to a cursory reader. But it is greatly in the interest of clearness and precision. The posture of one engaged in prayer was to elevate the arms and extend the open palms of the hand.

Ps. XLV., 1.—"My heart is inditing a good matter" (AV.) is a mistranslation, and in consequence of it, this clause fails of that nice adaptation to its context which was intended. In speaking of the king, and such a king, the writer says his tongue becomes the "pen of a ready writer," and at the outset he exclaims, "My heart overfloweth with a goodly matter" (RV.). The original word used, it is true, is found nowhere else in the Bible; but its meaning is sufficiently well established by a substantive of the same root occurring in Leviticus (II., 7; VII., 9). Verse 13: It was a strange misapprehension, or inadequate expression, of the poet's meaning to make him say, "The king's daughter is all glorious within" (AV.) as though her underclothing were referred to. His representation is that "within *the palace*" (RV.) in the women's apartments, she is all glorious, where, surrounded by her maids and attendants, she awaits the moment when she shall be led in to the king.

Ps. XLIX., 5.—If any clear impression be made on the ordinary mind by the words, "*When* the iniquity of my heels shall compass me about" (AV.), it is probably a false one. It is most likely understood to mean the evil consequences one has brought upon himself by walking in devious paths. But the writer is looking in quite a different direction. He is speaking of the iniquity of others as being "at his heels" (RV.), dogging his steps, striving to trip him up and lay him prostrate. But even in such circumstances he has the faith to exclaim: "Wherefore should I fear" mere mortals? None of them who "boast

* While the Revisers in this instance have consistently adhered to their rule to follow the Massoretic text and pointing, it might have been better to count it among the few exceptional cases where that rule should be disregarded. Unless they were prepared to do so, and change "his" to "my" in the phrase "help of his countenance" and so bring the refrain into harmony with itself elsewhere (verses 11, xliii., 5), they might better have left the whole unchanged. It is most likely that a *yodh* has been exchanged for a *waw* in the present passage, and that the punctuation is faulty.

themselves of the multitude of their riches" "can by any means redeem his brother, Nor give to God a ransom for him: (For the redemption of their soul is costly; And must be let alone forever," RV.; AV., "ceaseth forever").* Verse 14: It is with a feeling of real thankfulness that we accept what the Revisers offer us in exchange for the disconnected and, in some parts, almost unintelligible rendering of the AV., "Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them;.....and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling."

> "They are appointed as a flock for Sheol;
> Death shall be their shepherd:.....
> And their beauty shall be for Sheol to consume, that there be no habitation for it" (RV.).

Ps. L., 8.—When God is made to say to his ancient covenant people, in awkward phraseology, "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt offerings *to have been* continually before me" (AV.), we can only understand it as a covert rebuke of Israel, under an apparent concession, because their sacrifices had been fitful and intermittent. Just the opposite, however, is what is really said: "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices; And thy burnt offerings are continually before me" (RV.). What he justly blamed in them was their being content with mere sacrifices which fell so far short of his requirements.

Ps. LI., 12.—There is no reference whatever to the Holy Spirit, as a reader of the AV. might suppose from the rendering "Uphold me *with thy* free spirit." The penitent singer asks rather for a free spirit, the feeling of a son in place of that of a slave. Cf. Isa. XXXII., 8.

Ps. LII., 5.—It may be more significant for an Oriental than for us to compare the roof of the mouth to a tent; but that was no sufficient reason for abandoning the forcible and picturesque sense of the original Hebrew, and substituting "dwelling-place" for it.

Ps. LIV., 6.—A careless reader might easily overlook the distinction between "freely" sacrificing unto God (AV.) and sacrificing a "free-will offering" to him (RV.); but it is an important one. In the latter case not only is a peculiar kind of sacrifice meant, but the motive underlying the rite is especially emphasized. It was the spontaneous act of the worshiper, and not merely a bald compliance with the demands of the law.

---

* The American Committee have somewhat improved the dubious rendering of the last clause by making it "And it falleth forever." The whole passage would be still further relieved of obscurity if the adjective *yeqar* were translated by "too costly." There would be no grammatical objection to it, while the context shows that it is here used in just this sense.

THE SACRIFICES.

By Rev. Howard Crosby, D. D., LL. D.,

New York.

It is customary to regard the *'olah* (or burnt-offering) as signifying consecration, while the sin-offering represents expiation. I would suggest that expiation is the only idea in all the bloody sacrifices. The offerer puts his hand on the victim of the *'olah*, just as on any other victim; and that this putting on of the hand means a transfer of his sin to the victim there can be no doubt (see Lev. XVI., 21). The killing, cutting up and burning of a victim, and then the sprinkling or pouring of its blood around the altar were certainly significant of wrath, punishment and death. There was nothing of the nature of a gift to God in all this,—no notion of consecration. The whole scene was terrible, while consecration is beautiful.

What then was the difference between the *'olah* (burnt-offering) and the *chatta'th* (sin-offering), the *'asham* (trespass-offering) and the *zebhach shelamim* (peace-offering)? Simply this. The *chatta'th* (of which the *'asham* was a species) was the individual sin brought (in the person of the animal) to the altar to be slain, while the *'olah* was the general depravity of the man, underlying the individual sin, brought to be consumed. Hence a burnt-offering (*'olah*) accompanied every sin-offering (*chatta'th*), because every offerer would offer expiation first for his special sin and then for his wickedness in general.

The priests ate the sin-offering, excepting the fat, which was burned, because that represented the offerer's sin only; but they did not eat any of the burnt-offering, because that represented human depravity in general, in which they participated. So all of the *'olah* was burned.

In the peace-offering (*zebhach shelamim*), we have, after the expiation on the altar, the eating, of priests and offerer, from the remainder, signifying the peace and communion with God obtained by the expiation. My scheme of the sacrifices, then, is this:—

'Olah.....expiation of general depravity.
Chatta'th } .....expiation of special sins.
'Asham }
Zebhach shelamim..expiation and communion.

The *minchah* (meat-offering) and *nesek* (drink-offering) were mere accompaniments of the sacrifices, representing food and drink, the soul's nourishment through the expiatory grace of God.

Because *'olah* is used with the verb *'alah*, we think that the noun must be cognate with the verb, and hence *'olah* must mean "that which is lifted up;" but it is quite possible that a verb of similar sound should be made to accompany a noun when not cognate, the ear, not the sense, directing; as when, in English, a gourmand after dinner says "I *feel full*," or an evil doer says "I *will well*, but I act ill." Now as *'olah* (burnt-offering) is written with a *waw* after the initial *'ayin* (i. e., with a fully-written long *o*)* four times in the Pentateuch, and forty-three times elsewhere, why may it not be the same as *'awlah*† (wickedness), which we find as *'olah* also in several places? I see no good reason why the *'olah* may not be the *wickedness*-offering, just as the *chatta'th* is the sin-offering, and the *'asham* is the trespass-offering. By the way, the word "offering" leads the English reader astray. It should not be appended to these presentations. *Qarabh qorban* means "to present a presentation." It is not giving a gift. The *minchah* is a gift, which God accepts after the presentation of an expiation.

There was just one idea in all bloody sacrifices,—*expiation by a suffering substitute*. The gifts and communion and consecration were all sequels and results.

The *somata*, in Rom. XII., 1, are our *sins* (see Col. III., 5 for the same idea) to be destroyed, not our souls to be consecrated.

THE PROPER ATTITUDE OF THE MINISTRY TOWARDS BIBLICAL CRITICS.

BY REV. B. F. SIMPSON,

Duluth, Minn.

It must be well-known that this form of biblical study and research known as the Higher Criticism is prominently before the reading public of to-day. Although certain phases of the subject can be properly dealt with only by an advanced scholarship, yet such is the importance of the question and the documents of which it treats, that it is of necessity a popular one. Men are thinking on this subject in all directions to-day. It meets us on every hand; and the question is not, Shall we pay any attention to it? We dare not ignore it; for that will be equivalent to a surrender of our position, whatever that position may be. The true question for us to ask to-day is, What shall be our position with respect to this department of inquiry, and

* עוֹלָה † עַוְלָה

what attitude shall we sustain towards those who are engaged in promoting it?

On the one hand, some will be ready to say, Let this matter alone and it will come out all right. The truth is mighty and will prevail. These are very trite sayings; and yet because they involve a subtle half-truth, they sound very well. Yet we are not to wait for things to "come out all right," but to see that we bring them out all right. The truth will prevail, if those who are set for its defense shall stand by it and exhibit it.

Some one will say this is a matter for specialists to consider. But may we not apprehend some danger in such a course as this? It is true that the work of the specialist must be done. Some of it he alone can do; but others must join him in achieving the broadest and best results. The specialist must lay open the furrows, and make ready the soil. Others may join him in bringing the harvest to maturity. The specialist sees objects too much in their isolation, whereas every object of thought, every discovered fact has its relations to other objects of thought and other facts, and should be viewed in the light of such relations. The specialist will always bear watching; or better, he will always need assistance, and here lies the duty and opportunity of the minister. He is not supposed to be a specialist. He cannot well be one. But he is supposed to be a man of broad culture and good judgment, and in this matter such qualifications are of great value. The minister and the specialist must not condemn each other because they use different methods of inquiry, and arrive at results somewhat different. They must sympathize with each other; they must be willing to use their intellectual capital as a common stock, that by a proper division of labor there may be a harmonious co-operation which will lead to the fullest and most speedy results. The critic's work is no child's play. It is work which is of great importance. It places him in a position of great responsibility with respect to the truth and authority of the sacred word; and he should have the sympathies and prayers, rather than the frowns and anathemas of those who are so much interested in his work.

It is true that, in regard to the more strictly critical aspects of this question, the attitude of most men should be that of a modest silence. But few, comparatively, have made biblical research, in its critical and philological phases, enough of a study to speak intelligently on this point. Others should beware lest they bring discredit on their cause by an unscholarly defense of it. They should know that an ignorant defense of truth is more fatal to its interests than a sophistical opposition to it can be. They should know, moreover,

that the *onus probandi*, in this as in every case, devolves upon those who raise the question. When they have clearly demonstrated their positions we will be ready to accept them. Till then we will maintain a dignified silence.

In a recent number of one of our religious periodicals an anonymous writer gives his view of the attitude which we should assume towards all biblical criticism, as contained in the old Latin motto *obsta principiis*,—resist the first beginnings. It is well that this individual wrote anonymously, and did not put himself publicly on record as holding such a dangerous position. That method has been already tried too often, and its dire effects have taught most people that there must be a more excellent way. It avails nothing to-day to forbid investigation. In Protestant communities, at least, this is the case; and the only result which this denunciatory method can accomplish will be, on the one hand, to drive the critical investigators into still more extreme positions, while for the uncritical it will be the destruction of all progress in the proper understanding of truth.

Not many years ago some zealous defenders of biblical cosmogony, as they understood it, were ready to maintain that the world as it now is was made in six literal days, or else the Book of Genesis was not reliable history. This position was accepted by some and held so firmly that, when such a conception of creation became an absurdity, they had no alternative but to accept infidelity. There are some men to-day who will rashly affirm that, if the traditional views of the composition and structure of the Old Testament are not all correct, the whole Bible is unreliable. This I call a rash assertion; and yet it has sometimes come from men who regard themselves as careful students, if not profound scholars. This is surely a misfortune; and it is especially so when the writers of the New Testament, and even our Lord himself, are brought into this discussion and made responsible for the truth of such a view. Their treatment of the Old Testament made no pretensions of being critical. They quoted it in the freest manner possible. Evidently they had no scruples about a verbal inspiration. They do not take pains to give the exact words. They follow the Septuagint where it varies from the original text. At times their quotations are not literal translations of either the Hebrew text or the Septuagint. In quoting from the Psalms they use the common formula "David says," even though the particular psalm quoted may not be written by David. If it were absolutely necessary, as some have supposed, that the very language of the Bible should have been given by infallible inspiration, then, on the same grounds, it would be necessary that there should have been infallible transcribers, an in-

fallibly arranged canon, an infallible translation, and an infallible interpretation. We have none of these. Some of them, at least, we shall never have. It seems, then, that verbal inspiration is not so necessary as some have supposed, and we can forgive a New Testament writer if he gives us the general sense of a passage, without its exact words. Instead of affirming, *ex cathedra*, "If Moses did not write such words or such a passage, Jesus Christ was mistaken," it would be more prudent, as well as more modest, to say, "If Moses did not write the passage, I must change my view of the import of Christ's words."

We should meet these men as students desirous of knowing the truth as it is, and not in the attitude of polemics anxious to defend our view of what the truth should be. In this way we may soon come to a mutual understanding. In this way we shall find ourselves on a common ground with the critics, having common interests to subserve. We should not allow them to be more anxious to discover the whole truth than we are. It is as valuable to us as to them. All we shall ask is a fair and full search. We are not afraid that the truth will perish, or that its Author will be dethroned. We do not need to build bulwarks for its defense. All it needs is that it be discovered and exhibited, and its fitness will ensure its survival. Partial views of it, and the prejudices which support them, may pass away, "but the word of our God shall stand forever." It will stand; and it will commend itself more and more to an enlightened human reason as its wondrous depths of wisdom are better unfolded by a thorough and devout criticism.

To such an understanding of the word let the critics aid us. Let us look upon them, not as enemies, but as allies; and allies they will be. Let them correct for us the mistakes of transcribers and translators, that the errors of interpreters may also be corrected. If they show us that any of our ideas about the Bible have been wrong, it will be to our interest to have them righted. If they unfold for us some new phase of truth, it will be to our interest to accept it. In this way we will come nearer to them and will bring them nearer to us. In these matters we should have a common interest, and should mutually assist each other. Who does not know that there are interpolations to be removed and omissions to be filled up? Who does not know that any translation may be improved? Who wants to make his Bible a fetich to be worshiped, instead of an intelligible record which will teach him how to worship his Maker acceptably? Surely not any intelligent Christian. If any separate book can be shown to be uncanonical, who is not willing to carry a smaller Bible? If any book which

has not been thus far placed in the canon should be found to belong there, who will not enlarge his Bible enough to admit it? What we desire is the pure word of Jehovah, no more and no less. The Bible is a portrait of our Heavenly Father, and we desire all flaws and blemishes removed therefrom, that it may exhibit him distinctly. The Bible is a monument on which are inscribed the words and works of the Creator, and a just and wise criticism is to be the scaffolding by which we may climb to read and interpret the record. It would be folly for us to tear away the scaffolding on which we stand. It would be wisdom to assist in its further erection, that on it we may ascend to the very summit of revealed truth. We have nothing to lose, but every thing to gain from a true criticism. He who has learned, by practical experience, the truth of Revelation will not be easily alarmed. He who believes should not make haste. If this thing be of men, it will come to naught. If God is using this means to bring out the fuller light of his own truth, any opposition which we may offer will come to naught, and make us ridiculous in the eyes of men. Already discoveries in the realm of the various sciences have poured a flood of light on the Bible, or rather have drawn forth new beams of light from that book; perhaps a more abundant supply of that light still remains to be brought out in a similar way.

But, as already indicated, the burden of proof must rest upon those who raise the inquiry. Can they show that any radical changes are demanded in the present structure of the written word? Is language, known to be of a more recent origin, found in the Pentateuch? If so, let that fact be fully established, and then let it be shown how the integrity of the record is thereby affected. Can it be proved that, if writers in those early days sometimes signed other men's names to their compositions, any of the sacred penmen adopted this practice? If so, what was the effect on their writings? Can it be conclusively shown that names were given to individuals mentioned in the records after they had passed away and their characters were known, and not prophetically given in view of what their characters were to be? These are some of the important questions which the critics have raised, and it is their place to settle them beyond dispute, before they ask us to harmonize them with our views of the reliability and inspiration of the Bible. On such vital points assumption is presumptuous. Even plausible arguments will not suffice. We must demand clear demonstration.

Once more, while we will not discourage criticism, we should have something to say with respect to the method which it shall adopt, and the laws which should regulate it. The common rules of literary

criticism must be varied in their application to the Bible. It stands alone in literature, and its uniqueness has always been recognized. As well might the physical scientist attempt to discover the phenomena of mind by the use of the blowpipe or the retort, as may the mere grammatical and verbal critic expect to discover the fulness of revealed truth.

The biblical records are not narratives written according to the ordinary rules of composition. Really the Bible contains neither history nor biography, in the ordinary sense, but rather a series of sketches and pictures which, in a condensed outline, reveal great events and great characters. Surely the criticism of such a peculiar book must itself be peculiar. But, again, if the Bible be at all reliable as a record of historic facts, it certainly contains a supernatural element in it, and reveals the operation of a supernatural power. Here is an element of truth which can be but feebly represented in the forms of human speech, and must not be dealt with according to any arbitrary and mechanical laws of criticism. I mean, it must not be dealt with in a dogmatic way. Of course the usual laws must be applied by the critic, and as far as they apply, may be relied on.

In the common sense of the term, the Bible is not a scientific treatise. There is much said now-a-days about the harmony which is so soon going to be discovered between the teachings of Revelation and those of science. But these two departments of research are at present carried on on planes so widely separated from each other, and our knowledge of each is so crude, that this entire harmony will not soon be visible. When theologians, on the one hand, and scientists, on the other, can agree among themselves, it will be time enough to begin to look for a more general agreement. When will that time come? Certainly not in this generation.

Yet we must ever believe that a true science is not out of harmony with a true interpretation of the written word. And in the highest sense the science of sciences is that of religious truth, and the text-book of this loftier science is the Word of God. Geology is a science, though it does not disclose every thing contained in the earth. Astronomy is a science, although it reveals but a small part of the depths of space, and the orbs contained therein. And the Bible teaches a yet higher and deeper science, though the light which it casts thereon has not revealed to us as yet its infinite heights or its unfathomable depths. And while yet there is truth to be discovered, and light to break forth from the inspired page, we will welcome all help that can be given us towards a larger apprehension of yet uncomprehended truth.

THE HEBREW WISDOM,—THE BOOK OF JOB.

By Professor R. V. Foster, D. D.,

Theological School of Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

Of the several classifications of the Hebrew Wisdom literature the one which probably admits of the easiest, if not the most satisfactory treatment, may be substantially exhibited as follows:

I. The Hebrew Wisdom as exhibited in the inspired books of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, and many of the Psalms. This is the so-called classical period.

II. The Hebrew Wisdom as exhibited in the post-canonical and uninspired books of Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Tobit, Wisdom of Solomon, and the Prayer of Manasseh. This is the so-called post-classical period.

In the study of Hebrew Wisdom, or philosophy, as distinguished from the Old Testament Wisdom, or philosophy, there is no reason why the apocryphal books should be excluded from the classification.

I. THE CLASSICAL PERIOD.

The contents of this period may be briefly presented under the following analysis:

1. Wisdom, or pious reflection, in the form of dramatic dialogue —including

(1) The Book of Job; in the form of epic drama. From the fact that this book is here placed, no inference is to be drawn as to its supposed age. All that is here required is that the book be regarded as written within the canonical period.*

(2) The Song of Solomon and 45th Psalm—lyrical productions.

2. Wisdom in the form of the philosophic monologue—including

(1) Many of the Psalms.

(2) Ecclesiastes.

3. Wisdom in the form of the proverb—the Book of Proverbs.

* The uniform use by the author of the book of the name Jehovah seems to indicate that the book was written by a Hebrew, and at a time when that name had already come into common use in its distinctive sense among the covenant people; but at what time cannot be determined. The fact that other names are uniformly put into the mouths of the dramatis personae is in harmony with the other fact that the scene is laid outside of the sphere of the covenant people both as to their theology and their civilization. It is God in his relation to mankind generally that is presented, though this God is identified by the writer with Jehovah. The thought of the book is distinctively "Hebrew" only in so far as it is the thought of the writer. How far this is the case we may never know until we have learned to what extent the characters of the book were rea persons. These considerations, when elaborated somewhat, seem to render precarious any guess as to the age of the book based on internal evidence.

This classification is based wholly on the literary form of the several writings. An alternative analysis ignores the literary form, and is based on the phases of the general subject presented. In this case we should have

I. Divine wisdom, as exhibited in the creation, preservation, and government of the world and of the affairs of men. Under this head is to be considered the Hebrew view of the usual questions of theodicy, especially as presented in the Books of Job, Ecclesiastes and some of the Psalms.

II. Human wisdom, as exhibited in the fear of the Lord and in various ethical and practical maxims, based mainly on the writer's own experience as recorded in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

1. *The question of Inspiration.* It must be observed at the outset that we are by no means to regard all that is said by Job and his friends as altogether right and approved of God. See expressly to the contrary XXXVIII., 2; XLII., 7. The opinions of the several speakers on the questions arising during the progress of the debate are recorded by divine authority, but considered in themselves merely they are entitled to no more weight than other human opinions. They are valuable chiefly as conveying to us the uninspired views of ancient Orientals on the great questions involved in the discussion. Whatever may have been the purpose, or motive, of the author of the Book of Job, Ezra, or whoever the later editor was, saw something in it which, under divine guidance, induced him to incorporate it into the canon. The only thought in the mind of the original writer may have been a purely historical, or poetic, or philosophical, one; but the thought in the mind of the later editor, or aggregate of editors called the Jewish church of the early post-exilian period, was more than this. We should not in every case restrict our inquiry to the question, What did the original writer of a given book, or section, mean? He may have intended simply to spend a while in holy meditation, without having any ulterior object in view, as may have been the case with David when he wrote the 23d Psalm; or to record a touching incident, without appreciating in the least its permanent importance, as may have been the case with the writer of the Book of Ruth; or to write a nuptial poem in honor of some real or imaginary, some grand or obscure, occasion; or to speculate in dramatic and poetic form on the mystery involved in human life, as may have been the case with the writers of the Books of Job and Ecclesiastes. But the intention of the Holy Spirit went beyond all this, whether the human writer or

speaker were actually inspired by Him or not. What he said or wrote became inspired, and thereby endorsed, as a matter of record, though it may or may not have been originally inspired as a matter of sentiment. So the Book of Job, as a whole, has a value vastly above that which may attach to it as an expression of ancient oriental opinion on the questions involved. It is the word of God, a part of his revealed will, conveying to the church in all ages some of the most important truths, and an intellectual and spiritual culture, which are not presented with the same sustained dignity, beauty, and power, in any part of the Old Testament.*

2. *The Basal Thought.* (1) The scene is laid, in the first place, in the invisible world. Job is represented as being the subject of a conversation between Satan and Jehovah. Satan, in harmony with his name as the Adversary, or Accuser, prefers the charge of selfishness against Job. "Does Job fear God for naught?" Any one would serve God just as well and faithfully as Job does, if he were paid as well for it as Job is. He is a very rich and very happy man. It is easy enough to be good when all your temptations are in that direction. Jehovah is represented as denying this charge against his servant Job; and in order that the greater shame of defeat may accrue to Satan and the greater glory to himself and his servant Job, he says, Try him and see; do any thing to him, however severe; only, spare his life. This then is the basal thought of the book: The possibility of disinterested service; or, The possibility of faithful service induced by nothing but love. Doubtless Satan, unknown to Job, watched with keen interest the effect of his terrible experiments upon him. Not often are the gates so far ajar that we may see what is going on or hear what is being talked about in the spirit world; but we may oftener be the subject of observation or of conversation than we are aware.

(2) But the scene of the drama is changed from the invisible to the visible world. Satan and Jehovah disappear from observation. The dramatis personæ are Job and his friends. The scene is in Arabia at the desolated home of Job—his property all gone, his children all dead, even his wife, with lost integrity, speaking as one of the foolish women, his friends turned into accusers, himself afflicted from head to foot with a loathsome disease, and his bed an ash heap. Job the per-

---

*Ruskin, in his third lecture on Architecture and Painting, says that "the whole Book of Job appears to have been chiefly written and placed in the inspired volume in order to show the value of natural history and its power on the human heart." This is the shrewd and by no means valueless statement of an artist, illustrating, however, the important principle that what one sees in the Bible, as elsewhere, depends largely on the kind of glasses through which one looks. Ruskin says several other things in this third lecture suggestive, and therefore valuable, even to the Bible-student.

fect man and upright, one that feared God and eschewed evil! The basal thought now is, on the human side of the drama, Why do the innocent suffer?

(3) These two basal thoughts, the one on the invisible side and the other on the human or visible, may be united in the simple statement, The mystery of suffering. The answers are

1st. Jehovah's: To prove to their defamers, whether visible or invisible, the possibility of disinterested love and service. Thereby great glory accrues to Jehovah and a great vindication and reward to the sufferers. This solution restricts the case to the innocent.

2d. Job's: He cannot answer, but simply affirms his innocence, and wonders at the mystery.

3d. Job's friends': They answer substantially by denying that the innocent ever suffer. Only the wicked suffer, and simply as a matter of inevitable retribution which must be inflicted this side of the grave. It does not fall within the scope of this brief article to enter into the details of view expressed by the three friends and Elihu.

The third answer corresponds with the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, in so far as the latter taught that disobedience must be followed by punishment in this life, and in so far as it failed to emphasize that disobedience in this life may be followed by punishment mainly in the future life. As disobedience implied punishment, so punishment implied disobedience; and all suffering was punishment.

The second answer represents a spirit of dissatisfaction with the current doctrine of retribution, not because it did not contain a great truth, but because it did not contain the whole truth. For one class of sufferings it furnished no explanation. This remark holds true whether the Book of Job be regarded as an ante- or post-Mosaic production. One of the earliest religious instincts of man, or rather, one that soonest manifests itself, is to associate as cause and effect sin and suffering in this present life. Even the heathen have always been accustomed to say: "We have sinned; therefore the gods are angry with us; therefore this evil has come upon us." Or looking at the calamity, or evil, first: "It argues that we have sinned against the gods, and this in turn argues that they are angry with us." If you sin you shall be punished in this life. This was not only the Mosaic doctrine of retribution; it had always been, and is yet, the instinctive doctrine of the human heart. The very anticipation of punishment is punishment. This is one important sense in which the doctrine is always strictly true, no matter when the punishment is actually inflicted. Moses emphasized this form of the doctrine, not only because of the truth in it, but because a sound judgment as well as divine guidance

enabled him to know that it was the way whereby he could most effectively accomplish the tuition of the Israelites—especially in their national capacity. But obviously the common experience and religious consciousness of the Semite, whether Israelite or not, would at least cause him to suspect that the common doctrine of retribution does not include all sufferings—that there are some sufferings which are not to be regarded as punishments of individual sins.

The first answer classifies, or explains, these sufferings, at least so far as the nature of the case involved admits. Some non-retributive sufferings are disciplinary. The one guiltless of any specific sin may be caused to suffer for the purpose of discipline, just as a fruit-tree already healthy may be pruned to make it more fruitful or of a larger growth. But not so in Job's case. The suffering of Job, and of all whom he represents, is not disciplinary. It is what may be called illustrative suffering; or suffering for the purpose of object lesson; or, in other words still, for the purpose of making evident a truth the mere statement of which in abstract terms would not be believed, even if it were understood. The abstract truth in this case is, The possibility of disinterested love and service of Jehovah. To simply affirm the possibility of it to the accuser, whether in the visible or the invisible world, and to actually illustrate the truth of it in the case of a Job, are two very different things, the latter of which, of course, is far more convincing, and therefore more humiliating, to the party accusing.

In this view of the matter, the Book of Job may easily be translated into the life of many a suffering Christian, he himself becoming the hero of the new version. He has lost much, or he has suffered much, in his seeming interests or in his person. He would like to know why. May he not read, at least between the lines, these words of Jehovah: "I wish to make an illustration of you. Every once and a while it is said that no one serves me disinterestedly and unselfishly. I say you do. But I wish to prove it to the accuser. Will you submit?" Nothing is said to him about reward, nor does he read it between the lines. But he submits.

Job was a real person—many real persons, indeed; and the book so called is the record of their experience. Many a good man has prospered, and then lost all, including perhaps even his good name. Why? There the answer is.

Such, it seems to me, is the primary lesson of the Book of Job. Of course other important truths are involved in this one, and are developed in the course of the discussion. No better summary of them can be given than that of Dr. Conant, whose words I here vent-

ure to quote. Not only in specific passages, but by the general trend of its thought, the Book of Job teaches

1. "That the apparently arbitrary distribution of the good and evil of this life is not the result of chance or caprice. God, the creator and judge of all, the infinitely wise, holy, just, and good, presides over and controls the affairs of earth. His providential care extends to all his creatures. He has the power to restrain or chastise wrong, and avenge suffering innocence; and this power he uses when and how he will.

2. "That the government of the world belongs of right to him who created it; whose infinite justice can do no wrong; whose perfect wisdom and love devise only what is best; whose omniscience cannot err in the choice of means; who is infinite in power, and does all his pleasure.

3. "That to know this is enough for man; and that more than this he cannot know. God can impart to him no more; since omniscience alone can comprehend the purposes and plans of the Infinite.

4. "That man's true position is implicit trust in the infinitely Wise, Just and Good, and submission to his will. That here alone the finite comes into harmony with the Infinite, and finds true peace; for if it refuses to trust until it can comprehend, it must be in eternal discord with God and with itself."

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

By Prof. W. J. Beecher, D. D.,
Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

Feb. 14, 1886. The Handwriting on the Wall. Dan. v., 1–12 and 25–28.

We have no space for a full discussion of the historicity and the literary character of the Book of Daniel; but two or three points particularly demand notice.

The book, as it stands in the Hebrew, is made up of three parts. First comes the account of the education of Daniel and his three companions, chapter i. Then follow five stories of wonderful deeds or deliverances, wrought for or through these men, chapters ii. to vi. The remaining chapters constitute a series of visions and predictions. The first of the five stories which constitute the second part of the book includes the prediction of the successive kingdoms of gold, silver, brass, iron, and clay, and to that extent stands on a different footing from the other four stories.

The element of prediction is more marked in Daniel than in any other Old Testament book. Daniel is called a prophet in the New Testament, and by Josephus and other Jewish writers. The book is placed among the books of the later prophets, in the common English versions of the Bible. These facts ought to give point to the additional fact that the Hebrew Bibles do not reckon Daniel among the prophetic books. If one regards prophecy as equivalent to prediction, this is a strange peculiarity in classifying the books. Many scholars, assuming that prophecy and prediction are equivalent terms, explain this strange peculiarity by reasons that are still more strange. The fact is that prophecy and prediction are not equivalent terms, prediction being merely one element of prophecy. The fact is that Israelite doctrine, as it appears in the New Testament and in contemporaneous writings, attributes the Law and the Hagiographa, equally with the Prophets, to men endowed with the prophetic gift, and regards the element of prediction as belonging alike to all three. The fact is that the Book of Daniel is in a different class from the so-called prophetic books, because it belongs to a wholly different sort of writings. The books of the earlier prophets are made up of didactic selections from the pre-exilic history of Israel; the books of the later prophets are collections of distinctly homiletic addresses and poems (Jonah being partially an exception); the Book of Daniel is of a different character from either of these, and therefore belongs to a different class.

The predictive portions of Daniel have commonly been held to include predictions of the Roman power, and of events extending far into modern history. At present, however, the tendency is to regard these predictions as terminating with the times of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees; but it is by no means settled that this is the final interpretation.

Men who hold that the predictive portions of Daniel terminate with the Maccabean times, and who disbelieve in the reality of supernatural inspiration, of course hold that the book was written after the Maccabean wars, and contains a history of those wars, in the literary form of visions said to have been seen in

Daniel's time. This argument for the late origin of the book would have no weight with those who hold the received doctrines as to inspiration. In further proof of its late origin, it is urged that the book contains evidences of Greek influence, Greek names of musical instruments, for example. But there is no absurdity in the idea that Greek minstrels and other Greeks may have made their influence felt among the luxurious classes in Babylonia, as early as the times of Nebuchadnezzar. And a similar disposition may easily be made of the other reasons commonly urged for holding that the book was written long after the time of Daniel.

Against the historicity of the book many considerations have been urged, independently of the question of its date. It has been said, for example, that its Belshazzar is a myth; that he is not mentioned in other histories of these times; that the king of Babylon, when Cyrus captured it, was Nabonidus, and therefore could not have been Belshazzar; that he is known to have been at that time in Borsippa, and not in Babylon. Until a few years ago, our answers to these objections were purely conjectural; they consisted, not in explaining the difficulties, but in explaining how they might, perhaps, be explained. We now know positively, from inscriptions that have been recovered, that Belshazzar was the son of Nabonidus, and that no statement made concerning him in the Book of Daniel is at all improbable.

In like manner, it has been alleged that Darius the Mede is a mythical personage, unknown to profane history; and that profane history makes the reign of Cyrus to have begun immediately upon his taking of Babylon, and therefore leaves no room for Darius the Mede. The reply to this must still be conjectural; but amply sufficient conjectural replies are not difficult to make.

It has been further alleged that the chronology of the book is self-contradictory. In I., 21, it is said that Daniel continued till the first year of Cyrus, while in X., 1, we have an account of visions which he saw in the third year of Cyrus. But the first of these two statements does not necessarily imply that he lived *only* to the first year of Cyrus. The intention of the author may have been to call attention to the fact that, as Daniel participated in the events of the beginning of the seventy years of exile, so he saw the close of the seventy years, in the first year of Cyrus; this would be a fact worth stating, even if Daniel lived for many years longer. Or it may be that the two passages refer to the same year, designating it in two different ways; that it was the third year of Cyrus, according to the account now commonly received, which assigns to Cyrus nine years, beginning with the conquest of Babylon, but his first year, according to a different way of counting, which assigned the first two of the nine years to Darius the Mede, and only the last seven to Cyrus. Either of these explanations is sufficient.

It has also been alleged that the dates in Daniel contradict those of other history; and especially, that Dan. I., 1 is contradictory to Jer. XXV., 1, and to a host of corroborative passages in sacred and profane history. But we have already found (STUDENT for January, 1886, p. 225) that this contradiction does not exist; and that, on the contrary, the numeral in Daniel explains what would otherwise be difficult to understand, namely, the proper beginning and end of the seventy years of exile. The year in which Daniel was carried away, the third of Jehoiakim, was the accession year of Nebuchadnezzar, who was already king in that year, though the year counted as the first of his reign began with the following new year. From this third year of Jehoiakim to the third of the nine years of

Cyrus (both years included) is exactly seventy years; to the first of the nine years of Cyrus, it is seventy years, nearly enough for the purposes of a round number.

These and various other considerations seem to me abundantly to prove that the Book of Daniel, as a whole, is historical. We must not even touch the special questions that arise concerning certain parts of it. It would not have been justifiable to give so much space to the general questions, except for the light thereby thrown upon the following lessons.

FEB. 21. THE SECOND TEMPLE. Ezra I., 1–4 and III., 8–13.
FEB. 28. NEHEMIAH'S PRAYER. Neh. I., 1–11.
MARCH 7. READING THE LAW. Neh. VIII., 1–12.

We can attempt nothing more, in these lessons, than to set forth clearly the historical connection of the facts they contain. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah practically constitute one historical work, along with the Books of Chronicles, covering the history of Judah from the beginning to the close of the times treated of in the Old Testament. The writer of Chronicles closes his work with the sentences with which Ezra begins, as much as to say that, having brought up his history to the point already treated of in the Book of Ezra, his task is done. This seems to indicate that the Book of Ezra, as a whole, was written earlier than the Book of Chronicles as a whole. Other evidence confirms this conclusion.

To understand the post-exilic history, as found in Ezra and Nehemiah, we need to get distinctly in mind the fact that the narrative is not continuous, but is an account of things that occurred at four important epochs, with wide intervals of time left without mention. We need also to have distinctly in mind the succession of the Persian kings for the period, as the biblical events are dated by the years of these kings. Let us notice first the succession of the kings, and then the epochs in the history. The kings were as follows:

Cyrus 9 years, B. C. 538–530,
Cambyses 8 years, B. C. 529–522,
Comates, or Pseudo-Smerdis, a few months, not counted in the chronology,
Darius Hystaspis 36 years, B. C. 521–486,
Xerxes 21 years, B. C. 485–465,
Artaxerxes Longimanus 41 years, B. C. 464–424,
Darius Nothus, or Ochus, 19 years, B. C. 423–405,
Artaxerxes Mnemon 46 years, B. C. 404–359,
Artaxerxes Ochus 21 years, B. C. 358–338,
Arocus (the name is variously given) 2 years, B. C. 337–336,
Darius Codomannus 4 years, B. C. 335–332,
Alexander the Great 8 years, B. C. 331–324.

This list follows Ptolemy's canon, omits several brief or contested reigns, and counts the years B. C. as if they began, like the years of the ancients, with the spring equinox. This is not the most accurate method for all purposes, but for cases where it will answer, it is much the simplest method.

1. With this table before us, we are ready to take up the first of the four epochs of post-exilic history, that which begins with the events recorded in the Sunday School Lesson from Ezra. My present opinion, subject to correction from evidence, is that the first year of Cyrus, as mentioned in this Lesson, was the third of the nine years commonly assigned to Cyrus, and was therefore B. C. 536, instead of B. C. 538. I think, therefore, that the seventy years of Jer. XXV., 11,

are an exact number, and not merely a round number, and that the correct understanding of the numbers in Daniel, above mentioned, is that which agrees with this view. No other date, however, depends upon the taking of this view.

If "the second year of their coming," the year in which the second temple was founded, was thus 535 B. C., it was 52 years, counting inclusively, from the year of the burning of the temple. A large number of old people, who had seen the first temple, may therefore have been present at the founding of the second.

Daniel had something to do with the return from the captivity. In the year 538 B. C. (Dan. IX.), he was studying "the books," and finding out in regard to Jeremiah's seventy years. Beyond this, we have no information as to the details of his agency in the matter. But it was in this, or in the following year, that the affair of the den of lions occurred (Dan. VI.), and we are told that Daniel was prosperous and influential (Dan. VI., 28). That his influence would be exerted in behalf of his people is a matter of course.

It is easy to understand the biblical narratives as teaching that Cyrus was a monotheist, and a worshiper of Jehovah, and they have been quite generally so understood. But this understanding of them is not necessarily the correct one; and inscriptions of his, which have been recovered, indicate that his respect for Jehovah sprang rather from worldly wisdom than from piety. What he did for Jehovah and his worshipers, he did for other gods and their worshipers. He counted it a good thing to have the good-will of the priests and devout persons of the different religions that existed among his subjects.

We must not make the mistake of supposing that the greater part of the exiled Jews returned to Palestine at once, as soon as Cyrus gave them leave. Several different returning expeditions are mentioned, with long intervals between them. Doubtless there were many others, great and small, which are not particularly mentioned. But the Book of Esther and the other later books of the Bible, as well as the testimony of non-biblical writers, all show that the Israelites who remained in the various provinces of the Persian empire were far more numerous and powerful than those who went to Palestine.

Ezra, let us understand, had nothing to do with this first return, except, perhaps, afterward to write the history of it. Probably he was not born when it took place. The leaders of it were Zerubbabel, of the royal blood of Judah, Jeshua the lineal high priest, and the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. After the founding of the temple, the incident of the Lesson, things did not go smoothly with them. The mixed peoples inhabiting the neighboring regions wished to join them in their work, and being refused, made trouble for them. If Daniel died at about this time, the loss of his influence at the court of Cyrus must have been felt by his compatriots in Palestine. At all events, their enemies succeeded in hindering them, through the reign of Cyrus and of his successor Cambyses, whom (whatever the reason of it may be) the Book of Ezra calls Ahasuerus, that is Xerxes. Under Comates (called Artaxerxes in Ezra) the work was entirely stopped. It was resumed under Darius Hystaspis, and completed in the sixth year of his reign, B. C. 516, seventy years, not counted inclusively, after the first temple was burned, and either nineteen or twenty-one years after Zerubbabel laid its foundations. Such were the events of the first of the four epochs of post-exilic history. The account of them occupies the first six chapters of the Book of Ezra.

2. The second epoch is treated in the remaining four chapters of Ezra. It begins with the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B. C. 458, some fifty-

eight years after the completing of the temple under Darius. Within these years occurred the reign of Xerxes, the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther; the Jews out of Palestine seem to have been greatly prospered; but for this whole time, the history of Palestine is an absolute blank. That the interval had not been one of obedience and prosperity is evident from the unhappy condition of affairs, as Ezra found them. The event of the second epoch is that Ezra went up from Babylon with a fresh band of colonists, and with an ample commission from the king, and undertook to infuse new life into the Jerusalem Jews, and to secure the more complete enforcement of the law among them. It is especially important to be clear in our understanding of the fact that Ezra's expedition was nearly eighty years later than Zerubbabel's, and belongs to an entirely different generation.

3. Most of the Book of Nehemiah, including both of the Sunday School Lessons from that book, is devoted to the events of the third epoch; which covers the twelve years of Nehemiah's first administration as governor, B. C. 445–433, from the twentieth to the thirty-second of Artaxerxes (Neh. v., 14 and parallel places). This epoch begins, therefore, thirteen years after the beginning of the previous one. Ezra was still in Palestine, engaged in the work he had undertaken there, as appears, for example, from Neh. VIII., 2. But the state of things which made Nehemiah so anxious to go to Palestine, and that which he found when he reached Jerusalem, alike show that Ezra had not succeeded in his plans, and that Judea under his administration had met with severe misfortunes. Ezra and Nehemiah together accomplished what Ezra alone had found impossible. In the course of twelve years, the country was reduced to order, the enemies of the Jews baffled, the temple renewed, the city fortified, the Mosaic institutions everywhere put in force, and prosperity of all kinds restored.

The passage in Neh. VIII.–X. is of especial interest on account of its connection with the traditions concerning the Great Synagogue. It also holds a prominent place in critical discussions, on account of its testimony to the state of a large portion of the writings of the Old Testament, at the time when this reading of the law took place. Chapter IX., for example, presupposes a large part of the Old Testament, and in the order in which the books now stand. Many other questions of equal interest find a part of their solution in these chapters, but we must pass them by.

4. We complete our task by glancing briefly at the fourth epoch of post-exilic history, as mentioned in the Book of Nehemiah. It needs the more careful notice, as it is commonly too much neglected by the men who have treated of these matters. This neglect may be partially accounted for by the fact that it is less prominently mentioned in the Bible text than are the other three epochs. Yet the last chapter of Nehemiah is mainly devoted to it, and something concerning it may be learned from the genealogical matter in Nehemiah and Chronicles. The epoch is important because of its connection with the closing of the Old Testament canon.

After twelve years, Nehemiah returned to Artaxerxes. Soon, however, it appeared that his work in Palestine was not yet stable enough to endure the test of his absence. After a time he came again to Palestine, where he had to fight many of his old battles over again. Some particulars concerning this epoch will naturally be brought to our attention when we reach the Lesson from the Book of Malachi. How long this second administration of Nehemiah lasted, we are not informed. Apparently it lasted long enough so that he reached permanent results; and the twelve years of his first administration had been insufficient for

accomplishing results that would be permanent. It may have lasted as many as forty or fifty years or more; since Nehemiah was a very young man when he first came to Jerusalem, and may have remained there, after his return, to the end of his life. If Nehemiah lived to complete the Books of Nehemiah and of Chronicles, he lived to make record of a registration of Levites which was undertaken as an official act of the reign of Darius Nothus, which included the name of Jaddua, who was high priest in the time of Alexander the Great, and which was completed during the high-priesthood of Jaddua's father Johanan. See Neh. XII., 23, 24. There is nothing incredible in the idea that he may have lived so long as this. The current opinion, I think, is different. It is that the Darius of Neh. XII., 22 is Codomannus, and that this registration was made long after Nehemiah died. But, with all deference to the many eminent scholars who hold this opinion, it is in absolute contradiction with many points in the evidence, and is distinctly untenable.

STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

By Justin A. Smith, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

XIV.

THE IDEA OF REDEMPTION—SECOND ARTICLE.

In concluding what we have to say upon the subject introduced in the last of these studies, we notice a second idea of redemption, under which may be classed quite a different set of phenomena, as touching the views men have held in different ages and climes, and having reference much more than the one before noticed to the future life of the soul. We classify it as

II. THE JUDICIAL IDEA.

It is deserving of notice how much, in respect to what is here intended, the pagan thinker and devotee is sometimes found to be at one with the moralist and the rationalist of our own time, or of any previous one. I speak of that theory of human destiny, as regards the next life, which places man before God, when God is thus recognized at all, in the attitude of a claimant for the divine favor upon a plea of personal merit. *Quantum meruit*—this, we are even now often told, is the only ground upon which, consistently with self-respect, or with fundamental principles of right, man may ask approval and blessing, even of God. In some ancient religions this idea took the form of an actual balancing of the good and the ill in each man's character or life, with destiny decided as the one or the other scale should rise or fall. I call this, in each aspect of it, the judicial idea of redemption; perhaps with sufficient exactness to answer a present purpose.

There is something in man which makes this idea pleasing to him. It may be doubted if any other form of religious error has ever prevailed so widely, or has been able to put itself in such close alliance with certain phases of human culture. One of the forms which it assumes—and it is that which prevails to this day—is seen in a passage in Plato's "Republic." The aged Cephalus, in that part of the dialogue where the passage occurs, is discoursing with Socrates upon themes of this nature. He has just come in from sacrificing in the court of the dwelling where the party are met, in some of those acts of domestic worship cus-

tomary with the Greeks, and his conversation seems to take its tone, in a measure, from this circumstance.

"You know very well, Socrates," says Cephalus, "that when a man believes himself to be near death, fear and anxiety come over him in regard to matters which till now have never entered his mind. The tales told of the life below, setting forth how the man who has here lived sinfully must there suffer punishment, he has always laughed at before, but now his soul is tormented lest they should be true; and whether owing to the weakness of old age, or from being so much nearer to the life below, he seems to see it more distinctly. Thereupon, filled with apprehension and fear, he straightway begins to ponder and to examine whether he has ever injured any man. And he who makes the discovery of many wrongs done to others in his past life, cannot sleep for fear, but is ever starting from his very dreams, as frightened children do, and lives a life of evil foreboding. But to him who is conscious of having done no wrong to others, sweet Hope is ever present, and she is a good nurse in old age."

This he has said in part reply to a question of Socrates, in which he has asked him, "What, to your thinking, is the greatest good that has come to you from the possession of a large fortune?" Replying, now, more directly to this, Cephalus goes on to say:—

"This, then, it is, in respect to which I consider the possession of riches as of most value, not to every man indeed, but to the upright man. For if in departing hence we need have no fear lest at any time unwittingly we have lied or deceived, or lest we may be leaving behind us sacrifices unpaid to God or debts owed to man, it is the possession of riches that has in great measure brought this about. They have, of course, many uses besides, but weighing one against the other, I should none the less, Socrates, set the highest value upon this use of riches, at least to a man of sense."

How forcibly we are reminded, by this, of that saying of our Lord, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail on earth they may receive you into everlasting habitations!" In so far as a wise use of wealth may be concerned, even as respects the life to come, the philosophy of the one and the divine lesson of the other might be viewed as saying almost the same thing; yet how wide the difference between what may *enhance* heavenly happiness, and that which is the warrant of a sure hope of *attaining* heavenly happiness at all! I suppose that there are, to-day, more persons in the world, more in Christian America, or Christian England, or any other part of Christendom, more by far, whose hope for eternity is based upon such ideas as these of the old pagan Greek, than of those who rest in any thing that can deserve the name of a Christian faith. So much more acceptable to human pride is it to claim eternal felicity as a *due* than to accept it as a *gift*, though a gift free as the light, to such as do not persist in refusing it!

It is perhaps characteristic of Egyptian ideas in general that, in the ancient religion of that people, this judicial notion of redemption is set forth in a way so literal, and so gross. There was an element of coarseness in that old religion which reveals itself in their worship,—for in some sense it was a worship,—of animals and even reptiles. In their idea of the manner in which final human destiny is settled we see much of the same thing.

"No portion," says Rénouf, "of the Book of the Dead is so generally known as the picture which represents the deceased person standing in the presence of the goddess Maāt" [representing, in the trial about to occur, the divine justice], "who is distinguished by an ostrich feather upon her head; she holds a scepter in the one hand, and the symbol of life [a hieroglyphic sign, peculiar in form] in the other. The man's heart, which represents his entire moral nature, is being

weighed in the balance in the presence of Osiris, seated upon his throne as judge of the dead. The second scale contains the image of Maāt. Horus is watching the indicator of the balance, and Tehuti, the god of letters, is writing down the result. Forty-two divinities are represented in a line above the balance. These gods correspond to the number of sins which it is their office to punish. It is with reference to these sins, and the virtues to which they are opposed, that the examination of the deceased chiefly consists."

The destiny of the soul, thus under trial, being determined by the preponderance of sins upon the one hand, of virtues on the other. "No one," says Rénouf, "could pass to the blissful dwellings of the dead who had failed at the judgment in the presence of Osiris." This perhaps represents sufficiently what was most central and significant in the ancient Egyptian idea of the manner in which the eternal destinies of souls are decided. Grossly literal as it is, it does not seem to be a very inadequate illustration of what this idea of salvation as a work of human merit alone comes to in the end.

A more poetical setting forth of the idea of redemption, in this phase of it, is found in the Zend-Avesta, where Ahura-Mazda, replying to a question of Zarathustra, tells how it is with "one of the faithful" when he "departs this life." At the end of the third night after the soul leaves the body—

"When the dawn appears, it seems to the soul of the faithful one as if it were brought amidst plants and scents; it seems as if a wind were blowing from the region of the south, a sweet-scented wind, sweeter-scented than any other wind in the world. * * * And it seems to him as if his own conscience were advancing to him in that wind, in the shape of a maiden fair, * * * as fair as the fairest things in the world. And the soul of the faithful one, addressing her, asks: 'What maid art thou, who art the fairest maid I have ever seen?' And she, being his own conscience, answers him: 'O thou youth of good thoughts, good words, and good deeds, of good religion, I am thy own conscience. Everybody did love thee for that greatness, goodness, fairness, sweet-scentedness, victorious strength and freedom from sorrow, in which thou dost appear to me. And so thou, O youth of good thoughts, good words, and good deeds, of good religion, didst love me for that greatness, goodness, fairness, sweet-scentedness, victorious strength, and freedom from sorrow, in which I appear to thee."

When the soul thus departing is the soul of a wicked person, the maid who meets him, his own conscience, is of fiendish ugliness, and in place of such words of praise and welcome as those just recited, he hears words of upbraiding and doom. Each soul is then led across the Kinvad bridge which extends over hell and leads to paradise. "For the souls of the righteous," we are told, the bridge "widens out to the length of nine javelins; for the souls of the wicked it narrows to a thread, and they fall down into hell."

The translator of the Zend-Avesta, Mr. Darmstetter, speaks in a note of this bridge as known to many mythologies. It is the Sirath bridge of the Mussulman; and "not long ago," he says, "they sang in Yorkshire, England, of the 'Brig o' Dread, na brader than a thread;' and even now-a-days the peasant in Nièvre," a district in France, "tells of a little board," no longer and no broader than a hair of the Holy Virgin, which is placed between the earth and paradise; the good pass it safely, the wicked fall and are lost. So much, at least, in all this, survives of original truth,—that the final destinies of men are apportioned upon principles of justice; while that striking picture in the old Iranian religion of a man's conscience coming to meet him with the signals of his final doom, seems like a trace of some original right conception, still surviving, of that which must be in the next world such a large element of eternal sorrow or eternal joy.

I cannot take space for further expansion under this head. These may per-

haps answer as among the forms,—similar ones might be taken also from the teachings of the Koran,—which what I venture to call the judicial idea of redemption assumes in historical religions.

III. PROPITIATORY.

I go on, now, to the third and last of these phases of the general idea under consideration which I proposed to notice—the *propitiatory*. This can hardly be presented in a form so distinct as those already considered, the ascetic and the judicial. There is no religion besides Judaism and Christianity in which it appears as a characteristic feature, such as we have found in the other two instances. So far as we trace it at all, we must say that it appears as a subordinate element in many, perhaps most of the great historical religions; in some with more, in others with less distinctness. So far as the sacred books of pagan religions are concerned, any search for the clear and unmistakable presence of a propitiatory or expiatory element in the idea of redemption, in any of the forms which that idea assumes, will, I think, be disappointing to most persons. I am free to confess that such has been my own experience. I have been accustomed to think that the *need* of expiation has ever been so elemental in the human consciousness, and so deeply felt even by devotees of paganism itself, as that we may even find in it a reason for many of the most marked characteristics of pagan faith and worship. It is quite possible that a study of pagan *systems*, merely as such, is misleading in this particular. It may be that what is inmost in heathenism itself one might best find out by sitting down with one of its devotees in his own poor hovel, or in a mission bungalow, and encouraging him to speak out his own conception, however densely clouded, of what his hope of salvation, in any sense of that word, may be. It is true, too, that as in the idea of evil, so in the idea of redemption, the higher up we go in prehistoric times, the nearer we come, led by such traces as survive, to what the primitive revelation discloses, of man's need and man's hope. Confession of sin, and prayer for forgiveness, such as I quoted in a former paper, from the oldest Vedic hymns, and from those Akkadian penitential psalms whose date is lost away up in the prehistoric obscurity,—these belong to the utterances of primitive paganism, and are rarely found in those pretentious later books where we have so much more of mystical philosophy, or ascetic ritual, than of what deserves to be called religion. What kind of offering went with those old hymns as sung or chanted by the worshiper, we do not very well know. It is fairly certain, however, that the altar, and the slain beast, and the sacred fire more or less went with them; while in the petition itself, there seems such a resting of the worshiper's whole hope in the mercy of his deity, that it almost seems as if some sense of an expiation, however made, must be in it all.

When we turn, upon the other hand, to those so-called sacred books, in which these religions appear as systems, we perhaps ought not to be surprised that there is so little, upon such a matter as the present one, that we can really learn from them. We ought to look, it may be, for that which we actually so often find,—a mystical philosophy, in which men proud of their wisdom deal with the mysteries of being, with the origin of the world, the nature of God, man's own origin; on all which world-old legends are recited, made up into myths and parables, the only history which the people for whom they were written can have had during centuries. Or, again, so far as these books are ritualistic, they are the work of priesthoods, rarely having any real view to the benefit of the devotee, though very much to the effectual binding-on of the great burdens which every soul of the

millions so enslaved must carry from his birth to his death. So far as they contain moral precepts, they may some of them, in places, approach the excellence of Christian precepts itself, but they still leave the devotee, though ever so earnest in all outward observance, to find his way unhelped through the maze of dogma, and ritual, and law. We need not wonder, therefore, if we find our search for what is more and better than any of these so often without result.

We naturally look, in the various historical religions, to the rite of sacrifice as expressing the idea of expiation. And I think there can be no doubt that in all of them it originally did so, more or less. And then, either sacrifice, in the usual meaning of that word, or offering of some kind, is, so far as I know, common to all religions. It seems to be an element in religion regarded as essential even by savages, in whom the religious idea survives barely in the germ, and in those pantheistic, and so-called atheistic religions, where one might scarcely expect to find any worship or ceremonial of any kind. Brahmanic and Buddhistic pantheism, even after they have made God and the universe identical,—all that is seen being but the emanation of the unseen, into which after a time it returns,—and so appear to have dismissed the idea of personal deity altogether,—after all, even such pantheism seems driven by some consciousness that man must be a worshiping being, and that his worship must involve offering and sacrifice, to the introduction of elements which are inconsistent with its own first principles. The Buddhist places in his temple an image of the founder of his faith, and although the person so represented, far from being a god, is not even supposed to have now any conscious existence at all, but to have found that supreme felicity of annihilation to which the devotee himself aspires, still he brings his offering to the shrine, as if even for him there could be no religion without an offering. The Brahman has his own splendid temples, and the country is full of idols, representative of deities supposed to be themselves emanations of that original divinity which is one with the universe. When to these the devotee comes, it is usually, if not always, with an offering.

This conception of an offering to the deity as indispensable to religion is apparently as ineradicable as the idea of God itself. It looks as if there were a providence in this; at all events, a survival in some way made sure, of what must have been more or less clearly revealed to man when the first altar was reared in this world, the first victim laid on the sacrificial wood, and the first sacred fire kindled. Shall we say that not only in all this the one great sacrifice is anticipated, but that it is in this way provided that the devotee of any religion, in any age, in any part of the world, when he shall come to hear of that one offering for sin which really avails, shall be already familiar with the thought of an offering mediating between him who prays and the being to whom prayer is directed?

And then, upon the other hand, it is according to what happens otherwise, when this conception, though it should be innate in the very nature of man, becomes perverted, clouded, corrupted even, until it shall not only have lost wellnigh every trace of what it may have been at the beginning, but is found endorsing enormities even so great as those which were practiced in the temples of Moloch, in Druid groves, or on Aztec *teocallis*. If that idea of God which is certainly an original principle in human nature has undergone such perversion as we know, can we be surprised that this other, relating to an outward act of religion, should be equally so? The universality of the act, however, is all the more significant, for the very reason that, while it assumes so many often grotesque, often even

brutal forms, it still survives, as if endowed with a kind of immortality of its own, even after any correct notion of its meaning has perished.

I think we may say, without straining the point unduly, that in this way at least an idea of expiation is found in all religions. There is shown in the offering,—whatever its nature, and whether it assumes the form of actual sacrifice or not,—there is shown in it a consciousness that, when a soul prays, more is needed than simply the prayer. Let the petitioner have what perverted notion he may of the reason *why* more is needed, and of the *nature* of that more, the fact alone that he is not satisfied to simply pray, implies a consciousness in which survives, however dimly, however in the merest trace of what it once was, the idea of expiation. Perhaps we may say that, when we look at an act of pagan prayer or worship in this way, it is somewhat as the naturalist holds in his hand a lump of petrified clay on which he sees some fossil outline, telling him of a time when some living thing, a bird, a fish, or the leaf of a tree, became imbedded there, and now is found again, ages and æons have rolled away, in these few dim traces which to science mean so much.*

RESULTS OF THE INQUIRY.

Let me now, in as few words as possible, give some results of the inquiry thus far.

1. We find then in the idea of redemption in pagan religions the expression of a sense of need that is apart from, and unsatisfied by, what belongs to the ordinary and common life of men. There is something exceedingly pitiful in what is disclosed to us in the history of religion, in this respect. Perhaps we do not enough think of it. We look at these religions as they reveal themselves to us in their systems, in their worship, in the degrading practices and the degrading superstitions by which they are deformed, in the dishonor they put upon the very name of deity, and the dark and dreadful delusions in which their millions of devotees live and die. After all, there is something besides that. Back of it all is a poor humanity, with its dim yet keen sense of a something in its condition and its prospect more momentous than any of those needs or interests the satisfaction of which so fills and taxes their mortal life, from its beginning to its close. This sense of need is an element in man's nature simply universal. No race is so savage as to be utterly without it; no people so civilized and cultured as to have risen above it or passed beyond it. What a startling mystery of divine providence it seems to be that such millions of millions of human beings have lived and died in this world without any true answer to that cry of the soul!

2. Then, secondly, it is clearly by a kind of instinct that men turn to religion for what shall promise them any satisfaction of this felt need. We often speak of man as a religious being. Do we always realize what that means? It is not simply that man is, in his very nature, conscious of that which he represents to himself in his idea of God; nor simply a predisposition toward worship of some

* Prof. W. G. Blackie, of the University of Edinburgh, describing, in the fourth volume of his *Homer and the Iliad*, the sacrifice by means of which, in Book I. of the great poem, the Greeks seek to appease offended Apollo, says: "With regard to the significance of the religious act in the present case, it was evidently a sacrifice of atonement on account of sins committed against the gods, in order to propitiate their favor and avert their wrath. The Jewish idea of vicarious substitution does not appear in Homer; but there is a voluntary giving up to the god of what was most valuable to the possessor,—viz., his flocks and herds,—as a symbolical reparation for the offense committed by the mortal in contravention of the divine law." The idea of propitiation is here involved, but not in any sense strictly analogous to the Christian one. In the prayer of the priest Chryses himself (*Iliad*, I., 39-42), it becomes clear that, in offerings to the deity, the hope of favor rested on the acceptableness of the gift, and upon the pleased approval of the god as thus secured.

being who to him shall *be* God. It is that he cannot live *without* religion. An utterly irreligious and godless man is an anomaly in the history of his kind. He may be the strange product of a civilization that hardens in the same process by which it refines. He may be one who is doing violence to his own nature, and killing in the garden of his soul the most precious growth there. He can never represent to us the man whom God made, who is conscious, even in his worst state, of the fact that his religion ought to help him when all other help fails.

3. But, thirdly, at no point in the study of the religions of paganism are we more impressed with their failure as religions, than here where the test of their real value actually lies. Whether in the long, sad history of those races to whom no gospel of salvation ever came, there may have been some, serious, sincere souls, using to their best ability the light they had, and according to their knowledge exercising faith, of whom we may hope that in the great mercy of God they were saved—this we cannot know. It is a speculation, at the best. But this we *must* say, that if there have been such, they attained to that salvable condition, by going, perhaps with help of the divine Spirit, far beyond all that their pagan faith taught them. The holy God and sinful man never can have come into any such relation as redemption implies, through any system of ascetic practice, by any processes of acquired merit, or by propitiatory offerings to gods who were the creatures of diseased human fancy.

4. And now, as the final point, let us ask what it is in Christianity that makes it so infinitely superior, as a redemptive system, to all other religions of the world. I know not how we shall answer this question otherwise than to say that Christianity provides *a Redeemer*. The fatal defect in all these other religions is that it is humanity, dealing unaided with facts in its own condition even the nature of which it does not rightly understand. Just this circumstance alone, that the teachers of these religions offer to human faith such a multitude of expedients to the end desired, is sufficient proof that what they have to propose is in no case more than groping conjecture. Yet I am not sure but they have done all toward solving the momentous problem that man-made religions can ever do. When Jesus appeared on the scene, the question, How shall a sinful man be saved?—even the question, How shall burdened and sorrowing, and despairing humanity find real comfort, of any kind, in religion?—these questions were still unanswered for the great mass of mankind. Not even had philosophy answered them, much less religion, save as the answer Jesus was to give had already been anticipated in the dispensation that prepared his way. Well might *he* be called "The Desire of all Nations." Well might those mysterious "wise men from the east" bring to him in his manger-cradle their gold, frankincense, and myrrh. The great name given to him, "Immanuel, God with us,"—that was the key to the infinite difficulty with which founders of religions and of philosophy had struggled for thousands of years:—even more the name "Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." Here was redemption, because here was a Redeemer.

Other subjects contemplated in these studies are "The Idea of Incarnation," "The Idea of a Future Life," "The Ethical Value of Pagan Religions," and "Their Influence in the History of Civilization." The writer cannot venture to claim for these the needed space in the STUDENT, or to tax further the patience of its editor or its readers.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES,—AN ANNOUNCEMENT.

By the Editor.

In all work there should be progress. Lack of progress is failure. Many people imagine that, in their work, they are making progress, when, as a matter of fact, they are not. Many people, therefore, fail in their undertakings without being or becoming aware of it. This is especially true in the line of Bible-study.

That student makes no *real* progress, who without guide or teacher works wearily on according to no definite plan, with no fixed methods. He may suppose that time will straighten out everything; that, however confused he may now be, perseverance will enable him to attain the end he has in view. But herein lies his mistake. There is a chance, to be sure, that in his groping about, light may come. But it is the merest chance. He may suppose himself to be making progress; but it is like the progress of the mariner in an unknown sea with no compass in hand, with no stars over head. There is a going up, a going down, and a going around, but no going forward.

That student makes no *real* progress who, not knowing how to choose, performs his work by methods which, though definite, are false and misleading. There is no space here to enumerate the various methods of Bible-study or Bible-interpretation, to which the terms "false" and "misleading" are applicable. It is sufficient to say that *real* progress may not be expected from the spiritualizing method now prevalent, of which C. H. M.; Jukes, Pember, and to some extent, Pusey may be taken as representatives; nor from the "hop, step and jump" method which puts side by side texts from every part of Scripture without reference to the logical connection or specific force of each; nor from the "eisegetical" method, which reads *into* texts meanings never dreamed of even by the Holy Spirit. These and other similar methods do not lack, perhaps, in definiteness; yet this very fact makes them all the more dangerous. There may be a kind of progress by these methods, but it is a progress away from, not toward the light.

That student makes no *real* progress who is satisfied with having learned what some one else has said concerning the meaning of a verse, or the scope of a passage; who always *follows*, who is always *leaning upon* another. Such a student crams; he does not digest. His work is done for the moment; not for all time. He examines only results; never the processes leading to the results. The fact is, he does not do *bona fide* work. And yet all the world knows that the knowledge which does not come by genuine work does not stay; it may indeed be said never to have come. This explains the multitude of failures under the present Sunday School system, admirable as it is. Many students, strangely enough, suppose that they need only read the "notes" published in any sheet, or perhaps only the "practical lessons" suggested, and they will in time come to know the Bible. Partly because these "notes," are in so many cases the merest *trash*, and partly because even when most excellent they are not properly studied, the Bible-student who feels that the preparation of his Sunday School lesson is all the Bible-study which he need undertake, in too many cases, makes an out-and-out failure.

For the help of those who, perhaps, have no guide or teacher in their Bible-study, for the benefit of those who have been too greatly influenced by false and misleading methods of study, and as an aid towards independent study on the part of those who have been accustomed to lean too heavily on the crutches furnished, in these days, so freely, it is proposed to publish in successive numbers of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT a series of "Studies."

These "Studies" will fall under three heads: (1) Book-studies; (2) Topic-studies; (3) Section- or Verse-studies. The space which they may occupy will necessarily be limited. In their presentation three things will be held in view:

1) The acquisition of *real* Bible-knowledge; that is, not what men have said about the matter under consideration, but what the Bible says of it.

2) The cultivation of a historical spirit; that is, of a habit of studying thoughts in the light of the historical occasion which prompted them, in the light of the development of thought which had taken place at the time of their utterance, and in comparison with similar expressions of thought by other writers living before and after.

3) The attainment of a habit of independent investigation; that is, an ability to seek out for oneself, and to determine for oneself, with the use of all legitimate help, the exact force or meaning of a given passage.

These "Studies" will (1) indicate the work to be done, (2) furnish directions as to how it shall be done, (3) suggest particular lines of investigation, and (4) name authorities to be consulted. They will not contain information upon the subject to be considered, being intended only to show how and where this information may best be obtained. They are prepared for those readers of THE STUDENT who may feel the need of doing such work. They will not presuppose on the part of the student a knowledge of the original languages, although those having this knowledge will find abundant opportunity in the "Studies" for its use.

The first "Study" will be a "Book-study," and will treat of the *First Book of Samuel.*

GENERAL NOTES.

Daniel Webster's Knowledge of the Bible.—While a mere lad he read with such power and expression that the passing teamsters, who stopped to water their horses, used to get "Webster's boy" to come out beneath the shade of the trees and read the Bible to them. Those who heard Mr. Webster, in later life, recite passages from the Hebrew prophets and Psalms, say that he held them spell-bound, while each passage, even the most familiar, came home to them in a new meaning. One gentleman says that he never received such ideas of the majesty of God and the dignity of man as he did one clear night when Mr. Webster, standing in the open air, recited the eighth Psalm.

Webster's mother observed another old fashion of New England in training her son. She encouraged him to memorize such Scripture passages as impressed him. The boy's retentive memory, and his sensitiveness to Bible metaphors and to the rhythm of the English version, stored his mind with Scripture. On one occasion the teacher of the district school offered a jack-knife to the boy who should recite the greatest number of verses from the Bible. When Webster's turn came, he arose and reeled off so many verses that the master was forced to cry, "enough." It was the mother's training and the boy's delight in the idioms and music of King James's version that made him the "Biblical Concordance of the Senate."

But these two factors made him more than a "concordance." The Hebrew prophets inspired him to eloquent utterances. He listened to them, until their vocabulary and idioms, as expressed in King James's translation, became his mother-tongue. Of his lofty utterances it may be said, as Wordsworth said of Milton's poetry, they are "Hebrew in soul." Therefore they project themselves into the future.

The young man who would be a writer that shall be read, or an orator whom people *will* hear, should study the English Bible. Its singular beauty and great power as literature, the thousand sentiments and associations which use has attached to it, have made it a mightier force than any other book.—*Youth's Companion.*

The Messianic Interpretation of Nathan's Prophecy to David.—This prophecy marks an important stage in the Old Testament revelation which prepared the way for the Messiah's coming. The primeval promise to Adam held out the hope of deliverance through "the seed of the woman;" Abraham received the assurance that "in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed;" Jacob in his dying blessing assigned the sceptre to Judah. Thus the whole human race, one nation of the race, and one tribe of the nation, were successively designated to be the means of realising the promise of blessing to mankind. And now by this prophetic declaration a further limitation was made, and the family of David was chosen out of the tribe of Judah as the depositary of the promise.

At this epoch of the national history, Israel's hopes centred in the theocratic

kingdom, in the establishment of a government whose head was to be the visible representative of Jehovah. And now by God's message through Nathan this kingdom was for ever promised to the house of David. To it therefore men's hopes were now directed as the destined instrument of salvation.

But this prophecy does not speak of the Messiah as an individual; it does not predict the perfect reign of a sinless king. It contemplates a succession of kings of David's line, who would be liable to fall into sin and would need the discipline of chastisement. The perfect king in whom, as we now know, the line was to culminate, and the prophecy receive its highest fulfilment, is not yet foreshadowed.

It remained for prophet and psalmist, developing this fundamental revelation, to draw the picture of the ideal king who should spring from David's seed, and exercise dominion as the true representative of Jehovah on earth. As each human heir of David's line failed to fulfil the expectation, hope was carried forward and elevated, until He came to Whom is given the throne of His father David, and of Whose kingdom there shall be no end.

The subsequent references to this great promise should be carefully studied.

(*a*) David applies it to Solomon. 1 Chr. XXII., 9, 10; XXVIII., 2 ff.

(*b*) Solomon claims it for himself. 1 Kgs. V., 5; 2 Chr. VI., 7 ff.; 1 Kgs. VIII., 17–20.

(*c*) It is confirmed to Solomon. 1 Kgs. IX., 4, 5.

(*d*) It is repeatedly affirmed, that in spite of the sin of individual kings, the kingdom shall not be withdrawn from David's house for his sake. 1 Kgs. XI., 31–39; XV., 4, 5; 2 Kgs. VIII., 18, 19.

(*e*) Ps. LXXXIX., written no doubt in the dark days when the monarchy was already tottering to its fall, recapitulates this promise, and pleads with God that He should not suffer it to be frustrated. See especially verses 19–37. Ps. CXXXII., 11, 12, and Is. LV., 3, also contain distinct references to it.—*Kirkpatrick in Cambridge Bible for Schools, Second Samuel.*

The Will of Sennacherib.—Is it not a remarkable providence that the will of Sennacherib has been discovered? It is the oldest will in the world, and it has survived in order to corroborate the Bible narrative! For what does it reveal to us, and what light is thrown both by it and the annals of these ancient times upon this eventful story? First of all we gather from the annals that Esarhaddon was not the eldest son, and then the will reveals to us that he was his father's favorite, and was made heir to his wealth to the exclusion of his brothers. Let us read the will:

"I, Sennacherib, King of Multitudes, King of Assyria, have given chains of gold, stores of ivory, a cap of gold, other crowns and chains, besides all my riches, of which there are heaps, crystal, and other precious stones—over four hundred pounds weight—to Esarhaddon, my son, named Assurebil-mucin-pal, according to my wish: the treasures laid up in the temple of Amuk, and Nebo-irik-erba, the harpists of Nebo."

At the time this will was made Esarhaddon was not the heir-apparent to the throne; but the terms of the document, if they do not actually constitute him successor to the kingdom, afforded strong ground for suspicion that such was his father's intention. What, then, is more probable than that favoritism, such as this, stirred up the envy and passion of the sons who had been disinherited, and led them to wreak a terrible vengeance, in their act of parricide?

And this is further borne out by the memorials which remain to us of Esarhaddon's reign. Many of these have been mutilated, and the alabaster slabs and stones on which they were inscribed have suffered much from fire; but enough remains to echo back distinctly the voices of the sacred historian. From these records we gather that before Esarhaddon could ascend the throne he had to contend for the empire with his two brothers. Their names are given as Adar-malik, and Asshur-Sharossar, plainly answering to the Adrammelech and Sharezer of the Scriptures. He met them in pitched battle upon the field of Hanni-rabbit, where he utterly defeated them, and having been proclaimed king on the spot, by the soldiery, he returned victorious to Nineveh, while they escaped into the land of Armenia, where the reigning king, Erimenas, who, as we are informed, had been at war with Assyria, would be ready to receive them as the rivals and opponents of his foeman.

An inscription of Esarhaddon's, which was found at Kouyunjik, but is unfortunately much mutilated, throws a lurid light ubon this story of fraternal passion, and at the same time bears indirect but substantial testimony to the narrative given to us in the Books of Kings and Isaiah. We extract the following passages:

"1. I vowed from my heart. My liver was inflamed with rage. I immediately wrote letters saying that I assumed the sovereignty of my father's house, and lifted up my hands to Assur, the Moon, the Sun, Bel, Nebo, Nergal, Ishtar of Nineveh and Ishtar of Arbela, and they accepted my prayer....

"Then, as a bird spreads its wings, so I displayed my standard, as a signal to my allies, and took the road to Nineveh with much toil, by forced marches. Getting before my troops in the hill country, their powerful warriors attacked my advance and discharged their arrows; but the terror of the gods, who are my lords, overwhelmed them, and they retreated before the valor of my army. Ishtar, queen of war and battle, stood by my side, and broke their bows and, in her rage, destroyed their line of battle, proclaiming herself to the enemy as an 'unsparing deity.'.... By her favor I planted my standards where I had intended."

The Book of Chronicles informs us that Esarhaddon conquered Manasseh king of Judah, and took him "among the thorns, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon" (2 Chron. XXXIII., 11). Let us see what corroboration of this statement is furnished by the archives of Nineveh. In these a list of Esarhaddon's tributaries is recorded at full length, and the second on the list is "The king of Judah." The name of the king is lost, but there can be no doubt that it was Manasseh. All these are represented as having sent presents to Esarhaddon, and they were further directed by him to send materials for the palace which he was building at Nineveh. But the Bible account says that Manasseh was carried captive to Babylon by his conqueror. Why to Babylon? "Surely," exclaimed the critics, "it should have been 'to Nineveh,' which was Esarhaddon's capital." And they concluded that the sacred historian or his transcriber must have made a mistake. But the records of the past have more than verified the Bible version of the story. They inform us that Esarhaddon had been viceroy at Babylon during his father's lifetime; that he built there a splendid palace for his own residence; and that he there spent the best part of his life. "To Babylon," says Mr. Cooper in his *Resurrection of Assyria*, "he carried all his treasures; at Babylon he lived while life was an enjoyment to him, and at Babylon, by an edict dated in his thirty-third year, he resigned his empire into the hands of his favorite son Assur-ban-ipal II."

Devoutly thankful we should be for such accumulated evidences concerning the truth of God's holy Word. They are priceless in themselves, and invaluable as regards their use and influence; but let us never forget that they are only meant to corroborate, and to lead us upwards to those higher evidences, which are the inheritance of him who truly belongs to Christ, and therefore "hath the witness in himself"—

"He who hath felt the Spirit of the Highest
Cannot confound, or doubt Him, or defy;
Yea, with one voice, O world, though thou deniest,
Stand thou on that side—for on this am I."

— *Walsh, in Pulpit Treasury.*

Traditions relating to Jeremiah.—1. That Jeremiah addressed a severe rebuke to the Jews in Egypt is the last undoubted fact which we possess in connection with him (chap. XLIV.; see note on ver. 1), and it has been conjectured that it was in accordance with his own desire that his faithful minister Baruch refrained from inserting in the Book of his prophecies any further particulars of his life or record of his end—so slender at the outset and even inconsistent are the traditional notices.

2. The Christan tradition was that the Jews in Egypt, provoked by his rebukes, stoned him to death. "Jeremias lapidatur" Tert. *adv. Gnost.* c. 8; "Jeremias lapidatus...a populo," Hieron. *adv. Jov.* II., 37. See also beginning of § 8 below.

3. The Jewish tradition, perhaps however invented by way of hiding the truth of the charge brought against them by the Christians, was that the prophet had escaped from Egypt to Babylon, and there died.

4. In the (Apocryphal) Book of Ecclesiasticus (chap. XLIX., 7), the date of which is very uncertain, Jeremiah is referred to thus:—"They entreated him evil, who nevertheless was a prophet, sanctified in his mother's womb, that he might root out, and afflict, and destroy; and that he might build up also, and plant." See Jer. I., 10.

5. In 2 Macc. II. 1-7 we are told that Jeremiah at the exile "commanded them that were carried away to take of the fire," and that "the prophet, being warned of God, commanded the tabernacle and the ark to go with him, as he went forth into the mountain, where Moses climbed up, and saw the heritage of God. And when Jeremy came thither, he found an hollow cave, wherein he laid the tabernacle, and the ark, and the altar of incense, and so stopped the door. And some of those that followed him came to mark the way, but they could not find it. Which when Jeremy perceived, he blamed them, saying, As for that place, it shall be unknown until the time that God gather his people again together, and receive them unto mercy."

6. Judas Maccabaeus before his conflict with Nicanor sees in a vision (2 Macc. XV., 12-16) "a man with grey hairs, and exceeding glorious, who was of a wonderful and excellent majesty...a lover of the brethren...Jeremias the prophet of God," who presents him with a sword of gold, by which to prevail.

7. The following is the form which the tradition had assumed in the time of Polyhistor (brought from the East to Rome by Sylla the Dictator). He is quoted by Eusebius (*Praepar. Evang.* IX., 39). In the time of Jehoiakim Jeremiah prophesied. He found the Jews sacrificing to a goldon idol, named Baal, and announced the impending disaster. Jehoiakim was for burning him alive, but he said that

they (the Jews) should as captives cook food for the Babylonians and dig canals for the Tigris and Euphrates. The historian adds that Nebuchadnezzar hearing of these prophecies came with Astibar, king of the Medes, and captured Jerusalem, removing to Babylon the treasures of the Temple, "except the Ark and the Tables which were in it; these remained with Jeremiah."

8. In our Lord's time there are traces of a popular belief that Jeremiah's work on earth was not yet done, and this was one of the phases of Messianic hope. See Matt. XVI., 14, and compare John I., 21, where "that" (rather *the*) "prophet" is by some thought to have reference to him.

9. The treatise *De Vitis Prophetarum* attributed to St Epiphanius (died A. D. 402) relates as follows (showing that meanwhile the tradition had grown considerably), "Jeremiah the prophet was of Anathoth, and he was stoned to death by the people at Taphnae in Egypt. And he lies at the site of Pharaoh's house, for the Egyptians honored him, having received benefits from him; for asps and...crocodiles were destroying them, and at the prayer of the prophet Jeremiah both the venomous asps were driven from that land, and in like manner the treacherous beasts from the river, and all the faithful to the present day pray at that spot, and taking of the dust cure the bite of asps and put the crocodiles themselves to flight. This prophet gave a sign to the Egyptian priests, saying, that all their idols must be overthrown and all the works of their hands [see note on Jer. XXV., 7] collapse, when there should set foot in Egypt a virgin about to bear a Divine Child [Matt. II., 14]. And so it was." Epiphanius adds that the memory of this prophecy is kept up by a ceremony continued to his own time. He continues:—"This prophet before the capture of the temple seized the Ark of the Law with all its contents, and caused it to be swallowed up in a rock, and said to the priests of the people and to the elders who stood by, *The Lord departed from Sinai into the heavens, and He will come again in sacred might. And this shall be the sign of His coming, when all nations bow down before wood* (the Cross, see Matt. XXIV., 14). And he said to them, *No one of the priests or prophets shall disclose this Ark, save Moses the chosen of God. The Tables that are in it none shall open save Aaron. And in the Resurrection the Ark shall rise first, and shall go forth from the rock and be placed on the Mount Sinai, and all the saints shall be gathered together to it, there awaiting the Lord, and shunning the enemy who desires to destroy them.* And with his finger he impressed upon the rock the name of the Lord, and the impression was as though it had been cut with an iron tool, and a cloud overshadowed the rock, and no one knows that spot till the end of the world. And this rock is in the wilderness, where the Ark was first made, between the two mountains where Moses and Aaron lie. And at night a cloud like fire rests upon the spot, after the likeness of those of olden time, inasmuch as the glory of God will never desert His Law."—*Stearne in Cambridge Bible for Schools, Jeremiah.*

BOOK NOTICES.

WITNESSES FROM THE DUST.*

This volume aims to present, in popular form, the results of the discoveries which have recently been made in ancient countries, bearing upon the Bible. The author has succeeded in making a very attractive book. His style is excellent for the purpose in view. The time has come when these revelations, for such they are, must be put in shape for laymen. Scholars can no longer monopolize them. The illustrations are numerous and well chosen. Upon the whole, we know of no book from which the student can obtain so clear or so satisfactory a knowledge of the real facts in the case as from this book. Mr. Fradenburgh's papers in the Reviews have made him known to the reading public.

BISSELL'S "THE PENTATEUCH."†

The theory of the school of Wellhausen respecting the date and composition of the Hexateuch seems to be meeting with little decided favor among the Old Testament scholars of this country. Several able replies to various aspects of it have already appeared, but no one, in a single work, has attempted this so exhaustively as Dr. Bissell, who has not contented himself in endeavoring to show simply the unsoundness of this theory by a criticism of its presuppositions and salient points, but has undertaken an examination in detail of the laws peculiar to Deuteronomy, repeated and modified in Deuteronomy, and peculiar to the Priest's Code, with the view of ascertaining whether they were post-Mosaic, or exhibited different periods of origin widely separate from each other. Dr. Bissell finds they do not, and his arguments are able and convincing as against the position of Wellhausen. We have read Wellhausen's *History of Israel*, recently translated, in connection with this work, and have been struck again and again with the force and strength of Dr. Bissell's criticism. The whole fabric of the special theory of Wellhausen is honeycombed and left ready to fall through his investigations. If one, then, would understand the weak points of this theory, we know of no better work than this, and it should be in the hands of every one who reads Wellhausen's history. Some of the chapters will be found hard reading, and require close study from the intricacy of the matter discussed, but others will be agreeable to every Old Testament student. Dr. Bissell writes also at times with a real glow and fervor which every one must enjoy. The Bible is a book full of divine life to him.

---

*WITNESSES FROM THE DUST; or the Bible illustrated from the Monuments. By Rev. J. N. Fradenburgh, A. M., Ph. D. Cincinnati: *Cranston & Stowe*, 1886. 8vo, cloth, illustrated. Pp. 467. Price, $1.60.

†THE PENTATEUCH: Its Origin and Structure. An Examination of Recent Theories. By Edwin Cone Bissell, D. D., Professor in the Hartford Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885. Crown 8vo. Pp. 484. Price, $3.00.

The value of this work is increased also by copious indexes and a very full list of the literature of the Pentateuch and the related criticism of the Old Testament. We shall hope to publish an article in further review of this work at an early date.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY, VOL. III.*

The third volume of this annual review possesses all the good points of former volumes. The best word to characterize it is the word "fresh." One might suppose that the necessarily brief treatment of book after book would become monotonous and wearisome. It is quite otherwise. For the man who would be well-informed in the several departments of theological study, the purchase of this book will be a most economical investment.

Our interest, naturally, is greatest in that part of the work which relates to the Old Testament. In this Professor Curtiss aims to present material which bears upon the question of the Revision. To this end he considers (1) Textual Studies; (2) Lexicographical and Grammatical Studies; (3) Exegetical Studies, including notices of commentaries on the entire Old Testament, and commentaries on single books of the Old Testament; (4) Introductory and Historical Studies; (5) Miscellaneous Studies, under which notice is taken of subsidiary helps for the study of the Old Testament, Old Testament and Periodical Literature, and Encyclopædias. Then follows a criticism of the Revision.

The attitude of Professor Curtiss toward the much discussed question of Old Testament textual criticism may be gathered from the following paragraph:—

"While we should not blindly adhere to the Massoretic text as though it had an exclusive claim to inspiration, yet we have reason to believe that it represents the ancient text in its purest form, since it is in the language in which the sacred oracles were first given, and has been preserved by the Palestinian Jews, who would be most likely to be careful in the transmission of their Scriptures. There are, doubtless, cases where the unanimous testimony of the versions counter to the Massoretic text should be accepted, but not all, for the agreement may not represent an original condition of the text. Certainly the greatest care should be exercised in making such changes, and we should remember that while scientific accuracy should be employed in endeavoring to restore the original text, the result is not likely to produce any essential change in the articles of our faith, or in our belief, except that God has not attempted to give us the exact letter of his Word."

Driver's doctrine of the Hebrew Tenses, that the Perfect and Imperfect in Hebrew are not used in themselves to indicate tense, but rather the character of an action, as complete or incomplete in the past, present or future, is accepted. Emphasis is justly placed upon the great value of the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. No better commentaries for students have been written.

"This interest" it is said, "in the language and literature of the Old Testament, and those which are cognate with it, is two-fold:

1. It is on the one hand scientific. Its object is not religious, but philological and historical. It seeks to know who the Hebrews were, what were their

* CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. III. Chicago: *F. H. Revell*, 1885. 12mo, cloth. Pp. 359. Price, $1.50.

language and history, and what were the other nations with which they came in contact; not for the sake of the Hebrews themselves, but for the sake of ancient history in general and of Semitic history in particular.

2. It is on the other hand of a religious and apologetic character. The foundations of the Christian religion are considered at stake in the attacks made on the historical character of the Old Testament; hence the effort to verify its statements by excavations of ruined cities, and geographical researches. This is especially the case in England, and science is under perpetual obligations to religion for the valuable and exhaustive investigations, which were doubtless stimulated by the attacks of critics on the Sacred Records."

It is thought, in reference to the Revision, that the critical scholarship is found mostly in the marginal readings; that in the alterations made, very great conservatism has been manifested; that it shows to the ordinary reader "that the Bible is not a dead level from Genesis to Revelation;" or, in other words, that "it is not a legitimate use of the Old Testament to seek in it proof-texts for all the doctrines that are found in the New Testament."

Professor Curtiss is a man of ripe scholarship, sound judgment and careful statement. His opinions are worthy of careful consideration.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.*

The idea of this book is deserving of great praise. Part I., under the heading "The First Volume of Prophecy" takes up twenty-four direct Messianic prophecies, viz., five (Gen. III., 15; XII., 3; XLIX., 10; Num. XXIV., 17; Deut. XVIII., 15-18) in the Pentateuch; three (Job XIX., 25–27; 2 Sam. VII., 12–16; XXIII., 1–7) in the historical books; nine (Psalm II.; XXII.; XL.; XLV.; LXVIII.; LXXII.; LXXX., 15–17; CII., 12–16; CX.) in the Psalms; and seven (Mic. V., 2; Isa. IV., 2; VII., 14; IX., 6; XXVIII., 6: XL–LXVI.; Jer. XXIII., 5, 6.) in the Prophets. Part II., "The Second Volume of Prophecy," gives us an Introduction to the Book of Daniel, together with a translation of it and a commentary. The author's name is a sufficient guarantee for the character of the work done. Painstaking and clear, the book is in many respects a model for this kind of work.

The material discussed is just that material, about which, to-day, there is the greatest difference of opinion. What passages are Messianic, in what sense they are Messianic, and the exact force they are to be given, are questions which occasion the thoughtful and critical exegete great trouble.

In the first part of the volume, in which are taken up the several Messianic passages, there are some passages considered which, in such a treatment, might fairly, we think, have been omitted, while others have been omitted which certainly had good reason to be included. Among the former class, might be mentioned Ps. XL., LXVIII., and CII. Among the latter class, Gen. V., 29; IX., 27; which are barely mentioned in passing; 1 Sam.. II., 27–36; Isa., XI., 1–10, and several passages among the prophets. Dr. Murphy seems also not to have given that prominence to the historical connection in each case which it would seem to deserve; and, while emphasizing in his preface the progressive character of Mes-

* THE BOOK OF DANIEL; or, the Second Volume of Prophecy, translated and expounded, with a preliminary sketch of antecedent prophecy. By James G. Murphy, LL. D. and D. D., T. C. D., Professor of Hebrew. Andover: *Warren F. Draper*, 1885. 12mo, pp. 206. Price, $1.50.

sianic prophecy, he leaves comparatively little room for its growth and development, by interpreting too definitely and fully the earlier prophecies. It is, however, better to err in this direction than in the opposite one.

It is no easy task to handle the Book of Daniel in 135 12mo pages. Considering the space occupied, our author is to be congratulated upon the satisfactory manner in which he has performed this task. He does not enter very fully into the discussion of general questions, but this he could not do. The volume throughout is a valuable contribution to the study of prophecy.

BRICKS FROM BABEL.*

This little book is from the versatile pen of a woman whose other books have been welcomed into many homes as incentives to the formation of good habits and right ideas. It is a forgone conclusion, therefore, that the book immediately before us will have for its object some earnest moral purpose. Such is precisely the case. The aim is to show that both history and philology, especially as these are illustrated in the late discoveries of original investigators, go towards establishing the authenticity of the ethnological record contained in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Genesis. As is evident from the numerous references to authorities, much reading has been done to establish this thesis. But in nearly all instances the authorities referred to are those who have written in English, archæology thus being popularized. Heretofore it has been scholars only who have interested themselves in bricks from the walls of the world-wide Babel whose beginning was the tower erected on the plains of Shinar. Now these same bricks are to speak the wonderful works of God in our own tongue wherein we were born. Hence whatever defects the book before us may have, it certainly deserves commendation for its attempt at bringing out of its seclusion a subject which ought to receive general acquaintance.

The following will hint at what is contained in the twelve chapters, to which chapters is added a brief appendix on the Hittites, the Celts, the Iberians and the Polynesians. "The Race in its Cradle" is the heading of the first chapter. We are here taken back to the near descendants of Noah, to whom God imparted the "impulse of migration," when he unexpectedly went among them and checked their ambitious building enterprise. The second chapter illustrates "the Flight." Primitive language and religion are brought under some consideration, as also the general directions taken by the first migrations. The remaining chapters dwell more specifically upon the settlements made during the pilgrimages of the various races. We have "the Chaldaic Kingdom;" "the Monumental Land," that is, Egypt; "the Ethiopian Races;" "India;" "the Children of Gomer," the Germans and Celts; "the Ionian Land;" "the Polar Races;" "Mongols and Malays;" "the Children of the New World;" "Reign of the Three Brothers"—their leading qualities and the chief results which these qualities have wrought out in history.

The book bears the marks of rapid composition. Its literary style is marred

---

* BRICKS FROM BABEL: A brief view of the Myths, Traditions and Religious Belief of Races, with concise studies in Ethnology. By Julia McNair Wright. New York: *John B. Alden*, 1885. Pp. 181. Price 60 cents.

by a certain grandiloquence which detracts from the perspicuity necessary to the right treatment of archæological topics. Here and there are evidences of careless proof-reading and typography. But still it is a good book for the general reader, and for those who hereafter would lay the foundation of a knowledge of what investigators have being doing towards a revelation of the hidden things of the past. Scholars will welcome it only as a promise of a popular taste for the fruits of their labors,—at least they ought to welcome it for this reason.

SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

American Publications.

Abarbanel's Reader, for the use of Israelites, in schools and families. Cincinnati: *The Bloch Pub. and Print. Co.* Pp. 450.....$1.00

Andrews, Samuel J. God's Revelation of Himself to Men, as successively made in the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian Dispensations and in the Messianic Kingdom. New York: *Charles Scribner's Sons.* Pp. xiv, 391....$2.50

Hosmer, James K. The Story of the Jews. New York: *G. P. Putnam's Sons.* Large 12mo.....$1.50

Koenig, Friedrich Eduard. The Religious History of Israel. Translated by Alex. J. Campbell. Edinburgh: *T. & T. Clark.* New York: *Scribner & Welford.* 12mo, pp. viii, 192.....$2.00

Paine, Timothy Otis. Solomon's Temple and Capitol, Ark of the Flood and Tabernacle; or, the Holy Houses of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Septuagint, Coptic and Itala Scriptures; Josephus, Talmud and Rabbis. Boston and New York: *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.* In four sections. Each section.....$5.00

Ragozin, Z. The Story of Chaldea. New York: *G. P. Putnam's Sons.* Large 12mo.....$1.50

Smith, W. Robertson. Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia. New York: *Macmillan & Co.* Pp. 322.....$2.50

Taylor, George Lansing. Elijah the Reformer. A Ballad-Epic. New York and London: *Funk & Wagnalls.* Pp. viii, 279.....

Waffle, A. E. The Lord's Day: Its Universal and Perpetual Obligation. Philadelphia: *American Sunday School Union.* 12mo, pp. xv, 412.....$1.00

Foreign Publications.

Ewald, H. Commentary on the Book of Job, with translation. Translated from the German by J. Frederick Smith. London: *Williams & Norgate.* 1 vol., 8vo,.....10. 6d

———— Commentary on the Psalms. Translated by E. Johnson. London: *Ibid.* 2 vols., 8vo, each.....10s. 6d

———— Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Translated by J. Frederick Smith. London: *Ibid.*, 5 vols., 8vo, each.....10s. 6d

Handbücher der alten Geschichte. I. Babylonisch-assyrische v. C. P. Theile 1 Thl. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Tode Sargons II. Gotha. *Perthes*.....M. 6

Karpels, Gust. Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur. 2—7. Lfg. Berlin: *Oppenheim.* Large 8vo, pp. 65-448.....M. 1

Smith, W. Robertson. Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia. London: *C. J. Clay & Son* (Cambridge Univ. Press). Crown 8vo.....7s. 6d

Schrader, Eberh. The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament. Translated from the second Enlarged German edition, with additions by the author, and an introduction by Owen C. Whitehouse. Vol. I. with a map. London: *Williams & Norgate.* 8vo.....10s. 6d

The Book of the Patriarch Job. Illustrated with fifty engravings, after drawings by Sir John Gilbert, etc. London: *James Nisbet & Co.* Small 4to..... .12s.

RECENT ARTICLES.

GRIFFITH, F. LL. Identification of the City of Apis. *Academy*, Jan. 2, '86.

KOHUT, ALEXANDER. Superstition. *American Hebrew*, Jan. 22, '86.

NEUBAUER, A. Nebo in Canaan. *Athenæum*, Nov. 28, '85.

BISSELL, EDWIN C. The Canon of the Old Testament. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., '86.

CHAMBERS, T. W. Professor Briggs on the Revised Version of the Old Testament. *Ibid.*, Oct., '85.

SCHODDE, GEO. H. The Book of Jubilees (Chapters III.—VI.), translated from the Ethiopic. *Ibid.*, Jan., '86.

KREHL. Beiträge zur muhammedanischen Dogmatik. *Berichte ueber d. Verh. der K. Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Leipzig.* III., '85, pp. 191–236.

The Doctrine of Inspiration. *Chicago Standard*, Jan. 21, '86.

STEFFENS, N. M. Hebrew in Our Colleges. *Christian Intelligencer*, Jan. 13, '86.

CHEYNE, T. K. On Ps. XLIX., 7. *Expositor*, Nov., '85.

DAWSON, J. W. The Probable Physical Causes of the Destruction of the Cities of the Plain, *Ibid.*, Jan., '86.

DELITZSCH, FRANZ. The Bible and Wine. *Ibid.*

DRIVER, S. R. The Cosmogony of Genesis. *Ibid.*

FULLER, J. M. The Book of Daniel in the Light of Recent Research and Discovery. 3. Cyrus. *Ibid.*, Dec., '85.

CROSBY, HOWARD. Advantages of Greek [and Hebrew] to the Average Clergyman. *Homiletic Review*, Jan., '86.

LUDLOW, JAMES M. The Study Table. *Ibid.*

Hebrew New Testament. *Independent*, Dec. 31, '85.

OSGOOD, HOWARD. Textual Criticism of the Revision. *Ibid.*, Jan. 14, '86.

PICK, B. Some Emendations of the Text in Joshua. *Ibid.*, Dec. 24, '85.

POTWIN, THOMAS S. Johns Hopkins University and the Williams Syriac Manuscript. An Arabic Letter of the 9th Century in square characters. *Ibid.*, Jan. 21, '86.

WALLACE, SUSAN E. About Egypt. Alexandria Obelisks. *Ibid.*, Jan. 28, '86.

SCHMIEDL, A. Ueber den Schwierigen Ausdruck זכור in Ps. CIII., 14. *Monatschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judenthums*, Aug., '85.

SAYCE, A. H. The Old Testament in the Light of Recent Discoveries (Gen. X., XI.). *Monthly Interpreter*, Dec., '85.

SHANKS, D. The Book of Zechariah: Its authorship. *Ibid.*, Dec., '85.

SMITH, H. P. The Old Testament Text and the Revised Version. *Ibid.*

GREGORY, D. S. Key to Bible Unity. *Pulpit Treasury*, Jan., '86.

TUPPER, KERR B. The Story of Jonah. *Ibid.*

LANGHANS, E. Der babylonische Thurm. *Schweiz. Reformblätter*, '85, 38 S. 300–304.

FOSTER, E. P. Hebrew Accessible to All. *St. Louis Evangelist*, Jan., 14, '86.

NEUBAUER, A. On some Newly-discovered Temanite and Nabatæan Inscriptions. *Studia Biblica*, Oxford, '85.

BUCKLEY, J. M. Daniel. *Sunday School Times*, Jan. 23, '86.

LYON, D. G. Who were the Chaldeans? *Ibid.*, Jan. 9, '86.

PETERS, JOHN P. Daniel and the Monuments. *Ibid.*, Jan. 23, '86.

HOOP, SCHEFFER, J. G. DE. Is Joël een Apocalypticus van 't jaar 400 vóor Chr.' *Theol. Tijdschr.*, '85, VI., pp. 571–595.

LOUIS, S. Handicrafts and Artizans mentioned in Talmudical Writings. *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, '85, III., pp; 398–411.

TOY, C. H. The Present Position of Pentateuch Criticism. *Unitarian Review*, Jan., '86.

GRAPE, J. The Temptation and Fall, according to the Targums. *Universalist Quarterly*, Jan., '86.

PETRI. Hartmann-Beyers Biblische Historien, der erste evang. Versuch eines biblischen Geschichtenbuches. *Ztschr. f. prakt. Theol.*, '86, I., pp. 29–35.

KUECHENMEISTER, F. Beiträge zur biblischen Zoologie. *Ztschr. f. Wiss. Theol.* XXIX., 1, pp. 90–106.

REVIEWS.

BOWEN, FRANCIS. A Layman's Study of the English Bible. (C. J. H. Ropes.) *Andover Review*, Jan., '86.

KOENIG, FRIEDRICH EDUARD. Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religions Geschichte gegenüber den Entwickelungstheoretikern. (John Phelps Taylor.) *Ibid.*

WIEDEMANN, A. Aegyptische Geschichte I. (Steindorff.) *Berl. philol. Wochenschrift*, V., 38, 1885.

CHEYNE, T. K. Hebraica, *Expositor*, Dec., '85.

BISSELL, EDWIN CONE. The Pentateuch. *Lutheran Church Review*, Jan., '86.

BOWEN, FRANCIS. A Layman's Study of the English Bible. *Ibid.*

HURLBUT, J. L. Manual of Biblical Geography. *Ibid.*

KOEING, EDWARD. The Religious History of Israel. *Ibid.*

TRUMBULL, H. CLAY. The Blood Covenant. *Ibid.*

THOMSON, WILLIAM M. The Land and the Book. *Ibid.*

BISSELL, EDWIN CONE. The Pentateuch. (C. A. Briggs.) *Presbyterian Review*, Jan., '86.

GARDINER, FREDERIC. The Old and New Testaments in their Mutual Relations. (Francis Brown.) *Ibid.*

GREEN, WM. H. The Hebrew Feasts in their Relation to Recent Critical Hypotheses Concerning the Pentateuch. (Howard Osgood.) *Ibid.*

TRUMBULL, H. CLAY. The Blood Covenant. (W. H. Green.) *Ibid.*

BISSELL, EDWARD CONE. The Pentateuch. *Reformed Quarterly Review*, Jan., '86.

BOWEN, FRANCIS. A Layman's Study of the English Bible. *Ibid.*

GREEN, WM. H. The Hebrew Feasts. *Ibid.*

HARPER, WILLIAM R. Elements of Hebrew by an Inductive Method. *Ibid.*

———— Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual. *Ibid.*

PARKER, JOSEPH. The People's Bible. *Ibid.*

TRUMBULL, H. CLAY. The Blood Covenant. *Ibid.*

SOCIN, A. Arabische Grammatik. (A. Müller.) *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Oct. 31, '85.