

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT❖

VOL. IV.

OCTOBER, 1884.

No. 2.

THE WORK OF THE PROPHETS.

BY PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO,

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

In studying the Old Testament we need to settle definitely in mind what questions we expect it to answer. I presuppose of course that we confine ourselves to questions which it can answer. We may go to it and ask three classes of questions: 1st, What can you tell us about the nations that have lived upon the face of the earth? 2nd, What can you tell us about the progress of the human soul in appropriating religious, and especially revealed truth? 3d, What can you tell us about God's preparation of this world for the coming of Christ and for the establishment of Christianity? I do not say that no other questions can be asked of the Old Testament. What I do say is that nearly all important questions can be referred to one or another of these general questions. I add that the kind of question we ask should determine our method of arriving at the answer which the Old Testament can give us.

These three general questions approach the Old Testament from different quarters. They regard the Old Testament either as general history, as a history of a certain religion, or as a chapter in the history of Redemption. In either instance the historical element is predominant and a historical method should be adopted in investigation. While the historical method must prevail in all fruitful study of the Old Testament, the method of investigating each problem should be determined by the problem. Suppose you wish to study the Old Testament as a portion of the general history of the human race. Then you treat the book as you do any other history, presuming it to be true and testing its statements as you do those of any work. So far as it may be verified, corrected or illuminated by the records of other nations, you subject it to such processes. So far as it furnishes within itself the grounds for such testing, you do the same.

Otherwise on learning its statements you accept them as you would those of any other history. When, however, you have done this, you have gone as far as you can in treating the Old Testament just like any other book. You cannot always place a definite line of division between the use of the Old Testament as general history and the use of the Old Testament in the other ways; yet you can come very near to such a dividing line.

Apply this to the existence of that order of men who swayed such power in Israel, the prophets. There was a class of men whose character was distinctly religious, who claimed to have derived knowledge and authority from a superhuman source. These men seldom held an official position, yet they had an indefinite amount of power, sometimes enough to change the reigning dynasty. Often they were, by reason of weight of character, or social position, or by both, faithful counsellors of the king; yet more frequently were they the trusted advisers of the people. The people of Israel were not the only people in the midst of whom men arose with these general characteristics. In tracing the history of this class of men from a purely historical point we may ask several questions: When did these men live? What was the nature of the government under which they lived? What were their relations to popular freedom? What was their moral character? What was the basis of their influence over society? How did this influence vary and what were the causes of such variation? What was the final outcome of their labors? Such questions as I have suggested deal with purely historical facts. In other nations there were at times men who like the prophets carried a free lance; who had no official character in either political or ecclesiastical life, yet with a religious character or pretension as the basis of their influence. Similar questions could be asked concerning this class of men, and the outcome of their presence in the world. In the external features there are sometimes strong correspondences between the prophets of Israel and the persons just mentioned in other nations.

There is much in the Old Testament the primary interest of which is not distinctively historical. Turning in this direction we find ourselves at once face to face with subjects that are of present interest. I refer not to the question of Higher Criticism as such, but to the subject of Old Testament Theology. This is a historical study, i. e., the elements which it contains must be treated historically or not at all. For the Old Testament contains a record of the life of a race living under the inspiration and control of certain religious beliefs. The significance of the religion of the Old Testament was for the average Israelite far

more of the present than of the future. While *we* must believe the Mosaic cultus to have been, in part at least, typical, the pious Israelite, I am sure, could not have regarded it as other than symbolic, i. e., with significance for his own time rather than for the future. I think that if he could have regarded it as only typical, or even prevailingly so, all significance must in time have vanished from it. So the religion of Israel was a living religion as ours is; it had, I presume, no more regard for the future of this world than ours, and certainly there could not have been so much thought of a hereafter. With these facts before us we may well accept as the definition of the recently developed study of Old Testament theology the following: A historical representation of the religion of Revelation in the successive stages of its development and in the multiplicity of forms in which it appears. In regard to this study the whole definition takes ground upon which an anti-supernaturalist cannot come. Apologetically you prove that the religion of the Old Testament is a part of the religion of Revelation. In the study of the Old Testament as a part of the history of Redemption this apologetic subject is best treated. In common with an anti-supernaturalist you may trace the influence of beliefs upon the Hebrew mind, you may note the various forms in which the Hebrew worshipper was minded to express his devotion to his deity, and the successive elements which entered into his religious beliefs. When, however, you attempt to reason about causes, you must soon part company with the anti-supernaturalist. Thus definite have I been that I might call attention to those features of current discussions which we may judge by purely historical considerations, and also to elements which need sifting according to philosophical or theological principles. The truth is, that much that goes by the name of historical investigation is pure philosophical assumption.

It would be desirable, if possible, to fill out a syllabus in Old Testament Theology somewhat as follows:

- I. Theology—The Nature of God.
- II. Finite being,
 - A. Cosmology, Relation between God and the World.
 - B. Anthropology, Nature of Man and Proper Relation with God.
- III. Hamartiology, Actual Relation between God and Man.
- IV. Ethics, Relation between Man and Man.
- V. Soteriology,
 - A. Ground of Divine Favor.
 - B. Method of Gaining Divine Favor, (1) by Life, (2) by Cultus.
- VI. The Future,
 - A. Of this World.
 - B. Of Men after Death.

If the idea of development is to be used in the study of the Old Testament Theology, and it should be, it seems to me, that the Old Testament cultus is far too small a section upon which to build a great superstructure. Whoever should study the history of the Church of Christ during the last three hundred years would probably be obliged to revise every *a priori* principle of development with which he might have begun his work. It seems to me, therefore, that nothing but a thorough search of the entire Old Testament and a gathering of all the materials found into some such scheme as I suggest is a proper mode for deriving the principle of development. It should be set in order as far as possible by those chronological data of which we are reasonably certain.

So far as my investigation has gone, the following statements of religious belief seem to cover the facts at the time of Samuel :

1. Jehovah was the Creator and sovereign Ruler of the physical world about man, and of man himself.

2. Jehovah was righteous, both just and good ; He was merciful, long-suffering and forgiving.

3. Jehovah had entered into special relations with Israel conditioned upon obedience, and was expected by Israel to give security and prosperity as a reward for obedience ; disobedience would bring punishment. Punishment took the form of temporal calamity.

4. Men often sinned against God, and the essence of sin was a rebellious or perverse will.

5. Repentance was a necessary condition to avert God's punishments. Some symbolic act or work was often regarded as a necessary condition to secure forgiveness.

6. The ordinary principles of morality were the rules to guide in the treatment of fellow men, also generosity toward the poor and weak was a duty. Such principles were somewhat modified by race limits.

7. Definite ideas of an existence after death cannot be affirmed. As to the future of Israel, this was expected to be prosperous through the favor of Jehovah.

More might, perhaps, be added, but the features just given seem to be the most important of the common stock of religious beliefs when the prophets began their work. The prophet, viewed in his relations to his time, was a preacher of righteousness. There was need of labor to keep these religious beliefs active and operative in the popular mind. These principles needed fresh statement for successive generations. Hence the existence of an order of men to proclaim, interpret and enforce these principles. While the function of the priest was to bring men near to God, that of the prophet was to bring God's

will to men. In studying and interpreting the work of any prophet we should have reference not to the religious ideas of succeeding ages, but to those of his own. The New Testament is not the key of the Old Testament, when Old Testament Theology is the theme. Rather the Old Testament affords much by which to interpret the theology of the New Testament. While studying the work of the prophet from the standpoint of Old Testament Theology we interpret from the standpoint of his generation. Whatever is enigmatical from that point must be left unexplained.

This work of the prophet was the application of the common fund of religious beliefs which I have mentioned. These truths, doubtless then as now, were somewhat distorted in the popular mind. They were also encrusted with superstitions, and were but partially apprehended and needed to be taught more fully. In short, the progress of religious knowledge was then similar in nature to the progress of religious knowledge now. It was then brought about with the divine efficiency more directly manifest than now. Therefore in the domain of Old Testament Theology the question is: What were the modifications and developments of religious beliefs brought about by the prophets? In all this discussion we do best to regard the prophetic order as beginning with Samuel and ending with Malachi. There seems to have been no order of prophets before the one nor after the other.

The case is changed when we come to treat the Old Testament as a preparatory stage in the history of Redemption. We make certain assumptions even though we are not fully aware of them all. The more important are: There is a personal God who has revealed Himself to men; moved by the needs of a sinful human race, He prepared a portion of this race to receive such a revelation of Himself as was adapted to meet these needs; this preparation was the accomplishment of a definite plan, and extended through many generations. It will be seen at once that these assumptions are peculiarly Christian principles. If anyone denies them, then the Old Testament has no existence as a chapter in the history of Redemption; in fact, for him there is no history of Redemption. Thus, while the treatment of purely historical questions rests on ground common to Christians and unbelievers, the discussion of the Old Testament as a portion of the history of Redemption, belongs to a region where Christians and unbelievers have no ground in common. If the question must be treated from the side of Apologetics, the first thing to be proved is the existence of a redemptive work, and then the connection of the Old Testament with that work.

Assuming these Christian [postulates we ask: What work in the preparatory stage of redemption was accomplished by the Hebrew prophets? We ascertain the stage in spiritual training at which the people of Israel stood, and their common property of religious thought when the prophets began their labors. We then come into a position to deal with the question of what the prophets accomplished in the preparatory stage of redemption. In the examination of their work we seek to find what elements looked forward to the future. What things were the prophets consciously doing for the future. These, however, will not be a sufficient clue, nor even will they be the main clue to learning the nature of their work. When the questions which I have mentioned are to be answered, the work of the prophets must be interpreted from a New Testament standpoint. If we assume a plan, we bind ourselves to explain the successive stages of its execution by the results when the plan has come to completion. If it be said that on this basis the place of the Old Testament in the history of Redemption cannot be fully known until this world's history is ended, I am quite ready to accept that conclusion. Whoever examines the third chapter of Galatians will, I am confident, find the statement of this position respecting the place of the Old Testament as a part of the preparation for redemption.

Thus when we study the work of a prophet from the standpoint of Old Testament Theology we see that he worked with the needs of his generation in view. His work was thus grounded in the present, and consisted in interpreting and enforcing those religious principles currently accepted. Hope, fear, gratitude and love were all objects of appeal. In all his labor the prophet was conscious of his aims and intelligently adapted his course to the end in view.

When we study his work as a section in the history of Redemption, we find the work—the same work just mentioned—to be grounded in the present indeed, but used beyond his consciousness, and to an extent not easy to define, for the purpose of preparing Israel to accept and proclaim the Gospel of Redemption from sin.

This analysis lays a foundation for a general consideration of the work of the prophet. A few moments since it was said that among the religious beliefs of Israel when the prophetic order began its work was the conviction that Jehovah had entered into special relations with Israel. The record which gives the formal statement of this revelation is in Exod. XIX., 5, 6: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." It was a part of the

Israelite's consciousness that Jehovah had made a covenant with his nation. This covenant was a conditional one. The conditions were two; Obey my voice, and keep my covenant. The covenant thus based consisted of promises: That Israel should be a cherished possession, one which Jehovah would keep with care; that priesthood should be universal to the nation; and that holiness should be equally universal. In accord with this belief in a covenant the prophet was a representative of Jehovah. His work was to hold the people to the performance of the conditions on which the covenant was based and thereby to bring to perfection in Israel the high spiritual privileges promised. His object of activity is thus seen to be not abstract nor remote, but righteousness in the concrete with its rewards and blessings.

The prophetic office was in part ethical. This was almost universally the case with the earlier and non-literary prophets. If they wrought miracles or predicted future events they did so not as mere wonder-workers. Righteousness was the aim of all their labors.

A. They were teachers of moral duty and of religious obligation: They asserted the reign of a moral law over all men and the government of a God who executed this law. As an order they were of high character and exemplified obedience to the moral law. They were filled with a sense of the immediate presence of Jehovah and of his power over every detail of human life and action. They declared duty, rebuked sin and commanded righteousness. No department of human life was beyond their province, no dignity was sufficiently exalted to be above obligation to serve Jehovah. They announced retribution for sin, destruction for the unrepentant sinner. They constantly pledged the rewards of the covenant for righteousness if Israel should become obedient. These announcements involved a predictive element, but the predictions of the prophet as a preacher of righteousness were largely conditional. If blessings seem to have been promised unconditionally—the principle which rules in any failure is found in Isa. XLVIII, 18, 19: "O that thou hadst hearkened unto my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea: thy seed also had been as the sand, and the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof; his name would not have been cut off nor destroyed from before me." Even as preachers of righteousness some prophets had regard to a broader field than Israel alone. They preannounced the destinies of other cities and nations. Although the preaching of the prophets was as a rule confined to Israel, the principles of righteous conduct were considered not to be so confined, nor was the power of Jehovah limited by any

considerations of race or locality. Without doubt profound meditation on the moral government of the world gave much insight into the future. To this was added a degree of certainty and an accuracy of knowledge respecting the fulfillment of the prophecies which could have been attained by no human sagacity.

B. In addition to their work as teachers of moral law they also taught much respecting God's nature and character. These teachings centered in the universal monarchy of Jehovah which was stoutly maintained against every form of polytheism and idolatry. The following truths were prominent elements of their teaching: 1, Jehovah is the Creator in nature; 2, a Creator in history; 3, has all human destinies under His control; 4, rules over all in righteousness; 5, is supreme Ruler; 6, is a Saviour who deals with men not wholly according to their deserts but in sovereign love. These teachings were developed and reiterated endlessly. The God thus proclaimed was not so conceived by reason of abstract thought, but on account of His deeds. He had revealed Himself in his protection and guidance of Israel to be all that the prophets proclaimed him to be. It would be incorrect to treat these teachings of the prophets as additions to the former beliefs. They were developments. The full and explicit teachings of the prophets on these subjects are now seen to have been quite fairly implied in the earlier beliefs. That their contemporaries accepted or even understood such implications cannot be believed.

C. There was another element of prophetic labor which lay outside of the previous beliefs. Nay, even, it seemed to be in contradiction to the previous beliefs. The conception of the covenant was linked with the belief that there was no method of gaining its blessings save by fulfilling its conditions. The earlier prophets betray no different thought. In so far as God was conceived and taught to be gracious there was an element of prophetic teaching which lay outside of the functions of a preacher of righteousness. He was a preacher of grace. There are foregleams of this conception before the prophets, but it belonged to the later—the literary prophets to represent grace as a constant and prevailing factor in God's moral government. By the time of Isaiah, the prophets saw that the covenant was broken down, for the nation was faithless and there was no hope that the people would try to fulfill the conditions of that covenant. Hence the prophets held fast hold of the larger promises which were a national inheritance. The promise to bless Israel and through Israel all nations was not conditional. That Israel should become fit to dispense blessing to other races was implied in this promise. The method was not included in the belief. To the threat of chastisement

for disobedience was added an unconditioned promise of blessing and the seeming contradiction was solved by the belief in a purified remnant. Hence the possibility of a promise which might be fulfilled irrespective of present human conduct. Of such a nature was the promise to Daniel. Never in the entire history of prophecy was that promise revoked. While the kingship of the ten tribes came under such conditions as the Sinaitic covenant, the promise to David of the permanent kingship of his family was never canceled. The nature and scope of the kingship was partially modified but the promise remained.

As has been said, the prophets saw that the Sinaitic covenant was broken down. Perhaps the plainest indication of that is Jer. XXXI., 31 sq.: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God and they shall be my people." These prophecies of unconditioned future blessing had a present purpose. So far as the prophets themselves were aware of any aim in their work as messengers of grace they must have purposed to do good to those who in evil times loved God. Their design must have been specifically to console the righteous when in adversity, and to give them strength against apostasy. In discussing these labors of the prophets I have considered them from the standpoint of Old Testament Theology. Where the religious beliefs of Mosaism are considered in relation to prophetism, they are considered not as pointing forward to prophetism, but simply as showing the stage of religious thought at which prophetism began its work. Also so far as the work of the prophets is considered, it is not as furnishing a basis for the future, but simply in and for its own time.

However, it is seen that the actual work of the prophets had a vital connection with the previous beliefs of Israel. Not only did prophetism develop more fully the truths of Mosaism, but it was in part the goal of Mosaism. There is much in Mosaism that is incomplete without a knowledge of prophetism. There is much more that may not be understood save by some further development and this is found in the New Testament history of Redemption. This is true also of the teaching of the prophets. When the prophets began their work Israel expected some great blessing to the nation. This expectation

was general rather than definite and so far as I can judge wholly external or temporal. When the prophets ceased from their labors this expectation had become far more definite, temporal blessing was prominent, but ethical elements bore no small share in the enlarged thought. Out of the vague expectation had emerged the form of a deliverer and ruler whose dominion was to be far broader than the race of Israel and under whom all evils should have come to an end. In the statements of future blessing, by their variety and contrariety, lay the necessity of transition to a spiritual interpretation.

The reference of temporal calamity to moral causes which is constantly a burden of prophetic utterance was one means of breaking up the merely external conception of blessing. The representation of an antagonism between the world powers and the kingdom of God, together with the inevitable destruction of every power which set itself against God's kingdom, was likely to convince Israel of the reality of the ethical character of God's government. The forms in which evils, from which they should be delivered, were represented, were so various that a spiritual explanation best suffices to unite the varying utterances. Some of these evils were disunion among themselves, ungodly kings of their own, oppressive conquerors or even captivity in a foreign land, the cessation of temple worship. Much more is it necessary to find the real truth which underlay the various forms in which blessings were described. One promise was that of universalism, *i. e.*, a world-wide commonwealth with its centre at Zion. Yet no prophecy definitely declares that there shall be a single organization. Rather the conception is of vassalage on the part of other rulers. Although Zion is definitely mentioned as the place of worship, the God of truth and righteousness is the object of attention. Jehovah was conceived as the acknowledged ruler of the whole earth and as ruling obedient subjects. The conceptions of such universal service and of worship, which must be rendered only in one locality, is not to be reconciled in any literal fashion.

Again a literal interpretation of the distinctively Messianic prophecies is yet more difficult. While the words of individual prophets commonly did not involve features literally irreconcilable, the organism of all Messianic prophecy did. The device of explaining these differences on the supposition of two Messiahs—one the son of Joseph and the other the son of David—was an ingenious attempt. When however the personal Messiah is described as king, priest, deliverer, teacher, yet as a victim to a rage which others deserve to feel, it is evident that no literal explanation is adequate to the case. We may well question what perplexities arose in the minds of the later

prophets as they pondered upon their own teachings—mysterious as these were to themselves. The individual prophecies could be comprehended in a literal sense, the system demanded a key not suggested by itself. In the history of Redemption we find an ultimate explanation in the person of Him in whom every contradiction is solved.

STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

V.

Tradition in its Relation to History; (2) To Inspired History.

II.

In this article the subject of tradition in its relation to history is concluded.

THE YIMA MYTH.

The second Fargard of the Zendavesta, the sacred book of the Zoroastrian (Zarathustrian) religion, opens thus :

Zarathustra asked Ahura Mazda: O Ahura Mazda, most beneficent Spirit, Maker of the material world, thou Holy One! who was the first mortal, before myself, Zarathustra, with whom thou, Ahura Mazda, didst converse, whom thou didst teach the law of Ahura, the law of Zarathustra?

Ahura Mazda answered: The fair Yima, the great shepherd. O hoily Zarathustra: he was the first mortal before thee, Zarathustra, with whom I, Ahura Mazda, did converse, whom I taught the law of Ahura, the law of Zarathustra. Unto him, O Zarathustra, I, Ahura Mazda, spake, saying: "Well, fair Yima, son of Vivanhvat, be thou the preacher and the bearer of my law!" And the fair Yima, O Zarathustra, replied unto me, saying: "I was not born, I was not taught to be the preacher and bearer of thy law." Then I, Ahura Mazda, said this unto him, O Zarathustra: "Since thou wantest not to be the preacher and bearer of my law, then make these my worlds thrive, make my worlds increase; undertake thou to nourish, to rule, and to watch over my world." And the fair Yima replied unto me, O Zarathustra, saying: "Yes! I will make thy worlds thrive, I will make thy worlds increase. Yes! I will nourish, and rule. and watch over thy world. There shall be, while I am king, neither cold wind nor hot wind, neither disease nor death."

* * * * *
 And Ahura Mazda spake unto Yima, saying: "O fair Yima, son of Vivanhvat! Upon the material world the fatal winters are going to fall, that shall bring the fierce, foul frost: upon the material world the fatal winters are going to fall, that shall make snow-flakes fall thick, even an aredvi thick on the highest tops of mountains. * * * Therefore make thee a Vara [an enclosure], long as a riding-ground on every side of the square, and thither bring the seeds of sheep and oxen, of men, of dogs, of birds, and of red blazing fires. * * * There shall be no humpbacked, none bulged forward there; no impotent, no lunatic; no poverty, no lying; no meanness, no jealousy; no decayed tooth, no leprous to be confined, nor any of the brands wherewith Augra Mainyu stamps the bodies of mortals. * * * And Yima made a Vara, long as a riding-ground on every side of the square. * * * That Vara he sealed up with the golden ring, and he made a door, and a window self-shining within. * * * And the men in the Vara which Yima made live the happiest life." * * * O Maker of the material world, thou Holy One! Who is he that brought the law of Mazda into the Vara which Yima made? Ahura Mazda answered: "It was the bird Karshipta, O hoily Zarathustra."

In the Vedic form of the myth, Yima is named Yama, while the myth itself varies in particulars, although having strong points of identity. Prof. Max Müller is unwilling to see in this myth any tradition corresponding to passages

in the Genesis history. Other writers, however, such as Prof. Whitney, Darmstetter, whose translation of the Zendavesta I have used, and Lenormant—especially the last-named—do not hesitate to do so. The special interest for us, in our present study, of the Yima myth, is the remarkable way in which dim traditions of the first man, his “first disobedience,” of Eden and the Edenic life, and of the deluge and the ark, are mixed and mingled in the narrative, illustrating thus in a striking way the manner in which tradition in its legends confuses, even while more or less it retains, what history records as facts. Notice some of the points of resemblance in this case: (1) Yima is “the first of mortals” with whom Ahura Mazda—the Zoroastrian name for God—conversed. It is not said, indeed, that he was absolutely the first man, that feature of the story having dropped out in the construction of the myth. (2) Yima refused to be “the preacher and bearer of the law;” in which is preserved the faint tradition of an event far more serious in its character and consequences than is here implied. (3) The original command to “multiply and replenish the earth,” is changed in the myth into the injunction laid upon Yima, when it was found that he had refused to “preach and bear” the law. The idea of penalty for disobedience seems to have disappeared pretty much entirely. (4) The “garden planted in Eden” is represented in the Vara which Yima was commanded to build; yet (5) in this Vara, the garden according to the tradition, and the ark which Noah was commanded to build, are confounded, while in Yima we have represented, so far, both Noah and Adam. (6) The “fatal winters,” with the “fierce, foul frost” and the deep snow “on the highest tops of the mountains” remind of the deluge. (7) The instruction given to preserve in the Vara the “seeds” of all living creatures—carried in the myth into great detail—reminds of the command of God to Noah. It is quite apparent, too, how the garden and the ark are both represented in the Vara; for while this is described in places not quoted above, as having a river running through it, with green banks adorned with trees and birds in the trees, it has (8) a “door” and a “window” as mentioned of the ark, in Genesis. And then (9) when the bird Karshipta brings “the law of Mazda into the Vara,” is not that a dim reminiscence of the messenger dove of Noah?

There seem, really, to be good grounds for treating this Yima myth as preserving in tradition and legend those passages in primitive history of which mention has been made. But it deals with these in a way strikingly characteristic of all tradition.

TRADITION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

There is one of the New Testament books which presents for consideration some interesting phases of this subject. I mean the Epistle of Jude. Three passages in this brief epistle seem to bear a certain traditional aspect. One is the allusion to “the angels who kept not their first estate;” another, the notice of the dispute between the devil and Michael the archangel over the body of Moses; and the third, the prophecy of Enoch, “the seventh from Adam,” of the coming of the Lord, “with ten thousand of his saints, to judge the world.”

1. THE FALL OF THE ANGELS.

The first of these, the fall of the angels, touches upon a subject which inspiration, no doubt wisely, leaves wholly unexplained. Another reference to it, equally traditional in its origin, so far as any human source is concerned, so some

think, occurs in the Second Epistle of Peter, where the apostle makes a like reference to "the angels that sinned," whom God "spared not, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Several commentators, including some modern ones, take both these passages as referring to the incidents described in the sixth of Genesis, the words, "the sons of God," being there understood to mean angels. According to this interpretation, it was angels who took to themselves wives of the daughters of men, becoming thus progenitors of "the men of renown" spoken of in the same connection; while for this sin they were bound in chains of darkness "unto judgment." I think we shall agree that this is a view of the matter altogether too mythical, involving conditions absolutely impossible, and even monstrous. The more rational view, at least, is that which most interpreters now prefer as explained in the last of these studies. The sin of the angels that fell from "their first estate,"—"the angels who kept not their own principality," the new revision has it, "which kept not their first dignity," others translate—this is an event in the moral history of the universe of which we have no account anywhere in Scripture. It is simply, as in the two places cited, the subject of allusion, and also is apparently implied in the doctrine as to the fall of man.

Now, in this connection a question arises which I do not remember to have seen anywhere touched upon, save, very obscurely, in Lenormant's appendix to his "Beginnings of History," and concerning which I must not myself venture an opinion. I suggest it for such consideration as it may be thought worthy of. It is the question, whether some traces of a tradition similar to this which seems to be alluded to in the passages from Jude and from Second Peter, may or may not be found in certain features of nearly all the great ancient religions, just now made so much the subject of inquiry. It would, no doubt, be rash to speak confidently in such a matter, yet the question does not appear to be altogether an impertinent one.

The oldest mythologies of nearly all those ancient nations, the Greeks, the Phœnicians, the Egyptians, the Babylonians and Assyrians, the Iranians, or disciples of Zoroaster, have stories of what are termed in one of those mythologies, the Assyrian and Babylonian, "the wars of the gods." The myth has various forms, especially among the Greeks; but in its most notable one is thought to be Syro-Phœnician in origin. This is the story of the attempt of the monster Typhon, or Typhœus, to dethrone the chief god, and become himself master of the universe. He is described as in part serpent-formed, a mighty and monstrous being who seemed at one time likely to gain his end. At last, however, he is overcome and crushed with thunderbolts. Among the Babylonians and Assyrians the story had another form. I quote it as given by Rawlinson:

"They believed that at a remote date, before the creation of the world, there had been war in heaven. Seven spirits, created by Anu (who frequently appears in these legends as the supreme god) to be his messengers, took counsel together and resolved to revolt. 'Against high heaven, the dwelling-place of Anu the king, they plotted evil,' and unexpectedly made a fierce attack. The moon, the sun, and Vul, the god of the atmosphere, withstood them, and after a fearful struggle beat them off. There was then peace for a while. But once more, at a later date, a fresh revolt broke out. The hosts of heaven were assembled together, in number five thousand, and were engaged in slinging a psalm of praise to Anu, when suddenly discord arose. 'With a loud cry of contempt' a portion of the angelic choir 'broke up the lively song,' uttering wicked blasphemies, and so 'spoiling, confusing, confounding the hymn of praise.' Asshur (this was another of the chief gods) was asked to put himself at their head, but 'refused to go forth with them.' Their leader, who is unnamed, took the form of

a dragon, and in that shape contended with the god Bel, who proved victorious in the combat, and slew his adversary by means of a thunderbolt, which he flung into the creature's open mouth. Upon this, the entire host of the wicked angels took to flight, and were driven to the abode of the seven spirits of evil, where they were forced to remain, their return to heaven being prohibited. In their room man was created."

Among the ancient Iranians, represented now by the Parsees of India, in place of such a special and conclusive trial of strength between the powers of evil and the powers of good, we have in general the well-known idea of two great beings in perpetual contest for the supremacy, Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu. The detail of the myth, however, gives it some resemblance to those found in other ancient religions. Each of these two mighty beings calls into existence a multitude of inferior beings who are subject to them and fight on their side. A band of six chief spirits leads the host of Ahura Mazda, and the same number that of Angra Mainyu. The chief of the six good spirits, Rawlinson says, "was a glorious being, called Sraosha or Serosh—the good, tall, fair Serosh," who stood in the Zoroastrian system where Michael the Archangel stands in the Christian."

In the Egyptian mythology we find a deity, Horus, the son of Osiris, who resembles the Serosh of the Iranians, and the archangelic Michael of the Christians. The brother of Osiris, Set, or Suteich, assails him and murders him. Set is then attacked by Horus, deposed, and thrust down to darkness. Set appears in the very oldest of this mythology as a good being. He seems to fall from that estate and to become an evil spirit, leader of the host of such.

Now, it seems really remarkable that a mythical story, so identical for substance, should be found in connection with so many ancient religions. And it is noticeable that, while the myth assumes various forms, its most ancient one, in all cases, implies more or less of one striking feature,—the original high standing of the being who becomes at last the prince of evil; from which condition he falls, and drags hosts of others with him. It is not surprising, considering what Lenormant's general point of view is, when we find him expressing the belief that the Jewish conception of Satan is taken from these ancient myths, "ill-understood, relating to a divine war spoken of in the old traditions." Nor need we wonder when we find him expressing the belief that this author of evil, in the serpent form in which he is represented in Phœnician and Greek myths "becomes the serpent-tempter of the third chapter of Genesis and is reproduced in the δράκων ὁ μέγας [the great dragon], ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος [the old serpent] of the Apocalypse. If it had occurred to him, we should probably find him also expressing the belief that the passages in Jude and Second Peter which I have quoted, are like these others in traditional origin.

Care must be used not to make too much of these resemblances. It may be a question whether we ought to make anything at all of them. Unless it should be in one place, which I will name in a moment, there is not even an allusion, in Scripture, to any such war in heaven as these myths describe. What the Scripture references mainly imply is simply this—that certain of the angels fell from their first estate, fell into sin, and that these have become the tempters of the human race, and instruments in general of the evil of the universe. There is only one place where we can find even any apparent reference to a revolt of the angels against the sovereignty of God, as constituting the peculiar sin of the angels that fell. This passage is in the twelfth chapter of Revelation, where we read: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his

angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not." The proper interpretation of this passage, in the place where it stands, is, as I think expositors now pretty generally agree, that it represents in dramatic symbol that array of the forces of evangelism under Christ as the leader against Satan and all satanic forces and instruments, which is conceived of as ushering in and throughout characterizing, the gospel period. But it is characteristic of the symbolism of the Apocalypse that so much of it is based on Old Testament history, while it might seem consistent with this that some of it should also rest on certain world-old traditions. Nearly the whole of the sixteenth chapter, for example, which describes the pouring out of the vials, is based, in its symbolism, upon the plagues of Egypt. In other parts of the book the rain of fire and brimstone from heaven upon Sodom and Gomorrah supplies the imagery used; while for symbols of another class we have the holy city, the temple, the altar, the sacred fire, the holy of holies with its divine presence, Paradise and its rivers, and the tree of life. It would not be in the least surprising, while the striking imagery of that book thus continually looks back to primitive times and the former dispensation, if in one part of it there should be a glance backward beyond the beginning of time itself, with some wonderful event in the spiritual world and the eternity past, some revolt of angels against the Sovereign of the heavens used to image forth that long and fateful struggle between heavenly and satanic forces, which began with the beginning of the Gospel and is to end in the final overthrow of the devil and his angels.

We have, it is true, no ground upon which we can assert this positively; nor can we do more than conjecture that in the myths of the old religions some dim traditions of such an event may have survived. Still if we put the two things so far in relation to one another and there leave them, it is perhaps not to theorize over rashly. The confident language of Lenormant, in that connection, is surely not warranted,—that is, that the leader of the rebellion in these mythological "wars of the gods" suggested to the Jews the idea and personality of Satan.

2. THE BODY OF MOSES AND THE PROPHECY OF ENOCH.

The other passages in Jude to which reference was made bring up our general question in another form. We may associate with them the Song of Lamech, in Genesis, and the two quotations from the Book of Jasher, or "Book of the Upright," in Joshua, and in Second Samuel—a record, apparently, of heroic actions and divine deliverances, which seems to have been held in much esteem among the Hebrews. In Jude, the Prophecy of Enoch quoted is thought to be taken from the Book of Enoch, while of the contest over the body of Moses we find no mention elsewhere.

Now upon the point thus brought before us we may say, first, that wherever a tradition, or a passage from an apocryphal book is found used in an inspired writing, such use of it puts it in a new position. We do not use the word "traditional," as has already appeared in these studies, as synonymous with the absolutely and entirely false or fictitious; there is usually, perhaps always, a germ of truth; neither does the word "apocryphal" mean unreal or unhistorical. The first book of the Maccabees, though rated as apocryphal—that is, not to be included among inspired books—is regarded of great value as history. The Book of Enoch, says Dr. William Smith, "consists of a series of revelations supposed to

have been given to Enoch and Noah, which extend to the most varied aspects of nature and life, and are designed to form a comprehensive indication of the action of Providence." I believe the latest opinion of scholars to be that it was probably written originally in Hebrew, at some time not very long before Christ, and translated from that language into Greek. Dr. Toy, in "Quotations in the New Testament," dates it in the second century before Christ, and says that for six or seven centuries it was held in high esteem. It must be, without doubt, traditional in its basis, being mainly a collection of what had thus been preserved of the utterances of very ancient men. There is no good reason why portions of the book, at least, should not be genuine. The quotation in Jude is declared to be such by the simple fact of its use by an inspired writer. The tradition as to the burial of Moses might, even as a tradition, be used for purposes of illustration. The Song of Lamech comes into the inspired history as an illustration of the rude, fierce spirit of those sons of Cain who were leaders in the ante-diluvian wickedness; while the song of triumph in Joshua, and the lamentation in Second Samuel are quotations of Hebrew poetry, utterances of national heroism and national sorrow, which belong to Hebrew annals, just as the national songs of any people are a part of its history. As such, they are here used under inspired guidance. If we were to take that account of the sun and moon standing still at Joshua's command as purely poetical, the question of the reality of inspiration for the history proper would not be even touched.

A second point is this, that heathen traditions or heathen ideas, ought never to be quoted as sources, or originals, of what appears in the inspired books, whatever the resemblances between what is thus biblical, and that which is heathen. I think enough has been said to make it clear that the Bible had its own sources, alike of tradition and of history. It is a book of the Hebrew people—the people ordained of God to that especial end. So far as the sources of what appears in the Bible are human, they are supplied in the line of Bible men, and there is no evidence, whatever, that anything of what inspiration uses in the formation of this great literature, the vehicle of divine revelation, was ever sought or found at any heathen source. Heathen traditions and heathen ideas may in some instances relate to the same matters or events as what we have in the Bible, but they came down in quite another line, and are everywhere radically contrasted in character.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE WHOLE DISCUSSION.

I conclude this whole discussion, now, of the relation of tradition to history, with a brief reference to the view of those who will hold that the introduction of the supernatural in history, or the relation of incidents extraordinary in character, and unexampled by events occurring in the natural sphere—that these elements in a narrative necessarily discredit it as history, and assign it to the legendary and mythical. It is a question which would well deserve exhaustive treatment. The point is that narratives like those of the Creation, alike of the world and of man, the original Paradise, with its Tree of Life and its Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, the Fall of Man, the Confusion of Tongues, and all those accounts of the intimate intercourse between God and man in primitive times—that these cannot, with any propriety, be ranked as history. They must be viewed as legends, myths, although not to be classed with merely heathen myths, because of their far more elevated character and tone.

1. Now, for one thing, this assumes, what no man can have any right to assume, namely, that the supernatural cannot be even thought of as furnishing material for history; that the only genuine history must of necessity be history wholly on its human and secular side;—meaning by secular what belongs to the sphere of ordinary human experience. Who has a right to assume this; or to demand of you and me that we admit it as an axiom, not even open to argument? Of course, an atheist or an agnostic will insist upon it; but why should believers in God, and a supernatural sphere of things, and in the supernatural as always in relation to the natural, and entirely capable of manifesting itself in the sphere of the natural;—why should those who hold in common these first truths have any controversy at all over the question, whether the supernatural revelations of God to man, divine voices heard by human ears, divine presences consciously perceived, miracle, inspiration,—whether these are possible things in history?

2. Then, the notion to which I am objecting assumes that man was never to know anything, certainly, about his own origin or about his own primitive history. It virtually asserts that upon such matters man was never to have any history at all; that the utmost he could expect would be mythical legends of that remote past, amidst whose manifest fictions he might here and there, possibly, trace some suspicion of a possible truth, or fact, but be capable of certainty upon nothing whatever as to his own origin, or as to the early life of the world he lives in. If any man chooses to doom himself to ignorance such as this, he may do it, and welcome. There are plenty of others who are glad to “know these things.”

3. Then, further, this position virtually assumes that a difficulty of interpretation converts history into legend. The creation of the first man and woman and their first sin, in this primitive narrative of those events, are things which from our present point of view we cannot in every respect explain. Therefore these are not history; they are legend and myth. I am old enough to remember when it was first proposed to interpret the “days” in the first chapter of Genesis, as geological periods. Science accepts this interpretation, now, as adequate, and we are no longer obliged to resist assaults so based upon the historical value of that first chapter. Did the original difficulty of interpretation make that chapter mythical, and did it become historical only after the difficulty had been got out of the way? All persons are not satisfied with the explanation given of other parts of the Genesis narrative. But, what then? Is human insufficiency the just measure of divine possibilities? And is that alone history which no mortal can help understanding, and which obstinate incredulity can find no excuse for contesting?

4. In a word, such ideas of the province of history as these to which I am objecting, are a narrowing of that province in a way for which no justification or excuse can possibly be found. History is not limited to the sphere of such events as are passing to-day. When it tells of men and nations whose lives were conditioned in a way wholly unlike our own, it is history, and credible, just as when it simply reproduces for to-morrow the life of yesterday. When it describes a primitive life of the world as different from what we now see as if the world itself were another, and not the same, it is still history. And if it pleases God himself to descend into this historical sphere, and manifest himself on this stage of human story; if it please him to ordain some record of the way in which man himself came from his creating hand, and some record of those

opening chapters in all history which are a clue to the infinite problems of human history as a whole—where is the wise mortal who can be justified in asserting upon the basis of his own omniscience in the matter, that *this* is not history, and cannot be?

I would not, for my own part, have the difficulties of Biblical interpretation whether in its history or elsewhere, in the least degree different from what they are. I am glad that there is one book in the world which to the student can never grow old, exactly for the reason that there will always be in it something new to be found out. Till history ceases to be written and to be studied, Bible history will deserve to rank as the most deeply interesting, the most fruitful, the most inspiring, the most *authentic* of all.

THE FULFILLMENT OF PROPHECY IN THE NEW COVENANT.

BY C. VON ORELLI.

[Translated by Professor George H. Schodde from *Die Alttestamentliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches*. Wien. 1882, pp. 64-72.]

The entire prophetic and typical prediction (*Weissagung*) of the Old Covenant, in so far as this aimed at a complete establishment of God's sovereignty on earth following upon a judgment and deliverance, has found its essential fulfillment in the advent of the Mediator of the New Covenant. Jesus of Nazareth proclaimed himself as the Messiah announced in the Old Covenant, who, as had been prophesied, should establish this Kingdom of God; and the Christian Church, in accordance with his own declarations, has recognized in him the person in whom all the rays of prophecy unite. In the person of the Son of God and the Son of Man the relation between God and man, which had ever been the aim of God's dealings, has been realized in its purity and completeness. In his work the service which God demands of a true servant of the Lord has been entirely rendered, and thereby the fundamental conditions of the establishment of a divine-human (*gottmenschlich*) kingdom on earth have been satisfied. In one word, Jesus is the Christ in whom the central idea of the Old Covenant in all its completeness has been realized. Law and prophecy have been fulfilled in him, and can lay claim to no further recognition than that founded in him and mediated through him. On the other hand, of course, it must not be forgotten that this realization took place in its completeness only in his person, but not in the world. The kingdom which he founded has not yet become manifest in its full development. And until this takes place, those expressions of the Old Covenant which demand that the Kingdom of God in undisputed sway shall possess the earth have not yet lost their force. For the fulfillment dare not embrace less than the prediction. However, such expressions must be referred to the future only in the light of the revelation of Christ. But the individual rays of prophecy, which, without an exception, meet in the person of Christ as the central point, proceed from this again in all directions. Christ himself and the apostles have accordingly taken these up again, and thus the prophecy of judgment and of salvation begins anew. This judgment, however, is only the

outward establishment of an inner standpoint which has been, and will be, taken by individuals and nations in reference to the salvation offered in the historical person of Christ. Cf. John III., 18; XII., 48. And the salvation yet to come is only the actual appearance of the blessed Kingdom of God, which has been brought about by Christ, and is already virtually in the believer.

If the person and terrestrial activity of Christ in this way constitute the center of the history of fulfillment, then too it cannot be called "accidental" that in his history prophecy, not only in regard to its ideas, but also in regard to its forms, was realized as in no other history. Of course, the prophecy is not a mechanical copy of the fulfillment in the manner in which the fanciful sibylline oracles prophesied the history of Christ after it had taken place. But the organic connection between the prophetic and typical prediction and the life of the true Saviour is shown in innumerable unsought parallels of a seemingly formal character, as though by divine hints which point out in the historical Jesus the long promised Christ. We meet with many such features, which, in part, are especially referred to by Christ, the Apostles and the Evangelists, and in part are easily recognized. Since such shaping of the outward life according to a divine plan which cannot be deduced from general principles, is offensive to modern rationalism, and since it cannot here elude this fact on the plea of *vaticinia post eventum*, and since the explanation of mere accidental coincidences does not satisfy even human reason, it here, after the model of Dr. Strauss, casts suspicion on the fulfillment, as though this had been modeled to suit the prediction. And yet it is clear how different the life of a Messiah would of necessity have been, if the apostles had arbitrarily constructed it in accordance with their Messianic views.

The fact that the fulfillment through Christ also in the outward reality has produced a wonderful agreement with the words of prophecy, is for us more than a mere support for the weak. We see in them an intimation that "the end of God's ways is embodiment" (*Leiblichkeit*). Outwardly also the Lord will at last reveal his glory. And as little as we are not allowed to transfer into the future that portion of the Old Testament prediction which, as a temporary restraint, has been removed by the Gospel, as is done by a realistically inclined theology, so it is erroneous, on the other hand, to maintain that only certain ideas should be abstracted out of those expressions as an abiding residue, but that the form has no abiding significance. As little as its agreement with the historical person of Christ was accidental, so little will this form be without reference to the shape of the future Kingdom of God. Only this is certain that the fulfillment always brings something higher with it than can be thought out with the aid of the prophecy alone. Even the most faithful Israelites, who were waiting for the deliverance of Israel, on the basis of prophecy pictured the Messiah to themselves as entirely different from what he really was when he appeared. But when they had recognized him, they beheld with amazement how accurately everything had been fulfilled in him. And hence, too, all those who form for themselves a concrete idea of the future Kingdom of God on the basis of the Old and the New Testaments, have a very insufficient and in part erroneous view of it. But this does not prevent us then, when once it shall have appeared, from being filled with astonishment over the wonderful agreement between the word and the work of God, even in minute and outward features.

If we now look more closely at the position which Jesus himself took in

reference to the Old Testament predictions, we will see this especially that he subordinates himself to it, since in it the Father's will is laid down. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." (Matt. v., 17). These are his words at the beginning of that very speech in which he places over against the commands of the Old Law a "But I say unto you" spoken out of his divine self-consciousness. For he by no means destroys that command, through that which he places over against it as his demand and achievement, but rather brings to light its full divinely intended contents, and carries it out completely. But naturally in such a treatment of the Mosaic law the claim is immediately apparent that he has been called and is able to reveal in its full clearness and truth, and to bring to a reality that expression of the will of God which had been imperfectly laid down by Moses. Jesus subordinates himself to the law, in as far as it is divine; he places himself above it, in so far as it is Mosaic. We find a similar attitude in the position of Jesus over against prophecy. On the one hand, he submits himself entirely to the task there marked out for him, and considers his life and death in all particulars as something that *must* take place, because it had been so written in God's word; on the other hand, he knows himself to be the peak and summit to which all prophecy and the whole Old Testament were intended to be but guides. True, he nowhere places himself in opposition to the words of prophecy, at least as this is formally done in the case of the law, but he frequently gives for the first time to the words of the prophets their true meanings, e. g., to their idea of righteousness, Kingdom of God, and in fact such meanings which of themselves transcend the formal boundaries of the prophetic utterance and their national and local limits. The sovereignty of the Lord Jesus in reference to the prophets is especially to be seen in this that he places his person in the center of all that has been prophesied of the Kingdom of God and refers all this to himself as being fulfilled in him. He has more than once solemnly and emphatically declared himself to be the Christ, the Messiah, and in doing so laid the special stress on his royal and divine majesty, which belonged to him as the true "Anointed one of the Lord," and which raised him far above David and Solomon, Abraham and the prophets from Moses to John the Baptist.¹ But at the same time he pointed also to his humility and his death sufferings as something that of necessity was a part of his calling, since this was equally clearly proved by Scripture.² He has also referred to himself, in their completeness and entirety, both the pictures of the glorious Son of God and of the suffering servant of the Lord, which the Old Testament endeavors to unite only in certain indefinite outlines; and thereby he opened up to view that deeper harmony of Scripture of which the Old Testament seers had but an indistinct knowledge. But still more. From the beginning he proclaimed his advent as the coming of the kingdom of God,³ and therefore referred to his own person also those prophecies which predict not the Messiah, but the coming of Jehovah. He designates his precursor, John, as that voice which is heard in Isa. XL., 3 in advance of Jehovah,⁴ or as the Elijah who will come before the day of the Lord to prepare all things.⁵ The two chains of proph-

¹ Cf. Mk. xii., 35-37; Matt. xii., 42; John viii., 58; Lk. vii., 28.

² Cf. Matt. xii., 40; xvi., 21; Mark viii., 31; Luke xxiv., 45 sq.

³ Mark i., 15.

⁴ Matt. xi., 10.

⁵ Matt. xi., 14.

ecy, one of which speaks of a coming of Jehovah, the other of a future ruler from the house of David, thus are linked together in him. And if all the great and essential features, which have been spoken of in the completion of the kingdom of God, are found united in Christ, and reached their true greatness and being only in his person, then it is a matter of course that the whole Old Covenant testifies of him and points to him, as surely as the rule of God in Israel was, in accordance with a higher plan, directed to this fulfillment, and all the previous revelations of God were only a prelude of those which, in the fulness of time, appeared in his Son. The type finds here its adequate completion, as does prophecy its fulfillment. These two are not essentially different from the standpoint of the New Testament. The question as to how far the human consciousness also was aware of the reference to the fulfillment in the future is here a subordinate question. Even if David or any other pious man of God spoke in the psalms primarily only of their own experiences and feelings,—the idea of the suffering king and God, of the suffering servant of the Lord has been first fulfilled in Christ; hence those words refer to *him*, are fulfilled in *him*, i. e., they receive their full meaning only through his experiences and life. We select here an example where Christ himself sees his death predicted. Matt. xxvi., 31, "All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of his flock shall be scattered abroad." The quotation is taken from Zechariah xiii., 7, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones." Even if this sentence were spoken of a god-fearing shepherd in the days of the prophet, possibly of himself or of a king in his days, yet this has become true of Christ in a surpassingly higher measure. He is the good shepherd who can with right and truth apply to himself everything which the Old Covenant contains of this idea. But as he can with much better reason than all other shepherds call himself the trusted-one of God, so too, those words concerning the terrible end of the best shepherd, which bring such untold woe to the herd, in a most terrible manner were verified in him and his disciples.

It is only when we consider and do justice to this attitude of the Lord, which he through his own statements assumed over against the Old Covenant, that we can understand the explanation and application which the New Testament authors, the Apostles and Evangelists, make of the prophetic word and of the whole Old Testament as a prediction pointing unto Christ. It cannot be denied that the conception of Scriptures so vague in those days, the education of the authors of the Gospels and Epistles, as also that of their readers, exerted an influence to this end, and this more on the statements of the Evangelists than on the discourses of the Lord, on the Alexandrian educated author of the Epistle to the Hebrews different from the effect produced on the rabbinically trained Paul. The Jews of that day regarded with favor a free application of the Scriptural words, an application which does not always lay claim to be exactly an explanation; and even when the aim is exegesis, the grammatico-historical principle does not always prevail. But such a reference to the subjective way of thinking common to those days and under the spell of which the New Testament authors were also bound, or the view that they did this merely as a matter of accommodation to their readers, does not satisfy the demands of the case. The objective ground,

which gave the messengers and witnesses of Christ a good reason for this procedure, lies in the mentioned attitude of Christ over against the Old Covenant. Not only have the divine thoughts that are presented in that Covenant, first and without exception, found their actual embodiment in Christ, but, further, the agreement between the form of prophecy and the appearances of Christ Jesus have left upon his contemporaries, in so far as they were enlightened by the Spirit of God, an overwhelming effect, which they, through their testimony, sought also to impart to others. Especially is it the aim of the first and of the fourth Gospel, in their narratives of the life of Christ, to show that he is "the Christ," the promised Messiah. For those who had seen the Word of Life with their own eyes, and touched him with their own hands, not one single feature in him was accidental or unimportant. In the most minute points, as in the greatest, they discovered a wonderful agreement with that which God had spoken from of old, and to this they pointed when they spoke of the Old Covenant. They do this as those who live entirely in the light of the New Covenant, and for whom the whole aim of the Old has been realized in this, that it has testified for the New. In the full consciousness that their Master was the yea and amen of all that God had ever and always spoken and promised, they, without any anxious fear, seize upon the multitude of the prophetic words, and place upon his head the full and complete crown, without asking whether, in doing so, a flower or a leaf here and there may not be removed from the place that originally produced them; for they all have grown for him.

From what has been said, the question of method, namely, whether and to what degree the New Testament fulfillment must be decisive for us in the treatment of the Old Testament prophecy, will find its answer. Very correctly, at the present day, is the grammatico-historical method emphasized over against the method formerly in vogue in the churches, according to which correct way the prophecies, in the first instance, are taken into consideration in the sense which they must have conveyed to the contemporaries, and which accordingly the speaker himself must have laid upon them. The New Testament authors in no wise desire to relieve us of this scientific task; their object is a different one than to point out the original connection and character of the passage. We, therefore, do not question the authority of these writers, when we first ask concerning the human conditions of these prophetic words, the purely divine contents of which alone came into consideration for them. Indeed, it is easily possible that such words have gone through a whole course of development, and only attained a larger application on a higher scale of revelation.

On the other hand, it must not be overlooked that the individual prophetic oracle is not the accidental product of momentary circumstances and feelings, but it claims to be the production of the divine spirit, and that this claim is verified through the inner harmony of prophecies originating in different centuries, different localities and under widely differing historical circumstances and personalities, and through the fact that finally the revelation of Christ shows itself in this inner central place, in which all the veins of this organism join together. Thereby a consideration of the several prophecies is demanded which does not consider them as isolated atoms, but looks at their inner connection. And as every organism can be fully comprehended in all its members only when its development is complete, so too the prophecies of the Old Covenant in all their members and connections and all their bearings can

be fully appreciated only on the basis of the completion in the New Covenant. Nor can we sanction the dualistic separation which we find in Riehm, "The contents of prophecy, i. e., the sense in which the prophets and their contemporaries understood it must be separated from the reference to its completion in Christ as contemplated by divine revelation." Both may have to be separated in some instances. But in general the reference to the completion of the kingdom of God through Christ belongs to the contents of the prophecy, and indeed this forms its essential, although often hidden, contents. For it must be borne in mind that the prophetic word generally has an impenetrable residue, a mysterious something, before which the consciousness of the speaker and the reader stands still in awe. It is therefore wrong to count as the contents of the prophecy only that which was present to the consciousness of the speaker or hearer. In it there is generally a mysterious germ, whose development is only divined, but which nevertheless belongs to the contents. A satisfactory or truly historical treatment demands that this be taken into account and regard be had to the future development, and in this manner the organic harmony with the New Testament fulfillment will be achieved. But the witnesses of the New Covenant point out to us only the ultimate aim to which we should look. We must take our stand entirely in the time of the origin of these words, and from there only mark out the way to this ultimate goal. In other words, the history of the fulfillment must have also an important, even though only relative, influence on our consideration of prophecy.

THE NAME LUCIFER.

BY REV. MAURICE G. HANSEN,

Brooklyn, N. Y.

It is much to be deplored that the euphonious and comprehensive name—*light-bearer*—should ever have been applied to the prince of "the rulers of the darkness of this world" so persistently, that it popularly has come to be considered as belonging exclusively to him. The fact is that in his case the title is thoroughly a misnomer. It only *seems* to apply when he "transforms himself into an angel of light." In the bestowal upon him, even by the Lord's servants, of a name which is the property alone of One who is the light itself, there is unfortunately no protest against this usurpation of the arch-deceiver. But how did Satan come to be so designated?

The whole trouble arose from the effort to put into Is. xiv., 12 more than is really there. The words are: "How art thou fallen from heaven, לְקִיָּלָה , son of the morning." Gesenius renders לְקִיָּלָה "brilliant star," and says: "Aptly so, since it is followed by 'son of the morning.'" Now, the morning-star, as everyone knows who has seen it, is very beautiful because of its luminousness. Hence the Vulgate gives for the Hebrew לְקִיָּלָה the Latin "Lucifer." The Staten-bybel reads "Morning-star, son of the dawn," and has this note: "That star is more brilliant than any other in the firmament because it alone causes an object to cast a shadow." The Septuagint gives the reading "early rising dawn-bringer" ($\delta \epsilon \omega \sigma \phi \acute{\epsilon} \rho \omicron \varsigma \delta \ \pi \rho \omega \tau \acute{\iota} \ \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$).

This high-sounding title was applied metaphorically to the King of Babylon

(Is. xiv., 4). This king was either Nebuchadnezzar, because of his eminence, and his temporary abasement, or, more probably, Belshazzar, because, in his death and in the capture of his capital, the Babylonian empire, as one of the great sovereignties of the earth, came to an end. In either case the morning-star represented a human being only, one who held a prominent earthly rank and was brought down to the grave.

Let us look at a gem from that casket of jewels, Bungener's "Bourdaloue and Louis XIV." Claude was in the Avenue of the Philosophers, surrounded by Fénelon, Bossuet, Flécher, and others. The subject of his discourse was the sublimity of the Scriptural ideas of death and the nothingness of man. He spoke: "The most beautiful funeral oration that I know is the famous chapter (Is. xiv.). A king dies. The nation asks if it be really true. They were so accustomed to see him live as if he were never to die, that they had almost come to believe that he never could die. But he is really dead. They raise their heads. For the first time they dare to fix their eyes upon this countenance before which they have so long bowed themselves to the dust. They had transformed their monarch into a giant. And now that he lies low, a few feet of ground is sufficient for him. Scarcely were his eyes closed upon this world, when he must open them in another world, and be a witness of his own interment in the depths of the tomb. All the kings of the nations are come to meet him. To salute him? No, to mingle among the rest of the dead, and to contemplate him confounded among the nameless crowd. And then burst forth beneath the infernal vaults these voices, these cries, this terrible and solemn chant of the grave's equality, 'How art thou fallen from heaven!'"

Why was more sought, under the prophet's highly figurative language, than the announcement of a plain historical fact and a most solemn lesson? It is to be regretted that occasion has been given for the indignant protest of Dr. Henderson: "The application of this passage to Satan and to the fall of the apostate angels, is one of those gross perversions of sacred writ which so extensively obtain, and which are to be traced to a proneness to seek for more in any given passage than it really contains."

This particular example of "gross perversion of sacred writ" is of an early date. Not as early, however, as that impliedly assigned by Nägelsbach, who appears inclined to hold the Septuagint responsible for the error, because in their translation they changed the second person of the Hebrew (נפלת) into the third of the Greek (πῶς ἐξέπεσεν), the oratorical personal address into an exclamation of a general nature. By the change the eloquence of the prophet's apostrophe is sacrificed, but, still, in the view of the translators, the being to whom Isaiah refers may have been the human dethroned potentate only. Dr. Balthasar Bekker states, in his celebrated "The World Bewitched," that Athanasius, in his first and second books against the Arians, erroneously derives the overthrow of the devil from this text. Dr. Kitto declares that Tertullian and Gregory the Great, understood the prophet's language to refer to the same thing. The perversion of this passage probably originated at the beginning of the fourth century of the Christian era, and was adopted as sound interpretation by the theologians of the middle ages. The modern English commentators do not positively endorse it, but they seem indisposed to abandon it wholly, since it has become so firmly established in the minds of the readers of King James's version; and, indeed, of those of all other renderings of the original Scriptures. Scott says: "This

language may refer to the fall of Satan and his angels," and directs us to the words of the Lord, Luke x., 18, "I saw Satan fall as lightning from heaven." Fausset, perceiving another allusion still, states that Antichrist shall hereafter assume the title Lucifer, and that "the Antichrist of Daniel, John and Paul alone shall exhaustively fulfill all the lineaments given in the prophet Isaiah's chapter." Barnes, on the other hand, distinctly rejects the mediæval notion that the fall of the devil is taught in this text in the prophecy of Isaiah. After giving the beautiful Chaldee paraphrase—"How art thou fallen from on high who wert splendid among the sons of men"—he says, "There can be no doubt that the object in the eye of the prophet was the bright morning-star, and his design was to compare this magnificent Oriental monarch (the King of Babylon) with that." This is correct. There is no ground for the application, to the enemy of God and of man, of a name originally bestowed in a figure on a once powerful Babylonian prince, who, together with his empire, passed away when the design of Providence in their existence had been fulfilled. The title Light-bearer, in respect to every particular of the spiritual significance of the metaphor, belongs to Christ because of his inherent dignity, his soul-attracting charms, and his illuminating power in the midst of all moral darkness. To deprive him of that name is to rob him of a ray of his glory. He claims it. "I am the bright and morning star" (Rev. xxii., 16), is the witness which the glorified Redeemer bears to himself. That utterance is only the prolonged echo of the word that fell from the lips of the God-man before his passion had culminated in the awful scene on Calvary—"I am the light of the world"—that word itself, a divine commentary on the promise of old given by the prophet Malachi (iv., 2), "Unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings."

Let the name "Illuminator" be restored to him to whom it properly belongs. Call Satan, Lucifer, as appropriately as Bread of Life, Good Shepherd, or any other title owned by our Lord Jesus in virtue of what he is to the starving, wandering sinner whom he invites to come to him. To everyone who, following Christ, "walks not in darkness but hath the light of life," he is "the day-star (*φωσφόρος*) who arises in their hearts" (2 Peter i., 19). In the Latin versions of the text in Isaiah which has been considered, and of the above statement of the apostle Peter, the word *lucifer*, occurring in each, should have been printed with a capital L only in the latter instance, and not, as unfortunately is the case, in the former alone.

RECENT ADVANCES IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THEIR RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

BY REV. T. K. CHEYNE,
Rector of Tendring.

"My own conviction," said the late Dr. Pusey, "has long been that the hope of the Church of England is in mutual tolerance." That truly great man was not thinking of the new school of Old Testament critics, and yet if the Anglican Church is ever to renovate her theology and to become in any real sense undeniably the Church of the future, she cannot afford to be careless or intolerant of attempts to modernize our methods of criticism and exegesis. It would no doubt

be simpler to content ourselves with that criticism and exegesis, and consequently with that theology, which have been fairly adequate to the wants of the past; but are we sure that Jesus Christ would not now lead us a few steps further on towards "all the truth," and that one of his preparatory disciplines may not be a method of Biblical criticism which is less tender to the traditions of the scribes, and more in harmony with the renovating process which is going on in all other regions of thought? Why, indeed, should there not be a providence even in the phases of Old Testament criticism, so that where some can see merely the shiftings of arbitrary opinion, more enlightened eyes may discern a veritable progress, leading at once to fresh views of history, and to necessary reforms in our theology, making this theology simpler and stronger, deeper and more truly Catholic, by making it more Biblical.

Some one, however, may ask, Does not modern criticism actually claim to have refuted the fundamental facts of Bible history? But which *are* these fundamental facts? Bishop Thirlwall, twenty years ago, told his clergy "that a great part of the events related in the Old Testament has no more apparent connection with our religion than those of Greek and Roman history." Put these events for a moment on one side, and how much more conspicuous does that great elementary fact become which stands up as a rock in Israel's history—namely, that a holy God, for the good of the world, chose out this people, isolating it more and more completely for educational purposes from its heathen neighbors, and interposing at various times to teach, to chastise, and to deliver it! It is not necessary to prove that all such recorded interpositions are in the strictest sense historical; it is enough if the tradition or the record of some that are so, did survive the great literary as well as political catastrophe of the Babylonian captivity. And I have yet to learn that the Exodus, the destruction of Sennacherib's army, the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the unique phenomenon of spiritual prophecy, are called in question even by the most advanced school of Biblical criticism. One fact, indeed, there is, regarded by some of us as fundamental, which these advanced critics do maintain to be disproved, and that is the giving of the Levitical Law by Moses, or if not by Moses, by persons in the pre-exile period who had prophetic sanction for giving it. Supposing the theory of Kuenen and Wellhausen to be correct, it will no doubt appear to some minds (1) that the inspiration of the Levitical Law is at any rate weakened in quality thereby, (2) that a glaring inconsistency is introduced into the divine teaching of Israel, which becomes anti-sacrificial at one time, and sacrificial at another, and (3) that room is given for the supposition that the Levitical system itself was an injurious though politic condescension to popular tastes, and consequently (as Lagarde ventures to hold) that St. Paul, by his doctrine of the Atonement, ruined, so far as he could, the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ.

But I only mention these possible inferences in order to point out how unfair they are. (1) The inspiration (to retain an often misused but indispensable term) of the Levitical Law is only weakened in any bad sense if it be maintained that the law, whenever the main part of it was promulgated, failed to receive the sanction of God's prophetic interpreters, and that it was not, in the time of Ezra, the only effectual instrument for preserving the deposit of spiritual religion. (2) With regard to the inconsistency, (assuming the new hypothesis) between the two periods of the Divine teaching of Israel, the feeling of a devout, though advanced critic would be that he was not a fit judge of the providential plan. Inconsistent

conclusions on one great subject (that of forgiveness of sins) might in fact be drawn from the language of our Lord Himself at different periods of his ministry, though the parallel may not be altogether complete, since our Lord never used directly anti-sacrificial language. And it might be urged on the side of Kuenen, that neither would the early prophets have used such language—at any rate in the literary version of their discourses—if they had foreseen the canonical character which this would assume, and the immense importance of a sacrificial system in the post-exile period. (3) The theory that the law involves an injurious condescension is by no means compulsory upon advocates of the new hypothesis. Concessions to popular taste have, indeed, as we know but too well, often almost extinguished the native spirit of a religion; but the fact that some at least of the most spiritual psalms are acknowledged to be post-exile ought to make us all, critics and non-critics alike, slow to draw too sharp a distinction between the legal and the evangelical. That the law was misused by some, and in course of time became spiritually almost obsolete, would not justify us in depreciating it, even if we thought that the lesser and not the greater Moses, the scribe and not the prophet, was mainly responsible for its promulgation. Finally, the rash statement of Lagarde has been virtually answered by the reference of another radical critic (Keim) to the well attested words of Christ at the institution of the Eucharist. (Matt. xxvi., 28.)

I have spoken thus much on the assumption that the hypothesis of Kuenen and Wellhausen may be true. That it will ever become universally prevalent is improbable—the truth may turn out to lie between the two extremes—but that it will go on for some time gaining ground among the younger generation of scholars is, I think, almost certain. No one who has once studied this or any other Old Testament controversy from the inside and with a full view of the evidence can doubt that the traditional accounts of many of the disputed books rest on a very weak basis, and those who crave for definite solutions, and cannot bear to live in twilight, will naturally hail such clear-cut hypotheses as those of Kuenen and Wellhausen, and (like this year's Bampton Lecturer) credit them with an undue finality. Let us be patient with these too sanguine critics, and not think them bad Churchmen, as long as they abstain from drawing those dangerous and unnecessary inferences of which I have spoken. It is the want of an equally intelligent interest which makes the Old Testament a dead letter to so many highly orthodox theologians. If the advanced critics succeed in awakening such an interest more generally, it will be no slight compensation for that "unsettlement of views" which is so often the temporary consequence of reading their books.

One large part, however, of Kuenen and Wellhausen's critical system is not peculiar to them, but accepted by the great majority of professed Old Testament critics. It is this part which has perhaps a still stronger claim to be considered in its relation to Christian truth, because there is every appearance that it will, in course of time, become traditional among those who have given up the still current traditions of the synagogue. I refer (1) to the analysis of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua into several documents, (2) to the view that many of the laws contained in the Pentateuch arose gradually, according to the needs of the people, and that Ezra, or at least contemporaries of Ezra, took a leading part in the revision and completion of the law-book, and (3) to the dating of the original documents or compilations at various periods, mostly long subsequently to the time of Moses. Time forbids me to enter into the grounds for the confident

assertion that if either exegesis or the Church's representation of religious truth is to make any decided progress, the results of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch must be accepted as facts, and that theologians must in future recognize at least three different sections, and as many different conceptions of Israel's religious development, within the Pentateuch, just as they have long recognized at least three different types of teaching in the Old Testament as a whole. On the question as to the date of these sections, and as to the Mosaic origin of any considerable part of them, the opinions of special scholars within the church will, for a long time yet, be more or less divided. There is, I know, a belief growing up among us, that Assyrian and Egyptian discoveries are altogether favorable to the ordinary English view of the dates of the historical books, including the Pentateuch. May I be pardoned for expressing the slowly formed conviction that apologists in England (and be it observed that I do not quarrel with the conception of apologetic theology) frequently indulge in general statements as to the bearings of recent discoveries, which are only half true? The opponents of whom they are thinking are long since dead; it is wasting time to fight with the delusions of a past age. No one now thinks the Bible an invention of priestcraft; that which historical critics doubt is the admissibility of any unqualified assertion of the strict historicalness of all the details of all its component parts. This doubt is not removed by recent archaeological discoveries, the critical bearings of which are sometimes what neither of the critical schools desired or expected. I refer especially to the bearings of Assyrian discoveries on the date of what are commonly called the Jehovistic narratives in the first nine chapters of Genesis. I will not pursue this subject further, and merely add that we must not too hastily assume that the supplement-hypothesis is altogether antiquated.

The results of the anticipated revolution in our way of looking at the Pentateuch strike me as four-fold. (1) Historically. The low religious position of most of the pre-exile Israelites will be seen to be not the result of a deliberate rebellion against the law of Jehovah, the Levitical laws being at any rate virtually non-existent. By this I mean, that even if any large part of those laws go back to the age of Moses, they were never thoroughly put in force, and soon passed out of sight. Otherwise, how can we account for this, among other facts, that Deuteronomy, or the main part of it, is known in the reign of Josiah as "*the law of Moses?*" We shall also, perhaps, get a deeper insight into the divine purpose in raising up that colossal personage who, though "slow of speech," was so mighty in deed—I mean Moses—and shall realize those words of a writer specially sanctioned by my own university: "Should we have an accurate idea of the purpose of God in raising up Moses, if we said, he did it that he might communicate a revelation? Would not this be completely to misunderstand the principal end of the mission of Moses, which was the establishment of the theocracy, and in so far as God revealed through him, the revelation was but as means to this higher end?"

(2) We shall, perhaps, discriminate more between the parts of the Old Testament, some of which will be chiefly valuable to us as bringing into view the gradualness of Israel's education, and as giving that fulness to our conceptions of Biblical truths which can only be got by knowing the history of their outward forms; others will have only that interest which attaches even to the minutest and obscurest details of the history of much-honored friends or relatives; others,

lastly, will rise, in virtue of their intrinsic majesty, to a position scarcely inferior to that of the finest parts of the New Testament itself.

(3) As a result of what has thus been gained, our idea of inspiration will become broader, deeper, and more true to facts.

(4) We shall have to consider our future attitude towards that Kenotic view of the person of Christ which has been accepted in some form by such great exegetical theologians as Hofmann, Oehler, and Delitzsch. Although the Logos, by the very nature of the conception, must be omniscient, the incarnate Logos, we are told, pointed his disciples to a future time, in which they should do greater works than he himself, and should open the doors to fresh departments of truth. The critical problems of the Old Testament did not then require to be settled by him, because they had not yet come into existence. Had they emerged into view in our Lord's time, they would have given as great a shock to devout Jews as they have done to devout Christians; and our Master would, no doubt, have given them a solution fully adequate to the wants of believers. In that case, a reference to some direction of the law as of Mosaic origin would, in the mouth of Christ, have been decisive; and the Church would, no doubt, have been guided to make some distinct definition of her doctrine on the subject.

Thus in the very midst of the driest critical researches we can feel that, if we have duly fostered the sense of divine things, we are on the road to further disclosures of religious as well as historical truth. The day of negative criticism is past, and the day of a cheap ridicule of all critical analysis of ancient texts is, we may hope, nearly past also. In faith and love the critics whose lot I would fain share are at one with many of those who suspect and, perhaps, ridicule them: in the aspirations of hope their aim is higher. Gladly would I now pass on to a survey of the religious bearings of the critical study of the poetical and prophetic books, which, through differences of race, age, and, above all, spiritual atmosphere, we find, upon the whole, so much more attractive and congenial than the Levitical legislation. Let me, at least, throw out a few hints. Great as is the division of opinion on points of detail, so much appears to be generally accepted that the number of prophets whose works have partly come down to us is larger than used to be supposed. The analysis of the texts may not be as nearly perfect as that of the Pentateuch, but there is no doubt among those of the younger critics whose voices count (and with the pupils of Delitzsch the case is the same as with those of Ewald) that several of the prophetic books are made up of the works of different writers, and I even notice a tendency among highly orthodox critics to go beyond Ewald himself and analyze the book of Daniel into portions of different dates. The result is important, and not for literary history alone. It gives us a much firmer hold on the great principle that a prophet's horizon is that of his own time, that he prophesied, as has been well said, into the future, but not directly to the future. This will I believe in no wise affect essential Christian truth, but will obviously modify our exegesis of certain Scripture proofs of Christian doctrine, and is perhaps not without a bearing on the two grave theological subjects referred to already.

Bear with me if, once again in conclusion, I appeal to the Church at large on behalf of those who would fain modernize our criticism and exegesis with a view to a not less distinctively Christian but a more progressive Church theology. The age of œcumenical councils may have passed; but if criticism, exegesis, and philo-

ophy are only cultivated in a fearless but reverent spirit, and if the Church at large troubles itself a little more to understand the workers and their work, an approximation to agreement on great religious questions may hereafter be attained. What the informal decisions of the general Christian consciousness will be, it would be impertinent to conjecture. It is St. John's "all truth" after which we aspire—"all the truth" concerning God, the individual soul, and human society, into which the labors of generations, encouraged by the guiding star, shall by degrees introduce us. But one thing is too clear to be mistaken—viz., that exegesis must decide first of all what essential Christian truth is before a devout philology can interpret, expand, and apply it, and Old Testament exegesis, at any rate, cannot be long separated from its natural ally, the higher criticism. A provisional separation may no doubt be necessary, but the ultimate aim of successive generations of students must be a faithful exegesis, enlightened by a seven-times tested criticism.—[From *The Guardian*.]

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

BY REV. J. W. HALEY,
Amherst, Mass.

There are in my library some *Judaica* which are more or less rare and interesting. I hardly need mention Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, edited by Carpzov, Lipsiæ, Anno MDCLXXXIV. This work is an old-fashioned square quarto of some 1,500 pages, and contains abundant extracts from rabbinical writers illustrating various passages in the Gospels, Acts, and 1 Corinthians. This work has been translated into English by Gandell, and published in four vols., Oxford, 1859.

Next may be mentioned the *Entdecktes Judenthum* of J. A. Eisenmenger, Königsberg, 1711. This work has a curious history. Its author was Professor of Oriental languages at Heidelberg. For some reason he became imbued with a spirit of intense hostility to the Jews, and spent some nineteen years in writing the *Entdecktes* which has been well characterized as "a curious and learned but exceedingly one-sided and spiteful representation of Judaism." He seems to have fished up from the great deep of the Talmud everything weird, *outré*, ridiculous, or revolting which it contained. So bitterly antagonistic was the work that the Jews procured an imperial edict forbidding its publication. They even offered Eisenmenger twelve thousand florins for the edition, but he demanded thirty thousand. After his death the work was published at the expense of Frederick I., King of Prussia. It is in two square quarto volumes, of over 1,000 pages each; and is a complete thesaurus of recondite information respecting rabbinical opinions, customs, and teachings. The list of writers cited in the book occupies sixteen pages.

I may allude also to the well-known *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ* of Christian Schœttgen, Dresdæ et Lipsiæ, MDCCXXXIII. This work, which forms a kind of supplement to that of Lightfoot, is in two square quarto volumes of some 1,300 pages each, and is intended to illustrate various passages throughout the New Testament.

The next book to be noticed is a quite rare and curious one. I have never

seen but two copies, that now before me, and another in a private library. The title is as follows: *The Book of Religion, Ceremonies, and Prayers of the Jews, as Practised in their Synagogues on all Occasions, &c.* Translated immediately from the Hebrew by Gamaliel Ben Pedahzur, Gent. London, MDCCXXXVIII. Whether the author's name, as here given, is a pseudonym I am unable to say.

The Table of Contents of the Ceremonies contains some very minute, not to say ludicrous, particulars. We give some specimens:

First prayer at awaking in the morning.....	P. 1
What they are to do as soon as out of bed; the manner of washing their hands; the words to be repeated before they wipe their hands.....	Pp. 1, 2
The manner obliged to put on their clothes.....	P. 2
Concerning their dead and their burials; their method used to prevent too great a mortality in any one family; with many other ceremonies relating to deceased persons.....	P. 15
Their manner of mourning, their obligation for eating hard eggs at their return from the burying ground.....	P. 18

There are many other ceremonies prescribed, some of which are frivolous, and others will not bear to be repeated in print.

I observe that Pedahzur agrees with other Jewish authorities, in the statement that the Jews, at Passover, drink no fermented wine. His words are (p. 55): "Their Drinkables is either fair Water, or Water boiled with Sassafras and Liquorish, or Raisin-Wine prepared by themselves." I give his words *verbatim et literatim*.

The last part of the book, comprising 290 pages, contains "Prayers for the Morning of Every Day in the Week." These prayers are translated from the Hebrew—in part from the Book of Psalms, and in part from the Rabbinic Ritual. Some of the petitions are childish or absurd; many of them are truly spiritual and devout in tone and expression.

Pedahzur's book is possessed of much interest as presenting apparently a minute and faithful portrait of modern Judaism as it was taught and practiced a century and a half ago. The volume is a duodecimo, bound in leather, and contains 394 pages.

In another paper I will speak of some other works of similar scope and character.

→GENERAL NOTES.←

Zechariah's Times, and the Occasion of his Mission.—In the first year of his reign in Babylon B. C. 538 (*Rawlinson*) Cyrus the Great made a decree for the return of the Jewish exiles to Jerusalem, and for the rebuilding of the House of the LORD God of Israel, which was in Jerusalem. The sum total of the "Congregation" which came up on this occasion was 42,360 (*fathers of families*, probably, i. e., about 200,000 free men, women and children), besides male and female slaves to the number of 7,337. These came up under Zerubbabel, the Head of the Captivity, son of Shealtiel and Joshua the son of Josedech the High Priest. Zerubbabel is called son of Pedaiah (son of Jeconiah, son of Jehoiakim), Shealtiel having probably died without male issue, and his brother Pedaiah having taken his deceased brother's wife. Zerubbabel was thus legal heir of Jehoiachim, king

of Judah. Feeble indeed was the people's response to the Persian king's invitation to return to their own country, and remarkably so with those who ought to have been most eager to avail themselves of it, viz., the priesthood. Of them but 4 out of the 24 orders, and of the Levites only 74 (*households*, probably) returned. After the returned exiles had arrived at their respective cities, as the seventh month was approaching they were assembled, as one man, to Jerusalem, and rebuilt the altar of burnt-offerings, and from the 1st day of Tishri re-established the daily sacrifices. They kept also in that month the Feast of Tabernacles "according to the scripture" (viz., from the 15th to the 22nd of the seventh month). Then in the second month of the second year of their return (whether this was the second or third year of Darius cannot be decided) energetic measures began to be taken for the building of the Temple, and the foundation thereof was shortly laid amid the blasts of trumpets, the clashing of cymbals, and songs and praises to the LORD "for His mercy (endureth) for ever upon Israel," while some shouted for joy, and the ancient men, who had seen the former House, wept, when the foundation of this House was laid before their eyes. But the building was not destined to be completed at this time. When the Samaritans heard that the community, which had returned from the Captivity, were beginning to rebuild the Temple, they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chiefs of the people, and desired to take part in the work. On their co-operation being declined they set themselves to hinder the Jews in their work, and bribed some of the favorites at the Court of Persia so effectually, that they frustrated the purpose of the people of Judah during the rest of "the reign of Cyrus, even up to the reign of Darius;" i. e., from about B. C. 536 to B. C. 529 when Cyrus died, and during the reign of Cambyses, son of Cyrus (B. C. 529—522), and the ten months (or less) of the reign of the pseudo-Smerdis (or Bardes) B. C. 522—521, and during one year of the reign of Darius, who succeeded Bardes in 521—in all about 15 years. In the second year of Darius, God raised up Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah, the son of Iddo, to prophesy to the Jews which were in Judah and Jerusalem, so that Zerubbabel and Joshua the High Priest and the rest of the people "came and worked at the House of the Lord of Hosts in the 24th day of the sixth month of the second year of Darius." Although it is true that the enemies of Judah and Benjamin were a chief cause of this long neglect of the work of rebuilding, still such neglect seems to have been in great measure caused by remissness on the part of Zerubbabel and Joshua, and the heads of the people. For Haggai on the 1st of the sixth month administered to them a scathing rebuke, when he said to them, "Is it time for you, *you* indeed, to dwell in your houses all ceiled, while this House lieth waste?" He calls on them too, to "consider their ways," to call to mind, *why* it was that they "sowed much, and brought in little," it is (says he) because "My House is waste, and ye run every one to his own house." In the seventh month the word of the Lord came again to Haggai, and he foretells the "shaking of the heavens and the earth and the sea," encourages the people by the promise that "the choicest things of the nations should come" to glorify God's House, and assures them that "the glory of that House will in later times be greater than at the first." At this juncture it was, that the first recorded revelation came to Zechariah, in the eighth month, and he is commanded to exhort the people to repentance, and to warn them against neglecting the words of the prophets as their fathers had done before them, if they would not experience their chastisements.—From *Lowe's Commentary on Zechariah*.

David's Fight with Goliath.—The fight with Goliath has given rise to many a fight between critics. In 1 Sam. xvi., 21, David the harper is said to have become Saul's armor-bearer; but (1 Sam. xvii., 15) about a page farther on in the story, he goes back to Bethlehem to keep the sheep. Then in 1 Sam. xvii., 40, he appears dressed as a shepherd; and in 1 Sam. xvii., 55, both Saul and Abner know nothing about him. A great difficulty exists here, or there is no difficulty whatever. The former view of the passage has been in favor for many centuries. As long ago as the copying of the oldest manuscript of the Septuagint Greek, not only was the difficulty felt, but an attempt was made to remove it out of the way. That attempt has met with approval in modern times. It consisted in omitting 1 Sam. xvii., 12-31 from the text. The going back of David to his father's house, his visit to the camp, his conversation with Eliab, and with the soldiers, were left out as pieces somehow added to the real story. This solution is accepted as giving the ancient Hebrew account of the fight. The twenty verses omitted are considered a later embellishment, which a blundering editor found current, and thrust into the Hebrew text without thought, or in despair of reconciling the two. Does this solution remove the difficulty, as several critics imagine? It does not; it leaves matters worse than it found them. In 1 Sam. xvi., 21, David appears as Saul's armor-bearer; but in 1 Sam. xvii., 40, immediately after the omitted verses, he appears in shepherd's dress with staff, scrip, and sling. And in the previous verse (39), he avows himself ignorant of sword, and helmet, and arms generally, although he is supposed to have been Saul's armor-bearer. What, then, is gained by omitting the verses? Nothing; but the inconsistency in the story only becomes greater. David the armor-bearer turns out to be David the shepherd! The omitted verses have actually to be supplied in some way before we can understand the verses which are retained.

Really, however, on a fair reading of the story, there is no difficulty whatever. A writer is entitled to anticipate in his book parts of the story which he intends to relate fully afterwards. This is done every day. Let the last three verses of 1 Sam. xvi. be read on the supposition of the writer having adopted this principle, as he has often adopted it in other passages, and the difficulty will prove to be no difficulty at all. Thus 1 Sam. xvi., 21, 22: 'David came to Saul, and [as I shall relate fully afterwards] stood before him; and he loved him greatly, and he became his armor-bearer. And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, Let David, I pray thee, stand before me, for he hath found favor in my sight.' After the story of the fight, this sending to Jesse is clearly hinted at (1 Sam. xviii., 2) as a point already related: 'Saul took him that day, and would let him go no more home to his father's house.' A view of the passage which reduces everything to order without violence, and without resorting to 'critical subterfuges,' is the simplest way. It is also in accordance with the rules of historical writing, which have been followed in all ages, and which are observed in the book of Samuel. Thus there are two accounts of Abiathar's coming to David (1 Sam. xxii., 20-23, xxiii., 6). But the Greek translators, believing he did not join the outlaws at Keilah, and yet fearing this inference might be drawn from the Hebrew, brought the two into agreement by a slight change on one word:—

1 SAM. xxiii., 6 (HEB.).

When Abiathar fled to David to Keilah, he came down with an ephod in his hand.

1 SAM. xxiii., 6 (GREEK).

When Abiathar fled to David, he came also down with David to Keilah, having an ephod in his hand.

—From Sime's "Kingdom of All-Israel."

Character of Isaiah.—Isaiah was self-evidently a man endowed with the noblest genius, with an inexhaustible wealth and brilliancy of imagination and fertility of thought. He had inherited the spirit and traditions of the Hebrew people in his life-blood. He was familiar with the events of Israel's past history, as is shown by his frequent allusions to such events as the calling of Abraham, the destruction of Sodom, the marching of Israel out of Egypt, the stretching out of Moses's rod over the sea, the discomfiture of the Canaanites in the valley of Gibeon, the cloud by day and the fire by night, etc.; and still more deeply was his spirit impregnated with the spirit of the nation, as called and inspired by God to be the people of righteousness, bearing the treasures of truth and salvation for the world. He shows himself accurately informed in the geography and politics of the countries around Palestine, even of Egypt and Assyria. His rich and vivid imagery shows wonderful familiarity with the scenery and flora and fauna of his own land. He was versed in the literature of the poets and prophets before him, as many quotations testify. But he did not derive his inspiration at second hand; his spirit had taken fire by personal contact with the Eternal Spirit of truth and righteousness, and burned with a perennial glow. No doubt he had vexed his righteous soul with the corruptions of his people even before, about the age of twenty, the death of Uzziah prompted his visit to the temple, where he saw, in a trance of meditation, the vision of God in the midst of the chanting seraphim, where, in the vision of the Thrice-Holy, the cry burst from his awed soul, "Woe is unto me! for I am undone. For I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips!" and his lips were touched with fire for his purification; where, in answer to the call, "Whom shall we send and who will go for us?" he had volunteered the answer, "Here am I, send me." From that hour he became the seer and mouthpiece of the Holy One, "filling the whole earth with his glory," and filling his own soul with its *πλήρωμα* full and overflowing. One is impressed in reading him with the burning intensity of his sense of God's holy presence in him, and of his solemn charge as the bearer of the divine messages. His soul, in every faculty and feeling, quivers with thrills of spiritual life, and his words tingle with it. His thoughts become lightning-flashes of the celestial fire; his oracles thunder-peals of the voice of eternal righteousness. His own person, his marriage with the prophetess, the birth of his children and their symbolic names, become object-lessons of his prophetic utterances, as he says, "Behold I and the children which the Lord hath given me are for signs and portents from the Lord of Hosts who dwelleth in Zion."—*From Dunning's Recent Researches in Isaiah. The Independent.*

Chaldean Imprecations. [Among the Chaldeans] the formulæ of imprecations were really terrible. They called upon all the gods of heaven and of the abyss to display their power by overwhelming with misfortunes the person against whom they were directed. I shall quote as an example those upon the celebrated monument of our national library, which is known by the name of Caillou Michaux, after the traveler who brought it from the suburbs of Bagdad. It is an ovoid boulder of black basalt, fifty centimetres high, upon the lower part of which are sculptured some sacred symbols; the rest of the stone is covered with a long inscription in the Assyrian tongue, containing the law concerning landed property as a dowry for a woman on her marriage, and giving the whole measurement of the land to which the stone served as a boundary. After the copy of the act pas-

sed in an authentic manner, come the imprecations against any one who displaced the boundary, or troubled in any way the peaceable possessor of the lands.

They (the imprecations) shall precipitate this man into the water; they shall bury him in the ground; they shall cause him to be overwhelmed with stones; they shall burn him with fire; they shall drive him into exile into places where he cannot live.

May Anu, Bel, Nouah, and the Supreme Lady, the great gods, cover him with absolute confusion, may they root up his stability, may they efface his posterity!

May Marduk, the great lord, the eternal chief, fasten him up with unbreakable chains!

May the Sun, the great judge of heaven and earth, pronounce his condemnation, and take him in his snares!

May Sin, the illuminator, who inhabits the elevated regions, catch him in a net like a wild ram captured in the chase; like a buffalo whom he throws to the ground by taking him in a noose!

May Ishtar, queen of heaven and earth, strike him in the presence of gods and men, and entice his servants to perdition!

May Adar, the son of the zenith, the child of Bel, the supreme, destroy the limits and the boundary of his property!

May Gula, the great lady, the spouse of the winter Sun, pour inside him a deadly poison; may she cause his blood and sweat to flow like water!

May Bin, the captain of heaven and earth, the son of Anu, the hero, inundate his field!

May Serakh destroy the firstfruits of his harvest * * * may he enervate his animals!

May Nebo, the supreme intelligence overwhelm him with affliction and terror, and lastly may he hurry him into incurable despair!

And may all the great gods whose names are mentioned in this inscription curse him with a curse from which he can never be released! may they scatter his race until the end of time!—*From Lenormant's Chaldean Magic and Sorcery.*

↳ CONTRIBUTED NOTES. ◀

Maimonides's Creed.—And here is an appropriate place to mention that the fundamental doctrines of our religion are thirteen.

1. One must believe in the existence of a Creator, be he blessed, i. e., that the Existent is perfect in all his existence and is the cause of all things that exist, and that they derive their existence only from him. His non-existence is impossible, as without his existence nothing else can exist. But if even nothing besides him should exist, his existence can not cease. He alone, whose name be blessed, is *one* and *Lord* for he is all-perfect and all-sufficient, having no need of any other being; but all other beings, as angels, the spheres, and all which is therein, as also all that is beneath them, are depending on him. This first article is taught by the words, "I am the Lord thy God." (Exod. xx., 2.)

2. The Unity of God, whose name be blessed, we must believe: that the Cause of all is *one*, not like one of a pair, of a species, or like one man which can be divided into many, or like one body that can be divided into parts infinite, but that God is one like no other one. This second article is taught by the words, "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord." (Deut. vi., 4.)

3. The immateriality of God we must believe, that this one is not matter, nor possesses any properties of matter, as motion and rest, either in essence or attributes. Therefore have our wise men divested him of composition and

division, as they said (Chaguiga, fol. 15), "There is in heaven neither sitting nor standing." The prophet said also (Isa. XL., 25), "To whom then will you liken me, or shall I be equal? saith, the Holy One." But all that is said in holy Scriptures of God's going, standing, sitting and speaking is anthropomorphic. And thus said our wise men of blessed memory. The law speaks in the language of men. Our wise men have said much on this subject. This third article is taught us by the words (Deut. IV., 15), "For you saw no manner of similitude," which means, ye have not perceived him to be anything like matter, or as having the properties of matter, as we mentioned above.

4. We must believe in the absolute preexistence of God, and that nothing existed before him. The passages of Scripture showing this are many. This fourth article is taught by the words (Deut. XXXIII., 27), "The eternal God is thy refuge."

5. The blessed God alone is worthy of worship, praise and obedience; nor may we worship anyone beneath him in existence, as the angels, spheres, elements, or anything composed of them. For they are subject to divine laws, and are not free agents. Nor are they to be worshipped as mediators to bring us near to God. But all our thoughts should go *direct* to him, and to none else besides him. This fifth article is the prohibition of idolatry, which is very frequently spoken of in Scripture.

6. We must believe that there are some men possessing such qualities, and such perfections that their souls are fit for the reception of supernatural conceptions. Such are prophets, and this is prophecy and its nature. To give a proper and full explanation of this article would be too long a task, neither will I give any proof of it, as it requires a knowledge of all the sciences. I speak of it only as a fact, and many passages of holy Scripture bear witness that prophecy and prophets existed.

7. We are to believe that the prophet Moses was the father of all the prophets that were before him, or after him. All prophets were inferior to Moses, as he was the best of mankind and reached to a knowledge of the Godhead to which no other man ever attained. And we must believe that he in his manhood attained the excellence of angels, that he overcame every hindrance, so that no bodily weakness was in his way; the common human desires, feelings and perceptions disappeared and there remained but the sense of the soul; wherefore it is said of him, "He spoke with God without intermediate angel." It was in my heart to explain this wonderful subject and to unlock the closed passages of Scripture; to explain the meaning of "mouth to mouth" (E. V. face to face) and the like about the prophetic state of Moses. But I saw that it would require numberless proofs and many introductions and preliminaries. I should first have to speak of the existence of angels, and how they differ from God; then about the nature and properties of the soul. The treatment would have to be enlarged to explain what the prophets said concerning God and angels. And even all these would scarcely suffice; so that if I were to write a hundred sheets it would not be enough. I will therefore leave it for a book of Sermons which I intend to write, or for a commentary on the prophets now in preparation, or for a separate book which I intend to compose on these articles. I will now return to the meaning of this seventh article, and show that Moses's nature of prophecy differed from all others in four points. *First*, God's communication to any other prophet was through some

medium, but to Moses it was direct, as it is said (Num. XII., 8), "With him I will speak mouth to mouth."

Secondly, to any other prophet the prophecy comes either when he is asleep, in a dream or vision; or when awake, some dizziness falls upon him, so that all his bodily powers are suspended as in a dream. But Moses received God's word while standing between the Cherubim, as God appointed him: as it is said (Exod. XXV., 22) "And I there will meet with thee" (Num. XII., 8) "Mouth to mouth."

Thirdly, any other prophet, although the word come in a vision or by angel, becomes weak, and a fear overtakes him as if he would die (Dan. x., 8): "And I saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me, for my vigor was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength." But Moses had none of these feelings, for it is said (Exod. XXXIII., 11), "And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend;" which means, as no man is afraid when he speaketh with a friend, so Moses had no fear though the word came direct to him; and this was because of his soul's unity with God.

Fourthly, the prophecy of other prophets did not come to them at their will, but by God's will; the prophet may wait days and years asking God for a revelation. Some had even to apply means that the prophecy might come, as Elisha, when he said (2 Kgs. III., 15), "But now bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him." And even then the prophecy did not necessarily come. But Moses said (Num. IX., 8), "Stand still, and I will hear what the Lord will command concerning you." So it is also written (Lev. XVI., 2), "Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place;" which our wise men have understood to mean: Aaron is prohibited, but not Moses.

8. The Law is from heaven, i. e., we have to believe that the whole Law which was given by Moses, is entirely from God's mouth; it came to Moses, speaking anthropomorphically, by *God's dictation*. For though we cannot conceive how it was, he nevertheless wrote by dictation. He wrote all the history of those times, the conversations and commandments; and therefore he is called Lawgiver. And there is no difference between the passages, "The children of Ham were Cush and Mizraim," "The name of his wife was Mahatabel," "And Timnah was the concubine," and "I am the Lord thy God," or "Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God." For all came from God's mouth, and the whole Law of God is perfect, pure, holy and true. And he who says that Moses wrote such verses and narrations out of his own mind is regarded by our wise men and prophets as an unbeliever and false interpreter of the Law, because such a one thinks that the Law contains what is useful and useless, since these histories and narrations would be of no use being only of Moses; it is the same as saying, "The Law is not from God." Any one who says, The whole Law is from God except this one verse, of him it is said, "He has despised the word of the Lord." But every word of the Law contains wonderful wisdom for such as are able to comprehend it. All the wisdom that it contains will never be comprehended, as the measure thereof is longer than the earth and broader than the sea. One must only follow in the steps of David the anointed of the God of Jacob, who prayed, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law!" The same is true of the traditional explanation of the Law by God, as the making of the booth, the taking of the palm branch, the blowing of the horn, making fringes (on our gar-

ments) phylacteries, and the like. This eighth article is taught us by the words (Num. xvi., 20), "Hereby ye shall know that the Lord has sent me, to do all these works, and not out of my own mind."

9. We must believe that this Law was delivered from the Creator, whose name be blessed, and from none else; and nothing is to be added to, or diminished from either the written or oral law; as it is said (Deut. xiii., 1), "Thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it."

10. We must believe in God's Omniscience; that he knows what men do, and does not withhold his eyes from them, as they who say, God has forsaken the earth. But as Jeremiah said (xxxii., 19), "Great in council, and mighty in work; for thine eyes are open upon all the ways of the sons of men." (Gen. vi., 5), "And God saw that the wickedness of men was great in the earth." (Gen. xvi., 20), "The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great." These verses teach us this.

11. We must believe that God will reward him who keeps his commandments and punish those who transgress them. The great reward will be the world to come, and the strong punishment, the being cast off. The passage (Exod. xxxii., 32), "Yet now if thou wilt forgive their sin—well—; and if not, blot me I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written," and God answered him (ibid., 33), "Whosoever has sinned against me, him I will blot out of my book;" is a positive proof that God knows who is righteous and who is wicked, to reward the one and punish the other.

12. We are to believe that Messiah will come, and, though he tarry, to wait for him. Nor may we fix any time for his appearance out of Scriptures. Our wise men said (Sanhedrin, fol. 97), May the spirit of those who compute the time, when Messiah will come, be extinguished. We are also to believe that his glory and honor will surpass that of all other kings who have ever existed, as all the prophets, from Moses to Malachi have prophesied. And whosoever doubts it or diminishes the Messiah's glory denies God's word which is plainly told in Num. xxiv., 17-19, and Deut. xxx., 3-10. This article includes also, that the Messiah is to be from the Davidic house and of the seed of Solomon, and any one who opposes this family denies the word of God and the word of his prophets.

13. We must believe in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. This article has been explained above. When any man believes these articles, and shows his belief, he is an Israelite and we are commanded to love him and to do him every good as God commanded us to love our neighbor with a brotherly love. And though such a one may commit sins because of his lust, and the evil nature which overcomes him, he will be punished for his transgression but he has a part in the world to come, and he is a sinful Israelite. But when one denies one of these thirteen articles he does not belong to the congregation of Israel; he denies the *root*, and is to be called unbeliever and heretic; he is cutting off the branches, and it is well to hate and destroy him. Of him it is said (Ps. cxxxix., 21), "Do I not hate them, O Lord, who hate thee?"—[From his Commentary on Chapter xi. of Tractat Sanhedrin, of the Mishna.]

ALEXANDER MEYROWITZ.

The Significance and Richness of Genesis.—Genesis or the Book of Beginnings is the basis of the Torah; the Torah is the foundation of the Old Testament; and the Old Testament is the preparation of the religion of redemption. The five books of the Torah in the Old Testament correspond to the four Gospels in the New. In

fact also the Gospel of Matthew βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is at its beginning joined to Genesis; and the Gospel of John sustains to the synoptic Gospels a relation like that of Deuteronomy to the preceding books of the Torah. Yet, not only *beginning* and *beginning*, but also *beginning* and *end* of the Old and New Testament canons are closely connected. Genesis and the Apocalypse, the Alpha and Omega of the canonical writings, are mutually interwoven. To the creation of the heaven and the earth on the first pages of Genesis corresponds the creation of the new heaven and the new earth on the last pages of the Apocalypse—to the first creation, which has for its end the first man, Adam, the new creation which takes its beginning from the second Adam. The Holy Scriptures form a rounded, completed whole,—a proof that not merely this or that book, but the whole is a work of the Holy Spirit. The Torah, with the σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, is the *root*; the Apocalypse is the summit, towering into the αἰὼν μέλλων; and it is true, as has been said: "Let the first three chapters of Genesis be taken from the Bible, and there is taken away the *terminus a quo*; let the last three chapters of the Apocalypse be taken, and there is taken away the *terminus ad quem*."

What the Son of Sirach¹ says of the Torah as a whole is pre-eminently true of Genesis:

"All these things are the book of the Covenant of the most high God, even the law which Moses commanded for an heritage unto the congregation of Jacob. Faint not to be strong in the Lord: that he may confirm you, cleave unto him; for the Lord Almighty is God alone, and besides him there is no other Saviour.

"He filleth all things with his wisdom, as Phison and as Tigris in the time of the new fruits.

"He maketh the understanding to abound like Euphrates, and as Jordan in the time of the harvest.

"He maketh the doctrine of knowledge appear as the light, and as Geon in the time of vintage.

"The first man knew her not perfectly, no more shall the last find her out.

"For her thoughts are more than the sea, and her counsels profounder than the great deep."

The aim of the book is, to be sure, a religious one, but there is scarcely a realm of culture or of science for the beginnings of which it is not to be regarded as an ancient record, and one worthy of respect. Therefore Luther said: "*Nihil pulchrius Genesi, nihil utilius.*" Likewise Erasmus Reinhold, the mathematician of the age of the Reformation, in his petition to Duke Albrecht (1551), insisted upon the fact that the book of Genesis, and especially the history of Noah, clearly indicate an intimate acquaintance on the part of the primeval patriarchs with the movements of the heavenly bodies. No science, no art, if it would seek out the cradle of its origin, can suffer this book to lie unnoticed; and its expositor, if he would be equal to his task, must keep step not alone with linguistic, ethnographic and geographic research, but, in general, with progressive science in the world of man and nature. The means of understanding and authenticating this book are to be sought not only in the depths of the spirit, but also in the depths of the earth into which the primeval world herein described has sunk down; and not merely the Egyptian temple-walls and sepulchres, but also the customs of the Tungus and the Delawares,—not merely the ruins of Babylon and the monuments of ancient Assyria, swallowed up by the earth, but also the heights of the Himalaya and the depths of the Dead Sea, aid in the exposition of this unique book. [Translated from "Delitzsch's Genesis."] G. F. MCKIBBEN.

¹ Ecclesiasticus xxiv., 23-29.

→ EDITORIAL NOTES ←

Rev. T. K. Cheyne.—Readers of *THE STUDENT* will find in this number an address delivered within the past year by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, Rector of Tendring, England, on "Recent Advances in Biblical Criticism, in their relations to the Christian Faith." This address was delivered before a Church congress, and was but one of many addresses given at the same time. We call attention to it, not because we endorse the sentiments of the writer, but in order that our readers may become acquainted with the position of one who is recognized as a leading Biblical scholar in England. Perhaps there is no commentary on the book of Isaiah, from which one can gain so vivid an idea of the times and circumstances of the various Isaianic prophecies, as from Mr. Cheyne's commentary. He is the author of the Pulpit Commentary on Jeremiah and of the volume on "Mical" in the Cambridge Bible for Schools. Mr. Cheyne is also the author of many of the Biblical articles in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Besides others, the articles on *Amos*, *Canaanites*, *Circumcision*, *Cosmogony*, *Daniel*, *Hittites*, *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah* are by him. He has recently published in the "Parliament Series" a translation of the Book of Psalms. This has not been so well received by critics as his other work. Mr. Cheyne's position, as will be seen, is an advanced one. A professor of Hebrew in this country could maintain such views and hold his position in but few institutions. In England, however, both in the Established Church and among Dissenters liberty of opinion is exercised to a greater degree than in this country. Mr. Cheyne is an avowed defender of the "Higher Criticism." Of the advanced critics, he is one of the most cautious. He has two admirable characteristics: He does not hesitate to give up a theory when the facts are shown to be against it,—this cannot be said of many critics; and he seems to be an eminently devout and conscientious Christian. That he is honest in the statement of his opinions, that he is an earnest seeker after the truth must be clear to every one who is familiar with his writings.

Old Testament History in the Sunday School.—Many of our most earnest and intelligent Christian teachers think that it would be wise to leave the Old Testament out entirely from our Sunday School lessons, confining the scholar's attention exclusively to the New Testament. Some of them express themselves very strongly on the subject, as for example, Rev. Mr. Meredith of Boston, and a recent writer in *The New Englander*.

The objection is not to the Old Testament itself, but to the method of teaching employed and the *abuse* which is made of the Book. And when we recall facts which have come under our observation, we must acknowledge that the objectors have many strong arguments on their side. There has ever been a disposition to try and find "an inner meaning" in the words of the Scripture, and especially so in the Old Testament; it seems to be taken as a matter of course that a message from the deity must contain some mysterious hidden element which can only be discovered by careful searching. So men have given a double and triple sense to God's words, even to those which on the surface are plain and easy to be understood. There is an undue tendency to spiritualization, which finds mystical meanings in the decorations of tabernacle, the dress of priests and

the most trivial incidents of every day life. While there are, of course, the prophetic and typical elements in the Old Testament, we should not strive to find these upon all its pages, but recognize that much of the Book is the narration of simple fact, and is to be treated as such.

The record of the history of Israel shows in a wonderful manner the watch-care and providence of God, and is given to teach us the lessons of trust in him, the blessings flowing from obedience to him, and the suffering and sorrow which result from disobedience. All of the historical portions of the Old Testament can and should be used as illustrations of these facts, and thus to help, strengthen and warn us in our lives as individual Christians.

The Old Testament is as really and truly a part of the Word of God as the New, and is equally profitable for instruction in doctrine, but the doctrines are here stated not in the form of distinct propositions but are rather to be drawn out by inductions from the facts presented. Much of the historical narrative was written, as we believe, like other history, save only that the writers were divinely guided in the selection of the facts to be recorded; if this be so, then in our treatment of these events we should in large measure teach the sacred history as we would other history. We should try to make the story real to the minds of the scholars; the actors, men and women; and the events, actual facts, not ideal fancies. We must picture before the mind the scene, and present it in all its bright coloring. The Bible narratives are full of interest. History is not dry if rightly taught, the youngest are interested in the biblical stories of Joseph, Isaac, or David, and come to them again and again with increasing love. So, too, there are many other incidents in the later history of Israel, which have only to be known and they will be as richly prized.

Prophecy and Poetry.—From what has just been said, we would not have anyone draw the conclusion that only the historical portions of the Old Testament should be studied in the Sunday School. Prophecy and poetry should be taught as well as history, but more care and skill is needed in handling these parts of the Word, since they are far more difficult to explain. Prophecy, it seems to us, must be taught in the light of the history of the time in which it was spoken, and in view of the immediate object present in the mind of the speaker; while at the same time, the lessons which it teaches us, the evidence which it gives us by its fulfillment must be carefully thought over and wisely presented. The fulfillment should be sought for not in the mere verbal resemblances and fancies that may be imported into the text, but in the true thought and meaning of the passages under consideration.

Poetry, again, must be treated as such—we must recognize the character of the Eastern mind, the tinge which the customs and habits of those ancient peoples give to the sacred poets; and so here especially we must be on our guard against any forcing of the words in a literal matter of fact way which they will not bear.

There are certainly many perplexing questions to be settled as to what is the proper treatment of the Old Testament poetry and prophecy, but these remarks at least indicate the lines to be pursued.

Shall we study Biblical Theology?—This question may seem strange to many readers of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT. The affirmative answer is so strong in their minds. Yet with many it is not. Indeed Biblical Theology, when there-

by is understood the systematic arrangement of the religious ideas of the different periods and writers of the Bible, so as to indicate their variety as well as their unity, is regarded by many as a useless, unprofitable, if not dangerous discipline. "Give us," they say, "the final comprehensive truths of the Bible, not any partial, incipient ones." To such objectors we would answer: The very basis for determining these final comprehensive truths must be obtained through the method of Biblical Theology. One must start somewhere with some definite conception in the mind of a writer, and this single conception can be reached only by the most rigid historical and grammatical exegesis. But this will gradually involve obtaining similar conceptions of other writers of Scripture, and, before one is aware, he has been working in the direct line of Biblical Theology. The writings of the Apostle John present to us the final or highest truths of the Bible respecting God; but to understand and grasp in any fullness and completeness the Biblical doctrine of God, crowned and summed up in the words of John, one must find out the conceptions upon which his is based, must trace the idea of the Divine One as it is unfolded in the writings of Moses, of the Prophets and of the Psalmists. In no other way can a full comprehensive idea of the God revealed in the Holy Writ be obtained. And so also of every other Biblical notion. The final teaching of the Spirit can only be gathered through the process of Biblical Theology.¹

Another important service of the study of Biblical Theology is the guard it gives against the perversion of Scripture. Men who are trained to regard the varieties of the teachings of the Bible will not be led into the false notions, which so often arise from a one sided or partial view of scriptural truth. This is especially so in the case of Old Testament ethics.

One accustomed to the method and results of historic exegesis is not troubled in the least by teachings of the Old Testament respecting slavery, polygamy, the use of wine, etc., or of those respecting future life. Indeed it is the lack of the schooling given by such study and instruction that leads many to be constantly harassed by the infidel objections based upon Old Testament morality and eschatology, and, we fear, has caused some even to reject the Bible as the Word of God. Defenders of the Divine Truth need to know its doctrines in their variety as well as unity; as given individually by Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul, James, John and the other holy men as well as by these altogether; as understood in each age from the very beginning, as well as they are understood now.

¹ We are not to be understood as ignoring in any way that enlightenment which comes through gifts of grace. We speak now only of the method of Biblical study, not of the heart and mind so necessary to understand the things of God.

→BOOK NOTICES←

SOURCES OF HISTORY IN THE PENTATEUCH.*

One would naturally think, from the title of this volume, that the author proposed to enter the field of Higher Criticism, and discuss questions concerning the materials used in the composition of the Pentateuch, whence these materials were derived, and other kindred topics; but such is not the aim of the book, these subjects being only touched on in the last lecture. The object of the book, as stated in the opening lecture, is to "set forth, in the direct and affirmative aspect, the claims of the Pentateuch as a book of origins containing the sources of all our earliest consecutive knowledge, and alone solving those great questions concerning the human race which must be asked, and which lie otherwise unanswered."

This design is certainly a most praiseworthy one, the only query which might arise being whether the author was not proposing too broad a field for discussion, and also, perhaps, claiming too much, when he would find in the Pentateuch the *only* solution of these great questions which perplex mankind. However this may be, the ground proposed has certainly been covered with great care, and these lectures show on every page the evidences of earnest study and wide-scholarship.

The book contains six lectures (delivered originally on the Stone Foundation, in 1882), with titles as follows:—The Earliest Cosmogony, Early Man, Early Arts, Early Consanguinities, Early Movements of the Nations, Early Documents. Under the first, the *nature* of the narrative (Gen. 1), historical; its *method*, condensation; its *design*, intelligibility—are all presented clearly and forcibly. Some fifteen points of agreement between the Biblical account and the latest investigations of scientists are noted.—The location of the garden of Eden (Upper Armenia is preferred), the primeval condition of man, the institution of marriage and the Sabbath, and the narrative of the Fall, are discussed in the second lecture. The danger in the discussion of these themes is that we try to find more certainty than the sacred account itself requires, and to magnify slight outward agreements into positive allusions; we think that this portion of the book bears marks of this propensity, and is decidedly the most unsatisfactory of any in the volume.

The lectures on the Early Arts and Early Consanguinities are interesting and instructive—the latter taking up the general objections urged against the unity of the race, and disposing of them satisfactorily and thoroughly, at the same time bringing forward weighty reasons to support the Biblical account.

In the last lecture (on the Early Documents), the external and internal evidences in favor of the Mosaic authorship are presented. While it is admitted freely and frankly that earlier narratives have been used, Moses is held "responsible for the Pentateuch." The author very reasonably "demurs to the unwarranted inferences which have been drawn from the use of earlier narratives, and the capricious minuteness of the schemes that are erected upon it." In this discussion, perhaps, full weight is not given to the arguments urged against the

* SOURCES OF HISTORY IN THE PENTATEUCH. By Saml. C. Bartlett, D.D. Stone Lectures, 1882. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 5¼x7½, pp. 247. \$1.25.

Mosaic authorship; though the arguments urged by Pres. Bartlett *per contra* deserve full consideration, and, in some cases at least, decidedly produce the effect intended.

The book is written in a pleasing and attractive style, is replete with facts and valuable data, and has brought together much of the more recent investigations bearing upon the earlier parts of the Pentateuch.

COMMENTARY ON ZECHARIAH.*

This commentary is to be placed side by side with Wright's Genesis, and Wright's Ruth. It approaches more nearly than any other, the ideal commentary. The primary aim of every commentary should be to collect material, and arrange it in such manner that a student may most easily master it and arrive at his own decisions. And again, what is needed in our day in the case of each book of the Bible is a grammatical commentary, and not a theological commentary. If the time wasted by scholars in the Semitic department in the fruitless discussion of hair-splitting theological points had been devoted to work of a more important and vital character, our libraries would not now be so full of useless lumber, our clergy would not now be so ignorant of Hebrew, the Bible would not now be studied in a manner so unproductive of good results.

In this commentary, "words and sentences are treated from a purely grammatical point of view, and in so doing no difficulties have been wittingly avoided, but, rather, some have at times been intentionally raised, when by so doing an opportunity has been afforded of explaining some of the *minutiae* of Hebrew Syntax."

The work of the author has been performed with great care. In the study of each verse there are taken up (1) Words, (2) Constructions, (3) the Versions, (4) Remarks. A detailed criticism would be in place rather in *Hebraica*. It is sufficient to say in general that a student of Hebrew, who desires to study the Book of Zechariah, will probably find more textual help, i. e., more help on the text, from this commentary than from all others combined.

CHALDEAN MAGIC.†

This book, issued in France in 1874, has as its characteristic feature, "the exposition of Assyrian thought, as evidenced by the language of the Cuneiform inscriptions themselves, compared with the traditions and usages of other contemporary and descended races both Semitic and Turanian." "There is probably no section of the science of comparative mythology of which, till recently, less has been known, or of which, at present, more authentic materials remain, than the subject of 'Chaldean Magic: its Origin and Development.'"

The book contains thirty-one chapters, and discusses many questions properly outside of the subject proposed. The general reader will probably find nowhere a better presentation of the questions relating to the Accadian people; their lan-

* THE HEBREW STUDENT'S COMMENTARY ON ZECHARIAH, HEBREW AND LXX. With Excursus on Syllable-dividing, Metheg, Initial Dagbesh, and Siman Rapheh. By W. H. Lowe, M. A., Hebrew Lecturer at Christ's College. London: Macmillan & Co., 1882. Pp. 155.

† CHALDEAN MAGIC: its origin and development. Translated from the French. With considerable additions by the author and notes by the editor. By Francois Lenormant. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. Pp. 414.

guage, its relation to the Turanian (Altaic) family, its phonology; the priority of the Accadian population of Chaldea; the Sumerian influence in Chaldean and Babylonian civilization; the archaic legislation of the Accadians, and other kindred topics. Under the topics "Chaldean Demonology," "Chaldean Amulets," "Chaldean Sorcery," many strange facts are given. The comparison between Egyptian and Chaldean magic, and between Accadian and Egyptian magic is a most interesting one.

This volume must be regarded as, upon the whole, a most important contribution to the literature of the department of Comparative Mythology. Much work has been done in the Assyrian field since the issue of this book, and many new discoveries, doubtless, have been made; yet the material here gathered is to be regarded as trustworthy and up with the times.

DOWN IN EGYPT.*

Since the hieroglyphics have found their tongues, and pyramid and obelisk and temple wall become historians, we know more of the Egypt of the Pharaohs than of the Egypt of the Pashas. This is partly because there is more to know of the former, and partly because of the wonderful exactness and life-likeness with which that long vanished civilization has been reproduced.

"Israel in Egypt" is a recent addition to the rapidly increasing literature of this subject. The title of the book scarcely reveals its real scope, as it is of Egypt rather than of Israel that we read. The writer's object is to present in an interesting, popular form, the results of modern discoveries and advances in Egyptology, and give his readers a picture of the life and society there revealed. He blots out the ages that have passed. That far away yesterday is to-day again. We walk through the land of Thothmes and Rameses, as we might through France or Italy, through a living land, full of work, and pleasure, and sorrow—full of human life.

The larger part of the book is of this nature, descriptive. The temples with all their solemn and severe grandeur, the home life of the people, cheery and kind, their industries, their religious life, these are depicted in turn. Then follows a section upon early Egyptian history, and the book ends with a chapter upon the Exodus.

It is very pleasant reading, rather recreation than study, but at the same time affords valuable aid in understanding the times of which it treats. Mr. Clark is a good word painter, and some of his bits of coloring are very fine. There are beside the word pictures, more than two hundred illustrations. The book is well gotten up, mechanically, and the large type and generous pages will recommend it to those who live by their eyes.

SACRED MOUNTAINS AND SCENES.†

In reading the Bible, we frequently invest its scenes and persons with such a sacred (so called) atmosphere, that they become unreal to us. Theoretically, we believe in the existence of Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Samuel, while, in reality, we

* ISRAEL IN EGYPT; Egypt's place among the Ancient Monarchies. By Edward L. Clark. New York: *Nelson & Phillips*. Pp. xvi, 352. \$4.00.

† SACRED MOUNTAINS, CHARACTERS AND SCENES IN THE HOLY LAND. By Rev. J. T. Headley. New York: *C. Scribner's Sons*. 5½x7¾, pp. 441. \$2.00.

never picture them to our minds as really and naturally as we do other historical characters.

The book before us recognizes this truth, and, believing such a method of treating God's Word to be erroneous, seeks to remedy it by describing some of the sacred scenes in language such as we would use to-day in relating similar incidents. Events occurring on mountain tops are the ones which are generally depicted. Ararat, Moriah, Sinah, Hor, Tabor, Carmel, Lebanon, Zion and Calvary are spoken of, while scenes in the lives of Joseph, Ruth, Samuel, Eli, Absalom, Daniel and Christ are related. The author has succeeded much better than the majority of those who have undertaken the same work; and some of his descriptions are extremely vivid and realistic, *e. g.*, his description of the Flood, the Passage of the Red Sea, the story of the Nameless Prophet (1 Kgs. XIII.), and the Mount of Olives.

The book does not pretend to be a scholarly or scientific treatise, but accomplishes in good degree the end proposed. Some of the illustrations would better be left out, as they detract from the interest of the work.

HELLMUTH'S BIBLICAL THESAURUS.*

It is undoubtedly true that no book has suffered so much at the hand of would-be expositors as the Bible. Its friends have, in this particular, done it vastly more harm than its enemies. The book before us is but one of many ill-devised, impracticable attempts to help in an understanding of the Bible. The industry exhibited by its author is commendable, but his judgment and scholarship are scarcely equal to the task which he has set for himself. Supplied with this work, the student needs no text, no lexicon, no concordance, no grammar, no reference-book of any kind. It is *multum in parvo*,—so much so, in fact, that the little of good contained in it is difficult to find. One would suppose that, in this day of advanced scholarship, no writer would care to identify the Hebrew 'ērēts (*earth*) with the German *erde* and the Latin *terra*; the Hebrew rā'a (*to see*) with ὁράω; rāqī(ā) (*expanses*) with the English *rack*, *to stretch*; or yābbāshā (*dry land*) with the Greek βίαις. These, however, are but examples of a thousand or more derivations proposed by our author.

The plan of this book is absurd, the execution of the plan still more so. The book will not only fail to aid the student, but will do him great injury by its false statements and undigested material. We fail to discover any good purpose which this volume is likely to accomplish. It would seem probable that the one hundred and twenty-eight pages covering Genesis I.—XVI., given us in this Part I. of Vol. I. would satisfy all demand for publications of this sort.

* BIBLICAL THESAURUS; or, A literal translation and critical analysis of every word in the original languages of the Old Testament, with explanatory notes in appendices. By Right Rev. J. Hellmuth, D. D., D. C. L., Assistant to the Bishop of Ripon. Genesis i. to xvi. Vol. I., Part I. Pp. 128. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row. Price, 5 shillings.

→SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY.←

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- DEWITT, JOHN. Praise-Songs of Israel; a new rendering of the Book of Psalms. New York: *R. Brinkerhoff*. \$1.50
- HURLBUT, J. L. Manual of Biblical Geography: a text-book on Bible History, containing maps, plans, etc. Chicago: *Rand, McNally & Co.* Pp. 158. . . . \$3.75
- RANKE, LEOPOLD VON. Universal History; the oldest historical group of nations and the Greeks. Ed. by G. W. Prothero. New York: *Harpers*. Pp. xiii, 494. \$2.50
- REVILLE, A. Native Religions of Mexico and Peru (Hibbert Lectures, 1884). New York: *Chas. Scribner's Sons*. 12mo. \$1.50

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- CHEYNE, T. K. The Prophecies of Isaiah. Vol. I. 3d Ed. revised. London: *Paul Kegan, Trench & Co.*, 1884. 8vo., pp. 310. 12s. 6d.
- LEVY, J. Libri Kohelet, versio Arabica quam composuit Ibn-Ghijâth. Leipzig: 1884. 8vo., pp. 32.
- ORELLI, C. V. Durch's Heilige Land. Tagebuchblätter. 3. Aufl. Basel: *Spittler*, 1884. Gr. 8vo., pp. xiv, 290. M.3.20
- OXLEY, W. Egypt and the Wonders of the Land of the Pharaohs. London: *Truebner*. 8vo., pp. 326. 7s. 6d.
- PERLES, J. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hebräischen und Aramäischen. München: *T. Ackermann*, 1884. 8vo., pp. 247.
- SEINECKE, L. Geschichte d. Volkes Israel. 2. Thl., Vom Exil bis zur Zerstörg. Jerusalems durch die Römer. Göttingen: *Vandenhoeck*, 1884. Gr. 8vo., pp. xii, 356. M. 7

RECENT ARTICLES.

- Excavations at Tanis. *The American Hebrew*, Aug. 29, '84.
- The Old Testament Manuscripts discovered in Russia. *American Israelite*, Sept. 5, '84.
- HAUPT, P. The Babylonian "Woman's Language." *American Journal of Philology*, v., 1, '84.
- BITTINGER, J. B. The Eschatology of the Psalms. *The Andover Review*, Sept., '84.
- BRYANT, W. M. Buddhism and Christianity. *Ibid.*
- TAYLOR, J. P. Modern Glimpses of Assyrian Art. *Ibid.*
- STEVENS, H. The Coverdale Bible of 1535. *The Athenæum*, July 12, '84.
- REID, W. H. The Psalms. No. 2. *The Episcopal Recorder*, Aug. 21, '84.
- DEANE, W. J. The Septuagint Additions to the Hebrew Text. *The Expositor*, Aug., '84.
- A Possible Fulfillment of a Remarkable Prophecy. *The Homiletic Monthly*, Sept., '84.
- DEEMS, C. F. Is Any Theory of Evolution Proven? *Ibid.*
- DUNNING, H. N. Recent Researches in Isalah. *The Independent*, Sept. 4, '84.
- LEVY, A. R. Medicine among the Ancient Hebrews. *Jewish Record*, Sept. 5, '84.
- WHITON, REV. J. M. The Anti-Christian Use of the Bible in the Sunday School. *The New Englander*, Sept., '84.

- BROWN, FRANCIS. The Religion of Samaria in Sargon's Time. *The Pulpit Treasury*, Sept., '84.
- DAWSON, J. W. Nature and Revelation in the Nineteenth Psalm. *The Sunday School Times*, Aug. 16, '84.
- STEVENS, G. B. The Peculiarity of Jewish History. *Ibid.*, Sept. 6, '84.
- COX, S. Absalom: A Study. *Ibid.*, Sept. 13, '84.
- SAMSON, G. W. Dr. Toy's Quotations from the Old in the New Testament. *The Watchman*, Aug. 28, '84.
- LIEBLEIN, J. Le Mythe Osiris. *Revue de l'histoire des Religions*. May, June, '84.
- MONTET, E. Les Origines de la Croyance à la Vie Future chez les Juifs. *Ibid.*
- PERROCHET, A. Le siècle d'Ésaïe. *Revue de Theol. et de Philos.*, July, '84.
- SMEND, R. Ueber die Bedeutung des Jerusalemischen Temples in der A. T. Religion. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1884, 4.
- DIECKHOFF, A. W. Die neu aufgefundenen Vorlesung über das Buch der Richter. *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wissensch. u. Kirch. Leben*, 1884, 7.

REVIEWS.

- BOSE, RAM CHANDRA. Brahmaism, or History of Reformed Hinduism. *The New Englander*, Sept., '84.
- DEWITT, JOHN. Praise-Songs of Israel; or a New Rendering of the Book of Psalms. *The Independent*, Aug. 28, '84.
- ELLIOTT, C. Vindication of the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch. *The Sunday School Times*, Sept. 6, '84.
- GUTHE, H. Ausgrabungen bei Jerusalem im Auftrage des Deutschen Vereins zur Erforschung Palästinas ausgeführt und beschrieben. (By K. Furrer). *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Aug. 9, '84.
- HAUPT, P. Das Babylonische Nimrodepos. (By D. G. Lyon). *Andover Review*, Sept., '84.
- NEWTON, R. HEBER. The Book of Beginnings. *The New Englander*, Sept., '84.
- PERLES, JOS. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hebräischen und Aramäischen. (By Dolfe). *Literatur-Blatt*, Aug. 21, '84.
- RANKE, L. VON. Universal History: the oldest historical group of nations and the Greeks. *Sunday School Times*, Sept. 13, '84.
- REUSS, E. History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture. *The Independent*, Aug. 28, '84.
- SEINECKE, L. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. II. (By H. Vuilleumier). *Revue de Theol. et de Philos.*, July, '84.
- SMITH, W. R. The Prophets of Israel. (By M. Vernes). *Revue Historique*, May-June, '84.
- TOY, C. H. Quotations in the New Testament. *Universalist Quarterly*, July, '84. *The Independent*, Aug. 28, '84.
- TERRY, M. S. Biblical Hermeneutics. *Universalist Quarterly*, July, '84.