

◀THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT▶

VOL. VIII.

JANUARY, 1889.

No. 5.

POINTS of view are often determining factors in historical interpretation. This fact should always be remembered in connection with the study of the Old Testament. What then are the points of view to be taken? Are we to criticise and investigate the narratives concerning Israel simply from the point of view of their likeness to the traditions of other peoples? This resemblance, indeed, cannot be ignored; for to do that would be both superficial and unscientific. Does it not seem necessary that biblical history be analyzed and dissected in the same critical way in which all other history is treated? But there is also another point of view which must not be overlooked. That is the one derived from the culmination of Israel's history in Jesus Christ and his church; and, above all, from the historic fact of the resurrection of the Christ. The Old Testament records of divine manifestations cannot be properly and scientifically investigated except from the point of view of the resurrection of the Christ.

IT is interesting to look back upon the thoughts and labors of those who have contributed to the elevation of biblical studies in the church and to the present high standard of attainment which is maintained with few exceptions in our country. Among such scholars and teachers was Prof. Bela B. Edwards, whose too brief career, cut off in its prime, gave promise of large service to the cause of Old Testament study. In his inaugural address as professor of Hebrew at Andover in 1838, he elaborated some reasons for the study of Hebrew, which may well be considered to-day. They are as follows:

1) An argument for the study of Hebrew may be derived from the fact that great eminence in the pursuit, on the part of a few individuals, cannot be expected in the absence of a general cultivation of the language.

2) We will be better prepared to take all proper advantage of the immense stores of erudition on the general subject which have been collected in Germany.

- 3) It strengthens the faith of the student in the genuineness and divine authority of the Scriptures.
 - 4) It influences the imagination and the taste.
 - 5) It has an important bearing upon the missionary enterprise in the training of translators.
 - 6) It throws light on the systems of Christian theology.
 - 7) It counteracts the present increasing tendency in some portions of the church to undervalue the Old Testament and to degrade it from any connection with the New.
-

EXCEPTION is not infrequently taken to works on the Bible that lay emphasis upon the part of man in its production. The charge against such a representation seems to be that it designedly minimizes the divine element in the Scriptures. Is this objection valid? Will it not be granted that there is almost insuperable difficulty in drawing the exact line between the divine and the human elements in the Bible, just as is the case in analyzing the person of Christ? It would at least seem to be fair to assume that, as far as the Bible can be reasonably explained as the product of man's genius, this explanation must be allowed. Regarding all such elements as the product of the human mind, the determination of the divine element is simplified. It is found in the residuum which cannot be attributed to man. We confidently affirm that there is such a residuum which stamps the Scripture as an authoritative rule of faith and practice. No doubt the part of man in producing the Bible may be and is sometimes over-estimated. On the other hand, one may err in magnifying the divine element. It is a question whether certain schools of theological thought have not done this. If the former extreme is dangerous, may not this latter error tend to hinder a clear understanding of Scripture and to prevent it from having its true and rightful position of influence in the world?

THE study of ancient religions is not only a fascinating work. It is full of instruction by way of resemblance and contrast with the religion of Judaism. While in Israel men confidently expected deliverance, in the other nations they were driven by failure and despair to desire ardently the same blessing and to seek for it. What God revealed in a unique and positive manner to his ancient chosen people, was, it might almost be said, forced out of less favored races by the anguish of their hopelessness. Those truths which were written in light for the one, were by the others dimly discerned in darkness through their experiences of want. In the midst of such diversity,

how remarkably similar are the ultimate issues in all these early civilizations. Redemption is the key-note, the far-off harmony, to which all respond. Preparation, in the one case through progress, but through relapse and decline in the other—still preparation, all the while, for the consummation of this redemption, is the underlying principle which rules the course of events. Thus all this ancient life, whether in Israel or in Assyria and Egypt, becomes instinct with divine forces and full of divine significance.

BOOKS upon biblical topics occupy no insignificant place in the mass of literature which presents itself for examination before Christian ministers and students. That this is so is an encouraging fact. But it is practically very important to inquire also as to the characteristics and methods which such books reveal. Are we improving upon our forefathers? They produced a massive, stalwart biblical literature, which demanded study and meditation. A vigorous effort was indispensable for the mastery of the works they furnished for their day. We live, on the contrary, in the era of clearness, simplicity and brevity. Commentaries are compact and concise. Sermons are pithy. The primer is the favorite form of publication.

In relation to the Bible a gratifying progress has also been made in methods. Not only do exegetical works find a ready sale; they are themselves more scientific and systematic. Attention is also being paid to the separate books of Scripture; their contents are expounded and their teachings formulated. Bible characters are studied in the light of their times. A flood of radiance is poured upon the histories, prophecies and epistles from the habits and customs of the ages in which they were first produced. But in close relation to this movement is another tendency. Homiletical helps are very popular. So-called aids to preachers in their preparation for the pulpit and to teachers for their study of the Bible are appearing on all sides. The great danger in thus multiplying material which would lighten the difficulties and remove the hindrances in the way of the Bible-teacher is that it will tend to destroy individual effort.

This is a deplorable result. Our students must be masters of their helps, or these will crush them. The Scriptures invite and demand individual study. No amount of expository literature however valuable can supply the place of it. The choice between books relating to the Scriptures must be determined by this rule—Do they stimulate or do they take the place of personal study? Have no book which will not help to do better and more effective *work* on the Bible.

THE BEARING OF NEW TESTAMENT STATEMENTS UPON THE AUTHORSHIP OF OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS.

BY PROF. GEORGE B. STEVENS, PH. D., D. D.,

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

It is justly felt by all reverent students of the Bible that great importance attaches to those references to the books of the Old Testament which are made by our Lord and his apostles. That they ascribed divine inspiration and authority to those books there can be no doubt. Did they make statements equally explicit and intentional regarding their *authorship*? By most persons it will be felt that a greater degree of importance attaches to what Christ may have said or implied on this point than to that which may be found in the writings of the apostles and other New Testament writers. For whatever the degree of their inspiration, or even infallibility, regarding religious truth, it is rarely claimed that they were omniscient respecting historical and literary questions. On the problem of the authorship of a book—which, indeed, was not a problem *in their time*—they might receive the traditional opinion and express themselves accordingly without forfeiting their claim to be competent and authorized interpreters of Christian truth, even if subsequent investigation should prove the assumed opinion to be erroneous. Most persons would admit this possibility as being involved in the limitations of their knowledge regarding subjects lying outside the range of essential spiritual truth.

But while the Christian world has never claimed omniscience for the apostles, it has made this claim for Christ, at least in regard to the matters where he mentioned no limitations upon his knowledge (cf. Mk. 13:32),—matters upon which he has made some declaration. It becomes a question of great interest, therefore, to the Christian, whether Jesus has stated anything in regard to the authorship of Old Testament books; and if he has not stated anything explicitly, whether any opinion is implied in his language. If he has explicitly stated that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch, then the conclusions reached by many critics regarding the composite character of those books are in conflict with Christ's authority, and the alternative is: (a) Are these conclusions in error? or (b) Was Jesus fallible in his knowledge in regard to this (and perhaps similar) subjects? There are scholars who espouse each of these views. Is there any other view more tenable than either of them?

Much will depend upon *how explicitly* Christ has spoken upon these points. Has he made any statement *with the intention* of maintaining that a particular person (as Moses or David) wrote a particular book or psalm? or has he simply spoken of such compositions by the names which were universally associated with them in his time, it being no part of his purpose to affirm anything regarding their authorship? Do his allusions hinge upon the question of authorship, and are they intended to bear upon it? or are they intended to serve purposes which are not really affected by that question?

Recourse must be had to the passages. A complete induction of all the New Testament passages which would be in point, is impossible in a brief article. But for the reason stated, the words of Christ are most important. I consider two questions: (a) What is the bearing of Christ's words upon the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch? (b) Does Christ mean to authenticate the Davidic authorship of Ps. 110 in Mk. 12:35-37 (parallel passages, Mt. 22:41 sq.; Lk. 20:41 sq.)?

The ten most important and decisive passages in the Gospels bearing upon the first question (the only ones, counting parallel passages as one, having any *direct* bearing) may be classified thus:

(a) Passages in which a *command* is referred to Moses: (1) Mt. 8:4 (par. pass. Mk. 1:44; Lk. 5:14) "And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer *the gift that Moses commanded*, for a testimony unto them." The reference is to Lev. 14:4 sq., and the command there imposed is said to issue from Moses. (2) Mt. 19:7,8 (Mk. 10:3-5) "They say unto him, Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives," etc. The reference is to Deut. 24:1. It is the Pharisees who refer to the command as *Moses'*; but the same idea is implied in Christ's answer: "Moses suffered," etc.*

(b) One passage in which an Old Testament commandment is characterized as something which "Moses said": (3) Mk. 7:10, "For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother," etc. (Exod. 20:12). In the parallel passage, Mt. 15:4, the expression, "for Moses said," is replaced by "for God commanded, saying." According to Mark, Jesus speaks of one of the ten commandments as something which Moses said; but taken in connection with Matthew, if the two expressions used are considered as substantially equivalent, the result would be that this passage refers the commandment to God as its source, and to Moses as the accredited human agent through whom it was proclaimed, rather than to him as the writer of the book in which it is found, or even of the passage itself considered as a part of a book.

(c) Passages in which Moses is said to have written something: (4) Mk. 12:19 (par. pass. Mt. 22:24; Lk. 20:28), "And they (the Sadducees) asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave a wife behind him, and have no child, that his brother should take his wife and raise up seed unto his brother" (Deut. 22:5). It is the Sadducees who speak of Moses as writing this commandment. "Moses wrote *unto us*." Are they thinking of literary authorship or simply of the *authority* with which the command referred to came to them, namely, that of Moses? Does the silence, or perhaps the acquiescence of Christ in what they say, commit him to the position that Moses was the literary author of Deuteronomy, or, at least, of so much of it as the Sadducees quote?

(d) Passages which speak of the "book of Moses." (5) Mk. 12:26 (par. pass. Mt. 22:31; Lk. 20:37): "But as touching the dead, that they are raised; have ye

* Mk. 10:5 (par. to Mt. 19:8) reads: "But Jesus said to them, On account of the hardness of your heart, he (Moses) wrote you this commandment." The parallel expression to "he wrote" is "he permitted," showing that the Mosaic *concession* to the rude conditions of the time is what is referred to. We follow here the narrative of Matthew as being, probably, the more original (so Meyer *in loco*). But if Mark is followed to the neglect of Matthew, no thought of literary authorship can be associated with the words. If Mark were here followed, this instance would fall under (c).

not read in the book of Moses, in the place concerning the Bush, how God spake unto him, saying," etc. (Exod. 3:6). In the parallel passage we find instead of the expression, "book of Moses," (Mt.) "Have ye not read that which was spoken to you by God, saying," and (Luke) "Even Moses showed, in the place concerning the Bush, where he called the Lord the God of Abraham," etc. The result is that, according to Mark, Jesus refers to Exod. 3:6 as being in the "book of Moses"—a current name for the Pentateuch. The passage is spoken by God (Mt.) and Moses is represented as "showing" (Luke), that is, establishing a certain conclusion by means of it. Does the use of the passage in any way turn upon the authorship of the book called the "book of Moses"? Certainly not. Does then the allusion to the book as Moses' commit Christ to the opinion of its Mosaic authorship? It cannot be maintained that it was any part of his *set purpose* to refer to the subject. If the passage authenticates the Mosaic authorship, it can only do so by a tacit assumption of it, at most. The question was not consciously before the mind of Christ or before the minds of his time. Unless some passage or set of passages can be produced which is equivalent to Christ's saying that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, it is competent to maintain that the language in which he spoke of such subjects was the language of his time, and was conformed to the universal opinions of his time which he had no occasion to consider, much less to discuss or to pronounce upon. May not Christ have referred to the Pentateuch by a current title, "the book" or "books of Moses," without pronouncing any literary judgment or being in any way implicated in a literary problem arising centuries later, as well as one might now refer to the Homeric poems without thereby in any way committing himself or making himself responsible for any literary opinion in regard to the unity of the Iliad and Odyssey, or as to their composition throughout, in their present form, by a man named Homer?

We have (e) references to the "law of Moses." (6) Lk. 2:22: "And when the days of their purification according to the law of Moses were fulfilled," etc. (Lev. 12:2). (7) Lk. 24:44: "All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets," etc. (8) John 1:17,45: "The law was given by Moses," etc. "Philip findeth Nathanael and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write," etc. (9) John 7:19,22,23: "Did not Moses give you the law?" etc. "Moses hath given you circumcision," etc. "That the law of Moses may not be broken," etc. (10) John 8:5: "Now in the law Moses commanded us," etc. (Lev. 20:10).

In this set of passages we have undoubted references to the Pentateuch as the "law of Moses." Not only is a certain ritual requirement (Lev. 12:2) spoken of as a part of the "law of Moses," but the prophetic element, which is evidently thought of as pervading in the Pentateuch, is said to find its fulfillment in Christ. It is not to be doubted that Christ thinks and speaks of the whole Pentateuch under the term "the law of Moses." The passages of John are in harmony with this supposition: "The law came by Moses" (1:17); "Moses gave you the law" (7:19).

Are these allusions to the Pentateuch as the "book" or the "law of Moses" fairly equivalent to the statement that Moses was its literary author in its present form? Many will declare that they are and that this settles the question. Others will take the same view, and since they believe that critical research does not confirm the statement, will impute error or ignorance to Christ. It is to

be noted that these opinions coincide in one premise, but, differing in the other, they reach opposite conclusions. The arguments may be thus represented (using the terms "orthodox view" and "rationalistic view" to designate them, for want of better names):—Orthodox view: Christ said that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; whatever Christ said must be true; therefore Moses did write the Pentateuch. Rationalistic view: Christ said that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; it is found that Moses did not write it; therefore Christ did not know, and was in error.

It is to be noticed also that critics of both the types named deal with the passages in the same way. They maintain or assume that the words of Christ refer to literary authorship, or at least apply to it, when that question arises. This is the assumption of both schools. Is it a fair and warrantable assumption? If it is, then the mind which hesitates to hold that Christ is committed to such a question of historical investigation and critical research is at liberty to sift the passages and demand that, on the assumption that it is fair to apply Christ's words to literary authorship at all, he be made responsible for *absolutely nothing which he himself did not say*. With this view let us classify again our ten passages on a new basis.

In *two* cases (Mt. 19:7,8; John 8:5) it is the Pharisees who speak, referring *two commands* to Moses, to *one* of which Jesus alludes as a *permission* of Moses. It will hardly be contended that these statements apply to literary authorship, and whatever their reference, there is no explicit assertion of Christ.

In *one* case (Mk. 12:19) it is the Sadducees who speak, referring to Moses as writing a certain Old Testament passage (Deut. 25:5). Even if this statement of the Sadducees were authoritative, it is not equivalent to the affirmation that Moses wrote the whole present Book of Deuteronomy, much less the whole Pentateuch.

In *one* case Luke (2:22) speaks of a passage (Lev. 12:2) as a part of the "law of Moses;" in *one* (John 1:17) John the Baptist states that the law "*was given*" by Moses, and in *one* (John 1:45) Philip speaks of Moses in the law writing of Christ. The last is the only one in which anything is said about Moses *writing* anything, and this is said with distinct reference to his writing *prophetically* in the law about Christ. Do Philip's words fairly apply to the authorship of our present Old Testament law books? The reader must judge. But *six* of our *ten* passages have been passed in review and yet we have no *affirmation from Christ himself*.

In *four* cases the Gospels introduce Christ as speaking in reference to the matter. In *two* of these (Mt. 8:4; Mk. 7:10) he refers *two commands* (Lev. 14:3 sq.; Exod. 20:12) directly to Moses. Moses gave these commands. They emanate from that lawgiver. Is more than this contained in them? Are they *fairly equivalent* to the statement that Moses wrote the books in their present form in which those commands are found? In *one* case (Mk. 12:26) Jesus speaks of a passage (Exod. 3:6) as being found in the "book of Moses," and in another (Lk. 24:44) says that all the prophecies written in the "law of Moses" concerning Himself must be fulfilled. That the Pentateuch was universally called by these names is certain. Does Christ in using these universal designations mean to affirm anything touching authorship? Can his words be fairly thus applied? They *explicitly affirm* nothing more than that Moses is the (human) source of these specific commands referred to. If they necessarily imply *writing*, they do not imply it to the extent of the whole Pentateuch in its present form. The per-

son who holds that it has been ascertained by study that only the fundamental legislation of the Pentateuch emanates from Moses and that our completed "books of Moses" are not the direct product of his hand, may safely challenge his opponents to bring any word of Christ which conflicts with his opinion. Christ refers specific commands to Moses; he speaks of the Pentateuch under the popular designations; but *there is not a passage* (unless an exception be made in favor of Mk. 10:5; see note on page 165) *in which Christ explicitly states that Moses wrote a single verse of the Pentateuch.*

To many there will seem to be something harsh and perhaps forced in this method of handling the passages, confining them to what they *explicitly say* and not letting them make their own natural impression. The method is no favorite with us. But if one school of interpreters insists upon applying these passages to literary authorship and making them a make-weight in the discussion of the literary problems connected with the Pentateuch, it is fair for another school, as against these, to insist that the passages shall be used for what they *say* only. To say that Christ's language naturally *implies* a certain opinion is too easy a mode of disputation. That position may always be challenged. Does it *necessarily* imply any particular opinion on Christ's part or any committing of himself to it? Those who use the supposed implications of his allusions in this peremptory way and as an authority precluding discussion may properly be reminded how much of their ground is of the nature of supposition and inference, and how little of it (if any) is found in the explicit words of our Lord.

The two views which we have characterized (with no fondness for either term) as rationalistic and orthodox, assume, more or less distinctly, that it is fair to apply the words of Christ to the question of Pentateuchal analysis and authorship. The latter view lays much emphasis upon this; the former generally assumes at least so much as that Christ shared the belief of his time on the subject. Does not our review of the passages rather lead to the conclusion, on the one hand, that he did not intend to affirm and has not actually affirmed any opinion on the question, and on the other, that the state of his mind on the subject is at most a matter of speculation and not of testimony? The practical result in the orthodox view is that it decides a literary problem by the alleged authority of Christ, or in other words, that, for all investigators of the subject, it insists upon pivoting the authority and trustworthiness of Jesus as a teacher upon the decision of a critical and historical problem. This imperils faith in Christ far more than the rationalistic view, because it is possible to hold (as many do) that literary (and kindred) subjects lay outside the sphere of Christ's knowledge in his incarnation (as did the day of his coming), but that the former limitation no more disproves his authority as a divinely sent teacher than the latter.

We prefer to hold that we are neither compelled to affirm the rationalistic assumption on the one hand, nor to accept the orthodox dilemma on the other. Christ did not design to teach and did not teach anything upon the authorship of Old Testament books. His mission was immeasurably grander than such a supposition implies. His concern was with the truths of eternal life in God's kingdom and not with literary questions. This is the more certainly true since those questions have been developed from modern investigation and did not exist at all in his time.

Our next inquiry concerns the bearing of Mk. 12:35-37 (par. pass. Mt. 22:41-46; Luke 20:41-44) upon the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm there quoted.

The passage reads: "And Jesus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that Christ is the son of David? For David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. David therefore himself calleth him Lord, and whence is he then his son?" (Ps. 110:1).

Here Jesus seems plainly to base an argument upon the view that David wrote the 110th Psalm. Modern criticism finds from a study of the Psalm itself great difficulties in the supposition that David wrote it. These it does not belong to us to discuss. The only question is, whether *if* we conclude that David did not write that Psalm we should be denying or depreciating the authority of Jesus.

It is evident, in the first place, that the three verses in which we have the narrative, give us but a fragment of the argument of which the statements recorded form a part. The expression, "Jesus answered" (35), implies an argument with the Jews in which they had tried to "catch him in talk" (Mk. 12:13). The earlier portion of the chapter narrates three such attempts. May not Jesus here have retorted with a question which none of them could answer? All the Jews assumed that David wrote the 110th Psalm, and that in verse 1 he spoke of the Messiah. Now how could the Messiah be David's son (as they said) and his Lord at the same time (as the Psalm calls him)? If he wished thus to put them in a dilemma, this question would certainly do so. But many shrink from supposing that Jesus used a method of argument so nearly like that which the scribes and Pharisees employed against him.

Let us then suppose that Jesus spoke after the universal manner of his time of the Psalm as written by David. The important question is: *Does the point of what he here says depend upon the direct Davidic authorship of the Psalm?* If it does, then we must either suppose, as many do (though granting the great difficulty of the supposition) that David wrote the Psalm, since Jesus virtually said so, or that Jesus here based his argument upon an incorrect opinion. But if the argument does not depend upon the Davidic authorship, then we are at liberty to say that Jesus simply referred to the Psalm, as it was universally the custom to do, as David's, but that the *essential point* which he wishes to make, and therefore the nerve of his argument, does not depend upon whether David actually wrote it or not. What is that point? It is this. How can the scribes maintain that the Messiah is merely a descendant of David, when, in the 110th Psalm, he is spoken of by the regal title of Lord, and is accorded by Jehovah a seat at his own right hand? The purpose of Jesus is to set over against the low Jewish conception of the Messiah as a great human monarch in David's line, his own idea of his true, divine mission and character. If the 110th Psalm is *Messianic*, he establishes his point, whether it is Davidic in authorship or not. The true Messiah is no mere son of David—a second Solomon—who shall reign in earthly splendor; his is a mightier sceptre, a grander position, a more enduring throne. The edict of Jehovah has placed him on that throne. The whole argument turns on two conceptions of the Messiah, that of the scribes and that of Jesus, which alone rises to the full dignity of such Messianic passages as Ps. 110:1.

Jesus spoke of the passage as what David said. Whether he consciously turned his mind to the question of authorship we need not speculate. It was no part of his work to discuss such questions. In reference to all such universal beliefs, where no essential moral principles were involved, he spoke the language

of his time as truly as he spoke the dialects of the lands where he labored and taught. How immeasurably inferior to what it is would his teaching have been if he had mingled in his instruction concerning the kingdom of God some lessons on the authorship and composition of some of the Jewish sacred books! How incongruous with his character would such a course have been!

The Psalm in question is variously interpreted. Some suppose it to refer directly to the Messiah; others, indirectly, the primary reference being to the king of Israel as a type of the Messiah. Christian scholars are well agreed that it is Messianic, and this position is all that need concern us here. David may have written it; but if he did not, the force of Christ's thought is not broken. In this case the reference to David belongs to the drapery of his argument. It is an example, of which there are multitudes, of his using the thought-forms of his time. In those forms he has embodied the essential, imperishable truths of his kingdom. That which he has here embodied is the truth of his superhuman character and divine, spiritual kingship. This truth gleamed from the pages of the Old Testament, and the Jews might have seen it, had not their eyes been blind to the import and bearing of their own prophetic types and symbols. It was a glimpse into the deeper import of prophecy which Jesus would give the captious scribes, when, teaching in the temple, he propounded the question: How the Messiah could be merely a descendant of David, when, in ancient prophecy, he is called David's Lord, and is assigned a seat at Jehovah's right hand.*

TIELE ON BABYLONIAN-ASSYRIAN CULTURE.† I.

BY REV. A. S. CARRIER,

McCormick Theol. Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

It is not intended to describe the culture of Babylonia and Assyria in all its peculiarities, still less to follow its development step by step. The time for that has not come, and the investigation of our very imperfect sources has not progressed far enough. But the subject is too important to be passed in complete silence. The people of the Euphrates and Tigris won for themselves, by conquest, a pre-eminent position in the world's history. But they were, besides, the custo-

* Since the discussion of this passage has been necessarily limited in scope, I will add a few sentences from two eminent scholars, illustrating and confirming the view taken:

"Christ quoted the Psalm in order to unfold the higher idea of the Messiah as the Son of God, and to oppose, *not* the idea that he was to be Son of David, but a one-sided adherence to this, at the expense of the other and higher one.... He used Ps. 110 to convince them that the two elements were blended together in the Messianic idea.... In this regard it is a matter of no moment whether David uttered the Psalm or not."—Neander, *Life of Christ*, pp. 402,3 (Bohn ed.).

"Looked at closely, the appeal (to this Psalm) is merely the form in which Jesus brought home to the scribes the incomparableness of the true Messiah, well attested in the Old Testament." "The fulfillment of this Psalm in its highest significance was claimed by Jesus as something raising him above David. And certainly, as those expressions were inspired by the Spirit of God, they first found their fulfillment in David's perfect Son."—Orrell, *Old Testament Prophecy*, 154, 157.

† This article is the first of a series presenting a condensation of the last chapter of *Tiele's Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1888.

dians of a civilization which gave the standard to Western Asia, nay, influenced Greece itself; and to this culture, no less than to their martial prowess, they owe their commanding position.

The origin of Babylonian culture loses itself, like that of Egypt and China, in the mists of antiquity. The oldest monuments show a high degree of artistic ability, and the oldest cuneiform inscriptions are far removed from what must have been the original picture-writing. Such progress points to a long antecedent development. Whence then is the origin of this culture to be sought? That theory finds most favor which refers it to a non-Semitic people who brought it with them from the shores of the Persian Gulf and disseminated it among the Semitic inhabitants of Babylonia.

But here we confront another question. Did such a non-Semitic people exist? Halévy and others answer in the negative, and others ascribe to the Semitic people themselves the sources of their own culture. But we have decided reason to believe that a non-Semitic language, which we may term old Chaldean, was spoken and written in Babylonia down to the latest period of the empire.

But it is quite another question whether this old Chaldean people created this culture which the Semitic Babylonians took and developed. It is not impossible that we must go back of them for its origin. It is not the place here, however, to discuss what is, at the most, a mere conjecture, though I cannot entirely discard the idea that culture and cuneiform writing came to the old Chaldeans and through them to the Semites from a people who spoke a widely different speech.

It is also merely conjecture that this culture had its origin on the shores of the Persian Gulf, but it is conjecture with a high degree of probability. In legends transmitted by Berossos we are told of the divine Fishman, Oannes, who every morning rose from the Erythrean Sea to teach the barbarous Chaldeans sciences and arts and orderly social life, and at evening plunged again beneath the waves. It can hardly be doubted that in this divinity we are to recognise Ea, the god of the light and fire-germs in the waters, who figures so frequently on Babylonian and Assyrian monuments. The oldest seat of Ea's worship is Eridu, close by the sea. His son Maruduk and his associate Nabû, received special honor on the islands and coasts of the Persian Gulf. The tradition that seems to lie imbedded in this legend is, that it was the worshippers of Ea, seamen and coast dwellers who introduced their culture into Chaldea.

In agreement with this are the antiquity and sacredness of the laws of Ea, and the incantations of Eridu, and the fact that the oldest traditions, like the Gizdhubar-Epos, are localized near the sea-coast. There also were the centers of mighty states, there are found the oldest monuments of Chaldean culture. The reign of the first Semitic king of Babel, Sargon I., if we follow the reckoning of Nabûna'id, must be put earlier than the oldest known kings of Ur. But his inscriptions show that even he used a mode of writing not native to his speech. The leading divinities to which Babel and Borsippa were dedicated, are the same which, in the south, belonged to the circle of Ea. Perhaps the ruling class at Babel, which brought there the higher civilization, had its origin also in the south.

Wherever its origin is to be sought, there can be no doubt of the high antiquity of the Babylonian and the derived Assyrian culture, and though it cannot be proved that it was the mother of all culture, this is not impossible.

The Babylonians did not leave the culture they inherited just where they found it. They assimilated and enlarged it. They purified it and gave it a higher aim. The Semites never excelled their predecessors in artistic perception, perhaps not as seamen or merchants. But they infused a seriousness and depth into the religious life, strengthened the monarchical idea, enriched the literature, and founded a state on such principles that it long resisted the mightiest shocks, and ruled for centuries the most extensive territories. Though they were borrowers, they were not therefore lacking in originality. Greece and Persia, nations that borrowed freely on all sides, disprove such a theory. The culture in which the Babylonians were instructed, blossomed out under the influence of their own ideas and became their own inalienable possession.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT, LAWS, AND CUSTOMS.

Very little is known of the Babylonian and Assyrian form of government. We attempt to present only what we know with certainty. The government was undoubtedly monarchical; but from the Assyrian method of naming the years after high officials, including the king, it has been conjectured that the government was originally an aristocracy. This, though not impossible, cannot be proved. From the earliest times we find the monarch bearing a distinctive title. The oldest ruler of Assur called himself Iššaku, or Išaku, with the addition "of the God Assur." This indicated a religious dignity. The king was vicegerent of the supreme god. Some South Babylonian princes, whose monuments are found at Telloh, and some princes of Eridu, bear this title, but in such connection as to indicate that they are not vicegerents of a god, but vassals of a great king, the name of a place being added.

We can with certainty say that the oldest form of government in Assyria was theocratic. To these peoples, as to other Semites, the highest divinity was the only true king; the earthly ruler, only his representative. He may have originally belonged to the order of priests. These call him to rule. The sovereignty rests with the god, that is, with the priesthood. The kings are the heirs and successors of the oldest Išaku whom we know; and while they were never high priests in the literal sense, they were recognized as such in Assyria, and in Babel actually stood at the head of the priesthood. They have the right to sacrifice while the priest stands behind them, so that they can call themselves *sangû* of the high divinity of Bel, which can hardly be other than a priestly title. Still higher is the other favorite title, *šaknu* of Bel, that is, vicegerent of the divinity.

But while they called themselves not alone Iššaku, but Šarru or Malku, it was only king by the grace of the god. They are deeply conscious of dependence. The divinity elected and called them. They were begotten by the highest god, borne by the mother goddess. Despotism as they may be in their rule over men, they are the humble, obedient children of their god. Their palaces, like temples, were carefully oriented, and in clothing and ornaments, they alone imitated the gods.

Whether, as in Egypt, they received worship as gods, is another question. They are called, however, "sun of the land," "sun of the whole people." It is not meant that the sun-god was incarnate in them, but this is the figurative language appropriate to describe the king.

On the other hand, it is certain that the oldest royal names did not have a vertical wedge only before them, like ordinary proper names, but also the star,

the determinative for God. Hence they were reckoned as sons of god, and received a reverential regard similar to the Brahmans and kings of India, who are frequently called *Deva*.

We find in Assyria no trace of that king-worship so frequent in Egypt. The only thing which looks like homage to royalty, is the remarkable fact of an altar standing before a relief of Asurnasirpal at the entrance of a temple found by Layard at Kalah. The picture of the king was, however, according to Assyrian ideas, the symbol of the kingdom, and one could pray to this, without paying divine reverence to the king.

The unified states of Babylonia and Assyria, whether Ur, or Babel, Assur, or Nineveh was the capital, certainly arose from the blending of several smaller kingdoms and could in a certain sense be called feudal. The king allowed the subject princes to occupy their thrones as vassals, paying tribute or furnishing auxiliaries in case of war. Hence the titles, "king of kings" (*šar šarrâni*), "ruler of kings" (*nasik šarrâni*), "lord of lords" (*Bêl bêli*). These tributary provinces were part of the empire, though distinguished in the inscriptions from the states which "were reckoned to the land of Assur." So Israel, after the capture of Samaria by Sargon, was united to Assyria, and Judah, after the abortive insurrection of Zedekiah, was incorporated into the Babylonian kingdom.

While the Babylonian and Assyrian kings were without doubt absolute rulers, they recognized the laws as binding upon themselves, and took counsel with the magnates of the empire, with the learned men, and the priests, reserving always the right of final decision. Nabûna'id restores the temple of Šamaš at Sippar, after taking counsel with the wise men of his kingdom. And when Esarhaddon wished to associate his son with him on the throne, he called together a parliament of the dignitaries of the realm.

The Assyrian kings had a large court, to which belonged the so-called *râbi* and *šuparšaki*. By the first title are denoted princes of the blood; by the second, the highest officials. The Turtanu or Tartan stands at the head of these. He was the chief field marshal. In a catalogue of Assyrian officials a distinction is made between Tartan of the "right hand" (*imnu*), and Tartan of the "left hand" (*šumêlu*), that is, of the south and of the north. After the Tartan followed four high officials whose duties are not clear; the Nagir-êkalli or governor of the palace, the Rab-bi-lub, perhaps master of the eunuchs, the Tukulu, and the Šalat or royal governor. We must class here the Rabšakê, whose rank was that of lieutenant-general.

The governors of the provinces rank next to these dignitaries, though it cannot be determined what led to the order of precedence. The Sargonids changed this order completely.

Frequently we read that the king had the "image of his kingdom" erected in a territory. This was the symbol of his over-lordship. But the more distant a province was from the capital, the more was left to the discretion of the Šalaṭ.

It is doubtful if the office of Limu was more than honorary; it may have had a religious character. It was certainly old, for Tiglath-pileser I. dates from the Limu-year of Ina-ilija-allik; and Rammân-nirâr I. a century earlier has a Limu-date.

In Babylonia, time was reckoned by the years of the king's reign, but the official system seems not to have differed materially from that of Assyria. Five

high dignitaries were at the head. But while in Assyria a warrior had the precedence, in Babylonia it was a spiritual lord. After these five came, as in Assyria, the great governors of the realm.

That the higher offices in Babylonia were hereditary cannot be proved and is improbable. Many inscriptions indicate otherwise. The condition was exactly the same as in Egypt.

The *army* was the especial care of the Assyrian kings. For centuries their arms dominated Western Asia. From the sculptures on their palaces we learn how carefully their armies were organized. There were three, perhaps four military divisions, the charioteers to whom the king and higher officers belonged, the cavalry, the foot-soldiers, and a corps which may be compared to our engineer corps. The chariot is drawn by two, sometimes three horses. The charioteer has always a driver, often two armed attendants, who fight with bows and arrows or with lance, also with sword and dagger. The royal chariot, like that of Egypt, is known by its peculiar plumes. The cavalry consisted of bowmen and spearmen, the footmen consisted of bowmen, lancers, and slingers. While the light infantry are armed simply with quiver, bow and sword, and clothed with a light loin covering, the heavy armed infantry wore a coat of chain armor, greaves and a helmet with, or without, crest. Sometimes a round shield was carried; sometimes a woven shield, the height of a man, was borne before the warrior. The art of siege was carried to a high degree of perfection, as is witnessed by the reliefs. Battering rams were used, as well as implements for hurling great stones. Mining was resorted to, and a fortified camp often established outside the beleaguered city. On the walls of Sennacherib's palace is a portrayal of the siege of Laḥîs in Judah; the assault, the defence, the surrender, and its delivery to the king, who sits for that purpose, in full array upon his throne—all are accurately depicted. Within the fortified camp a religious ceremonial is seen in progress. Two priests with ball-shaped cups are sacrificing on an altar, before which stands a table with sacrificial gifts, and the objects of their reverence are apparently two standards, which always accompany the king in war. We may judge that the standards are the pledge of the divine presence in the army though the symbolism is unknown to us.

Tireless warriors, all-powerful rulers, then were the kings of Assur, while those of Babylonia were no less absolute monarchs. But if we may conjecture what cannot be proved, they were limited in their despotism by the mighty priesthoods of Babel, Nipur, Eridu. An unlimited autocracy does not exclude the presence of general laws, and to the question whether the great kings themselves were bound by such laws, we must decidedly answer in the affirmative.

Sargon II. speaks of the laws of Assur, violated by his predecessors, restored by himself. A remarkable Babylonian-text describes the fearful misfortunes that visit land and people when the king does not respect the laws. It is true that no earthly power can call him to account, but he has to fear the vengeance of Ea, the arbiter of destiny. If he judges after the book of Ea, the gods will exalt him. If injustice is done to Sippar, Nipur or Babel, the vengeance of the gods of these places visits him. The whole prophetic discourse is thus summed up. "Be he over-shepherd, be he temple-director, or a royal official who superintends temples in Sippar, Nipur or Babel... the great gods will be angry, they will forget their dwellings, they will not enter into their sanctuaries." It is clear then that the

Babylonian and Assyrian monarchy was no blind despotism, but that the duty was recognized by prince and people to rule according to justice and law.

The *customs* of the people can only be presented in their leading features. But we find in the palaces of Assyrian princes, and in the remnants of the old Chaldean culture, evidences of great luxury. The walls are richly adorned, the men and women wear various ornaments of precious metals; weapons, wagons, furniture, all articles of daily life, unite artistic simplicity with richness and splendor. Of course a wide difference existed between court life and the life of the common people. But whatever may be conjectured concerning the earliest life of the people, it is certain that at Ur and Eridu, houses have been excavated, built of bricks, with several chambers, with traces of wall painting, which without doubt were private dwellings. Business transactions were not limited to those high in rank. There is evidence that in the great cities, like Babel, there was a well-to-do middle class, and luxury may not have been peculiar to the nobility.

As in other states of antiquity, so in Assyria and Babylonia, slavery and the slave-trade existed. The price of a slave varied from about \$12.50 to \$475.00. A high price was paid for one who understood handicraft. In Babel the slaves wore small olives of burnt clay about their necks, which bore their own names, that of their master and the date of purchase. The temples had their slaves, who sometimes gave oracular utterances.

The Babylonians are usually represented as soft and voluptuous; the Assyrians as harsh and cruel. This statement is too sweeping. We know the treatment of Zedekiah by Nebuchadnezzar, and luxury was by no means unknown to the later Assyrians. There is, however, some truth in the contrast. The Assyrians were more warlike and aggressive than the Babylonians, who, on the other hand, in the arts of peace, in the sciences, in the elements of higher civilization, were pre-eminent. Assyrians formed the nucleus of the Assyrian army. The Babylonian army consisted of Kassites, and they paid the mercenaries of Elam with their temple treasures.

The Babylonian artistic sense was finer; the Assyrian, more realistic. The voluptuous Istar was extensively worshiped in Nineveh as well as in Babylonia. From whatever sources Herodotus derived his account of the sacrifice of chastity upon the altar of the great goddess at Babel, it is clear that Istar of Uruk (Erech), together with her companions, presents no ideal of purity. But the poets of Babylonia are sharp in condemning her. The repulsive features of Istar's worship must have been survivals of an early cultus, which was non-Semitic. Religious conservatism sometimes perpetuates customs which have long lost their significance. The difference in moral standards seems to be rather between the old Chaldeans and Semites in the north and south, than between Assyrians and Babylonians. In the south the old Chaldaic element was prominent.

The kings of Assyria and Babylonia had extensive harems. Perhaps queenly honors were granted to but one of the wives. In a well-known relief, the king is seen taking a festal meal, in his vine arbor, in a splendid palace garden, with his queen, surrounded by eunuchs; but this does not prove that he had not true wives and many slaves besides.

The architectural precautions against the violation of the female apartments indicate that, at least, in the higher circles, polygamy was the rule. Choice wines

were greatly prized by the Assyrians. This love for wines probably gave the Prophet Nahum opportunity to reproach the Ninevites with drunkenness.

They were the most cruel nation of antiquity. Without a trace of shame they picture their butcheries on the walls of their palaces. Maiming was the lightest cruelty. The sweetest revenge was to flay an enemy alive, and nail his skin to the city wall. Impalement was also a favorite torture, and when the king is merry in the garden with his spouse, the heads of his conquered enemies are hung up before his eyes. While the impartial historian can only express abhorrence at these barbarities, it must be remembered that all Semites were cruel and revengeful, and their successors, the Persians, and even western nations, considered no punishment too severe to suppress insurrection against the national god.

[To be continued.]

OLD TESTAMENT WORD-STUDIES: 5. DIVINE LAW.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL, D. D.,

New London, Conn.

The human spirit stands in close and dependent relation to the divine, which is not only the source of life but also the source of law. In the present group of words we consider those which express in one form or another the idea of divine will, justice, wisdom, and love entering into the sphere of human relations as fundamental principles of conduct, controlling, directing, guiding a sinful and estranged humanity from the pains and penalties of sin unto a restoration of the union and fellowship with God wherein man realizes his true happiness and exalted destiny.

Dîn cause, judgment.

The verb *dîn* in the majority of its occurrences refers to divine judicial interpositions; such, e. g., as when Jehovah vindicated the innocence of his maligned servants, Gen. 30:6; Ps. 7:8(9), pronounces sentence upon his people who have his law but fail to keep it, Ps. 50:4, or chastises heathen nations that have oppressed Israel, Gen. 15:14; Ps. 110:6. The substantive, however, which in the Aramaic of Daniel is used exclusively to denote a sentence proceeding from the divine tribunal, is used in biblical Hebrew only once in this sense, Ps. 76:8. In every other instance it denotes a judicial utterance emanating from human authority, Job 19:29; Esth. 1:13, and hence, by metonymy, the civil suits or disputed legal questions concerning which the parties interested sought to obtain favorable decisions, Ps. 140:12; Prov. 29:7. In its primary sense of ruling, this word points back to the time when judicial as well as governing functions were vested in the ruler or chief, as is still common in the East.

Dāth edict, law.

This word is characteristic of the latest biblical literature. From this it passes into the rabbinical writings where it is used in the general sense of law or religion. From the fact that no satisfactory Hebrew or Aramaic etymology has been discovered for it, and that the word suddenly became prominent during Israel's contact with Persia in the exilic and post-exilic periods, it has been inferred that the word

is of Persian origin, and may be traced to the passive participle of the verb *dâ*, denoting that which has been given, placed, fixed, hence a decree or law established by royal authority. This is the prevailing signification of the word in the Book of Esther. In Ezra and Daniel it includes also divine decrees; Ezra was a scribe of the law of the God of heaven, 7:12,21, and against Daniel no occasion could be found save concerning the law of his God, 6:5(6). One very remarkable exception to this very late use of the word occurs in the difficult passage, Deut. 33:2. Its presence in this early and pure Hebrew is not susceptible of explanation either on the traditional or the critical view of the origin of the book. Its presence here is possibly the result of a post-exilic corruption of the text, and this becomes the more probable in view of the LXX. reading, "upon his right hand his angels," instead of "at his right hand a fiery law unto them," 'ēsh dāth lāmō. Nor is it readily conceivable how such a corruption could have crept in through the error of a copyist.

Hōq, hūqqāh statute, ordinance.

The radicals *hq* form the basis of several verbs, such as *hāqāh*, *hāqāq*, which mean primarily to pierce, cut into, engrave, etc. The latter is used in Isa. 22:16 to designate the act of hewing out a sepulcher in the rock, and in Isa. 30:8 the inscribing of a divine message on a tablet where it might remain "forever and forever" as an imperishable testimony. In Isa. 49:16 Jehovah declares that he has engraved the restored Israel on the palms of his hands, that it might be continually before him. So Job (19:23,24) exclaims,

"Oh that my words were now written!
Oh that they were inscribed in a book!
That with an iron pen and lead
They were graven in the rock for ever!"

From these and similar usages it appears that a *hōq* designated the words which were thus engraved in metal or stone, and hence a fixed appointment, an immutable edict or decree proceeding from an established authority. *Hōq* might accordingly designate anything determined by measure, as "bread of my appointment," i. e. a portion which God assigns, Prov. 30:8; Job 23:12, a task given to slaves, Exod. 5:14; the predetermined bounds of human life, Job 15:5; the fixed limits of the sea, Job 26:10; Prov. 8:29. A consuetudinary law is called a *hōq* in Israel, Jud. 11:39. The word is chiefly used, however, to designate either a single regulation, or the whole body of theocratic laws imparted to Israel as a revelation of Jehovah's will touching morals, politics, jurisprudence, or religion. Inasmuch as the validity of these ordinances rested on a recognized authority uninfluenced by the fluctuations of public opinion or by royal caprice, they would naturally be designated by a term which, like *hōq*, would point to their permanence and stability. Hence the frequent expression "it shall be a statute forever," or "a perpetual statute."

Hūqqāh is from the same stem as *hōq*, and has the same general meaning. In two instances, 1 Kgs. 3:3; Mic. 6:16, it refers to royal decrees, but in all other instances it refers to statutes or ordinances conceived of as established by divine authority. In a few places, Lev. 18:3,30; 20:23; 2 Kgs. 17:8, it designates heathen customs and practices, but detestable as these were to the minds of

pious Israelites, in the estimate of the heathen themselves they were supposed to rest on the sanction of their deities. The laws of nature called "the ordinances of heaven," Job 38:33; Jer. 33:25, or "of the moon," Jer. 31:35, were regarded as direct expressions of the creative will of Jehovah. In all the remaining ninety-three occurrences of this word it refers directly to those early expressions of divine will which had been communicated to individuals for their personal guidance, as in the case of Abraham, Gen. 26:5, or to those more formal legislative specifications delivered to an acknowledged representative of the nation, as in the case of Moses and the Mosaic code. This was composed of ḥūqqôth, statutes, that could not be changed or repealed except by the Lawgiver himself, nor were the people permitted to make distinctions between the several precepts.

Mĭtsvāh commandment.

Both English versions are quite consistent in rendering this word by "commandment." The A. V. in only half a dozen, and the R. V. in a still less number of instances, depart from this rendering, Neh. 10:32(33); Jer. 32:11; 35:18; Dan. 9:5. In the first of these places the word designates certain "ordinances" which the returned Jews made for themselves relative to the support of the temple service, and here the usual rendering would clearly be out of place; in the second, its meaning is uncertain, denoting either the law of contracts, or the specifications contained in a contract; in the third, the variation seems to be required by the laws of euphony, and in the fourth to be entirely arbitrary. The corresponding word in the LXX. is ἐντολή, and in the Vulgate *praeceptum*. Mĭtsvāh is from tsāvāh, the root-meaning of which is "to be fast;" (Piel) to make fast, or secure; hence, to order, command. In a few instances mĭtsvāh is applied to special royal orders, but everywhere else it designated those direct expressions of Jehovah's will which constituted Israel's law. He had a right to command, and their duty was summed up in prompt and willing obedience.

Mĭshmĕrĕth charge.

The divine law was also Israel's peculiar treasure, that which distinguished and lifted the nation above all other nations in point of religious privilege and enlightenment. So long as the people loyally observed its precepts this law was regarded as a pledge of greater economic prosperity and of more secure defence against enemies than the fabulous wealth and vast armies of neighboring empires. It was the priceless national jewel to be kept and guarded with scrupulous care, not as a thing that Israel had discovered or devised, but as that which Jehovah, their covenant God, had most solemnly entrusted to their guardianship. From this point of view the law was called mĭshmĕrĕth, Lev. 8:35; 18:30; Num. 9:19,23; Deut. 11:1; Mal. 3:14, etc.; it was a charge, i. e. a trust accompanied by specific directions respecting the manner in which it was to be kept and used. More frequently, however, the word referred to the discharge of official duties connected with the care of the sanctuary and with its ritual. "The Levites shall keep the mĭshmĕrĕth of the tabernacle," Num. 1:53; to each of the three leading Levitical families was given the mĭshmĕrĕth, charge, of some designated part of this whole work, Num.3:25,31,36. At the dedication of the first temple the priests were arranged in ranks according to their several mĭshmĕrĕth, 2 Chron. 7:16.

Mishpāt judgment.

Like *dīn*, *mīshpāt* also denotes a judicial sentence. It is derived from *shāphāt*, to erect, set upright, and this primary meaning transferred to the administration of justice gives the signification of judging. *Mīshpāt* differs from *dīn* in that it implies a reference to an objective standard of right and equity. The latter is simply a decision handed down by a judge who has it in his power to pervert justice should self-interest or pleasure dictate such a course. A *dīn*, accordingly, may, or may not, be just and equitable. This being the case, we find it used only in a single instance, Ps. 76:8(9), of a divine judicial utterance. *Mīshpāt*, on the contrary, in virtue of its ethical force, always implies a sentence framed with reference to an absolute standard, and hence a just and equitable decision. Because of this moral aspect of *mīshpāt* we find, moreover, that it is quite frequently associated with *ts'dhākāh*, righteousness, the latter being the eternal principle and divine attribute which expresses itself as *mīshpāt* in relation to all forms of conduct. This makes it clear why this word rather than *dīn* was chosen by biblical writers to designate the judicial utterances of Jehovah, since these are universally characterized by conformity to perfect justice. These divine *mīshpātīm*, as declarations of the highest law, intimate also a close connection between obedience and reward, or disobedience and penalty. Jehovah is both the Judge and the Vindicator of his law, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do *mīshpāt*?" Gen. 18:25; i. e. Shall he not pronounce and execute a sentence respecting which there can be no possible suspicion of injustice? Nor does God pervert *mīshpāt*, Deut. 16:19; Job. 8:3, as earthly judges do who turn it into "wormwood" and "gall," Amos 5:7; 6:12.

Throughout Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy *mīshpāt* is most frequently synonymous with *hūqqīm*, statutes, and stands for the entire legislation contained in these books. This signification is also characteristic of the later historical books, of the post-exilic 119th Psalm, and especially of Ezekiel among the prophets. In the earlier prophetic and poetic literature, on the contrary, it usually denotes God's acts of punitive or reformatory judgment. In Judges, Samuel and 2 Kings it is generally used as a designation of religious customs or royal habits.

'ēdhūth testimony.

This is a significant and characteristic designation of the divine law. It is not merely a code determining the rights of persons and things, but a revelation which bears impressive witness to the holy character of God, to his unalterable opposition to sin, and to his displeasure against those who disregard his law. The law was an affirmation of universal and unchangeable principles of religion and morality, and as such became a standing testimony against every apostacy from Jehovah's service, as well as against every violation of personal rights. Throughout the middle books of the Pentateuch *'ēdhūth* is the technical designation of the Decalogue, which was laid up in the ark under the mercy-seat—"the symbol of God's righteous severity against sin being hidden beneath the symbol of his grace and mercy." The Decalogue was the basis of Jehovah's covenant with Israel, and as such occupied the central place in the sanctuary. Other things were named from their proximity to it, as, e. g., the two tables of the testimony, Exod. 31:18; the ark of the testimony, Exod. 30:6; the veil of

the testimony, Lev. 24:3; the tabernacle of the testimony, Exod. 38:21; the congregation before the testimony, Num. 17:4(19), etc. In the plural form, 'ēdh'voth, this word is used in the later historical books and in the Psalms as a collective designation of the whole body of laws that claimed Jehovah as their author. It was, therefore, interchangeable with "commandments" and "statutes." The title of Ps. 60 presents this word in a connection which, as in the case of most of these titles, is of exceedingly obscure interpretation. "Upon a Lily of the Testimony" suggests that the Psalm was set to a melody associated with these words.

Pîqqûdîm precepts.

A poetic term found exclusively in the Psalms. It occurs twenty-one times in Ps. 119, and only three times in all the rest. The LXX. in seventeen instances renders it ἐντολή, and the Vulgate *praeceptum*; hence the prevailing rendering "precept" in the A. V. The R. V. consistently translates it so in every instance. From the point of view presented in this word, the law is regarded as a system of ethics which, having a divine author, must be infallibly "upright," Ps. 19:8(9), in its exposition of human duty, and eternally "faithful," Ps. 111:7, assuring a realization of the highest good to those in every age and in all circumstances who make its requirements the *norma normans* of life and duty.

Tôrâh law.

The influence of a theory in determining the signification of a word is strikingly shown in the case of tôrâh. The scholarship of only a few years ago, resting on the traditional construction of Israelitish history, asserted quite positively that this word wherever it occurred in the Old Testament, referred to the Mosaic or Pentateuchal code. Now, on the contrary, the critics assure us that in the prophetic writings and in the Psalms, formerly supposed to be replete with references to the Sinaitic legislation, there is but one "absolutely certain reference to the Pentateuch," viz., Mal. 4:4 (Cheyne, Isa., vol. 1:6). In all other instances we must read "instruction" or "prophetic revelation." Of course if the Pentateuchal law, as we know it, did not come into existence until after the exile, the prophets who wrote before that time could not have referred to it, and any apparent references must be interpreted accordingly. The signification of this word in any given place will then be determined entirely by the interpreter's critical bias.

The word itself is derived from the Hiph. of yārâh, to show, teach, and means primarily instruction, doctrine. This meaning was gradually extended into that of authoritative declaration, and this again passed into the sense of law. Tôrâh, even when it came to have this last meaning, was not employed in such a rigidly "juristic sense" as our word law. "But in the theocratic sphere it always applied to a revelation of the divine will in the form of a norm and permanent rule." (Orelli, *O. T. Prophecy*, p. 129.)

JEREMIAH'S TEMPERAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR WM. G. BALLANTINE, D. D.,

Oberlin Theol. Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio.

It is popularly assumed that the Prophet Jeremiah was naturally of an extremely melancholy temperament. He is thought of as a man who carried gloom with him, who had a readiness for seeing the dark side of things, and who easily melted into tears. We hear much now-a-days of the "gospel of sunshine." The world is to be conquered by hope and courage. To many, Jeremiah stands as a conspicuous example of "how not to do it." He is contrasted with Moses and Samuel and Paul as timidity is contrasted with courage and as failure is contrasted with success.

But whatever of the gloom of the Book of Jeremiah we set down to the disposition of the prophet we subtract from the impression of that historical crisis which Providence appointed him to feel and to interpret. The idea is often flippantly thrown out in a humorous way that a man's theology is as much to be attributed to his liver as to his brain. Thus the most solemn expositions of the guilt and doom of sin are robbed of their power to alarm, being quietly referred to want of exercise or want of sleep on the part of the preacher.

The history of the Hebrew nation is a real tragedy. The Davidic kingdom failed. In its decline and fall every element of humiliation and bitterness was combined, and a lesson was given to all time. But the world can learn history only through literature. It was necessary that some grand, sensitive, patriotic, heroic soul should live through all these terrible national experiences, feel them as his own, take in their full moral significance, and express all the shame and woe of them in immortal words.

Measuring merit, as Americans do, by success, it is hard for us justly to appreciate the greatness of a man who was appointed interpreter of utter national collapse. Jeremiah did not succeed in anything but in doing his duty. At the end of twenty-three years, he could look back on a dead uniformity of failure. If Jeremiah is the saddest character in Hebrew history, we must remember that he had the saddest position of all. Moses was horrified at the sight of the golden calf. But he had power to destroy the idol, and his intercession for the people averted the threatened judgment. Jeremiah found idols everywhere; children were sacrificed to them; the nation clung to them even in exile. And he was forbidden to intercede, since the situation was beyond the help even of a Moses (15:1). Joshua lay on his face after the repulse at Ai, in deepest discouragement. But he soon saw the nation purged and victorious. Jeremiah's fellow-citizens were all Achans, and defeat followed defeat. Elijah, bold as he was, fled away disconsolate, as Jeremiah wished he could do, and sat down under the juniper tree. But he was sent to Horeb to learn that seven thousand still remained faithful to Jehovah. Jeremiah is left unable to find one that seeketh truth. Samuel was grieved at the failure of the theocracy and at the disobedience of

Saul. Yet his intercession for the people was still powerful, and he had the privilege of anointing David, the new hope of the nation. Jeremiah watches the brief inglorious career of each of the successive weaklings of the house of Josiah with no duty but to foretell ruin and to weep. For even a Samuel could have done nothing more now. Paul had great sorrow and continual pain in his heart for his brethren's sake; but it was his relief to go far away and do a mighty constructive work among the Gentiles. Jeremiah, equally scorned and rejected, had still to stay and watch the throes of national death.

Thus neither Moses nor Joshua nor Samuel nor Elijah nor Paul was ever subjected to such a trial as Jeremiah. As a sufferer he stands next to our Lord himself. Why should we attribute his distress to unusual predisposition to melancholy? If he shrank from the stern task assigned to him, Moses and Isaiah had done the same. If he yielded to discouragement, Joshua had done the same. If he longed for a lodge in the wilderness, the bold Elijah had sought the same. If he cursed the day of his birth, Job, the great example of patience, had done the same. If he wept over Jerusalem, so did our Lord. That Jeremiah preserved the sweetness of his affections and the loyalty of his piety and the boldness of his official testimony to the end, argues rather a naturally strong, ardent, high-spirited, heroic nature.

Jeremiah was a lonely man, not from choice but by divine command. The consolation of wife and children was denied him. His brethren and his father's house dealt treacherously with him. The men of Anathoth, his native village, conspired against his life. He suffered arrest on a false charge of desertion, imprisonment, the stocks, confinement in a miry dungeon. He lived at strife with the king, the princes, the prophets, the priests, and all the people.

As a patriot, Jeremiah had the unwelcome duty of discouraging patriotic hopes and resistance to foreign oppression. He shared in the overwhelming and never forgotten national sorrow over the fall of Josiah at Megiddo. Then followed the captivity of Jehoaahaz; the luxury, oppression, defiant impiety and death of Jehoiakim, who was buried with the burial of an ass; the weakness, wickedness, captivity, and childlessness of Jehoiachin; the pusillanimity, captivity, bereavement, and blindness of Zedekiah. When the royal house had thus exhausted all the possibilities of ignominy, and Gedaliah's vigor kindled a ray of hope, this was suddenly quenched by his atrocious murder, and all the wounds of the bleeding nation were opened afresh. Nothing could now restrain the infatuation of the people from a voluntary exile in Egypt. It was Jeremiah's duty to foretell continually invasion, famine, pestilence, drought, overthrow, captivity, the destruction of the city and temple. No other prophet ever had such a task—to go always downward but never upward, to pass from gloom into thicker blackness, to see each national shame merged in a deeper, to see defeat added to defeat, but never a victory, to see calamity fall on calamity, yet the people never wiser or more penitent. He was never allowed to attempt to arouse the national spirit.

As a prophet, to Jeremiah was not assigned the privilege of reforming, delivering, inspiring, leading, but only the burden of predicting, and then witnessing, the doom of obstinacy. He found the whole nation in a state of perpetual backsliding. Idolatry was universal. The blood of the innocent poor flowed unavenged. The prophets prophesied falsely, the priests profited by it, and the people loved to have it so. Sodom and Gomorrah alone could furnish a parallel.

Thus personally and as a lover of his country and as a lover of God, Jeremiah felt every grief that can wring the heart and never had any earthly alleviation. To ask why he was not cheerful and sunny and hopeful under such circumstances, is frivolous. His life was a long Gethsemane. He went down with his nation into its grave. To attribute the sadness of the Book of Jeremiah to the author's natural liability to the "blues," is to miss the point of the longest and sublimest lesson of the hideousness and dreadful consequences of sin given to the world before Calvary. In its effect upon so strong and healthful and great a man as Jeremiah we are to measure the appalling horror of the national ruin.

Jesus of Nazareth was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. We are never told that he smiled; but we are told three times that he wept. Those who think slightly of Jeremiah will find it hard to appreciate the character of our Lord. In view of our great national sins and our national levity, in view of the shallow views and superficial work of many professed Christians, it seems that the church of America needs a new study of the thoughts and feelings of Jeremiah. Even in our country there may be situations where a man of God may have a good reason for tears, a full excuse for failure, and a divine impulse to terrible denunciation.

A VISIT TO ZINJIRLI.

BY ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH. D.,

Bagdad, Turkey in Asia.

On the 19th of October, 1888, accompanied by Mr. Perez H. Field and two servants, I left Aintab for Zinjirli. After a journey of seven hours—almost due west—over a rugged and mountainous road, we stopped at Sara-Kaya, i. e. the yellow cliff, for the night. The inhabitants of this small mountain-village seemed to be afraid of our Frank dress and repeating rifles, as we were refused cover on all sides. However, after an hour's parley, we finally persuaded one of the old men to take us into his house. After a night of ceaseless fighting with the vermin peculiar to these regions, we continued our journey westward. The road, if such a dignified name can be given to the paths and river beds through which we passed, lay over the mountains, until, after seven hours riding, we reached the so-called Antioch plain. We crossed this plain in two hours; and, at 3 P. M., we were upon the mound of Zinjirli. The guard, left by the Germans, very kindly gave us permission to make our headquarters in one of the wooden tents, erected by the Germans for a warehouse. As we were fatigued, we made only a cursory examination of the mound before retiring.

On the next morning, we entered into a closer examination of the trenches, hoping to find some objects which the Germans had not taken away. We were only partially successful. In one of the largest ditches, I found a large statue of a Hittite lion. The figure of the lion proper rests on a base 1m. 76cms. high, 1m. 45cms. broad, and 76cms. thick. Only the head, shoulders and two fore-paws of the lion were carved out of this rock. The height of the lion is the same as the breadth of the stone, viz. 1m. 45cms. The highest part of its head projects

above the base 1m. 10cms., and the paws 80cms. The statue called to mind at once the large lions in the British Museum. The carving, however, is very much ruder—exceedingly rude. The stone and figure are perfectly preserved. There is no inscription on them. The statue is now lying in a circular hole in one of the largest trenches, tipped up at an angle of 45°.

We found another interesting room on the other side of the mound near the three wooden tents. The first thing to attract my attention here was a large statue, about the size of the Shalmaneser Monolith in the British Museum, leaning up against one of the sides of the trench. After a closer examination, I found that it was of plaster paris, colored—evidently an unsuccessful attempt made by the Germans to take a cast of some large object. In the same chamber, I found some very fine tiles. They were of burnt clay, reddish color, and about 29cms. square. They could be modern. They were placed evenly in the form of a floor and they had evidently served for this purpose. Further on, resting on a base 1m. 4cms. square, is a finely cut circular object with flat top and bottom. This object was probably the base of a statue. Its height is 60cms, circumference at top and bottom 2m. 30cms., and at centre 2m. 90cms. It is cracked lengthwise through the centre. Around both top and bottom are carved rope-mouldings. We found two other interesting chambers, which I shall not attempt to describe.

Zinjirli lies at the base of the Amanus mountains, called by the Turks Giaour—east of the ridge—facing the Antioch plain. It is in one of the narrowest parts of the plain, midway between Antioch and Marash. The mound is comparatively small and low—about a half-mile in circuit,—its elevation above the surrounding plain being 30–40 feet. The Germans, who excavated in the spring of 1888, have literally perforated the greater part of the mound with deep, broad trenches. The ground in the mound is very hard and gritty, and filled with large round stones. At present, these stones are being drawn away on two-wheeled carts by the natives to be used for building purposes.

An hour and one quarter to the east is another large mound. It is about 75ft. in elevation and larger than Zinjirli. From the inhabitants in the Kurdish summer-village at Zinjirli, I learned that the Germans intended to return in March, 1889, to prosecute their work at Zinjirli and to open this other mound. I also learned that two hours to the north-east, lying in a boggy marsh, there are two large Hittite monuments. At present they are under water. They could, however, be gotten out very easily, and the natives would be glad to point out exactly where they are.

Visitors to Zinjirli can find accommodations either on the mound itself or at Keller, a village 40 minutes to the south-west. On our return to Aintab, we remained over night at Beilan Kōj, taking from that point a much smoother and better road to Aintab. The distance from Aintab to Zinjirli is generally placed at 18 hours. We went in 16 and returned in 13. An interesting article on "Sculptures near Zinjirli" is to be found in the June, 1887, number of the *American Journal of Archaeology*.

AINTAB, TURKEY, Oct. 30th, 1888.

SYNOPSIS OF IMPORTANT ARTICLES.

The Interpretation of the Book of Job.*—The commonly accepted interpretation which makes "the mystery of God's providential government of men" the subject of the book is to be rejected, because 1) it lays too much emphasis upon what is external and mechanical; 2) it makes what is subordinate play the leading part.

The Book of Job is "the Epic of the Inner Life," "an epic in which is recorded the spiritual history of the man of Uz, his struggles and adventures, unknown to sense, but real to faith." Of Satan's agency in his calamities, Job has no knowledge; but of the calamities themselves, he has a very lively sense. They mark him as a man "smitten of God." Here, then, is Job's difficulty. He is righteous; and yet God is treating him as though he were guilty. How can that be? Doubt begets doubt. Can it be that the powers that work unseen are after all arrayed on the side of evil and against godliness? Even his friends do not understand his case. They withhold sympathy but not reproaches. He is led, however, to break with the conventional view of God and to stake "life and destiny on the belief that the powers that work unseen, in spite of inexorable appearances, are for righteousness."

Two questions remain. The first has reference to bridging the chasm between his soul and God. The second centers about the enigma of death. The idea of a Daysman between him and God furnishes the solution to the first. Only the supposition that man shall live again enables him to solve the second.

But what of this present world, with its perplexing facts and problems? The three friends portray the awful fate of the wicked. Job retorts by calling their attention to the prosperity and security of the wicked. The friends have no answer. It remains then for him to fit himself into the sum of things, to find by creative faith "the road through this life, where so often wickedness gets the pay and righteousness the oppression." He begins with the wicked. Their life is not founded on the truth of things. It will not, therefore, endure. The twenty-eighth chapter reveals "the true wisdom of life,"—the reality.

After Job's retrospect (chs. 29-31), of his former life of prosperity and honor, the discourses of Elihu are introduced. Elihu, like the three friends, is a conventional believer. "It is the author's intention, in the persons of Elihu and Job, to bring these two classes, who have been the antagonists throughout the poem, to the test of God's immediate presence." The way they meet that ordeal will show who has the real determination of heart towards God. Then comes Job's vindication. At last, that Presence is here for whose coming he had so fervently longed. But the revelation? Only this: that we are, in all things, "to see that there is wisdom and power sufficient for everything, to make every creature fulfill its part in one infinite purpose and will." And this is his vindication: "to go on with enlightened eyes and chastened spirit." Job's restoration to health and prosperity seems, to some, an artistic blemish. It would have been, had that

* By Professor John F. Genung, in *The Andover Review*, Nov., 1838. pp. 437-466.

been the end which Job sought. But that for which he longed had been realized in the vision of God. His restoration was merely an incidental addition. In other words, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." A. M. W.

The great merit of this interpretation is that it takes the book as it lies before us and seeks to harmonize all the facts. The article is a masterly one and deserves study.

The Resurrection in the Pentateuch.*—Can we derive from the Pentateuch the same idea of resurrection that we at present hold? Light is thrown on the meaning of the Pentateuch from two sources: 1) From discoveries in Babylonia. The description of the Chaldean Sheol resembles that of the Bible. The gods could restore the dead to life. After death those accepted by the gods would become like them. 2) From Egypt. As far back as 3000 B. C., the Egyptians looked forward to a future life, where the righteous as a reward for their good deeds were to die no more, and where the impure were to go to a lake of fire. Thus we get a knowledge of the religious belief of Babylonia, whence Abraham came, and of Egypt, under whose suzerainty over Canaan Abraham lived for 100 years. The Pentateuch contains the doctrine of resurrection, as is shown 1) by the appeal made to the Pentateuch in proof of resurrection by our Saviour and Paul; 2) by a study of Genesis, in relation to (1) the creation of man. Man is a union of a body, and a living spirit from God. Personality is not destroyed at death, but the spirit in the other world is to represent the man. Thus Abraham is to "go to his fathers in peace." (2) Adam, who first lived in communion with God. As a punishment for his sin, the sentence not merely of physical death, but of spiritual death, was passed on him, which means he was cut off from communion with God. (3) Cain and Abel. Abel, who was accepted of God, is slain by Cain, yet Cain's life is guarded by God. If, then, death ended all, was not Abel the loser and Cain the gainer? Adam, then, had this dilemma to face: Either death ends all, and hence there is no God of life who is faithful to his word; or God lives and Abel will be rewarded in another sphere, and Cain punished. Enoch, as a reward for his faith, was taken to God. Is it not reasonable to believe that faithful Abel looked for the same spiritual blessings? Would not Adam reasonably have this hope for Abel from all that he knew of God? All these things seem to point to a hope of resurrection. Enoch, Abraham, and Moses had this same belief. This is further illustrated from Ezek. 37:1-14 and Rev. 11:3-13. H. C.

An ingenious article on the right side—an argument, however, which takes no account of the critical view of the Pentateuch, and the possibility that the writer or writers wrote from the stand-point of their own times.

Elijah the Tishbite a Gentile.†—Six reasons are suggested to show that Elijah was a Gentile. 1. The Hebrew word *toshab* is used to signify "foreigner," "stranger," or "sojourner," and the two latter terms were never applied to Jews by their countrymen. 2. Elijah was fed by the unclean ravens; even if the raven had been clean, yet it would have here been unclean to a Jew, since its talons were

* By Howard Osgood, D. D., in *The Baptist Quarterly Review*, October, 1888.

† By Dr. Joseph Longking, in *The Methodist Review*, November, 1888.

polluted by contact with carrion. 3. The widow of Zarephath is to be regarded as a heathen. Elijah was sent to her, because 1) Elijah and his hostess were non-Israelites; 2) this foreign place afforded security. 4. The brook Cherith is east of the Jordan, and Elijah goes home when he goes to dwell by that brook. 5. Luke 4:25-27 establishes the fact of the Gentile origin of both the widow and Naaman, and strongly suggests Elijah to be of the same race. 6. In the transfiguration scene Elijah stands as a representative of the Gentiles.

Rejoinder by the Editor.—The language used implies not that he was a foreigner in Israel, but a foreigner in Gilead. *Toshab*, though usually employed to indicate a stranger dwelling in the midst of Israel, yet in Ps. 39:12 and 1 Chron. 29:15 is used of a pilgrim. 2. Because Elijah was fed by unclean ravens it does not follow that all they touch is unclean. Lev. 11:15,24,25,31,32 shows that the law applied to carcasses. 3. As to the location of Cherith, 1) natives tell us it is west of the Jordan; 2) if east, it proves no more than that Gilead is east of the Jordan. 4. In Luke 4:25-27 the Saviour places the emphasis more upon the woman than upon the prophet, and does not imply that Elijah was a Gentile. 5. At the transfiguration the living represented the living, and the departed represented the departed. 6. Again it is, 1) not likely that the Almighty would send a Gentile to the Hebrews; 2) no record of the non-Hebraic descent of Elijah is found; 3) in the character of Elijah we discover nothing incompatible with his Hebraic nationality. F.

The Rise and Decline of Idolatry.*—"Fetichism is the infancy of religion," is a theory that was started in a time of intellectual ferment and is crude, untenable. Idolatry, of which fetichism is the lowest type, "is not a primary but a secondary formation." "The human race, when it came to have a religion, set out with a pure monotheism," from which idolatry is a retrogression. The three stages in the development of idolatry are, 1) a beginning in nature-worship; man must worship, but apart from the light of divine revelation he worships that in nature which reflects himself; 2) a logical tendency from the simplicity of nature-worship to a diversity of personalized forms. This is historically true in Egypt, Greece and Rome, and suggests that as idolatry began in simplicity there was behind it an absolute simplicity, the one God, and a monotheistic faith, the common property of mankind. This view of idolatry is illustrated in the history of Israel in their rushing into idolatry under the impulse of their passions whence only God could save them. And here it is noted that not only passion but intellect left to itself begets idolatry. Witness the history of Buddhism, which, beginning in intellectual atheism, has ended in a multiplicity of gods. 3) The third stage is disintegration. The history of Hindoo religions is a history of perpetual division into sects, "a tangled jungle" of superstitions. Thus it is maintained that the scriptural doctrine of a fall from primitive spiritual monotheism is justified by the historical facts of the development of idolatry.

A vigorous discussion worthy of attention. The presentation of the subject is confused by a poor arrangement of the material and a tendency to diverge from the main point.

* By G. T. Flanders, D. D., in *The Universalist Quarterly*, Oct., 1888, pp. 465-478.

The Two Isaiahs, the real and the imaginary.*—This hypothesis of two Isaiahs is the creation of German rationalists, whose plausible reasoning has persuaded English students, particularly Drs. Cheyne and Driver, to adopt similar views. Dr. Driver's "Isaiah" is the latest and most popular presentation of them. But there seems to be no sufficient reasons given for disbelieving the universal and unbroken tradition of a single Isaiah. Let the methods of the new school be considered and tested. 1) They make much use of Assyriological material, which often conflicts with the biblical statements. This is more likely to show the inaccuracy of the Assyrian than that of the prophecy. Indeed, caution must be exercised in comparing the brief, condensed, general statements of Isaiah with the Assyrian records. The former are texts, summaries, and are lacking in the definite chronological character needful for adequate comparison. 2) A similar caution must be used in giving the work of the prophet a character largely political. The latter part of Isaiah is not so much concerned about Cyrus and the exiles in Babylon as about the great consummation of the church in the far future. This view links together all of Isaiah's prophecies, the early and the late. 3) These critics affirm that Isaiah could not take his position as the later prophecies represent him, in a distant future of exile, and prophesy a still more distant future to come. He must have lived in the exile to have thus spoken of the return. But the earlier prophecies speak of an exile, and the exile in effect had been slowly going on from Solomon's time. Hence Isaiah could take the wide-spread expectation of it for granted and go on to more distant events. That he should have given names of coming persons is marvelous, yet not more so than the element of time that appears. Prophecy is usually timeless. 4) They insist that the historical element in the book must settle the date of Isaiah's work. But the prophet rises above the historical situation. God, not history, is the source of the prophecy. Besides these main positions of the critics, which are largely untenable, there are other facts against them: 1) the frequent breaks in the book before ch. 40; 2) the indecisive argument from language; 3) the different views held about chs. 40-66; 4) the uniform tradition of the Jewish church. The methods and principles employed by the critics are to a great extent, (1) intellectually unsound; (2) morally irreverent and confusing in their tendencies; (3) scientifically unproductive and incredible.

This article presents an exceedingly strong argument for the older views of biblical science by using their best positions in a vigorous criticism of the newer school. Few would accept the old views if they were presented in a complete exposition, while the very boldness and progressiveness of the later criticism lay it open to assault. It is well to be reminded that one may go too fast in throwing aside what has been accepted in the past. This presentation is worth studying for its material, and demands study because of its want of order and clearness. One may note that Dr. Briggs declares in this very number of the *Review* (p. 663) that "no critic of eminence at the present day believes that Isaiah wrote chs. 40-66."

* By Principal George C. M. Douglass, D. D., in the *Presbyterian Review*, Oct., 1888, pp. 608-637.

➤BOOK : NOTICES.◀

BIBLICAL ESCHATOLOGY.*

Eschatology has been so generally relegated to the teachings of the New Testament, that a student of the Old Testament, at first sight, may deem the title of Dr. Hovey's book somewhat misleading. But the grave questions involved in the doctrine touch very vitally all revelation. Such topics as "Natural Death," "Resurrection of the Dead," "Condition of Human Souls between Death and Resurrection," "The Last Judgment," "The Final State of Believers," and "The Final State of Unbelievers" are topics which stir thought when reading Genesis as well as when reading the Apocalypse.

In a very compact form the author has given the results of years of study, stimulated by the questionings of his classes. Believing that our knowledge of final things for *definiteness* is entirely dependent upon the teachings of the Bible, he has followed the method of Christ with "a certain lawyer:" "What is written in the Law? How readeest thou?" (Lk. 10:26). Quietly, with mental reserve, and with a thorough, scholarly method, he interrogates nearly all the texts generally quoted for and against the subjects in hand, and gives us his own conclusions, leaving his reader to decide for himself. The tone of candor and catholicity is exceedingly charming. We have not noticed a sentence which smacks of the *odium theologicum*—a rare power and a rarer fact.

There may be differences of opinion as to the interpretation of some texts; perhaps some of those selected from the Old Testament are rather inferential than conclusive; but there can be no question as to the reverence with which all of them are considered. We commend the book, as timely and suggestive. It is a book to be studied as well as read, or rather to be studied when read.

THE ANCIENT WORLD AND CHRISTIANITY.†

In this work the history of the religious element in man is narrated from its earliest known sources. The well-known learning of the author, his candor and liberality, his hopeful and earnest spirit, are at their best in this volume. The literary style, as also the arrangement of the material, is worthy of praise. Beginning with pre-historic man, the religious development of the east is traced in Chaldea, Egypt and Phœnicia; then follow the religious ideas of the oriental Aryans, the religions of India in the Vedas and Buddhism. The scene changes to the west, where Hellenic paganism is succeeded by the Graeco-Roman syncretism, whose decay leaves the path open for the coming of Christ in this the fullness of time. The writer's view is that these endeavors of man after God

* BIBLICAL ESCHATOLOGY. By Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. Price, 90 cts.

† THE ANCIENT WORLD AND CHRISTIANITY. By E. De Pressense, D. D. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son.

were divinely ordered as a preparation for Christianity. "All history is sacred." The Spirit of God was at work in the heathen world as well as in the Jewish nation, to kindle a desire for the Redeemer and to foster and stimulate that desire until He shall be revealed. Nowhere are so many facts brought together concerning the ancient religions, or so broad and accurate a view taken of them in so small a compass, as in this volume. It would greatly stimulate all who are students of the Bible, whether ministers or laymen.

LUTHER AND THE BIBLE.*

The present volume of Dr. Schaff's admirable Church History possesses special importance for students of the Bible. The Reformation is the apocalypse and apotheosis of the Scriptures. It began with an opened Bible. Luther's greatest achievement was the German translation of the Scriptures. It is well known that from this period as the beginning, and from the great Reformer as the source, two great movements took their rise, the power of which is by no means broken to-day. On the one hand the Bible became an infallible book, and its very words the sole arbiter and authority in all doubtful questions. On the other hand, in Luther's free treatment of certain parts of the Scriptures may be traced the beginnings of modern rationalism. Two tendencies so opposite sprang from the same soil. In the pages of this volume will be found a clear and full statement of the facts concerning Luther's work upon the Bible and a critical estimate of his version. The dispassionate, industrious and devout spirit that characterizes all of Dr. Schaff's contributions to church history is manifest in this notable book.

GEIKIE'S HOLY LAND AND THE BIBLE.†

The literature which has grown out of Palestine exploration is very copious. Dr. Geikie recognizes the fact in the preface to the work before us. But his aim is in a popular way to employ the *latest* results of investigation in this field, and also by personal observation gather "illustrations of the several writings" from natural objects and local usages. "Nothing is more instructive" (so reads the preface) "or can be more charming, when reading scripture, than the illumination of its texts from such sources, throwing light upon its constantly recurring Oriental imagery and local allusions, and revealing the exact meaning of words and phrases which otherwise would not be adequately understood." From this it will be inferred that Dr. Geikie's itinerary is a sort of topographical commentary on the Bible. A perusal of the books confirms the impression conveyed by the preface. The increased vividness which the work gives to the scenes and events of God's Word will make it a valuable addition to the Bible-student's library. Nevertheless, it is open to criticism. Excessive diffuseness here and there distracts the attention; and there are exegeses that might better be left to the distinctively critical and exegetical commentaries.

* HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. VI. THE GERMAN REFORMATION. 1517-1590. By Philip Schaff, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$4.00.

† THE HOLY LAND AND THE BIBLE. A book of Scripture Illustrations gathered in Palestine. By Cunningham Geikie, D. D., Vicar of St. Martin's at Palace, Norwich. With a map of Palestine. 2 vols. New York: James Pott & Co. 1888. Pp. vi, 560, 544.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL OF HEBREW.

The prizes for the largest number of papers received within the year ending Nov. 30th, above the grade of 8, have been awarded as follows:

First prize, \$20.00 in books, Mr. J. K. MacGillivray, now in Princeton Theological Seminary, but of Winnipeg, Manitoba, up to the beginning of the seminary year.

Second prize, \$15.00 in books, Rev. J. F. Morgan, Coeyman's Junction, N. Y.

Third prize, \$10.00, Miss Maria Whitney, of New York City.

Fourth prize, \$5.00, Rev. D. H. Patterson, Tuilly, N. Y.

The next twenty students, in the order of the number of papers sent are 1, Rev. J. van Houte, S. Holland, Ill.; 2, Rev. E. H. Barnett, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.; 3, A. A. Quinian, College Mound, Mo.; 4, Rev. E. T. Miller, Halifax, N. S.; 5, Rev. Canon A. A. Von Iffland, Bergerville, Quebec; 6, Rev. C. G. Hudson, Anderson, Ind.; 7, Rev. Ira D. Darling, Sheffield, Pa.; 8, Rev. R. M. Kirby, Potsdam, N. Y.; 9, Rev. J. W. Saunders, Deer Park, Ill.; 10 to 13 (same no.) Rev. J. F. Clarkson, Osborn, Mo.; Rev. D. F. Davies, Paddy's Run, O.; Prof. Holmes Dyingier, Carthage, Ill.; Rev. C. H. Haggart, Townsville, Queensland, Australia; 14, Rev. B. W. Mebane, Dublin, Va.; 15, Miss Cassie Quinian, Stella, Neb.; 16, Rev. J. H. Messenger, Mechanicsville, N. Y.; 17, Rev. S. E. Jones, Wheeling, W. Va.; 18, Mr. D. S. Gage, Macon, Ill.; 19, Rev. J. G. Tanner, Houston, Texas; 20, Miss Frances Blackburn, Oxford, England.

The February number of the STUDENT will contain the annual report of the Principal, in which all members of both the Correspondence and Summer Schools will be interested. This will take the place of the Correspondence School page for that issue. The reports this month are therefore extended over the first half of Dec. as well as the month of Nov.

The enrollments number forty-six, viz.: Rev. John Allender, Champaign, Ill.; Prof. W. B. Anderson, LaBelle, Mo.; Rev. I. L. Case, Ripley, Tenn.; Rev. R. J. Church, Stratford, N. Y.; Miss L. R. Corwin, Cleveland, O.; Rev. W. J. Cuthbertson, Deer River, N. Y.; Rev. R. A. Davidson, Boston, Mass.; Mr. J. H. Dorsey, Tampa, Fla.; Miss Elsie S. Dow, Wasioja, Minn.; Rev. A. P. Ekman, New York City; Rev. G. W. Foiwell, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. A. W. Gerrie, Portage la Prairie, Manitoba; Rev. J. H. Gill, Southold, N. Y.; Mrs. S. R. Gray, Cambridge, N. Y.; Rev. I. M. Haldeman, New York City; Rev. E. C. B. Hallam, Dundas, Ont.; Rev. C. M. Hawkins, Boonville, Mo.; Mr. James Hoard, Summit, N. J.; Mr. T. H. Hunt, Charlottetown, P. E. I.; Rev. Geo. Jackson, Coleraine, Ireland; Mr. P. F. Jernegan, Providence, R. I.; Prof. Abby Leach, Poughkeepsie,

N. Y.; Rev. Geo. Lloyd, Frankfort, Mich.; Rev. W. F. Markwick, Meriden, Conn.; Rev. J. T. Marvin, Hamilton, Minn.; Rev. M. MoFadyen, Saticoy, Cal.; Mrs. W. B. McGill, Marlette, Mich.; J. M. P. Metcalf, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. Alfred Osborne, Markham, Can.; Rev. J. T. Plunket, D. D., Detroit, Mich.; Rev. David Prill, Grafton, Nova Scotia; Rev. Walter Reid, Weston, Ont.; Rev. A. E. Scoville, Dover Plains, N. Y.; Rev. R. H. Shirley, Owego, N. Y.; Rev. C. J. Shrimpton, Ridgeway, N. J.; Miss M. E. Silverthorne, Northfield, Mass.; Prof. L. A. Starr, Bellevue, Pa.; Rev. G. E. Stevens, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Herbert Symonds, Toronto, Ont.; Rev. F. T. Tapscott, Port Arthur, Ont.; Rev. F. W. Towle, Monticello, Me.; Rev. C. C. Townsend, Lowell, N. Y.; Rev. S. Warner, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. R. R. Watkins, Franklinville, N. Y.; Rev. N. O. Westergreen, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. W. W. Wilson, Easton, Md.

The graduates since the last report are Rev. J. F. Clarkson, Osborn, Mo.; Rev. I. D. Darling, Sheffield, Pa.; Rev. D. F. Davies, Paddy's Run, O.; Rev. C. T. Dunning, Petersburg, Pa.; Rev. J. C. Flanders, Manchester Centre, Vt.; Rev. G. Heam, Coeymans, N. Y.; Rev. C. G. Hudson, Anderson, Ind.; Rev. R. M. Kirby, Potsdam, N. Y.; Rev. E. S. Lewis, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Mr. J. K. MacGillivray, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. J. H. Messenger, Mechanicsville, N. Y.; Rev. W. A. Schruff, Chillicothe, O.; Miss M. Whitney, New York City. Of these two completed the Elementary Course, nine, the Intermediate and the Progressive.

Perfect papers have been received from the following: Three from Mr. W. M. Junkin, Christiansburgh, Va.; and Mr. S. D. Lathrop, Richmond, Mich., two from Rev. H. S. Gekeler, Upper Sandusky, O.; Mr. J. A. Ingham, Hackettstown, N. J.; one from Rev. E. H. Barnett, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. S. S. Conger, Summit, N. J.; Rev. E. A. Davidson, Boston, Mass.; Miss C. P. Dwight, Elmira, N. Y.; Mrs. John Howland, Guadalajara, Mex.; Rev. J. W. Smith, Xenia, O.; Mrs. H. M. Sydenstricker, Hamilton, Mo.

Remember that the number of prizes for next year has been increased from four to nine and the total value from \$50.00 to \$100.00.

This number of the STUDENT will be sent to all members of the Correspondence School whether subscribers or not. It is hoped that those who are not subscribers will become so. Every live member of the school should be interested in knowing how his own work compares with that of others, who are taking up the study with him, who are finishing the various courses, who win the prizes offered. If not ready to subscribe just yet, send 15 cents for the next number containing the annual reports and the plans for the coming year.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- La Messe, études archéologiques sur ses monuments.* By Ch. Rohault de Fleury. Continué par son fils. Vol. IV., V., VI. Paris: Impr. Motteroz; libr. des Imprimeries réunies, 1888.
- Iets over de Grieksche vertaling van het Oude Testament.* Oergedrukt uit het programma van het Erasmiaansch gymnasium voor 1888-89. By I. Hooykaas. Rotterdam: A. Eeltjes, 1888.
- Die Herrlichkeit der Bibel gegenüber den Angriffen ihrer Kritiker. Ein Zeugnis aus der Gemeinde f. die Gemeinde.* By G. Hasenkamp. Mit e. Vorworte v. C. R. Vietor. Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1888. M.4.
- Drie wegen, ten doel* [Renan, *Hist. du peuple d'Israël*; Kittel, *Gesch. der Hebräer*; Baethge]. *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, I. By A. Kuenen in *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1888, 5.
- The People's Bible.* XV. 1 Chron. 10 to 2 Chron. 23. By Joseph Parker, D. D. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. \$1.50.
- The Least of all Lands: Seven Chapters in the Topography of Palestine in relation to its History.* By William Miller, LL. D. London: Blackie & Son. S.3.6.
- The Hittites; or, The Story of a Forgotten Empire.* By A. H. Sayce, LL. D. London: Religious Tract Society. S.2.6.
- Läber Chronicorum, Textum Masoreticum.* Ed. S. Baer. M.1.50.
- Schorr's Talmudische Exegesen.* Untersucht v. M. Kohn. M.6.
- Evolution of Ancient Hindutem.* By A. M. Floyer. London: Chapman & Hall. . . . S.2.6.
- Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* 3. Aufl. By H. L. Strack. Neordlingen; Beck. . . . M.3.20.
- Alttestamentliche Theologie.* By H. Schultz. 4 völlig umgearb. Aufl. I. Goettingen. . . . M.15.
- Entstehung d. Volkes Israel u. Seiner nationalen Organisation.* By C. H. Cornill. Hamburg. M.0.60.
- Plain Commentary on the Minor Prophets.* Compiled from various sources by the author of "Christ our Law." London: Masters. . S.7.6.
- Some Chapters on Judatsem and the Science of Religion.* By Rabbi Louis Grossman, D. D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.50.
- A Personal Narrative of the Euphrates Expedition.* By William Francis Ainsworth. 2 vol. London: Kegan Paul.
- Early Adventures in Persia, Susiana and Babylonia.* By Henry Layard. 2 vol. London: Murray. S.24.
- The History of Jerusalem: the City of Herod and Saladin.* By Walter Besant and E. H. Palmer. New and revised edition. London: Bentley. S.7.6.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- Junior Right among the Canaanites.* Letters in the Academy, Oct. 27; Nov. 3, 10, '88.
- Baethgen's Beitrage zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte.* Review, *Ibid.*, Nov. 10, '88.
- Stade's Geschichte des Volkes Israel.* Renan's *Histoire du Peuple Israel.* Kittel's *Geschichte der Hebräer.* Reviews by Kamphausen in *Theo. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1, '89.
- Poetical Fragments in the Pentateuch.* By Rev. W. C. Daland in the *Sabbath Recorder*, Dec. 6, '88.
- From Sinai to Shechem.* By Edward L. Wilson in the *Century*, Dec., '88.
- Oriental Numbers and Battles.* By William Wright, D. D., in *Sunday School Times*, Nov. 24, '88.
- The Three Walls of Jerusalem: the Wall of Jeremiah as relating to Calvary.* By Prof. J. A. Paine, Ph. D. in *The Christian at Work*, Nov. 29, '88.
- Cheyne's Psalms.* Critique in the *Unitarian Review*, Dec., '88.
- Classic and Semitic Ethics.* By A. P. Peabody, D. D., in the *Andover Review*, Dec., '88.
- Kautzsch und Socin's Die Genesis.* Review. By G. F. Moore. *Ibid.*
- Bissell's Biblical Antiquities.* Review. By J. P. Taylor. *Ibid.*
- The Idea of God in Amos.* By Prof. H. G. Mitchell, Ph. D., in *Journal Soc. Bibl. Lit. and Exeg.*, Dec., '87.
- Psalms CX.* By Prof. T. H. Riley, D. D. *Ibid.*
- Ur Kasdim.* By Prof. Francis Brown, D. D. *Ibid.*
- Joshua 22:9-34 and the Israelitish Cultus.* By Prof. E. C. Bissell, D. D. *Ibid.*
- Who were the Philistines?* By Isaac H. Hall, Ph. D., in *The Sunday School Times*, Dec. 1, '88.
- Lewis' The Holy Places of Jerusalem.* Review in *Athenaeum*, Dec. 1, '88.
- Les hypogées royales de Thèbes. I.* By Maspero. In *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 3, '88. *II.* *Ibid.*, 4, '88.
- Les Travaux de M. Jeremias, et de M. Haupt sur la Religion et la Langue des Anciens Assyriens.* By Halévy. *Ibid.*, 3, '88.
- Studies in Practical Exegesis. II. Psalm IV.* By Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D. D., in the *Expositor*, Dec., '88.
- Advice about Commentaries. I. The Pentateuch and Joshua.* By Rev. C. H. H. Wright, D. D. *Ibid.*

