

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. IV.

NOVEMBER, 1884.

No. 3.

THE VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE WORK OF THE PASTOR.

BY PROFESSOR S. BURNHAM,

Hamilton Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.

I.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the Old Testament is a book for scholars only, without much practical value for the hard working pastor oppressed with the care of the church, and anxious for the salvation of souls. Yet such a conception of the Old Testament is far too common. Or, if it is regarded as of value to the ordinary pastor, it is too often even then thought of as a battle-ground to be defended against the assaults of the foes of the church, rather than as rich pastures in which to feed the flock of God. We sometimes hear the expression "a New Testament Christian," when there lurks in it the idea that an Old Testament Christian would be quite a different being. Indeed, it is doubtful, and more than doubtful, if many who talk so earnestly of New Testament Christians, would be willing to admit that there could be such a person as an Old Testament Christian. The Apostle Paul, however, had quite another idea of the matter. In 2 Tim. III., 15-17, he seems to teach that an Old Testament Christian, being a man of God complete and completely furnished, is a very worthy person. But perhaps Paul, who was only a Pharisee "born out of due time," had too Jewish ideas about this thing, and was not yet in the "full light." It may be well worth the time, therefore, to seek to discover, with as much exactness as possible, the true worth of the Old Testament for the pastor in his daily work of saving souls and perfecting the body of Christ.

It will be the object in these articles to show that this value of the Old Testament is two-fold; and arises (1) from the contents of the Old Testament itself, and (2) from the relations which it holds to the right understanding of the New Testament.

A careful study of the Old Testament will show that it contains four kinds of truth which either are not to be found at all in the New Testament, or, if found there, are found in such a different form, that, for the present purpose, and in a very real sense as well, they may be said still not to be a part of the New Testament presentation of truth. But these Old Testament forms of truth are of such a nature, that the pastor who does not utilize them in his preaching, will fail to present very important parts of the truth of God. Nor will the evils of this failure end with the loss of the truth itself. Even the truth which he does teach, being thus disconnected from the other truths he ought to teach, will either be less clear to the understanding of men than God intended it should be, or will lose interest and value for those who are taught. The result must be that the truth which is taught, will not have the power over the hearts and consciences of men, which added clearness, interest, or value would give it. It is, indeed, the fact that all the truth of God's Word has power over the souls of men only by the ministry of the Holy Spirit. But experience shows that the Spirit of God does not work at random, but in harmony with the fitness of means and agencies. The Scripture teaching as to the character of Scripture truth as a means by which the Spirit of God brings to pass his mighty work in the souls of men, clearly is that even the Spirit himself cannot make one truth do the work of another. This surely is the teaching of such passages as 1 Cor. III., 1-2, and 2 Pet. III., 18. It would follow as a corollary of this teaching, that a part of a truth cannot do in the soul the work of the whole truth; and as a second corollary, that a truth imperfectly, vaguely, or apathetically apprehended, is shorn of a portion of its power.

But we have yet to show how the preacher who neglects the Old Testament, will fail to teach the full truth. This will appear by considering the four kinds of Old Testament truth already referred to.

I. The History of the Central Preparation for the Incarnation.

Doubtless we are not to suppose that the preparation of the world for the coming of the Messiah was confined to the divine work which went on in the nation of Israel. Far and wide among men, was going on, in different ways, that work which was the necessary prelude to the establishment among men of the universal kingdom of God. Not less in these later days, we may believe, God is securing the destined results of the manifestation of his Son from heaven, by his providential dealings with all the races and families of men. Perhaps it is not too much to suppose that, in a certain way, the great ethnic religions have

a part to play in preparing the race for the coming glorious results of the Incarnation. Not by what is false in them, but by that which is true in them. For some truth there is in them all. The divine plan seems to be to give men truth as they are able to bear it, and to join on each new gift of knowledge to the highest knowledge already attained. Thus the lower truth of the ethnic faiths may yet be seen to be the appointed foundation on which to place the grander and higher truth of the divine and universal religion of the Son of God. It was only after long years and much discipline, that Israel itself was freed from its idolatry, though it had prophet, priest, and religion, ordained and appointed of God. The education of other races and nations may have to move on more slowly, and by the use of inferior means. At any rate, it would seem that God, in giving his Only Begotten to the world, would not have failed to do all that was possible to prepare the world to receive him, and would yet be doing all that God might do, to make his coming to the world a bringing of the world to him.

But, however wide and far reaching this great movement of God in the world may have been, and may now be, it is clear that it must ever have had some well defined center. Thus, in the preparation of the world for the coming of the Messiah, it was necessary there should be a central preparation which should provide a place and a national life in which the Incarnation might come to pass, and where the Son of God might, as the Son of Man, live his earthly life, and do his earthly work. Here he must find some ground on which to found his kingdom, some existing knowledge with which he might connect, at some common point of union, the grand and eternal truths of his religion. Here he must find hearts that would be ready to receive him, minds that would in some measure, at least, understand him, souls that were hoping and waiting for him. For even the Son of God, unrecognized, and rejected of all men, would end his work on earth with his own earthly life, being, in the saddest sense, one "born out of due time," and not appearing as did the son of Mary, in the "fulness of the time." In this prepared center, too, the Son of Man must find a national thinking and a system of truth which would give the needed form to his own developing consciousness; and prepare him to take up, in the fulness of that consciousness, his Messianic work. For, if he was truly the Son of Man, and was subjected, as the Scripture teaches, to the limitations which such a partaking of humanity implies, he could not be independent, in the development of his consciousness, of his environment. As he grew in wisdom, with the same normal

growth with which he grew in stature, as Luke tells us was the case, the character of that wisdom must have been to some extent determined by the thought of his age and country, and by the religious conceptions to be found in its literature, so far as he came in contact with all these things. Come in contact with them he must, if he was to be the teacher and savior of his age, and of the world. Jesus, as a Jew, was doubtless born with the physical marks of his race descent. His features, and his form, like his dress, his food, and his manner of life, were Jewish. Born at Rome or Athens, he would have worn another garb, and had another look. Is it too much to say that he would have had other thoughts, and another conception of the kingdom of God? It is not meant to imply that his conception and his thought, in this case, would have been fundamentally erroneous, or even at all incorrect. But how can we escape the conclusion that they would have been other than they were?

What a value, then, the history of Israel has for the preacher who desires to teach fully and accurately, and with power, concerning Christ and his kingdom! For it is the history of that central preparation which was the necessary prelude to the birth of the Messiah, and to the establishment among men of the kingdom of God. It is the history of that divine working and teaching, and of that human learning and development, of which the thinking and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth were the result, and also, as one may reverently say even of the God-man, the product.

Jesus was born an Israelite, and not a Greek or a Roman. As a Jew, he lived among Jews; as a Jew, he taught Jews out of the Jewish Scriptures. Himself, his teachings, and his kingdom, all were what they were because of the time and place in which they were, and so, because of the long preparation which made them possible. They were, in a very important sense, notwithstanding the supreme miracle of the Incarnation, the product of their environment; and they and the environment together were the product of the great central preparation which, through the centuries, had been going on in Israel. Christ, his doctrine, and his kingdom, his person and his work, are not, therefore, truly to be known without a correct knowledge of the environment which produced them, and of the great preparation which culminated in this environment. The history of that preparation, which is the only possible key to the understanding of it, and of the environment resulting from it, is the history of Israel. The preacher who does not understand this history, and see rightly its deepest meaning, cannot, it must follow, teach truly and completely concerning that wonderful person, that wonderful life and work, and

that mighty kingdom, in whom and in which that deepest meaning finds its own fullest explanation.

Socrates and Plato are to be understood and accounted for, and their teachings are rightly to be apprehended, only as they and their words are connected in the mind with all the past of Greece. They and their teachings must be studied in the light of the history of Greek thought from the earliest times, or the full meaning of themselves and their utterances will be missed.

In like manner, Jesus and his doctrines must be studied in the light of the history of the national life of Israel. But, in this study, this national life must ever be viewed as the great central preparation for Christ himself. It must be studied as a life born of the continued dwelling of God in the nation, of a divine indwelling that was special and remarkable.

But, however well taught the teacher may be, he can only teach those who already have a knowledge that fits them to comprehend the added truth he wishes to impart. It is, therefore, by a wise use of the Old Testament history of the central preparation for the coming of the Messiah, and the establishment of the kingdom of God, that the true pastor will so educate his people that they will be ready to receive the full and complete truth concerning Christ and his work, which he himself, has come to know by his study of them in the light of the history of the national life of Israel. So that, in the matter of a full and true Christian knowledge, the pastor who will not study the history of the great preparation for Jesus, and his life and work, will neither enter into the kingdom of God himself, nor suffer others who gladly would, to enter in.

II. The second kind of Old Testament truth to be noticed, is Proofs of Man's Need of Christ as an Atoning Savior.

The Apostle Paul, in Gal. III., 24, teaches that the law was given to lead men to Christ. This can mean nothing else than that the precepts and institutions of the Pentateuch were such as were necessary to show to Israel their need of Christ as an atoning Savior, and were also, to those who accepted Jesus as a personal Savior, the source whence arose in the soul the sense of a personal need of him. But the whole history of Israel was only the means by which the meaning of these precepts and institutions was more fully unfolded, and the truth of their teachings made more clear and impressive. The whole Israelitish history, therefore, as well as the institutions and precepts that were a part of it, and shaped its growth, was designed to give to Israel the proofs of man's need of the coming Christ as an atoning Savior. Moreover, it was from just this source that this need was

seen in Israel, so far as it was seen there at all. It was from this history that the apostles and their fellow-laborers sought to convince their fellow-countrymen of their need of a share in the great work of salvation begun in Jesus of Nazareth.

But "Salvation is of the Jews." Its agencies began their work among the Jewish people, and appealed to a Jewish sense of need. This same sense of need must arise in other nations, that the same agencies of salvation may successfully appeal to it. But there can be no national sense of need, only as there is this very sense of need in each individual soul. So that each individual soul, in coming to a personal faith in Christ as an atoning Savior, must travel the road in which Israel, as the representative nation of the race, came, so far as it came at all, to the acceptance of Christ, and which the nations must travel after Israel.

It may be objected to all this, that, in the preaching of the Gospel in heathen lands, men accept Christ as a Savior without any previous education of the soul based on Old Testament teaching.

The answer is two-fold. (1) The preparation by God for the establishment and perfection of the Messianic kingdom, while it had its center in Israel, has not probably been confined to this nation. As has already been seen to be natural, God was working in all the world as well, and other nations have, in one way or another, received more or less of the substance of that teaching in regard to sin and the sinner's needs, which was more fully given to Israel. (2) Not all the souls in heathen, any more than in Christian lands, readily accept Christ. In every age and country, there seem to be found a few grand souls who are easily taught of God, and readily turn to him. Enoch Noah, and Abraham, in the beginning of the Old Testament age, and the Capernaum centurion, and Cornelius of Cæsarea, at the beginning of the New Testament age, are notable examples of this kind. But the majority of men are harder to teach, and more slow of heart to feel and to believe. For these, in both heathen and Christian lands, the road to Calvary lies under the cragged peaks of Sinai; and they must find the Jerusalem which is above, after sojourning for a time in the Jerusalem which is in bondage.

An intelligent and a deep sense of the need of Christ and his saving work, that is *all* his saving work, must be a prerequisite to the most loving and earnest effort in his service, and to a whole-hearted and persistent struggle for a Christ-like, that is a Christian, character.

If there is, in the church of to-day, any lack of such effort and such struggle, it is not difficult to see that it may be, in part, due to a failure among the ministry to present with accuracy, clearness, and power,

the Old Testament proofs of man's need of Christ as an atoning Savior, and of the need of all his great work of redemption, which is, when rightly understood, a redemption from sins, no less than a redemption from sin.

GENESIS XVII., 6-8 AND GALATIANS III., 16.

BY REV. JAMES SCOTT,

Aberlour, Craigellachie, N. B., Scotland.

And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.

Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.*

New Testament quotation is a subject at once of much difficulty and of much critical importance. This citation may be regarded as a crucial instance well worthy of analysis. Not only have unbelievers founded an argument against the truth and authority of Scripture on the alleged inaccuracy both in form and sense of the quotations in the New Testament from the Old, but rationalistic believers in revelation and inspiration, such as Wetstein, Semler, and Seiler, and more recently Rosenmueller, Adam Clarke, Moses Stuart and Rhiem, have regarded some of them as mere rhetorical displays and rabbinical accommodations to current popular beliefs and prejudices. Notwithstanding, they are all capable of complete vindication both in their form and principle. These quotations are made on several principles, such as the psychological, the grammatical, the synthetic, the analogical, and the prophetic or prospective.†

We believe that the principle of this citation or application of an Old Testament text is the grammatical or philological, which embraces and covers both the literal and the tropical text of Scripture. Both classes of passages are alike grammatically interpreted. The difference between them lies in themselves, and not in the principle of their interpretation. This is evident from the definition of the terms themselves. Language is literal when the same words uniformly represent the same things or thoughts, which are thereby spontaneously presented to the mind as soon as the word or sign is seen or heard. It is figurative when words become conventionally the signs of other

* Οὐ λέγει· καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὃς ἐστὶ Χριστός.

† See the writer's "Principles of New Testament Quotation." New York: Scribner, Welford & Armstrong.

things or thoughts than those of which they are the natural or ordinary symbols. This implies that natural things themselves, of which words are the signs, are made the symbols of spiritual thoughts or things; so that the theory or rationale of all forms of language may be summed up in a single syllogistic formula:—Words are the signs of things; things are made the signs of thoughts; therefore words are the signs of thoughts. Accordingly, the text of the ancient Scripture, whether literal or figurative, was grammatically interpreted or applied by our Lord and his apostles, as is done now by all true critics. The authors of the New Testament acknowledged a double reference, based on the relation between natural and spiritual things, but not a double or divided sense, which did not lie in the language. They regarded the sense of Scripture as one, and, therefore, to be interpreted philologically, whether the words were literal or tropical. They carefully shunned the rock of uniform literalism on the one hand, and the whirlpool of mysticism on the other. They neither found Christ, like Cocceius, everywhere, nor, like Grotius, nowhere. They read the language of Scripture in the light of usage, as well as in the light of inspiration, and not in the light of popular prejudice, preconceived opinions, or the principles of the pagan or rabbinical schools. They understood the use and abuse of reason in the interpretation of the divine word, of which some of the early Fathers, their successors, were profoundly ignorant. We find in their exegesis nothing akin to the fanciful allegories of Barnabas, or the manifold uses of Origen, or the plastic symbolism of Ammonius Saccas, who labored to harmonize all the systems both of philosophy and religion not only with themselves but with each other. There is no trace of the Platonism of Philo and Josephus and of the rabbinical literature after the close of the Canon and during the prevalence of the Oriental and Alexandrian philosophies.

Paul here interprets the Abrahamic promise grammatically, and applies it to Christ personally. And to make his meaning all the clearer he renders it both negatively and positively, and uses the masculine relative pronoun *ὃς* after the neuter noun *σπέρμα*, "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which (who) is Christ." The word *zē-rā'*, the Hebrew equivalent of *σπέρμα*, like the English word *sheep*, is in several instances in the Old Testament, as Seth,¹ Samuel² and Solomon,³ individual or personal, though generally collective. And though it did not directly denote individuality, in the context of the promise, it might yet connote or involve it in all the circumstances of the case, which embraced the whole chosen seed

¹ Gen. iv., 25; Gen. xxi., 13. ² 1 Sam. i., 11. ³ 1 Chron. xxii., 10; Ps. ix., 26; 2 Sam. vii., 12, 14.

and Christ, the special seed of promise. The Abrahamic covenant was essentially a revelation of the covenant of grace, "Confirmed of God in Christ," with whom it was primarily made, as the second contracting party and prospective fulfiller, and merely secondarily made with Abraham. Consequently the chosen seed, from the beginning, derived their whole federal standing, character and destiny from Christ as their Surety and Head. The words of promise by themselves might be understood as expressing plurality rather than individuality, yet they connoted unity, or many in one, the members in the Head. And still more specifically, the context also in which the promise sits and in the light of which it must be read, expressly singles out and signalizes one individual, one family, and one class of character, as destined to culminate in one person, whom both Abraham and Moses knew to be *the seed* of promise, the grand personage by whom the elect seed would realize their destiny. And hence both kinds of unity, which involve one another, are thus grammatically interpreted and summed up in the aptest terms,—“He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.”*

The meaning may be thus paraphrased and the application of the text to Christ personally is just—He speaks not of seeds as of several individuals, or of several sorts of seed, which he would have done had he meant both Isaac and Ishmael and their families, but he speaks as of one, Isaac personally, and his posterity, both genealogically and spiritually, which is Christ and the Church.

STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

VI.

Nationality and Empire.

In Volume Seven of "Records of the Past"—a series of books containing translations in English of the Chaldean, Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments—is such a translation of one of the Chaldaic tablets to which the discoverer, Mr. George Smith, has given the name of the

LEGEND OF THE TOWN OF BABEL.

"The story which the tablet contains," says another English scholar, Mr. Boscawen, who is the translator of it as it stands in the book just named, "appears to be the building of some great temple tower, apparently by command of the king. The gods are angry at the work, and so to put an end to it they con-

* 1 Sam. viii., 15 עֲרֵבָה.—Mark iv., 31 σπέρματα. Matt. xiii., 31, 32.

fuse the speech of the builders." The tablet is badly broken, and parts of it have not been recovered, so that only a few lines are entire. The beginning and the end are both missing. We have therefore only a fragment of the legend, although enough, it seems, to satisfy the translator that it is indeed a portion of some more extended account, in legendary form, of events described in the eleventh of Genesis.

I will copy a few of the more significant portions. Being a fragment, it begins abruptly: in the middle of a line, in fact, only three words of the line being left. These three words are

"..... them the father"

Then come the following, in the first column of the tablet, referring evidently to the person, a king probably, by whose command the tower was built. The parallelism, or repetitions so common in all those old literatures, will be noticed. The words in parentheses are supplied:

(The thoughts) of his heart were evil.
 The father of all the gods he turned from.
 (The thoughts) of his heart were evil.
 Babylon corruptly to sin went and
 small and great mingled on the mound.
 Babylon corruptly to sin went and
 small and great mingled on the mound."

In the second column of the tablet, after a few broken lines, we find this:

"Their work all day they founded,
 to their stronghold in the night
 entirely an end he made.
 In his anger also the secret counsel he poured out,
 to scatter abroad his face he set,
 he gave command to make strange their speech,
 their progress he impeded."

These are the portions of the tablet best preserved and most significant. It does not appear to be quite certain that the words, "he gave command to make strange their speech," are a correct translation. Mr. Boscawen suggests, "make hostile their council," instead of "make strange their speech." Mr. George Smith translates, "small and great he confounded their speech." He also translates a column, very much broken, which Mr. Boscawen in "Records of the Past" omits, near the end of which we read, "Bitterly they wept at Babil, very much they grieved at their misfortune."

After making all allowance for the broken condition of the tablet, and for difficulties of translation, we seem justified in receiving this as a legend of Babel brought to Nineveh in about the eighth century before Christ from the ruins of some old Chaldean city, and discovered in late years in excavating upon the site of the great Assyrian capital. It bears in all respects the appearance of high antiquity, and may be one of the very oldest of human records. In spite of its legendary form and of its polytheistic features, its resemblance to the Scripture account is evident, while as compared with that account, it affords us another example of both the like and the unlike ways in which history and legend deal with the same event.

THE PEOPLE FROM THE EAST.

At the beginning of the eleventh chapter of Genesis, we are told how "the whole earth was of one language and one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, and they

dwelt there." Whether or not that derivation of the name Shinar is correct which traces it to the two Hebrew words meaning "the two rivers," there is no doubt, I suppose, that it designates the extensive level country between the Euphrates and Tigris in the lower part of their course, which afterwards bore the name of Chaldæa. The expression, "the whole earth was of one language and one speech" clearly implies that a sufficient time had passed since the deluge for a very considerable increase in the posterity of Noah, such a statement having otherwise little or no significance. It would appear, however, that they held together, more or less, numerous as they may have become, and had been moving, from place to place, from that Ararat region in northern Armenia where the ark had rested, and where the family of Noah reared their first altar and made their first home. There may have been two reasons for these successive migrations. If we may assume that the first human abodes, after the creation of man, were in the valley of the lower Euphrates and Tigris, it would be quite natural that this original home of the race should be an object of desire to them, and an objective point in all their search for a final abode. And then, as their numbers increased, they would find that mountain country amidst which the Euphrates and Tigris have their source, less and less suitable for permanent residence. It may be supposed that, in search of a better region, and perhaps with some view to such a return to their primitive abode, they crossed to the east of the Tigris, then slowly descended that river till reaching the country now known as Persia; that from this they turned westward, and settled at last in the level country between the rivers, called in Scripture "the plain of Shinar," and in our oldest histories Chaldæa. Thus they came upon this level country, "as they journeyed from the east." All this may have occupied a considerable time; the intervals between the successive migrations may have covered years, or even generations. It is possible, too, that, from the main body, branches may have parted off; sections of them journeying to the east and north-east, and planting the seed of those Aryan and Mongol races whose annals, so far as they can be dimly traced, run so far up into pre-historic times.

However that may be, with the arrival of this people journeying from the east into the plain of Shinar, post-diluvian history begins. Whether or not primitive man in ante-diluvian times made his dwelling in that same quarter of the world, it is at least undeniable that all indications at present available, not only Biblical, but archæological and traditional, point to the plain of Shinar as the cradle of nationality and empire, the seat of the first settled form of human society, and the point from which the various nationalities branched away.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EVENTS OF BABEL.

We see at once, in this view, the significance of that which occurred at Babel, as the absolute point of departure in the history of nationality and empire. Perhaps we may say that the basis of nationality is community of language; and a beginning of diversity of nationality would naturally be diversity of language. A question arises here which, I think, we might be glad to answer, if we could,—What form did this diversity of language first take, and what formal relation does it bear to diversity of nationality? One thing it seems as if we might assume, and this is, that the "confounding" of the speech of the builders need not be taken in any absolute sense. We are accustomed to speak of the incident as a "confusion of tongues." Can we suppose, after all, that this change of

human speech, as directed by divine wisdom, would be a change of intelligible language into mere jargon? It seems more rational to assume that the divine foresight and provision in the matter would anticipate the history that was to follow; not merely a dispersion of the human race, but the re-gathering in distinct nationalities, and all those relations between various nationalities which result from a knowledge of their community of origin, testified to by the fact of their cognate forms of speech. Not much, therefore, is hazarded, if we assume that this original division of the speech of mankind was such in nature and effect as to supply at least the elements of that classification in distinct families of language, which now, to the comparative philologist, is as certain as any other fact of his science.

Some support for this is found in the language used upon the oldest tablets. Readers of these papers are, of course, familiar with the fact that languages are now classified in three, by some philologists in four, great families; the Hamitic, the Semitic, the Aryan (or Indo-European), and the Turanian; this last including all that confused variety of tongues spoken by savage and barbarous races. Mention has before been made of the indications found, in the oldest Chaldaean tablets, that the most ancient language of which monuments are yet traced, bore resemblances to all four of these several great families, as they afterwards became. It may, some day, be found possible to say that, when the migrations from that primitive seat of the race began, each colony, whether moving to the east or to the west, already had at least an incipient bond of union in elementary forms of speech which grew, ultimately, into the languages spoken, for example, by all the nations descended from the children of Ham, or by those who traced their common ancestry in the descendants of Shem, or those sons of Japheth from whom all the Indo-European nations, including our own, have come, or the wild tribes which wandered away, with little or no bond of union amongst themselves, and became the uncivilized and uncivilizable masses of both the ancient and the modern world.

Something like this may some day be ascertainable. For the present, we can only say that the theory is not without plausible support. So far as discovery has gone, it sustains fully the Scripture narrative; and we may say of this as of other things, that every new achievement in archæology is a new witness to the truth of the Bible. In general, then, we are safe in noting as the point of outset in the whole history of nationality since that day, this incident of the breaking up of the one human speech, which broke up also the unity of the race as it then stood, and began that mighty dispersion and colonization and occupation of the world's vast territories, which has gone forward until this hour. All ascertainable evidence, thus far, sustains also the Scripture statement, that "the beginning" of the first kingdom "was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar." These cities, or their ruins, have come again to the light of day, after having been buried for thousands of years. Their identification, with that of another noted city, "Ur of the Chaldees," is believed to be certain. The first cities, after the Flood, were these, and the first man to establish anything like sovereignty seems to have been the "mighty hunter" himself.

EGYPT AND CHALDÆA.

The two great names in that ancient time to which our present study takes us back, were Egypt and Chaldæa. Which of these has the priority in point of date seems not quite agreed. Some seem to think that previous to the founding

of a kingdom by Nimrod, there had not only been a considerable period during which a kind of semi-patriarchal, semi-kingly rule had been maintained in what was afterwards known as Chaldæa, but that in the meantime a migration westward to the banks of the Nile had occurred, and a kingdom and a nationality been founded there. This seems to be Rawlinson's view, who urges in favor of it the fact, as he states it, that "the civilization in the land of the Nile is of greater antiquity than that in the land of the Euphrates." This consideration loses much of its force when we remember how the Egyptian monuments which testify to this early civilization are in most instances of the most solid material, the absolutely imperishable granite; while those of Chaldæa were often of merely oven-dried bricks, and never of stone. Added to which is that, though beginning later, the Egyptian civilization may have reached a high state of perfection much earlier than that of Chaldæa, owing to favoring causes.

At all events, with these two the great and checkered story of empire begins. Students of the monuments, confirming intimations of Bible history, tell us of a time when the world's two great centres were on the Euphrates and the Nile. Ur of the Chaldees, the first capital of the empire of Chaldæa, as we are told, shared the supremacy with Thebes and Memphis. The Chaldæans, whose "cry" was even then "in their ships," were the world's first merchants. Commerce sent its first ships down the Persian Gulf into the Indian Ocean, and eastward and westward along a coast which, however abandoned and desolate now, was then thronged with people. Civilization and science had their birth on the Euphrates and the Nile. Where the Arab now builds his mean hut and floats his rude skiff, argosies of the world's earliest commerce sailed up and down. And in that other land where now the daily story is of imbecility and outrage, empire and civilization achieved what has been from that time till now the wonder of both the ancient and the modern world.

SOME HARD QUESTIONS.

Difficult questions present themselves here, upon which something should be said. One of these is suggested by the fact of the remarkable development which nationality, empire and civilization had attained, at the time when the continuous Bible history begins, especially as compared with the interval which accepted chronology allows for, between the Flood, and that beginning in the time of Abraham. This chronology would give us an interval of a little more than four hundred years between the flood and Abraham's departure out of Chaldæa. With Abraham the continuous Scripture narrative, in that part of it, opens; and in his time we find what, at first, may surprise and perplex as regards the apparent numbers to which the race had grown from those eight persons who came with Noah from the ark, and as regards what seems like national organization and the growth of great empires. Egypt, in Abraham's time, appears as a well-organized kingdom, quite populous apparently, with its Pharaoh and its kingly court. In Chaldæa, if the tablets lately found are read aright, the kingdom founded by Nimrod has, at that date, already run its course, and the sovereignty of that whole region has passed into the hands of a king, Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, as we find him called in Genesis, who comes into the Scripture narrative as a conqueror, and the ruler of a wide region. Twelve years before the time when he appears in the history he had invaded the Jordan valley and had reduced to the condition of tributaries the kings of Sodom, of Gomorrah, of Admah, Zeboim and Zoar. These having now revolted, and cast off his supremacy, he comes a second time,

bringing with him Amraphel, king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, and Tidal king of nations;—these, it is supposed, being also tributaries of the Elamite ruler. In this expedition, we read how he smites Rephaim, and Zuzim, and Emim, and the Horites in Mount Seir, south of the Dead Sea, and then, returning northward, all the country of the Amalekites, till at last he falls upon those cities in the Jordan valley, and defeating their kings in a battle, carries them away captive. In this narrative we have, so far as authentic history is concerned, the very beginning of the long story of invasion, and battle, and conquest, the weaker subdued by the stronger, and a great empire formed out of subject nations and kings. For the students of those old Chaldæan tablets tell us that this Chedorlaomer turns out to have been a great conqueror; that at one time all Western Asia was subject to him, from the Persian Gulf to Damascus, and from Elam on the east of the Tigris and bordering on Chaldæa to the Mediterranean. His ascertained line of march, up the Euphrates to the region of Damascus, and then southward to the mountains and wildernesses south of the Dead Sea, then westerly to Kadesh and north again through Canaan to the cities on the Jordan—this is now with students of biblical archæology a sort of chart for tracing ancient sites, and identifying Scripture names. Place all this with what the Egyptian monuments up to the time of Abraham disclose, and does it not seem as if the period of four hundred years is too brief a one for such a development and growth in human affairs?

We must remember, for one thing, that the word "king" cannot have meant, then, all that is understood by this word now. Neither the king of Sodom, nor the king of Gomorrah can have been very much of a potentate. Nor can this army of Chedorlaomer have been what would now be called a formidable one. If it had been so, would Abraham's small force of three hundred and eighteen have won a victory so complete and so easy? Then, we may underestimate the probabilities of growth in population during even the period supposed. Dr. Murphy, in his Commentary on Genesis, estimates that during the four hundred years, more or less, between the flood and Abraham—about ten generations, as he computes it—the human race may have increased to the number of fifteen millions; and the author of the Pulpit Commentary says that, "supposing a rate of increase equal to that of Abraham's posterity in Egypt, during the four hundred years that elapsed from the call to the Exodus, the inhabitants of the world in the time of Abraham would be between seven and eight millions." Then, as to what changes may come about in the course of four centuries, remember that this is now the exact period of time since the Reformation. Has not the world changed wonderfully since the time of Luther and Calvin, of Leo X. and Henry VIII.? A good many things may happen in the course of four hundred years; and, indeed, of one hundred years. Added to all which, is the fact that the posterity of Noah did not begin a new career from the starting-point of barbarism. Such a structure as the ark is described to have been proves in its builders the possession of mechanical skill far enough removed from the blundering achievements of barbarians. Where is the hazard of assuming that ante-diluvian knowledge and skill in many things passed over through Noah and his sons to their posterity, and that cities rose and grew on the banks of the Euphrates and Nile, very much as they grow up now on some great river in Dakota or Montana? Let us not, at least, bring into questions of interpretation for this ancient story of "first things" found in the Bible, unnecessary difficulties.

UNCERTAINTIES OF CHRONOLOGY.

Two or three suggestions further may be added on this point. (1) One is that, as time passes, and knowledge of the remains of that ancient world increases, the views of archæological experts seem to undergo considerable modification as to the antiquity, for example, of Egyptian civilization. Twenty or thirty years ago, the date of Mena, the first Egyptian king, was fixed by some Egyptologists at the absurd figure of B. C. 20,000. The highest figure now given, according to Brugsch, is between five and six thousand, while the lowest is between three and four thousand. (2) Another fact, here, is that Egyptologists still differ widely on the subject, showing that material for any final conclusion has not yet been found. They differ from each other, as to the date of Mena, by no less an interval than that of more than two thousand years. (3) Still another consideration is that we are not shut up to a strictly literal interpretation of what seems the Scriptural Chronology for this period. When Cush and Mizraim are spoken of as the sons of Ham, and certain others as the sons of Shem and Japhet, we are not shut up to maintaining that these were literally sons. It would be consistent with the Scripture phraseology, as we know, to regard them simply as descendants. So in tracing the ancestry of Abraham.

In short, while the chronology of the Egyptologists is approaching that of the received Scripture interpretation, this interpretation itself is found capable of modification, so as that the two systems may one day be in substantial, if not in entire harmony. And even if a correct Scripture interpretation hold us to the four hundred years, literally, the history of that period itself is subject to revision, so as to qualify very materially the statements in that regard now made. The date of such monuments as the pyramids, for example, may be brought down to more recent times. The beginning of what is called the pyramid period, Sir Gardner Wilkinson fixes at B. C. 2450. The latest results of study in biblical chronology, I believe, date the Flood at B. C. 2515. Wilkinson has much to say of the surprising progress in the arts made by the Egyptians, up to that time. He appears to assume that the progress was from a beginning of substantial barbarism. As already shown, we know from the Bible that the first men after the deluge were by no means barbarians, but very likely possessed of a knowledge and skill in the arts for which they have never yet received credit. Then the date fixed for the pyramids, and that whole system of Egyptian chronology is partly conjectural, and subject to constant revision. It may be found, in the end, that the Bible story of that early time may be taken with very little change in the customary interpretation of it.

I will very soon pass from this; but before I do so, I would like to briefly name one fact which is significant as to the primitive character of the Egyptian monarchy in its original foundation. Mena, as I have said, was the first king. Lepsius, although, as just mentioned, neither this nor any other date is to be taken as final, fixes his reign at about B. C. 3600. Brugsch tells us that "he is said to have been the first lawgiver in Egypt, but to have corrupted the simple manners of the olden time, in that he replaced the frugal mode of life by royal pomp and sumptuous expense. Long after his time—as the story went—Technactes, or Tnephactus, the father of the unfortunate king Bocchoris, on the occasion of an expedition against the revolted nations of the Arabs, was compelled to forego this royal costliness of living. But the simple bed and fare of the desert pleased him so much, that he resolved henceforth to

practice temperance. He further commanded the priests to engrave his royal resolution upon a stone of memorial, which contained curses against Mena, and to set it up in the temple of Amon at Thebes."

It looks as if Mena may have been in Egypt what Nimrod was in Chaldæa. He certainly was a great builder like Nimrod, for Memphis was founded by him. He seems also, like Nimrod, to have changed a simple and patriarchal into a kingly form of government. Neither the one nor the other may have been a *great* king in the modern sense of the words; and nothing that is recorded of either need embarrass us in holding that we can bring all that is likely to prove true of either Egypt or Chaldæa, within the compass of a moderate chronology.

EMPIRE AND RELIGION.

But, now, what of all this, in relation to the subject of the world's great religions? Upon this I will briefly give a few points.

1. The first is that, as far back as any records will carry us in a study of the world's great empires, we find them already polytheistic and idolatrous. The fact shows how soon the great powers of the world set themselves against a true knowledge of God, and illustrates the utter inveteracy of that tendency in human nature of which Paul speaks in the first of Romans. Perhaps we may say that what is told us in the story of Abraham suggests the existence in his time, of a "remnant" in some parts of the world, at any rate, who held to a true faith. There was, in those times, a Melchisedek, as well as an Abraham; and there may have been others. But the great body of the people and the reigning powers were already idolatrous at the oldest date to which the monuments carry us up. This strange tendency toward polytheism and idolatry will come in view once more in the next of these papers. For the present, let the fact itself be noted.

2. In the second place, as population grew, and migration diffused the race more widely, and other empires grew and flourished, the same fact remained invariable. It is a familiar and common-place fact, but a most notable one, all the same. There were monotheistic elements in some, if not all, of these religions, as will appear hereafter, and great men were providentially raised up who, according to the measure of the light they had, withstood the universal tide of corrupt and corrupting idolatry. But it was a tide that could not be withstood for any length of time. As we trace the course of empire, from Egypt along the North African coast; from Chaldæa, eastward to the Indus, and so at last to the Pacific, where the greatest and one of the oldest of these great nationalities is to-day as strong in its age of thousands of years as it ever was; as we follow the path of our Aryan ancestors north-eastwardly from Chaldæa, across the Himalayas and the Hindu Kush, and see them amidst the mountains or on the wide plains of that rude region; as we turn again westwardly to the shores of the Ægean and the Adriatic, and watch the growth of Grecian and Roman power—always, as respects religion, the story is the same. There is endless diversity in the number and names of the gods, in forms and rites, in the nature and measure of corrupting and degrading tendency; but nowhere, along all this range of world-wide migration, and along this march of troubled and stormy centuries, save in one little corner, do you find a true religion. You can track the path of human migration over the world by the smoke of idolatrous altar-fires, and by the towering domes of idolatrous temples and pagodas.

3. Then, again, it is found to make little or no difference in the religion of a people, whatever its attainment in sciences, in arts, in culture, in civilization. A strange sight it is, to see an Egyptian teacher at whose feet Plato does not disdain to sit, worshipping, or seeming to worship, a bull or a crocodile! Strange to hear a Socrates, in his very last words, as he is about to drink the hemlock, request one of his weeping disciples to offer a cock in his name to Esculapius! Strange to find that neither a Buddha nor a Confucius, wise beyond all the uninspired men of their era, and models of human virtue in many ways, is able to grasp and hold right religious ideas! This is natural religion. This is its record on the same pages that record the history of empire and civilization. This is what man, at his best, attains, when uninspired or unhelped by that which is better than himself.

4. Meantime, last of all, we cannot but be struck with the method and the means of divine providence, in preserving among men, after all, a true religion. It would, perhaps, have been according to human wisdom to make some one of these great empires the instrument of such a purpose. Divine power could have done it, unquestionably. There is no reason, in the mere nature of things, why Memphis, or Babylon, or Athens, or Rome should not have been the true Holy City. There might have been enlisted on the side of the true religion imperialism in its most commanding form, and civilization at the seats of its very highest perfection. What *did* take place was the selection of a mere corner of the world, a narrow region between the Jordan and the Mediterranean, less than a hundred and fifty miles in average length, and only forty miles in breadth, about the size of one of the smaller New England states. Here God planted a people who never had in them the elements of a great and united nationality. Their history, upon its secular side, is one of the most checkered, and one of the least creditable ever written. Even on its religious side, it is, during centuries, a story of lapses into idolatry and recovery out of idolatry; most precious revelations dimly apprehended, prophetic ministries disparaged, disregarded, even persecuted; a chosen people to whom God had spoken "in voices and thunderings and lightnings," and among whom he had manifested himself in wonders and miracles such as were never seen in any other nation, yet often forsaking the altars of their own Jehovah for those of the cruel Moloch or the obscene Ashtaroth. How could a religion, alone against the whole world, and the gates of its citadel thrown wide by the hands of its own defenders—how was such a religion even to survive?

The history of religion, in all the annals of the race, from the beginning, as we very well know, is the history of a triumph of the weak over the strong, looking at things on their human side. It is that lamp of Israel, shining there in a corner of the dark world, itself at times almost extinguished, somehow become a very sun in the heavens. It is the truth embodied and symbolized in Hebrew institutions, and uttering itself in Hebrew literature, persisting through centuries of almost universal error and ignorance; or, as I may say, it is a seed of truth, simply *the truth*, not an institution, not a system, not a hierarchy, not even a church, but *the truth*, simply and alone, germinating in a soil apparently the most unfriendly, and growing and spreading, especially in the fulness of time, until now there is scarcely a hill-top in all the world upon which you may not see its branches waving. To me there is unspeakable inspiration, comfort and courage in this. We may not be great in ourselves; we may not have the world on our side; we may be often cast down and disheartened; but while we have the truth, and preach the truth, God gives us the victory.

BIBLE INTERPRETATION; HOW AND HOW NOT.*

BY B. FELSENTHAL, Ph. D.,

Rabbi of Zion Synagogue, Chicago, Ill.

That a Jew is now permitted, and indeed invited to speak before Christian ministers of the Gospel, is a hopeful sign that we are approaching the time in which seekers of truth of the various denominations, can work together, harmoniously and peacefully, like true brethren. All study and investigation must have but one and the same object in view, namely, to overthrow ignorance, to emancipate the mind from preconceived, but unfounded notions, and to arrive at the truth. And why should Christians and Jews, Trinitarians and Unitarians not work thus together? There is no Jewish Hebrew grammar, no Christian Hebrew grammar; no Presbyterian Greek language and no Episcopalian Greek language,—there is but one and the same Hebrew and one and the same Greek for all. I would even go farther. I would say that there is no denominational Ecclesiastical history and no sectarian Bible exegesis. In these fields, likewise, the truth is but one. In Church history, it is of course natural that a Jew should be more interested in the Rabbinical literature of the Middle Ages and the later development of the Jewish Church, than a Christian, in most cases, would be. On the other hand, it is also to be expected that a Christian student will take a deeper interest than a Jew, in the study of the history of specific Christian doctrines and institutions. A Baptist will naturally be more attracted by the study of the question of baptism than a Unitarian. But the absolute truth, I repeat, is but one. And so I foresee the time when, instead of four or five theological seminaries in Chicago and its suburbs, there will be but one excellently equipped and excellently endowed institution, with a large number of teachers for the various branches, with libraries and other advantages which may well be compared with those in Oxford and Cambridge, in Berlin and Leipzig. This institution for "theological" learning will, as I foresee it, be connected with a grand coming University, and will form an integral part of it. And in this University of the future, by the side of professorial chairs for all other possible departments of knowledge, and under the silent, yet powerful influence of the other branches of learning, the "theological" studies, will be secured against the creeping in of a spirit of mental narrowness on the one hand, and a spirit of undue haughtiness on the other.

But what have I to say concerning the exegesis of the Scriptures? Is this not to be taught differently in separate denominational seminaries? I answer, without hesitation, *no*. From the professor's chair, the Bible must be explained and studied without any preconceived doctrinal or sectarian bias. History, archæology, philology, must be the handmaids of Biblical science, and not denominational considerations. Whether in our days a man may marry his deceased wife's sister, or not, is, as a practical question, to be settled by the legislative authorities of the Episcopalian Church, in England by the English Parliament. But whether such marriages were allowed, or prohibited, by the Bible, is for the unbiased Old Testament student to say. When and in what manner the rite of baptism should be performed, is to be decided by the Councils and other competent authorities of the various Christian sects. But whether the Hebrew verb *ṭābhāl* means

* A lecture delivered before the Hebrew Summer School at Morgan Park, July 7, 1884.

to immerse, or to sprinkle, and whether immersion or sprinkling was the practice among the Jews 1800 years ago, are questions for the Hebrew philologist and Bible commentator, for the historian of Judaism and Christianity, and not for the elders of churches and for delegates to church conventions to determine. These questions *must* be answered and *can* be answered fully, independently of denominational disputes and rituals. And such is even the case in still more important questions of dogma and practice. Professors and learners in the field of Bible science must rise above all denominational bias. A biased teacher will too easily and too frequently darken where he should enlighten, and convey errors where he should give nothing but the absolute truth. Such biased teachers we find among the Jews as well as among the Christians, among the Protestants as well as among the Catholics, among the Muhammedans as well as among the teachers of the two older religions of Semitic origin.

Let me give here a few instances of such expositions of the Bible, tintured by religious prejudices. Muhammedan theologians find in the Old Testament quite a number of predictions of, and typical allusions to, the prophet of Mecca, where an unprejudiced Jewish or Christian Bible reader would not dream of detecting a trace of such an allusion. They see, e. g., Muhammed alluded to in Haggai II., 7, in these words: "*The desire of all the nations shall come.*" *The desire* (Hemdah) of all the nations, is Muhammed—so the theologians of the Islam say—and this is sufficiently demonstrated by the fact that the words Hemdah and Muhammed are derived from the same root, from the verb hāmādh. Is it necessary for us, who do not live under the shadow of the Mosque, and into whom Muhammedan teachings have not been engrafted, to show the total fallacy of this interpretation? *First*, the word hēmdāh, in this passage, cannot mean "the desired one;" its meaning is rather "the desirable objects," "the precious things," (plural), as the verb (ubhā'û) stands in the plural ("they shall come," not "he shall come"). *Secondly*, the whole contextual structure shows that the prophet speaks of the coming glory and grandeur of the new temple, whose erection had just begun in his days; and, referring to the bright future of the rising sanctuary, the inspired prophet says: "Thus says the Lord of hosts, In a little while I will shake the heavens and the earth and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the precious things of all nations, they shall come (*i. e.*, into this house), and I will fill this house with glory," etc.

To another instance of Muhammedan Bible-exposition I call your attention. You know that Muhammedan theology admits the divine origin of Judaism and of Christianity; but, at the same time, it claims that the Islam is also divinely revealed, and that, moreover, it occupies a higher grade of religion than do its two older sisters. In support of this doctrine, Moses is brought forward and made to bear testimony! Of the words with which his parting blessing (Deut. XXXIII., 2) commences, Muhammedan theologians give the following explanation; "*The Lord came from Sinai*," that means, the Lord revealed himself to Israel; for "*Sînāy*" signifies the Hebrew people; "*and he rose in light from Seir to them*;" that means, to Christendom also God revealed himself; for "*Sē'ir*," the country in which Edom dwelt (see Gen. XXXVI., 8, and other places) stands for Edom, and "*Edom*" came, in the course of time, to be regarded as a symbolical name for Rome, for the Roman empire, and afterwards for the Christian world, whose spiritual center was in the city of Rome; "*he shone forth from Mount Paran*;" that means, God revealed himself also to the Arabian prophet, to Muhammed;

for "Pârân," where Ishmael, the patriarch of the Arabians, was living (Gen. XXI., 21), is used here to designate the Ishmaelite Muhammed. Furthermore, it deserves mention that Muhammed himself appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures, which, he said, he did not come to destroy, but to fulfil, and which, as he argued, for those who had eyes to see, pointed to him. "*A prophet from the midst of you, from your brethren, like unto me, will the Lord your God raise up unto you; to him you shall hearken.*" Thus we read in Deut. XVIII., 15; and, in reference to such and similar passages, the doctors of the Koran ask: Was Muhammed not like unto Moses? Did he not come from Israel's brethren, from the children of Ishmael? Is there not, in the Hebrew Scriptures, the prophecy, and here, in the rise of Muhammed, the fulfilment? Are there not, in the Old Bible, the types, and here, in the new Koran, the antitypes? Did not the inspired men of Israel foresee the coming prophet of Arabia?

These peculiar methods of interpreting the Bible remind us of the methods, which Persian believers in the Koran employ in the interpretation of the odes of their great national poet Hafiz. Muhammed Shemseddin Hafiz, as is well known, sang of wine, and of love, and of nightingales, and of roses—in fact, of beauty in every form. Can such poetry be accepted by the ecclesiastical authorities in Persia, and by the pious ministers of the Muhammedan religion in that country? Yes, the odes of Hafiz, so they say, must only be understood rightly; it must be believed that they are intended as an allegorical and mystical revelation of things divine. And so their commentators tell us that "the wine" signifies the true faith, and that "the beloved lad" stands as a symbol for God, and that "the intoxication" means pious ecstasy brought forth by a deep contemplation of the divine works and words, etc. This has, indeed, been carried so far, that pilgrims from all parts of Persia now resort to the tomb of Hafiz, and almost regard that frivolous poet as a saint. (Who is not reminded, by these commentaries upon Hafiz, of a number of commentaries, Jewish and Christian, upon the Song of Solomon, Psalm XLV., and other parts of the Bible?)

The theologians among the Muhammedans assert that their Bible-expositions reveal the real and true meaning of the Scriptures. If, now, some of them would face us to-day, and would notice how we shake our heads at their strange interpretations, they would probably say: You are too superficial in your explanation of the sacred books; the "inner light" has evidently not dawned upon you; the "deeper sense" of the Scriptures has remained hidden to you. The Christian Mystics speak also of a "deeper sense;" the Jewish Kabbalists speak likewise of Mysteries, "Sôdhôth," etc. . . .

But do Muhammedans alone interpret the Bible under the influence of their religious prejudices? Jews and Christians also have sinned, and do continue to sin, in the same direction. Not that they sin consciously; not that they pervert the sense of the Bible wilfully; they err unconsciously. They *believe* that their expositions are the true ones, the only true ones. And they have not, and, in centuries gone by, they could not have, sufficient philological and other necessary knowledge to prevent them from making errors. We, rising above sectarian narrowness, must now be ready to admit that, in many instances, our own teachers, in olden times, erred, and that, in many instances, their interpretations cannot stand the light of criticism. Here also we may give illustrations. Rashi, an excellent Jewish expounder of the Bible, who wrote eight hundred years ago (he died 1105), explains the first verse of Genesis thus: "B'rê'shîth, *in the beginning*;

'b'rēshith' is equivalent to 'b'ish'bhil rē'shith,' for the sake of rē'shith. For the sake of rē'shith God created the world. Rē'shith is, then, first, a designation of the Torah; for, in Prov. VIII., 22, the Torah is called 'rē'shith dārkô,' the beginning of God's ways. Rē'shith, secondly, means God's chosen people Israel; for, in Jer. II., 3, Israel is referred to in the words 'rē'shith t'bhū'āthô,' the beginning of God's productions." Rashi desires, by his interpretation, to set forth the idea that God created the world, in order that the Torah should become manifest therein, and be a power therein, and for the further purpose that Israel should, so to speak, have a standing place, a sphere for his being and his fulfilling his mission in the world. Rashi here followed older Jewish authorities who preceded him with this explanation. We now find little to admire in this kind of interpretation; we think that b'rē'shith means simply "in the beginning," and that no other sense, no "deeper sense," no "hidden sense" is contained in it. So much is certain to us, that the author—whether it was Moses, or some one living hundreds of years after Moses—did not think of the Torah, or of Israel, when he wrote down the word "b'rē'shith." And our object, in our endeavor to understand the Bible words correctly, must now be to find an answer to the question, What did the author at first mean by his words? Of former interpretations, be they now by Rashi, or by St. Jerome, or by Luther, or by others, we take respectful and thankful notice, but we do so in the same spirit and manner as historians take notice of old documents, of old scientific views and systems. We carefully examine them; we accept what appears to us good and true; we reject what, according to our understanding, is erroneous. But far is it from us to take everything in them as being absolutely true. . . .

We have given a few examples of old Jewish explications which, in the light of modern scholarship, we unhesitatingly declare to be incorrect and untenable and to be colored by Jewish bias. But Catholics, and Protestants, also, otherwise quite erudite and quite independent in their studies and researches, show, often enough, in their Bible expositions the mighty influence upon them of opinions and doctrines that were inculcated into their minds when they were young. There have been, and probably there are, Catholic scholars who find in the Old Testament quite a number of allusions to the virgin Mary, the queen of heavens, as they call her, and to the almost divine attributes which are ascribed to her by the Roman Church. In the so-called Protevangelium (Gen. III., 15) where it is said that the seed of the woman will bruise the head of the serpent, Catholic theologians found the sense that *she*, the holy virgin, will bruise the serpent's head—*ipsa* conteret caput tuum, so the present editions of the Vulgata read, not *ipse* etc., the feminine gender being used instead of the masculine, despite the Hebrew text having the undisputed masculine pronoun and verb (hū y'shūph'khā) and not the corresponding feminine forms. Thus a text undeniably perverted is preferred to the true original reading, in order to make a Roman Catholic doctrine more plausible and to give to it a biblical basis.

Is it different with Protestant Bible expounders? Are the exegetical works of many of them not tinctured by religious prejudices and dogmatical presuppositions? Some of them discover Christ almost in any page of the Old Testament, some of them find the doctrine of the Trinity indicated in the very first word of the Bible,—for are not the letters Beth, Resh, Aleph of the word B'rēshith the initial letters of Bēn, Rūāh, 'Abh, (*son, spirit, father*)?—According to some of these exegetes it was the Cross that sweetened the waters of Marah, for is not

the numerical value of the Hebrew word for "tree" (Exod. xv., 25) or "wood" ($\text{קָדָשׁ} = 70+90$) the same as that of the word (in later Hebrew) for "cross" ($\text{צֶלֶב} = 90+30+40$)? And may not therefore the words "wood" and "cross" be interchanged?—With some of these exegetes, aye, with large numbers of them, Shiloh, Immanuel, etc., are but typical names of Jesus of Nazareth; for has not "the Church" so taught it for many hundred years?—And this is called Bible Science!

But place yourselves, for a moment, in the position of one who had never heard from a Christian pulpit, or from the lips of a teacher, or who had never read in a book of Christian devotions, that "Immanuel" is Christ; and then read that chapter in Isaiah, where Immanuel is spoken of. In such a condition of your mind the idea will never occur to you that in that plain, clear oration of Isaiah any reference is made to a divine savior who should come more than seven hundred years later. Before the gates of Jerusalem, in the presence of king Ahaz, and of a multitude of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the prophet is standing. The prophet says: Do not despair! Be hopeful! Be of good cheer! The Syrian armies and the armies of Ephraim, who are coming from the North, and who threaten you, and who, you fear, will conquer your land, lay waste your country, and destroy your sanctuary, will not succeed. In a few years the danger will all have passed away, and you will not be molested any more by this enemy. And this sign I will give you. Behold yonder young woman ('ālmāh), she has conceived, and she will bear a son, and she will call his name Immanuel; and before that child will be able to distinguish between what is good and evil, the enemy will have gone, the danger will have passed away, and a time of glory and of peace and of happiness will come for the kingdom of Judah, etc., etc.

Is this not a plain prophetic oration which hardly admits any misconstruction? And yet not only pious women and devout peasants, but learned expounders of the Bible cling tenaciously to the idea that Isaiah meant originally Jesus of Nazareth! And in order to make this idea more acceptable, they force upon the word 'ālmāh—which means *any* young woman—the meaning, immaculate virgin!

And in such a forced manner other so-called "messianic" passages are explained. I am well aware that many of these "messianic passages" were already understood and explained as messianic and as having reference to Christ by the authors of the New Testament. It would probably be improper for me to say before you, gentlemen, composing my present audience, that the New Testament expositions of Old Testament passages were not always exact and correct. To many of you the New Testament is the very highest authority in everything, and you might say, Thus far a Bible student may go, not farther. Where Jesus of Nazareth has expounded the words of the Old Testament, or where Paul of Tarsus has set forth their meaning, the true and only true exposition is given. If a modern expounder undertakes to give another explanation, not in harmony with the New Testament, he is presumptuous, he has left Christian grounds.

Far is it from me to combat in your face such positions. So much only I may be allowed to state in this connection, that explanations of Old Testament passages similar to those of St. Paul and the other New Testament writers we find also in the Talmud and Midrash and in the mediæval literature of the Jews. "Shiloh" and Tsemah (*Branch*) were also understood by some Jewish teachers of former ages as having reference to a Messiah. There is, however, a great difference between the Midrash of the Jews and the Midrash of St. Paul, or rather between the position of the Jewish student towards the Jewish Midrash and the

position of the Christian student towards the Christian Midrash. The former sees in the Jewish Midrash historical documents showing how the Scriptures were understood by the Jews at certain times of the past; and to him, to the Jewish student, a transitory stage of Jewish Bible exegesis is thereby made clear. The Christian student, however, finds in the Christian Midrash, that is, in the New Testament, expositions of the Hebrew Scriptures, which he does not consider as merely transitory, as merely characteristic of their times, but which have become for him petrified, authoritative, unalterable.

I have arrived at the limits of the time allotted to me, and therefore I must close, In drawing now a logical conclusion of all that I have said, it seems to me this :

The main question which a scholarly Bible student should ask himself, ought to be, What was the original meaning which the Biblical author desired to express by his words? And in attempting to find a correct answer to this question; that one laying claim to the title of a Bible scholar should free his mind from all misleading preconceptions, from all sectarian bias;—truth, nothing but the truth, should be his aim.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

BY REV. J. W. HALEY,

Amherst, Mass.

II.

The next book on my list is entitled, *A Succinct Account of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Jews, as observed by them in their different dispersions throughout the world at this Present Time*, etc., etc. By David Levi, London.

No date is given in the book; but, judging from internal evidence, it was not far from A. D. 1784. The book is a duodecimo of some three hundred and eighteen pages, printed in antiquated style, with the old-fashioned long "s." The first hundred and thirty pages of the book are devoted to a discussion of the Sabbath, Jewish Calendar, Passover, Day of Sheaf-offering, Day of Atonement, Feast of Tabernacles, and Feast of Purim.

I observe that he says of the Jews during the Paschal Feast, "They likewise may not drink any liquor that is produced from any grain, or matter that is leavened. . . . Their drink during the time of the feast is either fair water or raisin wine prepared by themselves."

The next portion of the book, to page 213, is devoted to consideration of Marriage, Circumcision, Redemption of First-born, Visitation of Sick and Burial of Dead, Phylacteries, and customary Prayers. Under the head of Marriage, he says that an uncle may marry his niece, while an aunt is not permitted to marry her nephew; the reason being that, in the former case, the law of nature is not reversed, since the same person remained at the head who was so before; while, in the latter case, the nephew marrying his aunt becomes, as it were, her head, thereby reversing the order of nature.

With reference to betrothal, Rabbi Levi says that it is customary among the Jews for the bride and bridegroom to be betrothed for some time previous to the marriage, in order that, during the interval, they may test each other's temper.

and disposition, and, if they find sufficient concord and harmony, proceed to marriage; otherwise, not.

From page 213 to page 223, the author treats of Houses, Food and Utensils, and of Brotherly Love and Charity.

He tells us how food is rendered *Kosher*, that is, right or lawful for a Jew to eat. Cattle that are to be converted into beef must be killed by a Jew duly qualified and specially appointed for that purpose. He must examine the animal carefully, and, if any blemish or unsoundness is discovered, the flesh is deemed unfit for food. If a Gentile butcher undertakes to sell meat to the Jews, there is a Jew appointed by the rulers of the synagogue to superintend its preparation, to inspect it as it is cut up, and to put a seal upon it. This seal is of lead, with the word *Kosher* on one side, and on the other the day of the week in Hebrew characters. "Without such a seal," says the Rabbi, "no Jew will purchase meat at a Christian butcher's."

The last part of the book treats of the Mishna, or Oral Law, and its teachers; and of the Gemara, or exposition of the Mishna. The author takes occasion to animadvert severely upon some mistakes or misrepresentations of Dean Prideaux with reference to Jewish beliefs. The Dean had asserted that the Jews held only to a "Pythagorean resurrection," that is, to the transmigration of souls. This assertion Rabbi Levi refutes with some warmth and asperity. As a whole, the work seems marked by great fairness, and is, apparently, a faithful exponent of the belief and practice of the Israelites of more recent days.

The next work on my list is characterized by Orme as "the best work on modern Judaism in our language." Its title is, *Modern Judaism; or, A Brief Account of the Opinions, Traditions, Rites and Ceremonies of the Jews in Modern Times*. By John Allen, etc. Second edition. London, MDCCCXXX. It is an octavo volume of four hundred and sixty-two pages. It comprises twenty-five chapters, the contents of which are as follows:—Chapter I. Old Testament—reception by Jews; three-fold division, etc. II. Targums, or Chaldee Paraphrases. III. Talmud. IV. Reasons for believing the story of the Oral Law a fiction. V. The Cabbala. VI. Thirteen Articles of Jewish Faith. VII. Jewish Opinions as to the Moral Condition of Human Nature. VIII. Rabbinical Traditions concerning God. IX. Traditions concerning Angels. X. Traditions as to Paradise. XI. Traditions concerning Human Souls. XII. Traditions concerning Persons mentioned in the Old Testament. XIII. Traditions concerning Behemoth, Leviathan, Bar Juchne, Sambation. XIV. Traditions concerning Jesus of Nazareth. XV. Traditions concerning Messiah. XVI. Concerning Birth, Circumcision, Purification, etc. XVII. Dress of Jews. XVIII. Congregation, Synagogues, etc. XIX. Forms of Prayer. XX. Traditions respecting the Age of the World. XXI. Festivals and Fasts. XXII. Meats, Drinks and Utensils. XXIII. Marriage, Divorce, etc. XXIV. Sickness, Death, Burial, Mourning. XXV. Caraites. Where a work is so rich in contents as that before us, no excerpts will do it justice. He cites the famous Rabbi Jarchi as maintaining that Jews actually receive a "supernumerary soul" on the Sabbath day, which "carries out the mind of man to eating and drinking, and makes him eat and drink with appetite and pleasure."

Allen's testimony as to the drink used during the Passover festival is as follows, "They are forbidden to drink any liquor made from grain, or that has

passed through the process of fermentation. Their drink is either pure water, or raisin wine prepared by themselves."

As a whole, the work is far the most elaborate and comprehensive which we have met with, respecting the subject.

The next work to be noticed is an octavo of four hundred and forty pages, bearing the following title: *Ceremonies, Customs, Rites and Traditions of the Jews, interspersed with Gleanings from the Jerusalem and Babylonish Talmud, and the Targums, Mishna, Gemara, Maimonides, Abarbanel, Zohar, Aben-Ezra, Oral Law, etc.*, etc. By Ilyam Isaacs. Second edition. London, 1836. The author was a converted Jew, and the preface to his book breathes a truly Christian spirit. The book itself has neither Index, Table of Contents, nor division into chapters. The several topics treated in the work are as follows:—Thirteen Articles of Jewish Faith; Forms, Customs and Manners of the chief Jewish Festivals; Phylacteries; Afternoon Prayers; Courtship, Marriage and Ceremonies; the Ethics of the Fathers; Rulers, Judges, Prophets and Wise Men; ending with a resumé of the Mishna and Gemara.

Isaacs follows quite closely in the footsteps of his predecessors above described; and yet he adduces many odd traditions and usages which the others omit. For example, he asserts that, if a Jewess says her prayers, it is thought that neither good nor evil will result from it. He describes a curious kind of expiatory sacrifice practiced by the Jews. The person who is to sacrifice procures a cock, which must be slain by a Rabbi. The offerer then takes the dead fowl by the legs, swings it nine times over his head, and prays to God that all the sins which he himself has committed during the year may enter into the fowl. The animal is then, with a suitable donation, given to the poor for food.

The testimony of this learned Israelite relative to the drink used at the Passover is almost identical with that previously cited. According to him, no fermented or leavened article was permissible. He gives it as an invariable rule of the Jews to bury the dead in the most decent manner possible, and to treat the repositories of the dead with the utmost respect. He says the Jews think that "the moment the soul leaves the body, it directly enters into purgatory," from which it may be delivered by the prayers and kind offices of surviving relatives. "As long as the soul is in purgatory, so long does the body remain alive in the grave and feel the gnawing of the worms, for a longer or shorter period, according to the sins which they have committed when alive."

The author recites a queer tradition respecting the "Shameer," an insect unknown, we judge, to modern entomology. It appears that, when Solomon was about to build the temple, he was much in need of the services of this peculiar insect. This creature, of the size of a barley-corn, was hidden very carefully, although Satan knew the secret of the concealment. Solomon constrained Satan to disclose the secret, which he did with the greatest reluctance. The arch-fiend dived to the bottom of the sea, and brought up in his arms a stone weighing about a thousand tons. This, in a paroxysm of rage, he dashed to the earth, when the stone split open, revealing a cavity at the center in which lay the "Shameer." This little artificer was set at work the very next day. Solomon, by his wisdom, knew the shape and size of every stone which would be required in building the sacred edifice. So, going to the quarry, he took a pencil and marked the outline of every stone needed in the structure. This done, he placed the

"Shameer" upon the pencil-mark. The good little creature followed the tracings implicitly, never deviating to the right or the left. Strange to say, as he proceeded, the stone split asunder along the line, cleaving precisely into the required forms, and with highly polished surfaces!

Elsewhere he tells of the Leviathan, a huge fish which God created at the beginning, then killed and salted down, in readiness for the great feast at the coming of the Messiah, when every Jew is expected to be present, and participate in the festival.

With reference to marriage, he mentions the opinion that, since the man lost the rib, he naturally seeks for a partner, while the woman has no occasion to seek, since she lost nothing.

Another tradition which has an obvious moral is this. After the Flood, Noah planted a vine. When this began to grow, Satan came slyly and watered the roots with the blood of a lamb, a lion and a swine. This was absorbed by the vine, and wrought such a change in it, that, from that time forward, whoever drinks moderately becomes as a lamb, whoever drinks freely becomes fierce and ferocious, like a lion, while he who drinks to great excess becomes like a swine.

It may be said, in a word, that Isaacs's book well deserves study as a portraiture of Judaism by one intimately acquainted with the subject.

We mention, at this time, one other book, bearing title as follows: *Fundamental Principles of Modern Judaism Investigated*, etc., etc. By Moses Margoliouth, of Trinity College, Dublin. London, MDCCCXLIII. It is an octavo of some two hundred and ninety-six pages. The book opens with a preface by Rev. Chancellor Raikes. Then follows a discussion of the Fundamental Principles of Modern Judaism, under several heads,—Are Phylacteries warranted by Scripture? How do Jews interpret certain texts? Wearing of Phylacteries; Absurdities connected therewith; Doctrine of Trinity implied in certain Prayers; Wearing of Fringes; Fables as to the Talith; Resemblance of Talith to Popish Scapular; Virtues of Talith and Fringes; Superstitions as to the Mezuzah; Introduction to, and Statement of, the six hundred and thirteen Precepts; ending with an Address to the Jews, and one to Christians. The book is one of much interest, as affording another aspect of modern Judaism, different in many respects from that presented by any one of the above-named writers. The author writes in a devout Christian spirit, and addresses himself earnestly and tenderly to his former co-religionists. Space will not permit extracts; the outline above given will suffice.

We cannot but think that every Christian minister should carefully study modern Judaism, as represented by those writers who are thoroughly versed in the subject. So greatly are Christians, and the world in general, indebted to the Jews, that their customs, traditions and writings merit careful and patient examination. If that remark (attributed, we believe, to Disraeli), be true, that one half of the Christian world worships a Jew, and the other half (the Roman Church) a Jewess, we surely cannot afford to ignore the claims, or overlook the utterances, of the Jews of modern times.

THE COVENANT AND THE EARLY PROPHETS.

BY C. J. BREDENKAMP.

[Translated by Professor George H. Schodde, from *Gesetz und Propheten*, pp. 21-30. Erlangen, 1881.]

As the criticism of Baur and his school traced back the distinguishing peculiarities of the Christian religion rather to Paul than to Christ, so the latest critical school reduces the importance of the founder of the Old Testament religion to such small dimensions that the later prophets of the Northern Kingdom appear to be the real protagonists of its fundamental and essential ideas. While Wellhausen as yet has said scarcely anything of the importance of Moses; this, according to Kuenen, consists in the fact that he created a firm connection between Jehovah and the people whom he had led out of Egypt. His importance is represented to consist, not in anything that he fixed for the public worship of God or the political organization of the people, but in this that he firmly established the worship of the God of the fathers, whose new name was revealed to Moses—"I will be your God and ye shall be my people"—to have brought this to the full consciousness of his people is the sum and substance of Moses's life work. And this consciousness was not again lost to the people; on the other hand, his people were not able to understand anything else, especially not the ethical conception of God. "In one word," he says (*De Godsdiens van Israel*, I. p. 291), "that which distinguished Moses from his people remained his own personal possession and that of a few other spiritual associates—under the influence of Moses, Israel took one step forward, but it was only *one* step." Wellhausen, with correct judgment, sees that if the idea of an historical covenant established with the people once for all time under Moses, with certain conditions, is of great antiquity and universal, then his historical structure has lost its foundation. He accordingly denies that the older prophets had any knowledge of a covenant relation entered into by Jehovah with his people. In this way we are led to a discussion of the idea of ברית in its importance for the prophetic literature. We must decide whether the older prophets already acknowledge the Mosaic covenant as their basis or not, and what characteristics they ascribe to this covenant.

In reference to the etymon of ברית we cannot agree with the explanation, which has also found an entrance into Gesenius's Lexicon, according to which, (derived from כרה = to cut, to separate) *decision, determination* is the meaning, and then only, in a derived sense, a decision established to regulate the relationship between persons. But rather the original meaning is not διαθήκη (in the original sense of the word = *μόνοπλευρος*), but συνθήκη; i. e., ברית proceeds from a mutual relationship, as is shown from its frequent constructions with עם, את, בין. The conception διαθήκη, generally expressed by the construction with ל, originates in the fact that each covenant contains some individual stipulations. In addition to this comes the peculiar character of this covenant, according to which God, as the Higher Being, offers to and imposes upon men the duties without which no covenant is thinkable; accordingly, but little is said of the compliance of Jehovah, because he, on account of his fidelity, naturally does his duties, and in reality there is need of a reminder only on the part of the other party. Without doubt the expression כרת ברית, which can be compared with the parallel expressions ἄρκια τέμνειν and *foedus icere*, proves that the natural and oldest meaning of ברית is a covenant concluded with a sacrifice, as this original

signification can yet be traced in the word *ברית*, literally "cutting apart or into pieces," cf. Köhler, on Zech. ix., 11.

The idea of a covenant includes the idea that it constitutes a relationship of right which carries with it duties and rights of those entering upon this relationship. Jehovah binds himself to be to his people a faithful covenant God, and in return for this, demands obedience of the people, for which reason the prophets so frequently describe God in the act of passing judgment. Israel, on the other hand, has the right to expect the fulfilment of the divine promises, if it remains faithful to its covenant promises. It is a question whether the cultus element belonged to these covenant duties. As in general in olden times covenant and sacrifice were closely connected, thus, too, not only the expression *כרת ברית* and the etymon of *ברית*, but also Gen. xv. and more especially the account in Exod. xxiv., prove that this same connection was present to the Jewish mind also. Since the oldest account of the Mosaic covenant represents it as having been established through sacrifices, and since the Book of the Covenant itself contains sacrifice as an integral part, there can be no doubt that the Mosaic covenant is most closely connected with sacrifices. It is accordingly quite natural that Wellhausen should attempt to eliminate the idea of a covenant out of the oldest prophetic literature. But this is a combat against windmills. "The consciousness," says Kuenen, p. 290, "that a peculiar and new relationship existed between the God, in whose name Moses acted, and the tribes of Israel, did, not again die out." This, indeed, is the case. All the prophets stood upon the condition of affairs established by Moses at Sinai; in the Blessing of Moses the chief duty of the priesthood is represented to be the preservation of the covenant of God with his people (Deut. xxxiii., 9); and the Blessing of Moses, like the Song of Deborah, (Judg. v.) begins with a reference to the manifestation of God on Mount Sinai. Wellhausen thinks that the narrative in Exod. xxiv., 3-8 had no influence on the older prophets. It is strange how little the latent character of the Book of the Covenant, to whose frame-work Exod. xxiv. belongs, troubles him here, although he considers a similar character of the Priest Codex as most improbable. But even supposing that the Book of the Covenant together with its historical frame-work and the Blessing of Moses were unknown to the older prophets, or had not been acknowledged by them, which is most improbable, do we not find the same idea in the oldest prophets? Although Amos may not have the exact words, yet the thing itself is there. When in iii., 1 he says, "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O Children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities" (the prophet here evidently thinks of Exod. xix., 5), it is certainly natural to conclude that Amos knows of a closer relationship between Jehovah and Israel, i. e., knows of a covenant, on account of the violation of which he recognizes the justice of the divine punishment. When Hosea compares the connection between Jehovah and his people to a marriage and then uses the picture for the thing itself, viii., 1; vi., 7, does he not know of a covenant? In viii., 1 the sum of Israel's guilt is concentrated in the transgression of the covenant. And when Jehovah, in Isaiah, is the king, or master, or Lord of the vineyard, then certainly these figures are only other expressions for the covenant relation; for the king loves and protects his people, the father his children, the master of the vineyard his vineyard, as long as they produce what he is justified in asking of them; and, in the opposite case, he

certainly dissolves his relationship to them and lays upon them punishment and judgment. The word was not the source of the idea, as Wellhausen maintains, but rather the idea finds expression in various but generically alike figures and pictures. Just in the universal potency of the idea of the covenant lies the truth of what Duhm says, when he remarks that Israel as a people is the object of the sermons of the older prophets, although he is wrong in denying the recognition of the individual. For the covenant is in the first instance a covenant of the people. In reality an impartial examination finds no difference between the older and the younger prophets in the conception of the covenant; as in general the stability of Old Testament ideas is much greater than is generally acknowledged. The remark of Guthe is indeed correct, that all the features of the sermons of Jeremiah unite and concentrate in the idea of a covenant, and that this idea appears more in this prophet than in any other. But his whole work as a preacher can be summed up in the *ברית* only for this reason that its importance is so central not only with "the authorities of Biblical Theology," but in the Old Testament religion itself; and in principle this is true also in the case of the older prophets. To conclude from the fact that Jeremiah never uses the word *ברית* metaphorically (as Job v., 23; Hos. II., 20) and never otherwise than in a religious sense, that he was the first to restrict the idea of a covenant to the purely religious sphere, and consequently entertained an idea of a covenant peculiar to himself, is certainly most superficial. Why could he not have used a term so common as this, as is done in Zech. XI., 10, or Mal. II., 14? Wellhausen commits the same blunder when he concludes from the covenant with the beasts in Hos. II., 18 that Hosea had not the specific idea of a covenant. With such feeble arguments it will be impossible to argue away the fact that all the prophets stand upon the covenant founded by Moses. Or do these critics think that possibly the establishment of a covenant was not effected through Moses? It could possibly be considered somewhat surprising that the name of Moses is so seldom found in the older prophets. But why should that be said which all know? Is not the same true in the earliest records as found in Genesis? The *ex silentio* argument, which plays so important a role in modern criticism, often proves to be very mechanical. When in Amos III., 1 sq. the special election of Israel for a peculiar relationship with God is brought into connection with the exodus out of Egypt, then certainly the exodus which took place under Moses is not the only ground for the duty of compliance, for a similar treatment had been accorded to Kush, Aram and Philistæa by Jehovah; he must know other fundamental facts besides these from the time of the beginning of the congregation, which, as a matter of course, transpired through the same mediator. And does Hosea (XII., 12 sq.) not set up Moses beside Jacob only as a prophet such as others. He says there, "And Jacob fled into the country of Syria, and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep. And by a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved." The contrast here evidently is this, that while Ephraim boasts of Jacob and Bethel, it has forgotten him who is greater, through whom God had led them out of Egypt and protected them. As much higher as a prophet is than a serving shepherd, so much higher Moses stands than the poor Jacob serving for a wife. It has been thought by Ewald and others that this historical retrospect is to illustrate the miraculous divine preservation in dangers. But, in the case of Jacob, we hear nothing of a deliverance from danger; but the poor shepherd's life of Jacob is contrasted with the prophetic activity

of Moses. The former watched the sheep for a wife; the latter watched over the people. It is all the worse that Ephraim has provoked anger most bitterly, that he spoke trembling, exalted himself in Israel, and has continued this conduct up to now (XII., 15; XIII., 1, 2). It is easily seen how groundless it is to suppose that Hosea is only laying down the foundation ideas of Israel's religion. For him, Ephraim's sin is backsliding from the Mosaic past and *מישמרת*. For this relationship lies clear to the view in his thought. The Mosaic times are the times of the first and youthful love (Hos. XI., 1); so entirely are the older prophets rooted to the covenant as founded by Moses. That Amos (v., 26) does not teach that Israel's religion was developed out of an originally Sabaic form of worship, as Vatke thinks, will soon be seen. Indeed, the whole manner of the prophets is such that they do not preach new doctrines. They do not endeavor to prove why people should comply with the religious and moral precepts; they rather presuppose that the sins of the people are transgressions against old and well-known truths; they live and have their being in the covenant relation, and accuse the people of unfaithfulness to this covenant. And the people are one with the prophets in this regard; every child in Israel knows that God, through Moses, had entered into a covenant relation with Israel. Smend, *Moses apud Prophetas*, p. 19, correctly remarks: "*Fœdus semel in Monte Sinai per Mosem junctum esse, traditione certissima atque unanimi antiquitus constabat.*" All the more the above stated question, whether the cultus element was included in the idea of a covenant, demands an answer. However closely covenant and sacrifice may have been connected in Israel, it would, nevertheless, have been possible for the prophets to have formed their own conception of the covenant. They would, of course, in doing so, have renewed their connection with the whole past, which considered the sacrifices as a portion of the Mosaic legislation, and, from the outstart, it is impossible that a prophet would have assumed a hostile attitude against the sacrificial system which was so closely interwoven with the history of the people. As Moses already, although, according to the covenant account of both Elohist and Jehovistic sources (Ex. III. and VI.), the name Jehovah was first revealed to him, nevertheless came to his people in the name of the God of their fathers, thus too every true prophet must live in the spiritual world and history of his people; otherwise, his activity is without historic connection. It creates no favorable opinion of the consistency of the modern critics, that they cut away the activity of the prophets from the roots of the religious past. For, from the prophetic polemics against the sacrifices as practiced in those days, so much at least is incontestably clear, that Israel must have lived in the faith that such offerings were pleasing to God. The people entertain no other idea but that in the oldest times the piety of the fathers found expression in such sacrifices. From the first offerings of Cain and Abel, through the patriarchal age, the practice of sacrificing was kept up, either to secure or to retain the good pleasure of God. Above all, Moses himself, according to all accounts, received into the legislation and sanctioned the sacrificial system. In truth, it is difficult to understand how true prophets, whose activity, as it appears, was guided by the principle expressed in Matt. III., 15, could, in so radical a manner, have deserted the common basis of an understanding with the people. They would have proclaimed an entirely new and strange conception of a covenant to the people.

How closely the covenant idea was associated with sacrifices in the religious consciousness of the Israelites can be seen, not only from Zech. ix., 11, where the

return of those in exile is predicted on account of the blood of the covenant, where, consequently, the connection between sacrifice and covenant is presupposed as a fixed and accepted fact, but also from Ps. L. This psalm is of an entirely prophetic character, and, according to popular exegesis—which, however, we cannot accept—is claimed to oppose sacrifices most emphatically. All the more important is it that the psalmist gives us his theme in verse 6, "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Whether the participle 'כרת' be taken in the sense of the past or present, the conclusion in each case follows that, in the eyes of the saints, the covenant was concluded and maintained only on the basis of sacrifices. כרת and זכה are, in the eyes of the "saints," inseparable. The prophet, indeed, is not to join in with this view; but even conceding this, it is, nevertheless, certain that his contemporaries, and, indeed, the saints among them—for an ironical interpretation of חסידים is not to be thought of—unite covenant and sacrifice. At any rate this psalmist, like Jeremiah, who (VII., 21 sq.) is claimed to exclude sacrifices from among the duties of the covenant, could have been permitted to hold his own peculiar view. The *divide et impera* has so much become the practice of the newer Old Testament criticism, that this possibility must not be left out of sight. Especially is it Duhm who ascribes not only to the prophets, but also to each prophet individually, a peculiar system of doctrine over against the law; as though the prophets were to be regarded in the light of modern systematizing theologians. In this manner he sets up his dry categories which oppose each other, like skeleton beings, so that, instead of a living picture, only the broken bones of dry conceptions and theological statements lie on the ground, and the wonderful harmony of the whole activity of prophecy is destroyed. While, according to this view, Hosea still permits sacrifices, Amos knows only of an entirely wordless cultus. Wellhausen, indeed, does not deal with such follies, but seeks to give a complete historical picture. He is, indeed, thereby compelled to make even men like Hosea opponents of sacrifices. The whole prophetic literature as such, according to the views of Wellhausen and of other critics, is claimed to stand in an irreconcilable antagonism to sacrifices as a divine institution. According to this, then, the covenant with God would have been conceived by the prophets as without sacrifices. But as no prophet expressly restricts the idea of the covenant in this manner, we will be able to decide this question only in the later discussion. Here it will suffice to mention the conclusion we have reached: The oldest prophecy has its roots entirely in the covenant concluded by Moses, mentions it repeatedly; and, when this is not done by name, the thing itself is there. If they conceived the duties of the covenant to be merely of a moral nature (*sittlich*), then the prophets contradict the fundamental ideas of the traditional religion and the method practiced by the fathers to prove their piety.

NOTES FROM ABROAD.

BY ROBERT F. HARPER.

Prof. Dr. J. Euting has recently returned to Strasbourg after fifteen months' absence in Inner-Arabia. His preparatory announcement of the results of his journey written to the Freiherr von Manteuffel and dated Beirut, July 13, 1884, is as follows: "On May 22d, '83, I left Strasbourg. From June to August I spent in Middle Syria and undertook a journey to Palmyra, from which place, among other things, I brought back a copy of a bi-lingual (Palmyrenish-Greek) inscription, which has long been desired by the Berlin Academy. Five chests of mummies and skulls, a number of altar and grave-stones are at present still in Palmyra. On the 31st of August, I undertook the journey proper into Inner-Arabia. After three months' stay in Hajel, the residence of Emir Mohammed ibn Raschid, on the 23d of January, '84, I travelled westward to Teima (an exceedingly old city mentioned in Isa. XXI., 14). Here I discovered a stone with an Aramaic inscription and a likeness of king Schozab ben Petosiri clothed in an Assyrian costume, dating in my opinion, from the eighth century B. C. Besides this valuable stone I found still others of less importance. The weary and dangerous journey to the ruins of Tibuk received no compensation. On the other hand, the ruins of the cities of Madein-Salich and el-Oela surpassed my expectations. I found there about thirty well-preserved and dated inscriptions in the Nabataean (dating from the times of the Nabataean kings Haretat-Aretas I. and Aretas II. who resided in Petra at the time of Christ) and fifty-five inscriptions in Himjaritic (South-Arabic). The impressions on paper and two stones as tests of the different sorts of writing have arrived safely in Strasbourg. Besides, I have copied in my day-books many hundred shorter inscriptions in a form of writing differing from the Himjaritic and up to the present time unknown." Prof. Euting also hopes, through the agency of an intelligent young Egyptian who passes yearly by the ruins of Bada and Maghair Schoaib to obtain impressions of the inscriptions in these places.

H. L. Strack, after a favorable review of Paul de Lagarde's "*Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior Graece*" in the *Theol. Litbl.*, No. 38, in the course of which he states that the last stereotyped edition of Tischendorf is utterly worthless, closes with the following appeal, "The second volume will finish the work. Will it appear? Theological Germany! P. de Lagarde prints the book at his own expense. He cannot and will not print the second volume, until he has, in a great measure, received back the money expended in the first. Will you not regard it as a duty of honor to assist this important work by purchasing a copy? Almost a year has gone by and, so far as I know, no scientific journal in Germany has, by a notice, recognized the importance of this publication. The fact that the author is not in a position to furnish copies for notice is not sufficient reason for this neglect, etc." It should be truly regretted that such men as Lagarde and Dillmann cannot find publishers for their works, viz., respectively, the Septuagint and the Ethiopic version of the Bible, and hence that the results of their labors and investigations must to a great extent be lost to scholars. Well has the critic bewailed the fact that Germany which claims to be the mother of all learning has turned her back to such important works as these.

Among the numerous books in preparation the following may be mentioned:

‘Arabische Grammatik nebst Uebungsstücken, Litteratur und Vocabular’ by Dr. Socin, Professor at Tübingen. This work will be published by H. Reuther and will take the place of Petermann’s “Grammatica Arabica” as Vol. IV. of the *Porta linguarum Orientalium*. An English edition will appear at the same time with the German. This book is expected very soon.—“Die Psalmen aus dem Grundtext übersetzt und durch eine fortlaufende Besprechung erläutert” by Lic. Dr. V. Andreae.—“Skizzen und Vorarbeiten” by Julius Wellhausen. Vol. I. 1. “Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Judas.” 2. “Lieder der Hudhaliten, deutsch und arabisch.”

October 12th.

→GENERAL NOTES←

The Non-Messianic Interpretations of Isalah LIII.—The most prevalent opinion among recent Jewish writers is that by the Servant of Jehovah, whose sufferings are here portrayed, is meant *the nation of Israel*. According to them, the prophecy describes the misery to which Israel is subjected, his stedfast adherence to the worship of the one living and true God amid the idolatry of the nations, and his final deliverance and glory. This opinion has been adopted and maintained by Rashi, Abenezra, David Kimchi, Lipmann, Adler, and other distinguished Jewish writers. Among them, however, there is some diversity of opinion. Some suppose that the whole Jewish nation is personified; whilst others, as Rashi and Lipmann, restrict the prophecy to the pious portion of the people. Thus Rabbi Rashi, commenting on Isa. LIII., 13: “Behold, my Servant shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high,” explains the words: “Behold, in the latter days my servant Jacob shall prosper, that is, the righteous who are in his midst.” Most of those Christian writers, who have adopted a non-Messianic interpretation, have also given a somewhat similar explanation but with a considerable diversity of opinion, Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Hendewerk, Köster, and Hitzig suppose that the whole nation of Israel is the subject of prophecy; Ewald, Bleek, Riehm, and Dr. Davidson think that the ideal Israel—Israel in the imagination of the prophet—is referred to; whilst Paulus, Thenius, Anger, and Kuenen restrict the application to the true worshippers of God as contrasted with the ungodly. Knobel supposes that we must distinguish the Servant of Jehovah in a wider and narrower sense: in a wider sense, the whole people of Israel are meant, so far as they had not apostatized from Jehovah, thus both the true and false worshippers; in the narrow sense, the true worshippers of Jehovah, the kernel of the nation, are meant; and he asserts that in this prophecy the phrase is sometimes used in the one sense and sometimes in the other. Oehler adopts the peculiar opinion that at first the Servant of Jehovah was used in a collective sense, denoting Israel; but as the prophet proceeded, the collective sense is dropped and an individual is represented, as is especially the case in this Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. “The figure,” he observes, “represents first the servants of God collectively, from which the holy seed proceeds which is to form the stock of the new church, and then culminates in an individual. This Servant, the ideal Israel, is accordingly called to establish judgment in the earth, and the isles wait for his law.

He is the light of the Gentiles, and through him the salvation of the Lord is to penetrate to the end of the earth." And, again, he observes: "The prophetic intuition of the Servant of Jehovah in the Book of Isaiah (XL-LXVI.) commences with the nation, but culminates in an individual. So early as chap. XLII. and XLIX., the view is gradually transferred from the nation to an individual distinct from the nation, who (XLII., 6) negotiates a covenant for the people, and then becomes the light of the Gentiles, who, as mediator of the covenant, re-settles the people, like a second Joshua, in the possession of the land (XLIX., 8). Even if these passages are got over by referring the Servant, so far as he is distinguished from the people, to that germ which represents the genuine Israel, the aggregate of the servants of God, including the true prophets chap. LIII., on the contrary, can only refer to an individual." This theory is very ingenious; it accounts for all those passages in which the Servant of Jehovah is called Israel and the "Seed of Jacob;" and it tries to reconcile both views—the opinion of those who consider that by the Servant of Jehovah the nation of Israel is meant, and the opinion of those who consider that a personal Messiah is intended.

The second non-Messianic interpretation worthy of mention is, that by the Servant of Jehovah is meant the *prophetic order*. This opinion is not nearly so generally maintained as the idea that the nation of Israel is intended: still it is adopted and defended by several distinguished theologians. Among its advocates are to be reckoned Gesenius, De Wette, Schenkel, and, to some extent, Umbreit and Hofmann. Umbreit remarks, "The Servant of Jehovah is the collective body of the prophets or the prophetic order, which is here represented as the sacrificial victim taking upon himself the sins of the people." But he considers that the prophetic order is only fully realized in the Messiah, the ideal prophet; and he thus finds an application of the prophecy to Jesus, as the Anointed Prophet, in whom resided the fulness of the prophetic gift. The view of Hofmann, as given in his *Schriftbeweis*, so far as the meaning of that obscure but most suggestive writer can be understood, is somewhat similar. The vocation of Israel, he observes, is that of a prophet or of a witness of God to mankind, as it is said, "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my Servant whom I have chosen" (Isa. XLIII., 10). This is especially seen in the prophetic order, who were despised and rejected by the people, as was pre-eminently the case with Isaiah himself. But the culmination of this prophetic mission will be especially seen in him who is the ideal prophet, namely, the Messiah. In this view Hofmann carries out His peculiar notion that history itself is prophecy.

The third non-Messianic view to be noticed here is, that by the Servant of Jehovah an *individual* is meant. The personal traits in the prophecy have constrained to the adoption of this view. Accordingly various persons have been fixed upon. Augusti supposes that Uzziah is here meant, Bahrdt fixes on Hezekiah, and Steudel on the prophet Isaiah himself. Rabbi Abardanel at first supposed that the nation of Israel was meant, but he changed his opinion, and made King Josiah the subject of the prophecy. "The whole prophecy," he observes, "was uttered with reference to King Josiah." The person, however, who has been most frequently fixed upon is the prophet Jeremiah. This opinion was first promulgated by Rabbi Saadia Gaon; it was afterwards favored by the illustrious Grotius, and has recently been defended by Baron

Bunsen. Professor Williams, in his theological essay on Bunsen's *Biblical Researches*, expresses himself favorably regarding it. He observes that if any single person should be selected, it is Jeremiah, and that "the figure of Jeremiah stood forth amongst the prophets, and tinged the delineation of the true Israel, that is, the *faithful remnant* (whom he considers to be meant by the Servant of Jehovah), just as the figure of Laud or Hammond might represent the Caroline Church in the eyes of her poet." Ewald was so struck with the personal characteristics of this prophecy that he relinquished in regard to this chapter the view that the ideal Israel is meant, and supposes that some unknown sufferer—some single martyr—is intended; and he regards this portion as interpolated from an older book. To such straits are non-Messianic interpreters forced to have recourse.—*From Gloag's Messianic Prophecies.*

→ CONTRIBUTED NOTES. ←

"Gamaliel ben Pedahzur."—*Fermented or Unfermented Wine?*—In the last number of *The Old Testament Student*, the Rev. J. W. Haley published some interesting *Bibliographical Notes*, among them notes on that rare work, *The Book of Religion, Ceremonies and Prayers of the Jews, etc.*, by Gamaliel ben Pedahzur. London, 1738.

The author's name is a pseudonym. Gamaliel ben Pedahzur was the name of a prince of the tribe of Manasseh, mentioned five times in the Bible (Num. i., 10; ii., 20; vii., 54, 59; x., 23), and occurring nowhere else. In post-biblical times, the name Pedahzur fell out of use altogether; and, in the whole Jewish history, that name does not appear. The name Gamaliel, likewise, which, in the Talmudical period, was borne by five or six men mentioned in the literature of those days, has disappeared almost entirely in post-talmudical times. Moreover, the reliable and learned Joseph Zedner, who compiled the *Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the British Museum*, says explicitly in said catalogue, p. 254, that the author's name is a pseudonym. From inner evidences, we must conclude that the author was not a Jew at all, but a Christian.

But there is another point in Mr. Haley's remarks which impels me to write the present lines. He says: "I observe that Gamaliel ben Pedahzur agrees with other Jewish authorities in the statement that the Jews, at Passover, drink no fermented wine. His words are (p. 55): 'Their Drinkables is either fair Water, or Water boiled with Sassafras and Liquorish, or Raisin-Wine prepared by themselves.'"

It is, first, to be remarked that the words "at Passover" seem to have been written inadvertently by Mr. Haley. Gamaliel ben Pedahzur spoke evidently of the use of "Drinkables" at all times.

Secondly, interesting as the book may be in several regards, it betrays gross ignorance, if it should say that the Jews, in consequence of their religion and law, abstain from drinking fermented wine. The author does not agree "with other Jewish authorities" in his statement. The utmost we can concede is that he may agree with other, Jewish or Gentile, writers, who are ignorant so far as concerns this matter.

The *Halakhah*, i. e., the Talmudical law, ordains the ritualistic use of wine on several occasions, e. g., when grace after meal (*birkhath hammazon*) is said; at *qiddush*, (on the commencement of the Sabbath); at *habhdalah* (on the close of the Sabbath); at the eve of Passover, when four cups of wine were to be drunk; and on a few other occasions. On all these religious and semi-religious occasions, fermented wine (*yayin hay*), mixed with water, was to be used (the unfermented wine being considered too strong); and only when fermented wine was not to be had, unfermented wine was allowed. In support of these statements, a large number of Talmudical passages can be referred to; e. g., B'rakhoth 51; Babha Bathra 96, 98; P'saḥim 108, etc.

But how do some people say that only raisin-wine, or other kinds of unfermented wine, were legally permitted to the Jews? Those who at first said so, may, in Poland or in Russia, or in some other poor northern country, have actually observed the exclusive use of raisin-wine or the like. But they did not know that in southern Germany, in France, Italy, and other wine-producing countries, fermented grape-wine has been in use among the Jews for time immemorial. They did not know that, when Jews in poorer countries made use of raisin-wine or similar concoctions, they did so under an indulgence granted by the Jewish casuists, who said that, in case fermented grape-wine should be too high-priced, or in case *Kasher* grape wine, which a strict law-abiding Jew might drink, could not be had, substitutes might be used. It is sufficient to refer, in regard to this point, to Jacob ben Asher's 'Arba'ah Turim and Joseph Caro's Shulkhan 'Arukh, I., §§ 182, 183, 272, 472, etc., and the parallel passages in Maimonides's Mishnēh Torah, and in the other casuistic books.

Let me, in conclusion, cite a word of Rabbi Judah bar Ilai, who lived in Palestine in the middle of the second century, and who had a natural dislike for wine. He said once to an interrogator, "Believe me that I never taste wine but for *qiddush*, for *habhdalah*, and the four cups on *Passah*; and then my head aches from Passover to Pentecost." (N'dharim 49, b.) It was certainly no wine made of raisins, of which that Rabbi drank, and of which, as a pious Jew, he was bound to drink.

The subject is not exhausted; but this may be sufficient at least to prove that neither the Jewish life nor the Jewish law knew anything of the theory of total abstinence.

B. FELSENTHAL.

George Henry August Ewald.—Germany, which is prolific in prolific writers, has hardly produced the equal of Ewald this century. Few writers have bestowed as much painstaking care on their few small works as he on each of his numerous and robust progeny. He died in 1875, in his seventy-second year. His first work, bearing the pretentious title: "The Composition of Genesis Critically Examined," he published at twenty, and he had just finished the fourth volume of his "Theology of the Old and New Covenant" when he died. Hardly a year intervened without a new demand on his publisher. Not to speak of review articles without number, and the magazine which he filled for twelve volumes with his own articles, the number of his greater works is simply astonishing. They were all centered about Oriental literature. He taught Persian, Turkish, Armenian, Coptic and Sanscrit and published grammars of Hebrew and Arabic. The works by which he is best known are his commentaries on the poetical and prophetic books of the Old Testament, and his History of the People of Israel.

The entire New Testament received comments at his hands. Though highly honored in the world of letters, his political views twice led to his dismissal from his chair at Göttingen, once in 1837, when he went to Tubingen, then again, after returning in 1848, his discontent with the Prussian annexation of Hanover led to his retirement in 1867. He was original, and like Archbishop Whately assumed that if nobody took the trouble to answer his books they were therefore unanswerable. He frequently quotes, but almost invariably from himself. He seemed to feel as Louis XIV., Exegetical science, it is I. He formed few friendships though his pupils admired him, and he would always assist them. The generally received opinion of Ewald places him among semi-rationalists. This is due to his peculiar views of the composition of the books of the Bible. But however he may rearrange them chronologically, he resists Hitzig and Strauss in their endeavors to make them too recent. One should turn from Ewald's critical and apparently destructive works to his last book, and see him as he constructs and lays down positively what he does believe concerning revelation, in order to judge him fairly as a devout student of God's Word.

W. W. E., Jr.

A new translation of Isaiah XLI.—

1. Come silently to me, ye far-off lands, and let the peoples renew their strength; let them draw near, then let them speak; let us meet together for the judgment.
2. Who hath roused up Righteousness from the East? He calleth him to his foot, he giveth up nations before him, and letteth him trample on kings; his sword maketh them as dust, his bow as driven chaff. He pursueth them; he passeth over safely; he treadeth not the road with his feet.
4. Who hath undertaken and brought to pass, calling the generations from the beginning? I, Jehovah, the first, and with the last I am the same.
5. Far-off lands have seen, and are afraid; the ends of the earth tremble; they have approached and come near. Every one helpeth his neighbor, and saith to his brother, Be strong! And the blacksmith hath strengthened the goldsmith; the smoother with the hammer the smiter on the anvil, saying of the welding: It is good! and he hath fastened it with nails; it will not shake. But thou, Israel my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, seed of Abraham who loved me; Thou whom I have laid hold of from the ends of the earth, and called from its borders, and to whom I have said: thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away; Fear not, for I am with thee; look not around, for I am thy God; I make thee strong, I also help thee, I also uphold thee by the right hand of my righteousness.
11. Lo! all who have been angry with thee shall be ashamed and confounded; the men who strive with thee shall be as nought and shall perish. Thou shalt seek them and find them not—the men who contend with thee; the men who were with thee shall be as nought and as nothingness. For I, Jehovah, thy God, hold thy right hand; I who say to thee, Fear not; I help thee.
14. Fear not, thou worm Jacob, ye men of Israel; I help thee, saith Jehovah, and thy Redeemer is the Holy One of Israel. Behold, I make of thee a threshing-sledge, sharp, new, possessed of teeth; thou shalt thresh mountains and make them dust, and of hills thou shalt make chaff. Thou

- shalt winnow them, and the wind will take them up and the storm-wind will scatter them, but thou shalt exult in Jehovah; in the Holy One of Israel thou shalt glory.
17. The afflicted and the needy seek water and there is none; their tongue faileth for thirst! I, Jehovah will answer them; I, the God
18. of Israel will not forsake them. I will open streams upon bare hill-tops, and fountains in the midst of valleys; I will make the wilderness a lake of
19. water, and the dry place springs of water. I will give in the wilderness the cedar, acacia, and myrtle, and the tree of fatness; I will set in the desert
20. together the cypress, plane-tree and sherbin-cedar. That they may both see and hear and lay to heart and understand that the hand of Jehovah hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it.
21. Present your cause, saith Jehovah: produce your defences, saith the King
22. of Jacob. Let them produce them, and show us what things will happen; show the past events, what they are; that we may fix our mind upon them, and know the issue of them; or make us hear the things to come.
23. Show what will be hereafter, that we may know ye are gods; yea, do good,
24. or do evil, that we may confront one another, and behold together. Lo! ye are of nought, and your work is of wind; whoever chooseth you is abomination.
25. I have roused up one from the North, and he is come! from the rising of the sun he shall call on my name; and he shall come upon
26. satraps as mud, and as a potter treadeth clay. Who hath shown it from the beginning, that we might know? and beforehand, that we might say, Right? Nay, none declared; nay, none caused to hear; nay, none heard
27. your words. I will give a first-fruit to Zion (saying) Behold, behold them;
28. and to Jerusalem a herald of joy. Though I look, there is no man; even among these there is no counsellor, that I should ask them, and they should
29. answer aught. Lo! all of them are emptiness; their works are nothingness; their molten images are wind and worthlessness.

WM. H. COBB.

[NOTE. The basis of this paper is a translation prepared by a local Hebrew club, of which the writer is a member.]

→ EDITORIAL NOTES. ←

Questions of Criticism; how and by whom shall they be settled?—This question is a living one; and in answering it, nine out of ten men, we believe, answer wrongly.

Many important variations between tradition and criticism confront us. And here we may confine ourselves to those questions, for there are many such, in which tradition on the one hand is definite and pronounced, while criticism, on the other hand, is unanimous and positive. What is to be done?

Nothing, say some. These differences will settle themselves. We need not interfere. The trouble will soon be at an end. The questions are, after all, of no great moment. These "theories" are merely the imagination of critics. They are only bubbles. In a short time they will be out of sight, and out of memory.

Nothing, say others. Indeed there is nothing which the student of our day can do. These questions have been settled for centuries. Our Lord settled them.

He who treats them as still open, who dares even to grant the right of discussion, exhibits a lack of proper faith in the New Testament. Such an one is no longer to be trusted.

Nothing, say still others. As a matter of fact you cannot do anything. We, who have given our lives to the study of these questions—we must settle them. You cannot be expected to know anything about them. You must remain silent. Hear what we may have to say, and accept it; but do not think that you can do anything whatever in settling these questions. Such an idea would be a preposterous one. Listen to us. We know. It is *our* affair. *You have nothing to do with it.*

Everything, we say,—everything that can be done. The path is an open one; we may all tread it. Some may go farther than others, but all may go. Let every Bible student investigate for himself these questions. With a heart open to the truth, with a mind free from prejudice, let him go to work. Examine the conflicting views. Take up, verse by verse, the texts and passages, for example, that are claimed to indicate the post-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. "*And the Canaanite was then in the land.*" (Gen. XII., 3.) Does this verse imply that at the time of the writer, the Canaanite had been driven out of the land? If so, Moses did not write it. Or, is it an interpolation? Or, may it be a statement intended to declare that the land was inhabited? Or, does it mean that *already* the land was in the hands of the Canaanites, even at this early date? "*And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the Children of Israel*" (Gen. XXXVI., 31). Does this imply that a monarchy began in Israel immediately after those kings, and that a monarchy had begun at the time of the writer? If so, Moses did not write it. Or, may the whole passage be explained as an interpolation from 1 Chron. I., 43-54? Or, is this a reference, based upon the expectation of the Israelites to have a king, an expectation aroused by God's promises to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob?

Continue this work patiently, deciding in each case what seems, upon the whole, to be the most natural interpretation. Having examined thus the single passages, study the laws which are claimed to be post-Mosaic. Investigate the so-called historical repetitions, the legal repetitions, the discrepancies, the cases of unnatural arrangement, etc. Now take the Pentateuch, verse by verse, and chapter by chapter, follow minutely the so-called Jehovistic and Elohist documents. When one is supposed to give place to the other, ascertain the reasons which are assigned for this supposition. Examine the various peculiarities which are said to mark each of the documents. Next, go back and collect all the evidence in favor of the Mosaic authorship. Arrange and systematize it. Sift it, and retain only what is legitimate. After this work,—a work which any Bible student, worthy of the name can do, a work which can be done quite largely with the English version—you are in a position to decide, so far as you are concerned, whether Moses did or did not write the Pentateuch. Nor is any man in a position to decide this question, or indeed to express an opinion of scientific value concerning it, who has not done just this work.

But by whom shall this be done? We answer: by every intelligent Bible student. There is nothing to prevent the average pastor from thus preparing himself. The "specialist" may do the pioneer work; he may point out what may seem to him to be "facts." But we are under no obligation to accept his "facts," much less the conclusions drawn from them, until we have weighed the evidence

which he presents in their favor. We may examine the so-called facts and reject all for which there is not sufficient evidence. We may decide, each for himself, what these facts shall teach him. This is our privilege; nay rather it is our duty.

The Department of the Old Testament in the Seminary.—The wide scope of the Department of the Old Testament is not generally considered. What must be included in it is really appreciated by very few. In no other field of theological study has there, within half a century, been so great an advance, so marked a "widening." What, in our day, is the Old Testament professor supposed to teach? 1) *The Hebrew Language*; nor is the divinity student any longer satisfied with the meagre knowledge of this language, thought sufficient twenty-five years ago. Instead of merely memorizing the paradigms, and becoming slightly acquainted with a few of the most common linguistic principles, the student must master the multitude of facts which make up the language, and understand the principles which regulate these facts. He must know the meaning of a thousand Hebrew words, instead of a hundred. He must read chapters, where formerly verses were read, and entire books, where chapters were read. The student is expected to leave the Seminary, able to read with ease his Hebrew Bible; this expectation, however, is realized only in the case of a small proportion. Although the ideal is, in our day, so much higher than heretofore, for various reasons which need not here be specified, the actual state of affairs is far from an encouraging one. "Oh! for more time," is the cry that ascends daily and hourly from the heart of the professor of the Old Testament.

2) *The Cognate Languages*; among which at least Aramaic, Syriac, Assyrian and Arabic are to be reckoned. Instruction in these languages must be given; because they furnish much material which is of use in a proper understanding of Hebrew grammar; because from these, often, information must be gained for the elucidation of Hebrew words of doubtful meaning; because in one of these languages, a portion of the Old Testament is written, and in another, there are locked up historical annals, contemporaneous with the Biblical records themselves. For these, and for other reasons, the cognates are studied. It is not wise, of course, for all students to endeavor to obtain a knowledge of these languages. This, indeed, is not even possible. But there are a few, and the number increases each year, who desire this instruction, and for whom it is most profitable.

3) *History*; and here we must include (a) the geography of Palestine and other Bible-lands, an acquaintance with which is demanded of Bible students; (b) the archaeology of the Old Testament,—the manners and customs, laws and institutions of the chosen people and of other nations mentioned in Scripture; (c) Sacred History proper, from the earliest times to the coming of the Messiah; and (d) the history of the nations with whom Israel came into contact; e. g., the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Romans, and others.

By far too little attention is given to this subject. The ignorance, which exists among those who ought to be familiar with these matters, is, indeed, remarkable. Of all the sub-departments connected with the Old Testament, this one is, perhaps, most neglected. That knowledge which is most essential, after a knowledge of the original languages, for any kind of Bible work, whether literary or exegetical, is in most cases lacking. Anything like an intimate acquaintance with the facts of Old Testament history, to say nothing of the philosophy of Old Testament history, is a rare acquisition. This is so, in large part, because no

attention is paid the subject in the Seminary. And although the professor of the Old Testament is appointed to teach the Old Testament, of which a large portion is history, and the remainder unintelligible except in its historical connection, this service is not performed; partly, because with the many other duties devolving upon the instructor *he* cannot find time, and partly because as the work of the Seminary is proportioned, there seems to be no time for the student to devote to it. That any other than an Old Testament specialist should be entrusted with this historical work, is, as Professor Curtiss has already stated, no longer possible.

4) *Literature*; which includes (a) Canonics, or the study of the Canon of Scripture; (b) Textual Criticism, or the determination of the true text; (c) Literary Criticism, or the study of separate Books and sections, with a view to ascertaining their authorship, date, integrity, style, etc. This work is, at present, receiving a large share of the attention of students and teachers; and this is rightly so. We can scarcely regard any part of the work of the Biblical scholar, as more important. The so-called "results" of destructive criticism are certainly to be rejected; but this does not imply that the methods and principles of Literary or "Higher" Criticism are to be ignored. The student, who endeavors to interpret the twenty-third psalm, without employing all the methods, and without working in accordance with all the principles of Higher Criticism, in order thereby to determine (1) whether David was really the author; (2) under what circumstances the psalm was written; (3) the literary style and character of the psalm,—that man fails utterly in his attempt at interpretation. The same may be said of him who would interpret a prophet, or an historian, without this aid. Let instruction in the Old Testament department include, however, not merely a history of critics, and of criticism; let it rather teach the methods and principles of criticism, after a thorough examination of the facts; i. e., the facts that *are* facts.

5) *Interpretation*; and here a distinction must be made between (a) Hermeneutics, the principles of Interpretation; (b) Exegetics, the rules of Interpretation, and (c) Exegesis, the work of Interpretation. This is the main work of the Old Testament professor. All other work is preliminary and preparatory. It is here that the largest share of time is spent,—and spent, too frequently, without satisfactory results. We would point out two mistakes made by a large proportion of Old Testament instructors.

(1) The student is introduced to interpretation, without any real knowledge of the literary and historical character of the book under consideration, and without any adequate knowledge of the language in which the book is written. It is absurd for a man who has studied Hebrew only three or four months, who has, as yet, learned the particular meaning of but few words, and is acquainted with almost none of the niceties of syntax, to be thrust into advanced exegetical work. Little or no work, of a strictly exegetical character, ought to be undertaken in the Junior year, as long as it shall be necessary for the student to begin Hebrew after entering the Seminary; and a fair share of the work in both Middle and Senior years should be exclusively linguistic.

(2) The professor dictates his exegetical notes. Precious time is thus employed in giving that which can be found in as good form, perhaps, in an ordinary commentary. The "notes" thus received by the student are laid carefully aside to be preserved. It ought to be known that here, as elsewhere, the student needs to be taught, not the thing itself, but how he himself may obtain it. The preparation, for himself, of the exegesis of one verse, with the criticism of it by the

instructor, will benefit the student more than the hearing from the lips of his instructor the interpretation of ten verses. Let the student, therefore, be required to interpret for himself. If he have not a sufficient knowledge of the language, to do this, he is not yet fitted to listen to the learned interpretations of his instructor. It may be inquired whether sufficient attention is paid to that most important of Old Testament topics, *prophecy*. This subject, if we mistake not, though deserving and, indeed, demanding the most careful attention, is, for the most part, neglected. Old Testament interpretation—what is there *not* included here? how dark and mysterious, yet how essential and profitable are the many topics, classified under this head.

6) *Old Testament Theology*. The claim of this as a department of exegetical work is not yet everywhere accepted. We believe, however, that before long Old Testament instruction will be regarded as incomplete without this its crowning department. Surely, without it, all exegetical work is incomplete.

And now, in view of this, two facts establish themselves:

First, No one man can be expected to do all this work. No one man *can* do it, and do it well. The Old Testament department must be doubly manned. Already this has been done in many seminaries; let all seminaries, that would rank high, see to it that there are two professors in the department of Hebrew and the Old Testament.

Secondly, No student, entering the seminary with a knowledge of Hebrew yet to be gained, can, in the time allotted this department, do work in it that may in any sense be called satisfactory. What then? Let him gain a working knowledge of Hebrew before entrance; and let those who have the arrangement of the curriculum of study recognize the fact that the Old Testament department, is, in reality, two departments, the one linguistic, the other, exegetical; and let them show their recognition of this fact by allowing it a proper amount of time.

→BOOKS : NOTICES.←

SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST.*

Just for the same reason that we should refer any person desirous of studying the Christian religion at original sources, to the inspired literature of this religion, any one wishing to understand, in any good degree, the historical faiths of paganism, must study them in their sacred books. Until recently, this has been a privilege possible to but very few persons. Not many, in the nature of things, can be so circumstanced as to have either time or opportunity, had they the peculiar linguistic gifts, enabling them to so learn the various languages in which these books were originally written as to master their literature even sufficiently to gain correct general ideas of the kind of religion they teach, or to put them in relations of comparison and contrast with our own inspired Scriptures. Hitherto, at least

* SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST. Translated by various Oriental scholars, and edited by F. Max Mueller. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

until within a few years, we have been dependent, in consequence of this, upon second-hand information on subjects of this nature. In old Greek writers something has been long recognized as more or less reliable in accounts of what Egyptians, Chaldæans, Assyrians, Persians hold in tradition or recorded in their sacred books, of ideas upon these great themes of religion over the religious history of man. When access had been afforded in the labor of scholars, to those Avestan, and Sanscrit, and Pahlavi tongues in which such a vast literature was almost as if buried, it was a great point gained that through the studies of these scholars, and their results, something could be learned of the contents of that literature, and of the thought and faith of the ancient pagan world as there enshrined. But these scholars, in the very nature of the case, had to be interpreters as well, and they did not always agree, even in the rendering of the sacred text, much less in their conclusions as to the real nature of the religious ideas there contained. Those who sought through these means to get correct views of the old pagan religions, could never be either satisfied or certain. All the more is the labor of those accomplished and skillful men to be appreciated, who now give us what is next in value to a knowledge of these literatures in their original languages, translations, such as render them accessible to any English student.

The sacred books of six of the historical religions of paganism are included in these translations: those of the Brahmans, the Buddhists, the Zoroastrians, the Confucians, the followers of Lao-tsze, another of the great Chinese sects, and the Mohammedan. At other sources one may have access to what is preserved of the literatures of Chaldæa and Egypt; especially the series of books entitled "Records of the Past," in which translations of what has been found in these literatures, most likely to be of service to the student, are given. We are now concerned with the books just named, rendered out of the various original tongues under the editorial supervision of Prof. Max Müller. Among the scholars associated with him in this work we may name Messrs. Beal, Bhandarkar, Bühler, Darmesteter, Rhys Davids, Fausböll, Jacobi, Prof. Legge, of Oxford, Oldenberg, and Palmer. Most of these are names comparatively little known on this side the sea; yet each of the scholars so named has acquired distinction by his work in one or more of the several languages in which these sacred books were originally written.

Some familiarity with the books themselves is necessary, to prepare one for appreciation of their value and their interest. Even in their English dress, there is in them something that to most readers, perhaps, will at first be forbidding. One needs to habituate himself, in some measure, to the point of view of the authors of these strange reveries, these often bizarre, to western ideas often absurd conceptions of the world, and man, and things divine; he needs to fill his mind with the thought that here he is in contact with man as he was even in pre-historic times, and hearing him speak out of the misty distance of a hoary antiquity. Seen at this point of view, what one here finds becomes intensely interesting and in a very high degree instructive,—more especially when in a comparison of these books and the Christian Scriptures all that immense distance which separates mere human groping in darkness, and the true knowledge imparted through light from heaven, is realized.

The work of translation of these sacred books, or at least of publication, seems to be still in progress. Some twenty volumes, however, are now in the

library of the American Institute of Hebrew, affording opportunity for examination for such as are interested in such studies. Two of these volumes are the "Upanishads," by means of which the doctrines, so to speak, of Brahmanism, are perhaps best of all learned. Of these Prof. Max Müller is himself the translator. Mr. Darmesteter is the translator of the Zendavesta, which is contained also in two volumes. One of the most interesting in this collection is the Bhagavadgita, being a portion of the famous epic, the Mahabharata. A life of Buddha, translated first into the Chinese, and now from the Chinese by Mr. S. Beal, fills one volume, accompanying which is the Dhammapada, translated by Fausböll, containing the teaching of the Buddhistic faith. The four principal Chinese "Kings," the Shu King, Shih King, Yi King and Hsiao King are also included, in a translation by Prof. Legge, of Oxford, well known by his writings upon Chinese religion and literature. Other volumes contain rituals and laws of various religions, including that of Mohammed, or the Koran. Some translations of the Vedas, with other works, are promised.

The introductions to the several translations are of great value, enabling the student to understand many things touching the origin, history and forms of those old literatures; the whole supplying a means of archæological study and research of whose value the intelligent observer of what is now passing in the world of thought and inquiry cannot fail to be assured. It is a great service to the cause of sacred learning which the editor of these volumes and his co-laborers are rendering; a service that must be more and more appreciated as time passes, and pending questions in comparative religion and in archæology receive more of deserved attention.

We may very briefly, in concluding this notice, touch upon one point of interest as regards publications of the kind here described. Attention has been very much drawn, of late, to the person and teachings of that Indian Prince, the hero of a most strange and eventful romance, Prince Siddartha, otherwise named Buddha. The marvelous growth of the religion founded by him is one of the strangest phenomena in history. Recent writings, especially those of Edwin Arnold, have invested Buddha with a species of interest which should make readers desirous of studying him and his teaching more at first-hand. The life of Buddha, included in the collection we are describing is of value in that respect. The conception given of him in such poems as "The Light of Asia," and in the writings of those who would gladly disparage Christianity by comparing it with Buddhism, should be tested by the actual facts of his career, so far as those facts can be discriminated from the mass of mere legend, and by his religion as it is in the Buddhistic books themselves. How little of title Buddha can have to be compared with Jesus, or his religion with Christianity, will then appear.

A question of peculiar interest offers itself in that connection. Correspondence, here and there, between Buddhistic teachings and those of the Bible, and similarities in what is related of Buddha himself with incidents in the life of Christ are very remarkable. How account for them? It is a question that cannot be entered upon here, but it might be followed out to very great advantage, and with results perhaps which would shed light upon other like phenomena in the comparison of other ancient writings with our own sacred books. We should like to commend this line of inquiry to some one who might have time, opportunity, and resources for prosecuting it successfully, and so far as possible conclusively.

J. A. SMITH.

HOW THE BIBLE WAS MADE.*

This work is a valuable hand-book, containing in little space considerable information. The author has succeeded in collecting, grouping and compressing many facts relating to the history of the Bible, as we have it to-day. He takes up the question of the Old Testament Canon, the Deutero-Canonical books, the history of the Hebrew text, the Ancient Versions, discussing their critical value. The Talmud, Targums and Massorah receive attention. The New Testament Canon, its manuscripts, uncial and cursive, are treated of at some length; and then, the Early Versions, the testimony of the Fathers, and the English Versions from the earliest effort by Cædmon in 676 down to the Revision of 1881 are spoken of.

The position taken on the questions is the one commonly received by the churches to-day, and the book is not, nor does it pretend to be, a scientific treatment. The views of the advanced school of criticism are not noticed at all in speaking of the structure of the Old Testament, and in discussing the question of the New Testament Canon, the Gospel of John is not mentioned as one of the books whose authenticity has ever been doubted. Omissions of this kind detract from the value of the book.

In speaking of the Deutero-Canonical books, the author says that "there is an evident tendency to adopt the longer Canon of the Old Testament." We think this statement is hardly borne out by the facts; we would rather say that there is a tendency to shorten the received canon of to-day by casting out books like Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon and others. Some other positions taken by the author we might not agree with, but in general we think his statements reliable and his conclusions just.

The book on the whole will meet a want by the fact, that it groups together information, which can only be found elsewhere by long search. It is to be much regretted that there is no index; that a book of this character may be in the highest degree useful an index is an absolute necessity.

THE GREAT ARGUMENT.†

That the Old Testament bears witness to Jesus and finds its fulfillment only in the man of Nazareth has been indeed the Great Argument of the Christian Apologist since the day of Peter's sermon, Dr. Thomson has made a re-statement of it in the light of modern investigation and discovery, and finds it as strong and convincing as ever.

We confess to have taken up this book with some hesitation and prejudice against it. So much has been written on the Messianic question which exhibits false and strained exegesis and puerile reasoning, that the argument itself has fallen into some discredit. But the reader, before he has gone over very many pages, finds that this discussion is of another calibre entirely than any to which he is accustomed. It is by all odds the best book of the kind in our language. It is *simple*. There is no prolonged and ingenious reasoning sustained by an ample

* HOW THE BIBLE WAS MADE. By E. M. Wood, D. D. Cincinnati: *Walden & Stowe*. 5x7, pp. 263. \$1.00.

† THE GREAT ARGUMENT: OR, JESUS CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Wm. H. Thomson, M. D. New York: *Harper & Brothers*. 1884. Pp. xlii, 471.

array of authorities, buttressed by quotations in a dozen languages. The author states his opinion or point in clear, vigorous English without flourish or parade, and leaves it. It is *honest*. There is no tampering with objections or opposed views, so that they appear weak before they are assailed. Rationalistic opinions are stated fairly often in quotations from able writers. Exegesis which to the writer does not seem sound, is first given and the arguments in its favor well stated. It is *able and clear*. When an opposing view is met, the writer shows himself a match for any opponent. His views in general commend themselves to our judgment and are ably presented. It is *connected*. The whole book leaves one impression. This is where many works on the subject lamentably fail. They give a series of scattered thoughts. This book is one argument. The first chapter does not make its full impression until the last is read, and the last is not complete unless the intervening ones are mastered. It is *broad in scope*. Scarcely one element in the Old Testament can be mentioned which is not shown to enter into some link of the Great Argument. The whole Old Testament with its history, its prophecy, its poetry, its types, its priests, the daily life and habits of its people, all are seen to be colored and shot through with this messianic idea. It is *suggestive*. Its language is vigorous and eloquent. The writer shows a broad acquaintance with literature in general and human nature. He had the advantage of personal acquaintance with the scene and sphere of Old Testament life, being the son of the veteran missionary and author of "The Land and the Book" and himself living some time in Palestine. We would commend the book most of all for its *common sense and balance*. Rationalistic and absurd views are not entertained or favored because of fear of "Higher Criticism" or out of deference to distinguished names. Dr. Thomson can see something else to be taken into account besides Grammar and manuscript authority and the mere negative criticism of date and author and style. Every reader will find this work interesting, stimulating, instructive and convincing. The paper and printing are all that could be desired.

G. S. G.

◀ SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY ▶

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- MASSEY, G. The Natural Genesis; or, Second Part of a Book of the Beginnings. New York: *Scribner & Welford*. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. \$12.00
- NEWMAN, F. W. Christianity in its Cradle. New York: *Scribner & Welford*, \$1.00
- OXLEY, W. Egypt, and the Wonders of the Land of the Pharaohs. New York: *Scribner & Welford* \$3.00
- REID, J. M. Doomed Religions; a Series of Essays on Great Religions of the World. New York: 12 mo., pp. 455.
- WRIGHT, G. F. The Divine Authority of the Bible. Boston: *Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society*. 7½x4½, pp. xii, 241. \$1.25
- SAYCE, A. H. Ancient Empires of the East. New York: *C. Scribner's Sons*. 12 mo., pp. 301. \$1.50

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- BARROWS, E. P. Manners and Customs of the Jews. London: *Religious Tract Society*. 2s. 6d.

- BLYTHER, V. The Lyre of David; or, Analysis of the Psalms. With Hebrew and Chaldee Grammar. Dublin: 1847.....\$8.00
 BUSH, R. W. Popular Introduction to the Pentateuch. London: *Religious Tract Society*.....2s. 6d.
 CONDER, E. R. The Origin of the Hebrew Religion. London: *Religious Tract Society*. 12 mo., pp. 54.....4d.
 DAVIDSON, A. B. Cambridge Bible for Schools. The Book of Job; with notes, introduction and appendix. New York: *Macmillan & Co.*, 1884. Pp. 360, \$1.25
 FERRIERE, E. Le paganisme des Hébreux jusqu'à la captivité de Babylone. Paris: *Alcan*. Pp. 432.....3fr. 50
 GAERTNER, H. Handbuch der biblischen Geschichte. Den Lehrern an Volks- u. Bürgerschulen dargeboten. 2 Thl. 1. Das alte Testament. Weimar: *Böhlau*, 1884. Pp. xvi, 392.....M.3.40
 GAUSSEN, PROF. Jonah the Prophet. London: *Religious Tract Society*...1s. 6d.
 LINTON, H. Notes on the Book of Numbers. With Maps and Appendices. London: *Philip*. 12mo., pp. 182.....2s.
 MONTET, E. Les origines de la croyance à la vie future chez les Juifs. Genève: *H. Georg*. Pp. 28.....1fr.
 REDFORD, R. A. The Authority of Scripture. A Re-statement of the Argument. London: *Religious Tract Society*.....5s.
 RÖTTSCHEER, A. Die Psalmen. Frankfurt a M.: *Fösser*. 1884. Gr. 8., pp. 24. --50
 SCHIFFER, S. Das Buch Kohelet im Talmud u. Midrasch. (Inaug. Diss.) Leipzig, 1884. Pp. viii, 140.
 SHARPE, J. Notes and Dissertations upon the prophecy of Hosea. London: *Bell*.....10s. 6d.
 VIGOUROUX, F. La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes en Egypte et en Assyrie. Paris: 1882. 4 vols.....5.35
 WASHBURN, E. A. The Great Social Problems of the Day. Lessons from the Hebrew Prophets for our Time. London: *Griffith & Farran*. Post 8vo., pp. 124.....2s. 6d.

RECENT ARTICLES.

- SCHREIBER, E. The Blessing and the Curse (Deut. II., 20, 28). *American Israelite*, Sept. 26, '84.
 REID, W. H. Not the Design of Scripture to mingle the Philosophical and Secular with the Sacred and Eternal Truth. *Episcopal Recorder*, Sept. 18, '84.
 AGLÉN, A. S. Note on Psalm xxxv., 13. *The Expositor*, Sept., '84.
 COX, S. Absalom. 2 Sam. xiv., 25. *Ibid*.
 DEANE, W. J. The Septuagint Additions to the Hebrew Text (cont'd). *Ibid*.
 FORBES, J. The Two Promises given to Abraham. *Ibid*.
 PLUMPTRE, E. H. Ezekiel; an ideal biography. VI. (cont'd.) *Ibid*.
 The Ancient Israelites. Their furniture and houses. *The Jewish Herald*, Sept. 19, '84.
 BISSELL, E. C. The Independent Legislation of Deuteronomy. *Jour. of Soc. of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, June—Dec., '83.
 BRIGGS, C. A. The Argument *e silentio*, with special reference to the religion of Israel. *Ibid*.
 FERGUSON, H. The historical testimony of the prophet Zephaniah. *Ibid*.
 HALL, I. H. Modern chapters and verses. *Ibid*.

- KUENEN, A. Ezekiel. *Modern Review*, Oct., '84.
- ZABRISKIE, F. N. Solomon and the Proverbs. *New York Observer*, Oct. 16, '84.
- KELLOGG, S. H. Matthew and Zechariah. *Pulpit Treasury*, Oct., Nov., '84.
- LIDDON, H. P. Balaam; or, Gifts without Grace. (A sermon.) *Ibid.*, Oct., '84.
- PORTER, J. L. Lebanon. Its Ancient Tribes and their Influence. *Ibid.*, Nov., '84.
- KIEFFER, J. B. On the Testimony of Language to the Unity of the Human Race. *Reformed Quarterly Review*, Oct., '84.
- HIRSCHFELDER, J. M. Mosaical Enactments. *The Restitution*, Sept. 24, '84.
- TRISTRAM, H. B. Israel's Empire; a brief geographical sketch of Israel at the time of its greatest glory. *Sunday School Times*, Sept. 20, '84.
- ISAACS, A. S. Solomon in Post-Biblical Legends. *Ibid.*, Sept. 27, '84.
- The Old Testament and its New Enemies. *Ibid.*
- PINCHES, T. G. Assyrian and Babylonian Temples. *Ibid.*, Oct. 4, '84.
- LOWRIE, S. T. The Temple and the Synagogue. *Ibid.*, Oct. 11, '84.
- TRUMBULL, H. C. Words about Kadesh-Barnea. *Ibid.*
- NAPIER, J. T. Egyptian Temples and the Jewish Temple in Egypt. *Ibid.*, Oct. 18, '84.
- STEBBINS, R. P. The Hebrew Prophets. *The Unitarian Review*, Sept., '84.
- Pithom and Rameses. *Juedisches Literatur-Blatt*, Sept. 18, '84.
- GOLDFAHN, DR. Die Synagogen in der Talmudzeit. *Ibid.*
- MASSAROH, G. Les rois Phul et Tuklat-palasar II dont parle le livre IV, chap. XV, des Rois sont-ils un seul et même personnage? *Le Museon*, July, '84.

REVIEWS.

- BARTLETT, S. C. Sources of History in the Pentateuch. *Reformed Quarterly Review*, Oct., '84.
- BERLINER, A. Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babylonien im Talmud und Midrasch. (By Kroner.) *Jued. Littbl.* 31.
- BERTHEAU, E. Das Buch der Richter und Ruth. *Lit. Centralbl.* 1884, 34.
- BISSELL, A. P. The Law of Asylum in Israel. (By H. L. Strack.) *Lit. Centralbl.*, 35.
- FILLION, M. L. Atlas archéologique de la Bible. *Le Museon*, July, '84.
- LILLY, W. S. Ancient Religion and Modern Thought. (By A. M. Fairbairn) *The Academy*, July 12, '84.
- LORTET, DR. La Syrie d'aujourd'hui. (By A. Socin.) *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, Oct. 4, '84.
- MUELLER, F. M. The Upanishads II. *The Athenæum*, July 16, '84.
- PULPIT COMMENTARY on Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. (By W. J. Beecher.) *Presbyterian Review*, Oct., '84.
- REVILLE, A. Lectures on Native Religions of Mexico and Peru. (By A. H. Keane.) *The Academy*, Oct., '84; *Modern Review*, Oct., '84; *Sunday School Times*, Oct. 11, '84.
- SHARPE, J. Notes and Dissertations upon the Prophecy of Hosea. (By T. K. Cheyne.) *The Academy*, Aug. 30, '84.
- STUART, A. MOODY. The Bible True to itself. (By A. A. Hodge.) *Presbyterian Review*, Oct., '84.