

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VII.

OCTOBER, 1887.

No. 2.

A LETTER of President Timothy Dwight of Yale University received too late to be included in the September Symposium on "Bible-study in the College," reads as follows :

It seems to me possible to make the study of the English Bible both profitable and interesting to the young men of our colleges. To this end, however, the instruction should be given by intelligent, large-minded, and inspiring teachers, and should be in the line of showing what the Bible is; how it came into being; what it is designed, and what it is not designed, to accomplish; what the mind of every thoughtful man may find in it; and where it meets the life of every such man in the experiences and duties of the present age. If it can be studied in this way and with such teachers, there can be no doubt of the value of the study and the teaching.

Yours very truly,

TIMOTHY DWIGHT.

All will agree that, desirable as may be the introduction of the Bible into the college curriculum, the success of the work, when once introduced, will depend largely, if not wholly, upon the character of the man who shall undertake to teach it, and upon the conception which he may have of the work which he has undertaken. Wherever the matter is entrusted to a man who is not a "living teacher," and the proportion of living teachers in the whole number is surprisingly small, or to a man who, although a teacher, has no proper idea of the line to be followed, there will be immediate failure. There is need, therefore, of careful and considerate action, and of wise and cautious choice.

IN a similar line, although with a somewhat different application, President David S. Jordan, of Indiana State University, writes :

"I should be glad to see the study of the Bible introduced into the curriculum,—could the work be conducted by trained men in a manly way, and in the spirit of investigation rather than of proselytism. I do not think that the results have been valuable from such work as conducted in most of the western colleges which have tried it; but the causes of failure are obvious."

It is one thing to announce the study of the Bible as a part of a college curriculum; it is another to furnish instruction of a character which will uplift both the subject studied and the student who studies it. It is one thing to conduct a Sunday-school class; it is another to teach the Bible as a classic. It is one thing to have college men translate the Greek Testament or the Vulgate; it is another to teach them the contents, the facts and philosophy of Israelitish literature and history. What is wanted? Not Sunday-school work; not the translation of Greek or Latin; not the dry and perfunctory recital of lists of names and dates, or of the contents of a text-book; but rather fresh and stimulating investigation, earnest and searching inquiry, work which may properly be called *work*. In how many of the institutions in which the Bible is studied, is such work done? In some, it is true; but how small is the number! In institutions in which poor work, or a wrong kind of work, is being done, it is as essential that for such work there be substituted something different, as that in other institutions Bible-study shall be introduced for the first time.

It is a matter of interest and significance that, after all, there is such unanimity of opinion among educators regarding this question of college Bible-study. In communications received within sixty days from the representatives of over *two hundred* colleges and schools of higher learning (theological schools not included), there has been expressed but a single sentiment. There can be no more auspicious time for action. With public sentiment so favorable, it only remains for those in authority to take steps to conform to this sentiment. There may be serious difficulties in the way of such work in some institutions; but these difficulties are in no case insuperable. At all events, an effort may be made to overcome them; and such an effort will be more likely to prove successful just now when the question is a living one, than later when direct interest has passed away. It is much easier to move *with* the tide.

It is not exaggeration to dignify the interest and effort now manifested in the matter of college Bible-study as a *movement*. It is a movement for which there have been long years of preparation. It is nevertheless in its infancy. What is its aim? To lift up the Bible and give it a place in the curriculum of study by the side of the great intellectual productions of all ages. To treat it as a great human

classic, although at the same time acknowledging its divine origin. To disclose its literary and historical riches to minds which have hitherto been in large measure ignorant of their existence. This, therefore, is a *movement*. It must be aided. How can aid be rendered? If you are a college *student*, petition your faculty to make provision for such instruction; when there is demand there will be supply. If you are a college *instructor*, discuss the question in faculty meetings; if objections are urged, answer them, for they will all be found answerable. If you are a college *trustee*, find out why such instruction is not given in your college, and arrange for it. If you are a minister of the gospel, urge the matter in the meetings of your association or presbytery, your synod or conference, write upon the subject for your denominational paper, and present its claims as forcibly as the seriousness of the case demands. If you are a parent, request the authorities of the institution which you desire your son or daughter to attend, to furnish such instruction; and if they do not grant your request, select an institution in which there is afforded an opportunity for such study. If you are a Christian, pray for this movement, that it may grow in force and influence; and for those who give such instruction, that they may receive wisdom from on high.

THE "Inductive Bible-studies" have met with an acceptance more favorable than could possibly have been anticipated. From men in all professions, from students of every class there come words of commendation and favor, which establish beyond a peradventure the fact that *something* in this line was needed. Those who are preparing the "studies" appreciate very keenly the deficiencies which characterize them. But in spite of what they lack, thousands of Bible-students are being helped by them. It has been suggested by a few that the "studies" are somewhat *difficult*. This may be true; but it must be remembered (1) that the great aim of this work is to elevate the standard of Bible-study; (2) that the "studies" are prepared for those who desire to *study*; (3) that those who find them to be so *difficult* should recognize the fact that this *is* so simply because of their desperate ignorance of the Bible, an ignorance of which they have not hitherto been conscious.

FALSE METHODS OF INTERPRETATION.

BY PROFESSOR SYLVESTER BURNHAM, D. D.,

Hamilton Theol. Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.

I. FALSE TYPOLOGY.

In a little commentary on Leviticus, published in this country by F. H. Revell, Chicago, 1861, is to be found the following language :

"All these things belonged to the burnt-offering phase of our blessed Lord, and to that alone, because, in it, we see Him offering Himself to the eye, to the heart, and to the altar of Jehovah, without any question of imputed sin, of wrath, or of judgment. In the sin offering, on the contrary, instead of having, as the great prominent idea, what Christ is, we have what sin is. Instead of the preciousness of Jesus, we have the odiousness of sin. In the burnt offering, inasmuch as it is Christ Himself offered to, and accepted by, God, we have everything done that could possibly make manifest what He was, in every respect. In the sin offering, because it is sin, as judged by God, the very reverse is the case. All this is so plain as to need no effort of the mind to understand it. It naturally flows out of the distinctive character of the type.

* * * "Thus, the intrinsic excellency of Christ is not omitted, even in the sin offering. The fat burnt upon the altar is the apt expression of the divine appreciation of the preciousness of Christ's Person, no matter what place He might, in perfect grace, take, on our behalf, or in our stead ; He was made sin for us, and the sin offering is the divinely-appointed shadow of Him, in this respect. But, inasmuch as it was the Lord Jesus Christ, God's elect, His Holy One, His pure, His spotless, His eternal Son, that was made sin, therefore the fat of the sin offering was burnt upon the altar, as a proper material for that fire which was the impressive exhibition of divine holiness.

"But, even in this very point, we see what a contrast there is between the sin offering and the burnt offering. In the case of the latter, it was not merely the fat, but the whole sacrifice that was burnt upon the altar, because it was Christ, without any question of sin-bearing whatever. In the case of the former, there was nothing but the fat to be burnt upon the altar, because it was a question of sin-bearing, though Christ was the sin-bearer. The divine glories of Christ's Person shine out, even from amid the darkest shadow of that cursed tree to which He consented to be nailed as a curse for us. The hatefulness of that with which, in the exercise of divine love, He connected His blessed Person, on the cross, could not prevent the sweet odor of His preciousness from ascending to the throne of God."

The quotation has been made at length, because, in no other way, could so good an idea be given of the method and spirit of a kind of interpretation of Old Testament passages which is, at the present time, only too common. This sort of typological interpretation has an attraction for many minds, because of its seeming religiousness, and because it appears like the result of a deep spiritual insight into the meaning of the Word of God. Of such interpretation the book cited is full, as are other commentaries by the same author. The same kind of interpretation is common in many somewhat popular books, appears in the sermons of some noted preachers of our day, and is not unknown in some Bible conventions or Bible schools, or other gatherings for Bible-study. It is important, therefore, to examine this method of interpretation, and to determine its real character. From a study of the example given above, we may learn of all.

We seek, first of all, for the central and determining principle. This is given us in the context of the quotation already made:

"We know there is nothing in the Word of God without its own specific meaning; and every intelligent and careful student of Scripture will notice the above points of difference; and, when he notices them, he will, naturally, seek to ascertain their real import. *Ignorance* of this import there may be; but *indifference* to it there should not. In any section of inspiration, but especially one so rich as that which lies before us, to pass over a single point, would be to offer dishonor to the Divine Author, and to deprive our own souls of much profit. We should hang over the most minute details, either to adore God's wisdom in them, or to confess our own ignorance of them. To pass them by, in a spirit of indifference, is to imply that the Holy Ghost has taken the trouble to write what we do not deem worthy of the desire to understand. This is what no right-minded Christian would presume to think. If the Spirit, in writing upon the ordinance of the sin offering, has omitted the various rites above alluded to—rites which get a prominent place in the ordinance of the burnt offering, there must, assuredly, be some good reason for, and some important meaning in, His doing so. These we should seek to apprehend; and, no doubt, they arise out of the special design of the divine mind in each offering."

All this can mean only two things: (1) the purpose of the Spirit, in the case of the details of the Jewish ritual, can never end with the details themselves; but (2) each of these details must have its own typical meaning. It is also virtually said in the words of our author, although not quite so formally and plainly, (3) that their typical meaning must be determined as the judgment, or rather the conjectures, of the interpreter may best avail to settle it.

These three principles are always present in all interpretation of this kind. The third would doubtless be rejected in theory, but it is adopted in practice. The first and the second could not be given up without abandoning the method altogether. And so these are formally or virtually admitted as well as followed.

Yet these two principles are the purest assumptions, for which there is no warrant either in reason or in the Word of God, no basis either scientific or scriptural. Moreover, in practice, they lead to erroneous and absurd consequences, as is clear from the example we have selected. These consequences may be classified under two heads:

(1) They lead to an ignoring of the plain statements of the Scripture itself, as this must be interpreted according to a sound Hermeneutics.

In speaking of the burnt offering, the author remarks, in another passage: "The idea of sin-bearing—the imputation of sin—the wrath of God, does not appear in the burnt offering." This, indeed, he must say to be consistent. But is such a statement consistent with the evident meaning of the Scripture language? What possible reason can be found in either the language employed, or the nature of the facts set forth, for supposing that the imposition of hands, the sprinkling of the blood, and the burning with fire, indicate one symbolical or typical meaning in the case of the burnt offering (Lev. 1:3-9), and another and different meaning in the case of the sin offering (Lev. 4). Or, when it is said of the burnt offering, "It shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him" (Lev. 1:4), and of the sin offering, "The priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savour unto the Lord; and the priest shall make atonement for him" (Lev. 4:31), what is there to indicate that the atonement in one case is different in kind or value from the atonement in the other? But, if the atonement is not itself different in value or in kind, there can certainly be no different typical meaning. To be sure, the author says on this point, "True, we read, 'it shall be accepted for him, to make

atonement for him;’ but, then, it is ‘atonement’ not according to the depths and enormity of human guilt, but according to the perfection of Christ’s surrender of Himself to God, and the intensity of God’s delight in Christ. This gives us the very loftiest idea of atonement.” This statement is not altogether clear. But how can any very lofty idea of atonement, even of an atonement “according to the perfection of Christ’s surrender of Himself to God,” whatever that may mean, fail to comprehend, as one of its elements, either the conception of sin-bearing, or of the wrath of God?

Again, the sin offering is made the type of Christ as the sin-bearer, “to shadow forth what Christ became for us,” notwithstanding the fact that it is distinctly stated in the passage in Leviticus that the sin offering is only to be made in the case of sins unwittingly committed. Touching this, our author says, “We need to understand that sin has been atoned for, according to God’s measurement thereof—that the claims of His throne have been perfectly answered, that sin, as seen in the light of His inflexible holiness, has been divinely judged. This is what gives settled peace to the soul. A full atonement has been made for the believer’s sins of ignorance, as well as for his known sins.” But, according to Leviticus, there was to be no sin offering for “known” or wilful sins. The type must mean, then, if it is to set forth Christ as the sin-bearer, that he bore our sins of ignorance alone, and made no atonement for our sins in which we so long and so obstinately consciously persisted. In his devotion to his theory, the author seems to have forgotten, or to have failed to see altogether, that it was for sins of ignorance alone, and not for these in addition to the known and wilful sins, that sin offerings might be made.

Finally, the idea which is made by our author possibly more decisive than any other in determining the real meaning of the burnt offering, is not in the passage in Leviticus at all.

Speaking of Lev. 1:3, our author says:

“The use of the word ‘voluntary,’ here, brings out, with great clearness, the grand idea in the burnt offering. * * * The blessed Lord Jesus could not, with strict propriety, be represented as *willing* to be ‘made sin’—*willing* to endure the wrath of God, and the hiding of His countenance; and, in this one fact, we learn, in the clearest manner, that the *burnt offering does not foreshadow Christ, on the cross, bearing sin*, but Christ on the cross, accomplishing the will of God.”

It is, however, most unfortunate that this “grand idea in the burnt offering” should depend for “clearness” in its presentation on a term which has in reality no existence. Neither this word “voluntary,” nor the idea it expresses, occurs in the passage under consideration, as a reference to the Hebrew will show, or as may be seen by consulting the text in the Revised Version.

(2) But there is still another class of consequences which follows the use of this false typical method of interpretation. These consequences are included in the fact that this method makes it possible, and even demands, that different interpreters should find different typical meanings in the same type. A method which thus, of necessity, puts a doubtful, or a double, a triple, or a quadruple meaning on the Word of God, commends itself neither to scholarship nor to spirituality. As a matter of fact the typical import is established, as is clear from the examples given above, not by sound Hermeneutical principles, or even by generalizations from scriptural instances, but by the application of certain subjective ideas of analogy to the types in question. These ideas of analogy, more-

over, are the product of the interpreter's notions of what Revelation and the plan of God ought to be, or must be, and not deductions or inductions from what the structure and character of Scripture are shown really to be, by a careful study of the Bible itself. By what principle, or with what justice, then, can one man, who makes his own subjective ideas of analogy the law of his interpretation, forbid the same liberty to another? How could our author, for example, reasonably object, if the writer should proceed to point out the true typical import of the burnt offering and the sin offering somewhat as follows:

The burnt offering, to which, by the laying on of hands, the sinner's guilt was transferred, is, in its death, the type of Christ the sin-bearer dying as our substitute. But the sin offering, which was only to be made in the case of sins unwittingly committed, became the sinner's substitute not as standing for him as wilfully guilty, but only as weak and erring. This sacrifice, in its death, therefore, was the type of Christ dying as the one who bore in himself all our infirmities, our sicknesses, and our mortality, and opening, by his death, the way to release from all our infirmities and our mortality. As our substitute, he paid the debt of nature, and brought into our world a resurrection into immortal life. How beautifully harmonizes with these different meanings the different disposition that was made of the body of the victim in each case. The burnt offering was all consumed upon the altar; for the Christ, who has paid the penalty, the full penalty, of sin, and they who die in Him, need not fear or hesitate to come boldly into the presence of God's holiness. There is no barrier to full and perfect acceptance by a holy God. But as the representative and the substitute of a weak and dying race filled with infirmity, even Christ cannot come to be fully and perfectly accepted by the Father, until all the weakness and infirmity of this race shall cease, and death itself shall die. To be sure, as His only and holy Son, Christ is always precious to the Father, and this is shown by the burning of the fat, the choicest part of the victim, upon the altar. But all the victim cannot come to the altar. This teaches us what is the great grace of our Lord in that he, by coming among us, has, in his love for us, deferred the day of his full acceptance by the Father to the time when we, with Him, shall enter into the immortal life of the resurrection, and He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all.

More might be written of like sort; but it would be but a waste of time.

The falsity of all typological interpretation of this kind will be all the more apparent if we determine what is the fundamental principle that must underlie a true interpretation of the types of the Old Testament, and what are the laws that must govern us in this interpretation. This determination must be the subject of the next paper.

OLD TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.,

Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

Indications are increasing that the problems of lower or textual criticism will occupy the attention of Old Testament scholars more than has been the case heretofore, when the perplexities of higher criticism almost monopolized their time and work. The discussions attending the appearance of the Revised Version of the Old Testament were almost entirely in this department. In the publication of Cornill's new Ezekiel text last year and Ryssel's Micha text this year, we have two elaborate attempts at the full elucidation of the principles of this criticism and the application of these principles to the biblical text, with a difference of stand-points and results that shows that an agreement on fundamental points has not yet been reached. The announcement of these works by critics of various schools, shows the deep interest taken in this kind of criticism and that, when the restored texts of Isaiah, Jeremiah and other Old Testament books promised by Cornill and others, make their appearance, their merits and demerits will be eagerly discussed. These facts are sufficient to justify a brief resumé of what is going on in this department, and may make a bird's-eye view for THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT not unwelcome to its readers.

There can be no dispute as to the work and necessity of textual criticism. The ultimate aim of all biblical study is the interpretation of the biblical text. The first requisite for this work is to have the biblical text in its original purity. The work of textual criticism is to examine into the existing text and see, with the help of all the best aids at our disposal, whether the form of the words as they have been handed down to us are the *ipsissima verba* of the sacred scribes; and, if there are legitimate reasons to believe that the text has in the course of centuries undergone changes, to restore, if possible, the original readings. Textual criticism thus seeks either to confirm the traditional texts as the original one, or to restore the original where this is necessary. Being such in character, textual criticism is really not a theological discipline at all, but philological, critical and historical. The Old Testament student has essentially the same work to do that the editor of a Latin or Greek classic has, when, on the basis of his MSS., he prepares a critical edition of Cicero, Cæsar, Homer or Thucydides.* The same principles have been applied, with no serious opposition at present, to the New Testament text, with the outcome that the "resultant text" of the three leading authorities, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Westcott and Hort, is essentially the same, although differing more or less from the old so-called *textus receptus* of former times. Indeed, in the New Testament field, the work of textual criticism is almost a *fait accompli*, while in the Old Testament department the real scientific work is only beginning.

The necessity of this science for the Old Testament also is fully demanded by the facts in the case. If it were absolutely sure that each and every word of

* Cf. also Cornill's *Vorwort* to his Ezekiel, p. v.

the traditional text was exactly the same as it was written by the pen of inspiration, and that no changes of any sort or kind had been introduced, intentionally or unintentionally, the textual study of the Old Testament would have the more negative aim of merely proving this absence of corruptions. But it is highly improbable that the Hebrew Scriptures have remained entirely free from corruption. The New Testament books were not thus miraculously preserved, and their *variae lectiones* are counted by the thousands. In the light of the history of both the New Testament and of all profane literature, nothing short of a miracle could have preserved the Old Testament in its absolute literal integrity. On the other hand, the actual state of the text furnishes its own evidence that corruptions have found their way into the text. However little we may feel inclined to accept as good critical material all the suggestions offered by the *Q'ri* and *K'thibh*, it is yet certain that many of these suggestions correct actual errors in the text, and the Massoretic notes are the first beginnings of Old Testament textual criticism. These emendations were made because the Massorites were convinced that the traditional consonant text did not, in these places, reproduce the original words of the writers. The existing MSS. of the Massoretic text, although presenting a remarkable agreement even in minute matters, nevertheless do not agree among themselves in every particular. If there were but a single variant, the application of textual criticism would be called for. And then the text of the Old Testament in a number of places shows that in its present shape it cannot represent the original form. A careful study, especially of the historical books, such as Joshua, Samuel and Chronicles, can leave no doubt in the mind of a candid and fair student that textual emendations are necessary. Keil, the most conservative critic of our day, in commenting on Josh. 8:13, acknowledges that there is a mistake here, as he does at a number of other places in the Book of Joshua, and says (p. 86 of the English translation): "We need have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that there is a mistake in the number given in verse 3, as the occurrence of such mistakes in the historical books is fully established by a comparison of the numbers given in the Books of Samuel and Kings with those in the Chronicles, and is admitted by every commentator."*

But when the next step is taken and the question is asked concerning the principles that should control this textual criticism, there is quite a difference of opinion. The state of affairs in regard to the Old Testament is rather peculiar, quite different indeed from that of the New Testament or other literary remains of antiquity the restoration of whose original form is attempted. Ordinarily the MSS. are the principal aids in the critical work, the points of discussion being chiefly the relative merits of this or that manuscript or class of manuscripts, the other aids, such as the versions, citations, etc., occupying secondary and subordinate positions in the critical apparatus and judgment. The chief reasons for this are the age and superior value of the manuscript helps. In Old Testament textual work this is otherwise. Our oldest Hebrew MSS. date from the ninth or tenth Christian centuries, and are thus thirteen and more hundred years removed from the autograph copies of the writers. On the other hand, the versions take the text up fully a thousand earlier. Notably is this the case of the Septuagint, which stands in matter of time at least as near and even nearer to the original writings than do the oldest and the best of New Testament manuscripts to the autographs

* Cf. for particulars, Keil's Introduction to the Old Testament, § 201.

of the apostles. Accordingly, on the supposition that these versions, and particularly the Septuagint, are good reproductions of the Hebrew originals of their day, and that these versions have been retained in the original form to our times or can be restored to their original form, and further, on the supposition that the Hebrew manuscripts, in being copied and re-copied in the course of more than a thousand years, would with each century show a larger departure from the original words, it would be sound philological criticism to maintain that the versions, especially the Septuagint, give us a better text of the original Hebrew than do the Hebrew manuscripts themselves.

But before reaching such a conclusion several facts of a peculiar kind must be allowed their weight. Strange to say, the Hebrew MSS. do not show the signs of corruption that would naturally be expected under such circumstances. The voluminous comparison of Hebrew manuscripts made by Kennicott in 1776-1780, who examined about 600 manuscripts and 40 of the old and more accurate printed texts, and of de Rossi, in 1784-1788, who examined many others, showed that all the existing MSS. of the Hebrew Scriptures substantially agree in their readings, which of course does not exclude the fact that there were quite a number of unimportant variants. So great is this agreement, that even the so-called Codex Petropolitanus, published by Strack, in 1876, which contains the Babylonian punctuation and represents a school of texts different from the ordinary Tiberian tradition, in the Book of Ezekiel, according to the searching investigations of Cornill, contains only sixteen variants from the ordinary Hahn edition of the Hebrew Bible.* Just what this singular state of affairs means is differently interpreted by critics. Many of the conservatives point to this as an evidence of the remarkable fidelity of the Massoretic tradition and a reason for adhering to its authority in preference to other authorities antedating it even by many centuries. Others again maintain that this is really a proof of the inferiority of these MSS. The leading advocate of this thesis is Lagarde, one of the shrewdest critics of this century. He says that "all our Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament are based upon one single copy [or prototype], whose very correction of mistakes in writing are faithfully copied as corrections, and whose imperfections they have adopted."† This prototype is put at the age of the Emperor Hadrian. This is done on account of the relation of the Hebrew text to the later Greek and other versions. According to this hypothesis then the Hebrew MSS. extant, as they are represented, for instance, in the resultant Massoretic texts published by Baer and Delitzsch, would have merely the value of a single MS. for text-critical purposes. This proposition, so fundamental in its character, is, however, yet *sub judice*. Even if accepted and judiciously applied, it will not justify such extreme application as has been made of it. Those who accept it differ widely in the method and extent of its application. For this position implies the other, namely that the Septuagint and other versions represent both an older and a better form of the original text, and that a reading of the LXX., if once accepted as an original rendering of the Seventy, is *eo ipso* to be regarded as an older and more original reading. The matter is all-important because the variants of the LXX. are many and far-reaching. In some parts of the Old Testament, as, e. g., in the Pentateuch, the Greek and the Hebrew present almost the same text; in others, e. g.,

* Cf. Cornill, l. c., Prolegomena, p. 9.

† Cf. Lagarde on the Greek Proverbs, 1863, p. 1 seq.

Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, they differ considerably. If, in these latter books, this principle is allowed full sway, it will seriously modify the Hebrew text. This is seen, e. g., in the researches of Cornill, in his text of the Book of Ezekiel. So extreme is he in his application and so willing to insert the critical knife, that he has, chiefly on the basis of the LXX., materially cut down the size of the Book of Ezekiel. He has given us a much smoother and easier and in many places a better text; but it is more than doubtful whether his Ezekiel text, as a whole, is any nearer to the original Ezekiel than is the Massoretic text.

While essentially maintaining the same stand-point on the question of the manuscripts (p. 1 seq.), Ryssel, in his recent discussions of the Micha text, differs entirely in regard to the influence to be allowed to the LXX. in emending the Hebrew text. Indeed, so far as Micha is concerned, he finds the LXX. practically worthless. As the result of his investigations of the various critical helps, he comes to the conclusion that these justify only a few and slight changes in the Massoretic text, for which he makes no higher claims than those of conjectural criticism. Both negatively and positively his discussions are interesting.

Ryssel first criticises the false ways in which the LXX. has been used in seeking for the original Old Testament text. It is thus that "in the text-critical investigations the words of the versions were mechanically translated back into Hebrew and the words of this re-translation were without further evidence regarded as the readings of the text from which the version was made, without examining whether such a departure from the traditional text is only a seeming one or can be explained otherwise than by the assumption of a variant." It is also incorrect, in case the version shows a mood different from the Hebrew, or a different number in the noun, or a somewhat different grammatical construction, to conclude at once that the original was different from our present Hebrew text. Such changes may have resulted from the genius of the language of the version or from choice on the part of the translator. It is further incorrect to believe that variants in the versions which are known to be wrong, where the Massoretic text is right, are always the result of false reading or hearing or other outward means. Altogether other reasons may have caused the new reading.

Positively, on the other hand, it is necessary, in case there are variants in the versions, to determine what may have been the cause of these, and how many, if any, demand the acceptance of readings in the original of the LXX. and other translators other than the readings in the traditional Massoretic text. Analyzing the text of the LXX. or of any version in this manner, necessitates, or even makes probable, a different reading in their original much less frequently than is the case with a less cautious method. Seeking to reproduce psychologically the work and working of the translators makes the process of that translation more intelligible to the critic, and thus enables him to secure a more reliable foundation for his superstructure. The considerations which the critic must here take special note of, are such as the linguistic peculiarities and characteristics of a language which may suggest or even necessitate readings that only seem to be variants, but are not; then logical considerations, which may have prevented the translator from rendering *verbatim*, as, e. g., using a collective singular for a plural; then formal considerations, which may have suggested seeming variants, as, e. g., the change of persons in verb and suffix, or the parallelism of members; then such considerations as the fact that a real variant or incorrect vocalization of a word may have brought with it other changes in the original text; then it

must be remembered that some of these differences may have resulted from an un-thorough knowledge of the Hebrew on the part of the translators. These considerations lead Ryssel to adopt the following as the fundamental principles of Old Testament textual criticism :

1. Only then when a variant cannot be explained as having sprung from one of the causes named, whether this be the deliberate choice of the translator, or the consideration of the connection, or a necessity resulting from different methods of expression in the two languages, or a lack of knowledge of the original language—only then can we consider the variant as having arisen from a reading differing from that of the traditional Massoretic text.

2. In determining the reading which lies at the bottom of the variant in the version, we must have the greatest regard to the similarity in form and size and sound of the word with the word in the present Hebrew text, and must reject all explanations according to which the difference between the ordinary text and the proposed reading is so great that an intelligent translator can scarcely be thought to have made such a blunder as to exchange them in his mind or to have been so careless as to have done this. Only then when an easily explained error of the copyist or an easily explained mistake of the translator cannot be found for the variant under discussion, have we the right to accept an entirely different and independent reading.

3. If even it is settled that the original of the version was a reading differing from that of the present Massoretic text, this does not yet prove that this new reading is to be preferred to that of the Massoretic text, even if the former did originate in a time when the latter was not yet fixed. But rather all readings must be measured according to the principle that the more difficult reading is to be preferred, and in accordance with this it must be decided which is the more original, since the variant may in itself be worthless or for some reason or other may have been caused by the copyist.

THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR OUR TIMES.*

BY PROF. E. L. CURTIS, PH. D.,

McCormick Theol. Sem., Chicago.

I.

The Old Testament is for our times *An Evidence of Christianity.*

In this it fits into a special need of to-day which calls so loudly for the foundations of belief, and demands a review of all testimonies for truth. Blot out the Old Testament, then we blot out one of the strongest reasons why we should accept the statements of the New and believe that Jesus of Nazareth was both man and God. The resurrection of Christ needs the evidence of the Old Testament looking forward to that event. I need not recall how often it is appealed to in the New Testament. Neither also is the belief in the incarnation easily reasonable without the preparation for it found in these old writings. The words, the thoughts of Israel's prophets, the significant events of Israel's history, the belief, the hope of that ancient people there embodied, are historic facts, and stand as an impregnable fortress of our Christian faith. These sacred records were written long before Christ came, and their testimony of him is unshaken by any school of criticism. For however men may distort their narratives and shift from century to century their composition, still here they are, written, I repeat, long before Christ came, and presenting a wonderful correspondence between Him and them. No criticism can ever wash that out. Suppose Moses did not write the proto-evangelium, or the promise given to Abraham (although the evidence points to their origin in Scripture through him), yet some one wrote them, SOME ONE, and even if at the time of the exile, then by the power of God, knowing the purpose that God did have at the beginning of man's history and Israel's history; giving also that which as a beam of hope, a ray of light, must have been there, for there was one, ever advancing, growing brighter and brighter in anticipation, taken up by one and another in story and song, until at last it broke forth realized in the one who said "I am the light of the world," and to whom we now look back, as they looked forward. Suppose Isaiah did not draw that wondrous portrait of the man of sorrows, acquainted with grief, who should yet see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied, yet some one did. The picture was given by the power of God, revealing a divine purpose, dimly understood and comprehended, it may be, until there appeared its counterpart—the vicarious, suffering Messiah, the risen and glorified Redeemer. Thus it is with all Old Testament teachings and history. The lines of their prefigurement of and preparation for Christ and Christianity can never be obliterated. They are like the stars set in the ethereal blue. They shine undimmed and undisturbed by theories of astronomers. Prof. Patton has well refused to make even the utterly unwarranted reconstructions of Jewish history proposed by Kuenen and Wellhausen, the logical warrant for denying the supernatural character of Christianity, saying:

* From an Inaugural address delivered April 6, 1887.

"For Judaism, however explained, is genetically related to the Christian religion." "Men may refuse to believe that God appeared to Moses and delivered to him a most completed system of jurisprudence and a complex sacrificial ritual. But they cannot ignore the correspondence between the Old Testament and the New."* The candid historical scholar cannot resist the belief that Jewish history was a series of preparations for Christ's advent. Even if one should endeavor to reject the inspiration of the book that records this history, he cannot doubt the inspiration of the history itself. God was there. Finding God thus in the history will lead one also to find him in the writing of the Book. For the Book and the history are one.

This study of the Old Testament will do then for apologetics that which has been accomplished by the recent study of the New. This latter has given us the true historic Christ. This former will give us the true historic Israel, prophetic of Christ.

II.

The Old Testament impresses upon us also *The Importance and Significance of this Life*. It has been thought strange by many that the Old Testament scriptures had so little to say concerning the life beyond. Various reasons have been given for this fact. Some have assumed that a conception of a future and immortal state was as vivid and clear to the ancient Hebrews as to us; and that this is always to be presupposed in reading those records, that no mention of it was made because none was needed. This is a mistake. Consider the sad pathetic words of the Psalmist† clinging to life, of Hezekiah when he said:

"The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee:
They that go down into the pit, cannot hope for thy truth.
The living, the living, he shall praise thee as I do this day."‡

These could not have been written by those who had the full New Testament hope and belief. The New Testament also denies full Christian knowledge and assurance to the past. Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light.§ It is wrong, however, to go to the other extreme and deny to the Old Testament writers a belief in a future life. Death with them was not an eternal sleep. Death also did not leave them mere shades wandering aimlessly on another shore. No, stronger than death was love of Jehovah, and with him there must be life hereafter.

"God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol,
For he shall receive me.¶

There is no idle speculation about this future state. Firm faith rested in this assurance and therewith was content. This life was the all-important, and no destiny was known that did not grow out of this. Here then is a needed thought, when men are prone on the one hand to find a second probation, and on the other to emphasize to such an extent divine forgiveness and the final entrance into glory, so as to make it appear that it made no difference whether a life had been all wasted and thrown away, and then at the last moment saved, or whether from the beginning it had been full of noble consecration and service. The Old Testament preaches the necessity of right living based upon a right heart. There is no mere legalism. The source of all is divine grace: God calling, yet being

* Pres. Rev., vol. IV., p. 380. † Ps. 6:5. ‡ Is. 38:18,19. § 1 Tim. 1:10. ¶ Ps. 49:15.

called; God knowing, yet being known; God loving, yet being loved; the heart, the disposition, is everything. There is no magical formula of intellectual knowledge or of external rite.

"Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble and to revive the heart of the contrite ones."^{*}

The rapture of the New Testament is not found in the Old. We are not transported with Paul to the third heavens; but there is a grandeur, a solemnity, a heroism in the conception of the true life linked to Jehovah reminding one of the familiar lines:

"A sacred burden is the life ye bear.
Look on it, lift it, bear it solemnly.
Stand up and walk beneath it steadfastly,"—

A conception needed in this age of so much mawkish gush and sentimentality, and which is the keynote of so much of the best preaching of the present day, which emphasizes continually CHARACTER.

III.

The Old Testament enters also into *Sympathy with the Anxious Struggles of Men over the Mysteries of Life*. Possibly these struggles are no more to-day than they ever have been, and yet they seem so. Men to-day think. They are not like dumb, driven cattle, blindly accepting the traditions of the past. The scientific investigation of both physical, mental and moral phenomena, has placed them in a new world. Their thought-environment is all different from that of their fathers. And they are asking with pathetic earnestness, What is life? Through the wide-reaching philanthropy, that Christ-like mark of our day, has come up also the old question, old and yet ever new, of the problem of evil, and above all, Why do the innocent suffer? This now is the thought of the Book of Job, and in that grand and matchless poem I find God's imprint of sympathy with all those who wrestle to-day with these dark problems, and I find also the only remedy, *God*. This old revelation does not brush aside with scorn the anguish and bitterness of souls who find it hard, very hard, to submit to God's dealings. Nay, it tells out the whole experience. There is the sad cursing of the day of birth,[†] the heart-rending longing that life might never have been,[‡] the bold complaint against God:

"Know now that God hath subverted me in my cause,
And hath compassed me with his net.
Behold I cry out of wrong, but I am not heard:
I cry for help, but there is no judgment."[§]

Full utterance thus is given; and though in the end there is condemnation for lack of faith and submission, yet a still severer condemnation is spoken against those self-appointed teachers who insisted on the application of their peculiar dogma, and wondered why their suffering friend did not through it give God the glory. Of a similar tenor also is the Book of Ecclesiastes, that strange riddle to many, which seems, with its sad refrain, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity," more full of skepticism than faith, and echoes that discontent which lurks at times in nearly every soul and finds expression in all literature. Appropriate now for us is this voice coming from the Word of God; for while men in all ages

^{*} Is. 57: 15.

[†] Job 3: 8 seq.

[‡] Job. 3: 11 seq.

[§] Job 19: 6, 7.

have thus sung, yet to our age has it been reserved to elevate this pessimistic mood into a powerful system of philosophy, and this book brings us into sympathy with this mood, shows us its reality, and gives us a clew of how we may help men out of the same. Yes, as a recent commentator has said: "Those who study it will find that it meets the special tendencies of modern philosophical thought, and that the problems of life which it discusses are those with which our daily experience brings us in contact. And if they feel, as they will do, that there is hardly any book of the Old Testament which presents so marked a contrast in its teaching to that of the gospels or epistles of the New Testament, they will yet acknowledge that it is not without a place in the divine economy of revelation, and may become to those who use it rightly, a school-master leading them to Christ."*

I believe the church has not generally apprehended the full and true meaning of these old writings. They are not profitable to every mind; but, since found in the Word of God, it has been often thought that in some way they must be. Hence they have been placed on the procrustean bed of allegory and compelled to teach almost everything that fancy could suggest, instead of being taken just as they are, the bitter experiences of souls tossed and baffled by the problems of this life, to reveal unto us how God sympathizes with such souls, how he would have us deal with them, and how he may even use them to tell us of him.

* Cambridge Bible for Schools. Ecclesiastes by E. H. Plumptre, D. D., pp. 11, 12.

INDUCTIVE BIBLE STUDIES.

[Copyright by W. R. HARPER, 1887.]

PREPARED BY

PROFESSORS W. R. HARPER (Yale University), W. G. BALLANTINE (Oberlin Theol. Sem.), WILLIS J. BEECHER (Auburn Theol. Sem.), and G. S. BURROUGHS (Amherst College).

FIFTH STUDY.—THE REIGN OF SAUL.

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Professors Beecher and Burroughs. It is edited by Professor Harper.]

I. PRELIMINARY NOTES.

1. Those students whose time is limited may omit the sixth "study," and divide the present one into the two parts indicated by the two parts of the Biblical Lesson.
2. The present "study" should be considered, not so much in its details, as in its *unity*. The student should exercise the *synthetic* method, as distinguished from the *analytic*.* An opportunity is afforded in its use to do what has *not* been done sufficiently in Bible-study, *viz., rise from the variety, through induction, to grasp the unity.*
3. The present "study" is a *biographical* one. The revelation found in the Scriptures, and in the Old Testament in particular, is *concrete*. Its teaching is through *life*. Practical instruction is found, not so much in *deductions* from the narrative, as in the narrative itself. One should place himself in the *atmosphere* of Bible-life, under the *play of concrete* Scripture teaching, and note the effect.
4. This "study" affords good opportunity for constructive work, in a limited way and sphere, in Biblical Theology. What were the religious conceptions and beliefs of the times of Saul and David? What were their personal conceptions and beliefs?†
5. This "study" also emphasizes the need of a knowledge of biblical geography and the true method of obtaining this knowledge, *viz.,* by studying the geography of the Bible in connection with historical personages and historical movements. Let the text be read with a map in hand.

II. THE BIBLICAL LESSON.

1. *Prepare for recitation* 1 Sam. 13:1-31:13, including the account (1) of the first part of the reign of Saul, ch. 11 (review) and 13:1,2;‡ (2) of the second part, after Jonathan was grown to be a warrior, including (a) the great Philistine invasion, 13:3-23, (b) the battle of Michmash, 14:1-46, (c) the general statements in 14:47-52, (d) the Amalekite war, 15:1-85; (3) of Saul's relations to Samuel (see last "study"); (4) of the Philistine wars in the third part of Saul's reign, 14:52; 17:1-58 (cf. 1 Chron. 11:12-14); 18:25-30; 19:8; 23:1-5,27; 24:1; 28:4; 29:1; 31.
2. Read the remaining parts of 1 Sam. 16:1-31:13, and study the account (1) of

* See Briggs, "Bible Study," p. 13 seq. † *Ibid.*, p. 390 seq. *Biblical Theology.*

‡ The technical translation of 13:1 is "Saul was a year old in his reigning." This is the earliest instance where the phrase "in his reigning" occurs. In all the subsequent instances it clearly means "when he began to reign." But this instance may have been written before the technical meaning became attached to the phrase. At all events, the sense requires a different meaning here, namely, that given in the old English version. The defeat of Nahash occurred just at the close of Saul's first year, and at the beginning of the second year he made the arrangements described.—W. J. B.

Another interpretation would understand the text of this phrase to have become corrupt.—W. R. H.

of Saul's evil spirit, 16:14-23; 18:10,11; 19:9,10; (2) of the anointing of David, 16:1-13; (3) of the more important incidents of Saul's relations to David, 18:1-27:12; * (4) of the witch of Endor, 28:1-25; (5) of Saul's death, 31:1-2 Sam. 1:27.†

III. HISTORICAL, LITERARY AND BIOGRAPHICAL TOPICS.

A. In connection with the first part of the Biblical Lesson:—

1. **The Hebrews.** 13:4,7; see also 4:6,9; 13:19; 14:11,21; 29:3; and consult further the concordance. (1) By whom, in general, is the name employed? What contrast does it imply? (2) Is it a patronymic (Gen. 10:21,24) or a derivative from the Hebrew word signifying *beyond*? If the latter, what is its meaning? (3) Compare its use with *Israel*, *Israelite*; see concordance.
2. **Moab.** 14:47; 22:3,4. (1) What was the location, and what the territory of the Moabites? (2) Their character as a people, e. g., as contrasted with the Ammonites (14:47; see fourth "study")? (3) Their relations, in general, with Israel? See concordance and dictionary.
3. **Edom.** 14:47; 21:7; 22:9,18. Answer (1), (2), (3), as above.
4. **Amalek.** 15:2; 14:48; 27:8; 30:1; 2 Sam. 1:8. (1) Origin? (2) Location? (3) Previous relation to Israel? See Ex. 17:8-16; Num. 14:45; 24:20; Jud. 3:13; 6:3, etc. (4) Later history?‡
5. **The Kenites.** 15:6; 27:10; 30:29. Answer (1), (2), (3), as above, from concordance.
6. (1) Observe the R. V. marginal readings from the LXX. (see Third "Study") on 13:1: 14:18; 17:6; and especially 17:12; 28:16. (2) Note further readings, e. g., those mentioned in Kirkpatrick's 1 Sam. on 13:15; 14:7,14,16,24,41,42, etc.; and see, in particular, Note VI., p. 241, on text of chs. 17 and 18.
7. **Character of Saul and Jonathan.** (1) State the blemishes and faults discoverable in Saul's religious character as seen (a) in 14:18,19, and (b) in 14:24 in connection with 14:31-35 and 14:36b-44. (2) Contrast the character thus disclosed with that of Jonathan as shown in 14:6,8-12,28-30,43. (3) Distinguish, in regard to each, between what appears to be the result of the surrounding religious atmosphere and what appears to be the outcome of personal traits.
8. **Saul's Sins.** (1) The sin described in 13:8-14. Did Saul personally perform the sacrifice? What was the relation of Israel's king to the prophet of Jehovah? Does this relation cast light on the sin of Saul? How?‡ (2) Compare Saul's sin of ch. 15 with 13:8-14, and show the change for the worse in Saul's character in the interval.
9. **Samuel and Saul.** (1) Samuel's conception of religion as shown in 15:22,23 and 24-29, as contrasted with Saul's. (2) The development of this conception of *heart service* as distinguished from *external ceremonial*, in the later prophets; e. g., Amos 5:21-24; Hos. 6:6; add passages from Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and show their application to the times of these several prophets. (3) Contrast Saul's feelings toward Samuel, to be inferred from 15:30 and 28:15, with Samuel's toward Saul, 15:10,11,35; 16:1, and draw inferences as to the depth of character of each.

* These chapters are so full and graphic in their descriptions that their study will not occupy the time which might be supposed. Their contents will fasten themselves upon the mind. They afford opportunity for the exercise of the imagination, an important element in Bible-study.

† On the topics covered in this Biblical Lesson, see Smith, "Dict.," vol. 1, art. *David*, first part; vol. 4, art. *Saul*,—both by Dean Stanley; McClintock & Strong, vol. 2, art. *David*, first part; vol. 9, art. *Saul*; Stanley, "Jewish Church," lects. 21, 22, *Saul, The Youth of David*; Geikie, vol. 3, pp. 92-122; Delitzsch, "Hist. of Redemption," p. 84 seq.; Blaikie, "Bible History," pp. 222-239; von Orelli, p. 148 seq.; Oehler, "O. T. Theology," § 164, § 194 seq., etc.

‡ See a valuable summary in Young's Concordance.

§ On the relation of the monarchy to the theocracy see especially Ewald, "History of Israel," vol. 3, p. 4 seq.

B. In connection with the second part of the Biblical Lesson:—

1. **Saul's Evil Spirit.** Study the passages cited, and decide, if possible, as to the malady and its cause.
2. **The Witch of Endor.** (1) Study with care the expressions of the narrative, 28:3-25. (2) Ascertain the various opinions regarding it.* (3) Decide as to which opinion is most reasonable.
3. **Relations of Saul and David.** 18:1-27:12. (1) State concisely and in order the events in the life of David from the time of his flight from the court of Saul until the latter's death. (2) Describe the court life of Saul as disclosed by 13:2; 16:19-23; 18:10,11 (spear?); 22:6, etc. (3) Show the educating force of events in the life of David, (a) at home, (b) at court, (c) in his life of wandering. State particulars.
4. **David, Saul and Jonathan.** (1) Compare David in his religious views and character (a) with Saul; see 17:26,36,45-47; 18:17; 19:18-24; 19:4-7; 24:16-22; 26:9-12; chs. 19-25; (b) with Jonathan; see 20:8,11-16,22, etc.; complete passages (see topic A, 7, (2)). (2) Compare Saul with Jonathan; state passages. (3) Contrast the extent to which each lived up to his convictions. (4) Endeavor to distinguish between such religious opinions and traits in these three men as were common to their time and such as were individual.
5. **Religious Condition of the Times.** Form some general conception of the religious condition and thought of the times from the above topic (4.), and also from 13:1-6; 19:18-24; 19:13 (cf. 15:23, teraphim?); 20:18,24-29; 21:1-9; 22:6-19, and other statements, e. g., 23:6; 30:26; 25:23-31; 2 Sam. 1:12,14, etc.

C. In connection with the Biblical Lesson as a whole:—

1. **Comparison of Pentateuch-passages.** Compare the following passages with those cited, in connection with each, from the Pentateuch: (1) 14:32 with Gen. 9:4; Lev. 3:17; 7:26; 17:10-14; 19:23; Deut. 12:16,23,24; (2) 19:5 with Deut. 19:10-13; (3) 20:26 with Lev. 7:20,21; (4) 21:6 with Lev. 24:5-9; (5) 23:3 with Lev. 19:31; 20:27; Deut. 18:10 seq.; (6) 30:24,25 with Num. 31:27. Give results.
2. **Special Difficulties.** Note, and, if possible, explain (1) 16:19 seq. as compared with ch. 17,† (2) 23:19-24:22 as compared with ch. 26,‡ (3) the apparent moral difficulties in 15:3; § 16:2,3; 19:13,14; 20:6; 21:2; 27:10,11; 29:8; (4) state some of the principles which should be adopted in dealing with what may seem to be moral difficulties in the Scripture records.
3. **Friendship of David and Jonathan.** (1) Note the facts of this friendship, and (2) compare it with other remarkable friendships, of somewhat like character, disclosed either in classical or later literature and history.
4. **Poetical Passages.** (1) Cast the prediction 15:22,23 into the poetic form; see 2 Sam. 1:19-27 in the R. V.;‡ and (2) point out and characterize the parallelisms, e. g., synonymous, synthetic, antithetic. (3) Make a more complete study of Hebrew poetry in connection with the Bow-song of David, 2 Sam. 1:18-27;¶ characterize it briefly (a) in itself, (b) as distinguished from the poetry of other tongues.
5. **Saul's Reign as a Whole.** (1) Its character; (2) As influenced by his personal character; (3) A preparation, good and bad, for the reign of David.

* See Kirkpatrick's 1 Sam., Note VIII., p. 244, for a valuable summary of the evidence and of opinions.

† See, in particular, Note VI., p. 241, Kirkpatrick's 1 Sam.

‡ *Ibid.*, Appendix, Note VII.

§ See on this command *Ibid.*, Note V., p. 240.

¶ See Smith, Schaff-Herzog, arts. *Poetry, Hebrew.*

¶ See Briggs, "Biblical Study," ch. 9, *Hebrew Poetry.*

IV. GEOGRAPHICAL.

1. In connection with part 1 of the Biblical Lesson, point out Gibeah; Bethlehem; Saul's route in and after the Amalekite war.
2. In connection with part 2, identify, as far as possible, the localities referred to in the wanderings of David, chs. 21-30; also describe the plain of Esdraelon and the valley of Jezreel; the movements of the Philistines, and those of David, in connection with the battle of Gilboa, 28:1-2; 29; 30:1; 31:7,10.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

1. According to Acts 13:21 Saul reigned forty years. This accords with all the known facts in the case, without making the forty years overlap any part of the time of either Samuel or David. The numbers given by Josephus must either be made to fit this state of things or be rejected. Apparently Saul is described as a young man, somewhat under the tutelage of his trusty servant, when he comes to the kingdom, 1 Sam. chs. 9,10. The tradition (or conjecture) incorporated into the R.V., 13:1, makes him to have been thirty years old, which is possible. At the time of his death, his grandson, Mephibosheth, was five years old; and one of his younger sons, Ish-bosheth, was forty years old, 2 Sam. 4:4; 2:10. It follows that Jonathan must have been a little child in the second year of his father's reign, and that the interval of time between the event recorded in 13:2 and that recorded in the next verse was long enough for the growing up of the child into a warrior.
2. The three parts of Saul's reign embrace, first, the time when we may presume him to have been in amicable relations with Samuel; second, the time during which their relations were disturbed; and third, the time after their relations were broken off, 15:35. The first probably lasted until Jonathan was grown. After the second year, we have no account of it except that in 13:1,2, unless possibly, it included some of the wars mentioned in 14:47,48. All we are told is that Saul stationed 1000 men "with Jonathan," the little crown-prince, at his home in Gibeah, while Saul himself, with 2,000 more, reigned from a military camp near by. Doubtless Samuel largely controlled the policy of the government. That it was prosperous we may infer from the magnitude of the preparations made by the Philistines for attacking Israel, 13:5.* That the time was peaceful we may perhaps infer from the fact of prosperity and from the silence of the narrative.†
3. The account of the second part of Saul's reign begins with 13:3. For some reason the Philistines have established a post at Geba, and Jonathan precipitates the war by attacking it. Owing to disagreements between Samuel and Saul (13:8-15) the army of Israel apparently dispersed without a battle, and the Philistines disarmed and plundered the country, 13:17-23. This condition of things perhaps lasted some years, and was followed by the battle of Michmash, and then by a series of wars. There is no note as to the duration of this part of Saul's reign, except that the third part lasted while David was growing from a stripling to thirty years of age, 16:11,18, and ch. 17, compared with 2 Sam. 5:4. So far as appears, this last third of Saul's reign was a time of misgovernment and disaster, the record dealing mainly with Saul's attempts against David, alternating with Philistine campaigns.
4. The representation that there was a priestly and a prophetic party in Israel, opposing each other, the one favoring Saul and the other favoring David,

* These numbers are credible on the supposition that the Philistines, in order to overcome the power of Israel, now growing so rapidly as to endanger his neighbors, had formed a confederacy with other peoples, perhaps including those mentioned in 14:47. The accounts of successive Hittite leagues, found in the Egyptian and Assyrian writings, show that there is no improbability in this supposition.—W. J. B. According to another view the numerals are altogether wrong.

† It is not fair to understand from 14:52 that the Philistine wars began with Saul's reign or before, but only that, after they had once begun, they continued to the end of his reign. Cf. 7:13 and Jud. 14:17.

has no ground in the statements of the Bible. Both the priests and the prophets favored David, and both were loyal to Saul, 19:18; chs. 21, 22.

5. Saul's symptoms in connection with his evil spirit are those of insanity. Whether the term evil spirit is to be regarded as merely a descriptive phrase for insanity, or as describing a personal agent who caused the insane symptoms, is another question.

VI. QUESTIONS FOR PRACTICAL WORK.*

1. Show how solicitations to evil accompany even opportunities for getting good and doing good.
2. Show the undermining influence of single sins.
3. Show how the moral man is in danger because he is a *moral* man and not *spiritual*.

SIXTH STUDY.—PROPHETS, RELIGION AND SCRIPTURES OF ISRAEL IN THE TIMES OF ELI, SAMUEL AND SAUL.

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Prof. Beecher. It is edited by Prof. Harper.]

I. PRELIMINARY NOTES.

1. This "study" is intended to sum up the biblical material furnished on the subjects cited, and to systematize the same to some extent. A mastery of it will aid in a better understanding, not only of the ground already covered, but also of that yet to be taken up.
2. The opinions presented, in some particulars, differ from those of many scholars, and especially from those of scholars who hold that the institutions described in the Books of Samuel are so radically different from those described in the Pentateuch as to prove that the latter cannot then have been in existence.
3. In view of this, the student should scrutinize closely all statements given, and examine with care every passage referred to, in order not only that he may fill out the statements, which are necessarily very brief, but also that he may prove or disprove them.
4. Notice is to be taken that in the presentation here given, (1) it is not intended to give a discussion of Pentateuchal questions, and (2) only material belonging to 1 Samuel is used. The treatment is therefore necessarily limited.
5. Once more, the student is urged to accept no statement which is not backed by biblical proof of the most satisfactory character.

II. THE PROPHETS.

1. **The Use of the name Prophet.** (1) In the earlier years of Samuel, the name prophet had either gone out of common use, or else had not yet come into common use, 1 Sam. 9:9. The latter alternative is accepted by many, but the former is positively required by the statements concerning the earlier times made in the Old Testament, Jud. 6:8; 4:4; Deut. 34:10; 18:15, 18, 22; 13:1, 3, 5; Num. 12:6; 11:25-29; Ex. 7:1; Gen. 20:7 (cf. 1 Chron. 16:22; Ps. 105:15).† (2) The representation made in 1 Samuel is that, in the time of Samuel's childhood, the prophetic gift had become very rare, though not altogether extinct, 1 Sam. 3:1, 7, 8; 2:27-36. During Samuel's early manhood, it "again" became abundant in Shiloh, 3:19-21. The "again" implies (not

* This "study" abounds in patent practical lessons. It is almost superfluous to make suggestions in this direction.

† If one should add to this list, by the aid of a concordance, all passages in the Bible that speak of Moses as a prophet, and in the books before Samuel, all passages that contain the expressions, prophecy, prophet, man of God, word of the Lord, appeared, vision, he would thus have a full account of the early history of prophecy.

necessarily, indeed, yet naturally) that, at some date, it had previously been abundant in Shiloh.

2. **The Prophetic Order.** (1) Samuel succeeded by Gad, Nathan, and others, begins a succession of distinguished prophets, that can be traced pretty continuously to Malachi; 22:5; 2 Sam. 7:2, etc. (2) Under Samuel's influence, prophetic organizations were formed. The followers of the great prophets, in these organizations, are doubtless sometimes called prophets. Prophets (in one or both meanings of the term) became numerous and influential, 10:5,6,10-13; 19:18-24; 28:6. (3) In these circumstances, it is natural to think of Samuel as being, in an important sense, the founder of the succession of the prophets. See Acts 3:24, but compare Acts 3:22.
3. **Function of a Prophet.** The function of a prophet, as shown in the passages we have examined, is evidently that of a public man with a special message from God, active in religious and patriotic duties. It is only as an incidental matter that he is a predictor of future events. He is not at all like a Greek oracle priest, or a dervish, or a modern fortune-teller. He distinctly claims, however, to have supernatural communications from God.
4. **Saul's Prophecy.** In 18:10, Saul's raving is perhaps called prophesying. In 19:24, Saul, in prophesying, acted in a distracted manner. But it does not follow that frenzied utterance was characteristic of prophecy. Saul's prophesying probably consisted in his uttering religious truths; it is mentioned as a *symptom* of his insane attack, not as another name for it.* The events described in ch. 10 and ch. 19 are analogous to our reform meetings or evangelistic meetings, rather than to the performances of crazy dervishes.

III. THE RELIGION.

1. **The Sanctuary.** (1) *Form:* The sanctuary at Shiloh was a permanent temple, with door-posts and doors, and sleeping apartments, 1:9; 3:15,3,5. But the "tabernacle of the congregation" was also there, 2:22, perhaps in the inclosed court of the temple, so that its curtains were the only roof over the ark, 2 Sam. 7:6.
- (2) *Compared with the Pentateuchal Requirements:* The Shiloh sanctuary meets the requirements of the Pentateuchal laws, in that (a) it was the home of the tabernacle and the ark; (b) it was served by priests descended from Aaron, 2:28; (c) the only attendant mentioned is the Levite, Samuel; (d) it was for "all Israel," 2:14 (Heb.), 22,24,28; 3:20, etc.; (e) it had its annual festival, to which Israelites came up, 1:3,7,9,21; 2:19;† (f) the festival had its sacrifices, 1:3,21, etc.; (g) its solemnities consisted partly in the fact that they ate and drank in Shiloh, 1:7,9. Compare Deut. ch. 12 and parallel passages.
- (3) *Its Removal:* At some unknown time after the capture of the ark by the Philistines, the sanctuary was removed from Shiloh. In the later years of

* The "also" in 19:24 does not necessarily indicate that the others, as well as Saul, prophesied distractedly.

† The date in 1:20 is in the Hebrew "at the circuit of the year." The expression is used with variations in 2 Chron. 24:23; Ps. 19:6; Ex. 34:22. In the last instance, and therefore probably in the others, it describes the time of the feast of the tabernacles, nearly at the autumnal equinox. This probably identifies the Shiloh festival. Whether other annual festivals were also observed there, the narrative does not say.—W. J. B.

Saul's reign, it was at Nob, 21:6,7; Matt. 12:4, having previously been located, possibly, first at Mizpah and then at Gilgal, 7:6; 10:19,25; 11:15; 12:7; 15:33. But we have no means of knowing whether any of these places was graced with the presence of either the ark or the tabernacle; and it is evident that none of them were centers of national worship in the degree in which Shiloh had been such a center, and in which Jerusalem was to be.*

2. Ceremonial Laws and Usages showing consistency with Pentateuchal Accounts. (1) *The Service of the Altar*: The accounts in Samuel represent that Israel then had rigid ceremonial laws which it was a sin to neglect, 2:29; 13:11-13, etc.† In many particulars, such as the following, these agree with those recorded in the Pentateuch: (a) the high priest wore an ephod, 2:28; 14:3; 21:9; 23:6; (b) the shewbread, 21:6; (c) the distinction between sacrifices for certain seasons, and special sacrifices, 2:21; (d) the recognition of sacrifices in connection with vows, 2:21; (e) the distinction between burnt offerings and peace offerings, 10:8; 13:9, and other places; (f) the technical terms "make atonement," "sacrifice," "minḥah," ‡ 3:14 (Heb.); (g) the burning of the fat on the altar, 2:15; (h) the offering of meal and wine along with an animal victim, 1:24; (i) the irregularities of Eli's sons, 2:13-17, which consisted partly in the use made of the "flesh hook," an instrument unknown to the Pentateuch, and partly in the priest's claiming his fee before the fat was burned, contrary to Lev. 7:29-34.
- (2) *Other Usages*: Apart from the service of the altar, (a) the Israel of Samuel's time had a usage resembling that of the Nazarite of the Pentateuch, 1:11; (b) they knew of Jehovah's prohibition of foreign gods, though they violated the prohibition, 7:3; (c) they had usages respecting ceremonial cleanness, uncleanness, and holiness, 20:26; 21:5; (d) they had religious laws against the eating of blood and against witchcraft, 14:33-34; 15:23; 28, etc. See fifth "study" B. 5 and C. 1. Certainly the Book of 1 Samuel mentions as many particulars in the Levitical laws as could be expected, on the supposition that the laws then existed in their present form, and its silence in regard to other particulars can hardly be regarded as significant.

* The statement is often made that, during this period, the ark was "in seclusion," and there was no sanctuary. That there was no sanctuary fully equipped for purposes of national worship is true; but the bare assertion that there was no sanctuary contradicts, verbally, at least, the statements made concerning Nob in 1 Samuel and in the gospels.

† The ark was in the custody of the men of Kirjath-jearim, either in a hill (Heb. *Gibeah*) near that place, or perhaps in Gibeah, the city of Saul, 7:1. It was not wholly withdrawn from the control of the priestly family of Eli, and it was possible for men to inquire of Jehovah by it, 14:18.

‡ When the ark was in the tabernacle, its vicinity is described by the phrase "before Jehovah," used technically for that purpose. The same phrase may supposedly be still applicable to the vicinity of the ark when lawfully removed from the tabernacle; or may be applicable to the sanctuary, even when the ark is not there. It is actually used in connection with Mizpah, Gilgal and Nob (see references above), and is not elsewhere used in this way in 1 Samuel. Each of these places was, in turn, the seat of Jehovah's special presence with Israel, and in that sense, at least, the national sanctuary. If Samuel laid up "the manner of the kingdom" before the Lord at Mizpah, 10:25, that writing was doubtless removed from there when the other belongings of the sanctuary were removed.

These facts show that there is no contradiction between such passages as Ps. 78:60,67,68; Jer. 7:12; 26:6, which represent Shiloh as the only permanent sanctuary before Jerusalem, and such passages as 2 Sam. 7:6,7; 1 Chron. 17:5,6, etc., which represent the Divine Presence, in this period, as wandering from place to place. That this wandering either of the sanctuary itself or of the ark from the sanctuary, was to cease with the building of the temple, is emphasized in such passages as 1 Chron. 23:25,26.

† This by itself would not identify the ritual of Samuel's time with that of the Pentateuch. The Philistines also had an elaborate ritual, as is shown by the measures they took in connection with the return of the ark, 1 Sam. 6.

‡ The word commonly translated meat-offering.

3. Usages by some regarded as showing inconsistency with Pentateuchal Accounts.

(1) *Central Sanctuary*: Israel in Samuel's time was sacrificing at different places (6:14,15; 7:9; 9:12,13; 10:8; 14:35; 20:6, etc.), and not at one place only, as required by the law in Deut. 12. But there is no proof (a) that Saul's altar, 14:35, was regarded as legal; or (b) that the sacrifices at Ramah and Bethlehem, 9:12,13; 20:6, were anything else than private sacrificial feasts, such as are provided for in Deut. 12:15,21,* or (c) that the sacrifices at Bethshemesh, Mizpah, and Gilgal, 6:14,15; 7:9; 10:8, etc., were not, within the meaning of the law, sacrifices at the central sanctuary (see above). Further, (d) two of the conditions of the law in Deut. 12, namely, that Israel should be at rest from his enemies, and that there should be "the place" chosen by Jehovah to put his name there, had only an imperfect existence in these times, and the law must have been, thus far, in abeyance.

(2) *Variations in points of detail*: A comparison of the ceremonial usages in 1 Samuel with those required in the Pentateuch shows many differences between them in points of detail: (a) in several of the accounts of sacrifices, it is not mentioned that any priest was present; but there is no proof, in these cases, that a properly qualified Levitical priest was not present, or that even Samuel ever performed a priestly act; (b) in Samuel, the word "minhah" perhaps means "offering," rather than "meal offering," 1 Sam. 2:17,29; 3:14; 26:19; (c) not the high priest only, but the other priests, and even Samuel, wore ephods, 22:18; 2:18; (d) Hannah offered an ephah of "meal" with three bulls, instead of three-tenths of an ephah of "fine flour" for each bull, 1:24; (e) the Pentateuch provides for no drawing of water, and no burnt offering of a sucking lamb, such as are described in 1 Sam. 7:6,9. But explanations of all such points may be readily found, provided we have evidence that the Pentateuchal system was known to the men of Samuel's time. That it was known, and was, to some extent, in use, the evidence cited, and to be cited in this study, seems to show; that it was in full and general use is a different proposition, and one that can hardly be maintained.

IV. THE SCRIPTURES.

1. **Pre-Davide Writings.** That certain sacred writings were produced in the times of Moses and Joshua, and under their influence, is asserted in very many passages in the first six books of the Bible, in the New Testament, and in most of the Old Testament books. The passages may be found by the help of a concordance, under the words "book," "write," "Moses," "Joshua," "law," etc. That David and Solomon had well-known sacred writings of Moses is affirmed in 1 Kgs. 2:3; 1 Chron. 22:12; 16:40. If these statements are historical, it follows that these writings existed in the times before David.
2. **Passages in Samuel which presuppose such Writings.** In accordance with this, several passages in 1 Samuel are naturally understood as presupposing such writings; though the writings are not often mentioned, and there is no evidence that they were either very widely known, or very influential. (1) Ch. 10:25; Samuel wrote "the manner of the kingdom" in "the book" (not "a book"), and laid it up before the Lord,† apparently doing with it as Moses had previously done with "the book of the law," Deut. 31:11, 9,26. The idea that the book in which Samuel wrote was the public copy of the book of the law, to which he now added, as Joshua before him had done, Josh. 24:26, is rejected by many; but can any more probable view of

* The word translated "kill," in these verses, is "sacrifice" in Hebrew.

† No one can prove that what he wrote was the sections of 1 Samuel that contain our present account of the rise of the monarchy, but equally, no one can disprove this, and it is a plausible conjecture.

the case be offered? Certainly, Samuel and Israel were distinctly conscious of the idea of divine law, as revealed through prophets, 12:23.* (2) Ch. 8:3,5,20, the elders, in seeking a king, and Samuel, in dealing with them, cite, both for substance and verbally, the regulations now found in Deuteronomy, cf. Deut. 16:19; 17:14,15. (3) The men of those times show familiarity with many of the historical facts now narrated in the Hexateuch, 4:8; 6:6; 12:6,8, etc. (4) We have already found (see above) a large number of instances in which the religious practices mentioned in 1 Samuel correspond to those required in the Pentateuch.

3. **Conclusion.** On the whole, one might not be able to prove from 1 Samuel alone that the men of those times had sacred writings, containing largely or wholly the contents of our first six biblical books; but one finds here much evidence to confirm the proof of this, as drawn from other sources.

SEVENTH STUDY.—THE RISE OF DAVID'S EMPIRE.

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Professors Beecher and Burroughs. It is edited by Professor Harper.]

I. PRELIMINARY NOTES.

1. This "study" and the following are pre-eminently biographical. "The life and character of David are presented to us with a completeness which has no parallel in the O. T."
2. It is of interest to note how the history of Israel, at this period, is intimately related to the life of David; how, in a sense, his life is the representation and interpretation of his times; e. g., (a) how, through his instrumentality, the Hebrew tribes acquired that material strength and national power which formed the foundation for the realization of their mission in history; (b) how the several and even conflicting elements of the national life find their center of higher unity in him and through him; (c) how his life, character and reign, in many and important respects, gave expression to the aspirations and the religious genius and consciousness of Israel.
3. It will be found profitable to compare the life of David, considered as *Scripture* biography, with biography in general, (a) in the vividness and truthfulness of the picture; (b) in its multiform character; (c) in its moral and spiritual impressions and teachings.

II. THE BIBLICAL LESSON.

1. *Examine and learn* the following outline of David's reign: (1) his reign over Judah only, seven and a half years, 2 Sam. 5:5; (2) a period of desperate wars and of conquests, lasting till David had grown sons, 8:18; (3) a period of peace, perhaps six or seven years, 7:1; (4) a period of domestic trouble, perhaps twelve years or more, 13:23,38; 14:28; Jos. Ant. VII. ix. 1. The topics (below) are arranged according to the view that David's bringing the ark to Jerusalem, and his plans for building the temple, belong to the third and fourth of these periods.†

* The verb here translated "teach" is from the same stem with the noun *torah*, law, and is strictly cognate with it in meaning. If *torah* be translated law, the verb describes the bringing of law from Jehovah.

† This view of the reign of David differs much from those commonly held. From Josephus down, it has been held that the bringing up of the ark, 2 Sam. 6, took place soon after David began to reign in Jerusalem, and before most of his great wars. But this view of the case is beset with difficulties. Probably the strongest reasons in support of it are the presumption that the events in these chapters are narrated in the order in which they occurred, together with the use of the phrase "after this" in 2 Sam. 8:1; 10:1, and the corresponding verses in 1 Chronicles. But these reasons are not decisive, provided sufficient evidence against them is

2. *Prepare for recitation** 2 Samuel, chapters 1-5, 8 and 10-12, with parallel passages, taking up the topics in the following order: † (1) David and the death of Saul, 1; (2) David king of Judah, 2-4; (3) king of all Israel, 5:1-3; 1 Chron. 11:1-3; 12:1-40; (4) Jerusalem made the capital, 5:4-16; 1 Chron. 11:4-9; 14:1-7; (5) defensive wars against the Philistines, 5:17-25; 23:13-17; 1 Chron. 14:8-17; 11:15-19; (6) offensive Philistine wars, and David's retirement from military life, 8:1; 21:15-22; 1 Chron. 18:1; 20:4-8; (7) conquest of Ammon, Moab, the Syrian countries, and Edom, 10; 11; 12:26-31; 8:1-14; 1 Chron. 19; 20:1-3; 18:1-13; 1 Kgs. 11:14-25; Ps. 60, title; ‡ (8)

forthcoming; the author may here have preferred some other order than the chronological, and the "after this" may be a part of the phraseology of the older writings used by him, retained here notwithstanding the fact that these passages have been removed from their original connection. See second "study" iv. 4 (3).

On the other hand, if we accept 1 Chron. 13:1-5 as historical, that is conclusive as to the point that the bringing up of the ark did not take place till after the completion of David's conquests "from Shihor of Egypt even unto the entering in of Hamath." And when we seek an arrangement of the events that will be in accordance with this fact, we presently find an order so natural and consequent as strongly to confirm the fact itself.

For example, on the scheme thus constructed, David's moral history—the great stumbling-block pointed at by those who argue that all our accounts of him are unhistorical—is as follows: During most of his relations with Saul, say up to the time when he was twenty-six or twenty-seven years old, he comes very near to being the most gifted and the most high-minded man described in the Bible. To this part of his life belong most of the Psalms that are dated in their titles, Ps. 7; 34; 52; 54; 56; 57; 59, for example. In the last years of Saul, David had deteriorated; this appears in his conduct toward Nabal, his readiness to join the Philistines against his own nation, his plan of gaining influence by marrying many wives. When he became king, prosperity did not lift him from this low moral plane; he was faithful in ordinary duties, and in many things obedient to Jehovah; but he continued his policy of polygamy; he illegally made his sons priests; he neglected to inform himself as to his duties to the worship of Jehovah; his muse celebrated the lives of Jonathan and Abner, rather than the praises of Jehovah. His tendency to moral degradation was strengthened by his withdrawal from active military service, 2 Sam. 21:17, and the luxurious living consequent thereupon. It culminated in the horrible combination of sins in the matter of Uriah; contemporaneous with these were the dreadful cruelties he practiced in war, 12:31; 8:2, etc. In the experiences of these months, God showed David the wickedness of his heart. Repenting of his great sin, David led a reformed life. He entered upon his neglected religious duties, at first blunderingly, and needing the rebuke that came in the death of Uzzah, afterward more carefully. But notwithstanding his repentance, the consequences of his misdoing followed him in the troubles that beset his later years.—W. J. B.

* Such a study of the passages is expected as will enable the student to present the substance in a brief but comprehensive form.

† It will be necessary, because of the view of the reign of David taken in these "studies," seven and eight, to combine the references to the literature of the subject. See Smith's "Bible Dictionary," and McClintock & Strong's "Cyclopædia," art. *David, concluded*; Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," vol. iii. chapters 8-13, pp. 183-313; Stanley's "Jewish Church," lects. 23, 24; Deitzsch's "O. T. History of Redemption," pp. 84-94; Lenormant's "Ancient History of the East," pp. 136-142; Blaikie's "Manual of Bible History," pp. 243-257; Edersheim's "Prophecy and History," pp. 183-190; von Orelli's "O. T. Prophecy," pp. 148-188; Briggs' "Messianic Prophecy," pp. 121-153; Oehler's "Theology of O. T.," pp. 156-169, etc.

‡ The student who carefully looks up these references will find, in the several accounts, a good many marked differences of statement—differences which it is certainly possible to regard as contradictions, invalidating the credit of the narratives. But in no case is it necessary so to regard them; they may be accounted for either (1) as referring to different parts of the event they mention, and therefore as not inconsistent with one another; or (2) as possible errors of copyists; or (3) as real inaccuracies, perhaps retained from the older accounts used by the writers of the books, not affecting the essential truth of the accounts. Other things being equal, the first of these three explanations is to be preferred, in any given case. In very many instances, the apparent discrepancies vanish, the moment you gain a clear understanding of the event.

David and Bath-sheba, 11; 12; Ps. 51; (9) David's cabinet, 8:15-18; 1 Chron. 18:14-17.*

III. HISTORICAL, LITERARY AND BIOGRAPHICAL TOPICS.

1. **David's Heirship.** (1) What was the general and popular feeling regarding David as heir to the throne of Saul (see 2 Sam. 1:2,10; 3:9,10,17,18; 5:1,2, etc.)? (2) What may be inferred from these passages as to any special divine declaration or prophecy through Samuel (cf. 1 Chron. 11:3)? Was there such? If not, how explain these statements?
2. **Royalty in Israel** (see 2 Sam. 1:14,16; cf. 1 Sam. 24:6; 26:9, etc.). (1) Its peculiar sacredness in Israel; (2) reasons for the same; (3) contrasted with royalty among other peoples, at this period and later.
3. **Important Localities.** Make a study of historical facts and circumstances as related to the following places, consulting the concordance: (1) *Hebron*, 2:1; see Gen. 23:2 seq.; Num. 13:22; Josh. 14:13-15; 21:11-13; 1 Sam. 30:31, etc.; (2) *Mahanaim*, 2:8; see Gen. 32:2; Josh. 13:26,30; 21:38; 2 Sam. 17:24; 19:32; etc.; (3) *Gibeon*, 2:12; see Josh. 9:3 seq.; 10:2; 18:25; 21:17; 2 Sam. 20:5-10; 1 Kgs. 3:4-15; 2 Chron. 1:3,5, etc.; (4) *Gezer*, 5:25; see Josh. 10:33; 12:12; 16:3,10; 21:21; 1 Kgs. 9:16, etc.; (5) *Damascus*, 8:5; see Gen. 15:2; 1 Kgs. 11:23-25; 15:18; 20:1,34; ch. 22; 2 Kgs. 6:24 seq., etc.; (6) *Hamath*, 8:9; see Num. 13:21; 34:8; 1 Kgs. 4:24 (cf. 2 Chron. 8:4; 8:65; 2 Kgs. 14:28, etc.); (7) *Rabbah*, 11:1, etc.; see Deut. 3:11; Josh. 13:25; note also Jer. 49:2,3; Ez. 21:20; 25:5; Amos 1:14, etc.
4. **Jerusalem** (see 5:6). (1) Gain a general conception of its *topography*; (2) its suitability for becoming the national capital, (a) because of its geographical situation, (b) because of its possibilities of military defence, etc., (3) its adaptability for becoming the religious center of Israel.†
5. **Various Readings.** (1) Observe and classify the marginal readings of the R. V. throughout the BIBLICAL LESSON of this "study;" (2) notice the readings from the LXX., e. g. as found in the notes of Kirkpatrick's 2 Samuel, especially on 3:30; 4:6; 8:4,7,8,13; 11:22, etc.
6. **Parallel Pentateuchal Passages.** (1) Compare, and state the results of comparison, 3:28, also 4:11, with Gen. 4:11; 9:5,6; Num. 35:31-34; Deut. 19:13,19; 21:7-9; (2) 5:1 with Deut. 17:15; (3) 12:9 with Num. 15:31; (4) 12:13 with Lev. 20:10; 24:17; (5) 23:17 with Lev. 17:10-12; add any other passages.
7. **Parallel Accounts in Chronicles.** (1) Compare parallel sections and passages as noted in the *Biblical Lesson*;‡ (2) notice the narratives found in 2 Samuel and not in 1 Chronicles; viz., 2 Sam. 1-4; 9; 11:2-27; 12:1-25; 13-20; 21:1-14; 22; 23:1-7; (3) notice the narratives found in 1 Chronicles and not in 1 Samuel; viz., 1 Chron. 12; 13:1-5; 15; 16; parts of 21; 22; 23-27; 28; 29; (4) as the result of this comparison of like portions and this observation of unlike portions, characterize the Book of 2 Samuel as distinguished from that of 1 Chronicles.

* "David's sons were priests," 2 Sam. 8:18. This eighth chapter seems to be a summary of David's wars of conquest, fuller particulars of some of these wars being given in chapters 10-12. The "government" here described is probably that which existed at or near the close of these wars. Some light is thrown on the date by the fact that David now had sons old enough to fill public offices; putting this with other indications, we may guess the date as near the middle of the forty years of David's reign. There is no reason for giving the word "priests" here any other than its usual meaning. The fact that David's sons were priests was a gross irregularity, of a piece with those that attended the first attempt to bring up the ark; we may presume that it was corrected, after the death of Uzzah, along with those other irregularities, 1 Chron. 15:2.—W. J. B.

† See concordance; Bible Dictionary; notes p. 82 and note 6, p. 239, Kirkpatrick's 2 Samuel.

‡ Note also the parallel sections, following the order of 1 Chronicles as follows: 1 Chron. 11:1-9 = 2 Sam. 5:1-3,6-10; 1 Chron. 11:10-41 = 2 Sam. 23:8-39; 1 Chron. 14 = 2 Sam. 5:11-25; 1 Chron. 18 = 2 Sam. 8; 1 Chron. 19 = 2 Sam. 10; 1 Chron. 20:1-3 = 2 Sam. 11:1; 12:26-31; 1 Chron. 20:4-8 = 2 Sam. 21:18-22.

8. **Abner, Joab and Abishai.** (1) Study the character of *Abner*, 2: 8,9,12-17,20-23,25,26; 3: 6-13,16-27,33, 34,38; (2) of *Joab*; the above passages and also 2 Sam. 3: 29; 1 Chron. 2: 16; 11: 6; 2 Sam. 8: 16; 10: 7-14; 1 Kgs. 11: 15,16; 2 Sam. 11: 1,6,14-25; 14; 18: 2,5,10-16,19-23; 19: 5-7,13; 19: 4-13, etc.; (3) *Abishai*, 2: 24; 3: 30; 10: 10; 16: 9-12; 19: 21-23; 21: 17; 23: 18, etc. (4) Influence of these men upon the outward history of David and upon the building up of his power? (5) Their influence upon the character of David and his inward life?
9. **David and his Sin.** (1) Compare David, even in the saddest and worst features of his life—in his fall and great sin—with others of his time; consider these features in connection with surrounding customs and habits; the conclusion? (2) Study the sin of David in the light of his acknowledgment of it, his confession, humiliation and repentance, his trust in Jehovah for forgiveness;* the conclusion?

IV. GEOGRAPHICAL.

1. Draw, by tracing or otherwise, an outline physical map of the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea, with the adjacent country, as far east as the upper Tigris, and as far west as the mouths of the Nile.
2. On this map draw lines (preferably colored lines) indicating the probable boundaries (1) of the country conquered by Joshua; (2) of Judah, Israel, Philistia, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Syria, Damascus, Syria Zobah, Syria beyond the River (10: 16), Hamath, at the beginning of the forty years of David; (3) of his empire at the conclusion of his conquests.
3. Trace on the map the history of David's foreign wars, defensive and offensive.

V. QUESTIONS FOR PRACTICAL WORK.

1. From the narrative, as a whole, show how character built up in struggle and adversity, is threatened by prosperity.
2. From the fall of David, show how one sin leads on to another until the man is entangled in a net-work of wickedness.
3. Consider the strength and nobility of character which are essential to and disclosed in *real* repentance.
4. Which involves more of *character*, trust in self or trust in God?

EIGHTH STUDY.—DAVID'S REIGN FROM THE COMPLETION OF HIS CONQUESTS.

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Professors Beecher and Burroughs. It is edited by Professor Harper.]

I. PRELIMINARY NOTES.

1. This "study," particularly when considered in connection with the view of David's history which is presented† is not only biographical in character, but also *psychological*.
2. Note how the private life of David, particularly his sin and its consequences, stands in relation to the general history.
3. Note, again, how this history—the course of events—(1) discloses the condition and working of David's mind and heart, and yet (2) reacts upon and influences his personal life and character.
4. Note, still further, how the history of Israel, not only at this period, but also subsequently, was shaped and colored by David's inmost thought and act.

* A complete study of the sin of David can only be made in connection with the subsequent portions of the narrative, which disclose its consequences. The consideration of David's inward life as discovered in his Psalms, is reserved for later "studies."

† See also, especially, remarks regarding this matter in the previous "study."

II. THE BIBLICAL LESSON.

[The literature of this "study" has been already given in connection with "study" seven.]

Prepare for recitation the remaining parts of 2 Samuel, with the parallel passages: (1) the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, 6; 1 Chron. 13; 15; 16; (2) the promise concerning the temple and the "house" of David, 7; 1 Chron. 17; (3) Absalom's provocation, crime and punishment, 13; 14 (note especially 13:23,38; 14:28; Jos. Ant. VII. ix. 1); (4) the fate of Saul's family, 4:4-12; 9; 21:1-14; 16:1-4; 19:24-30; (5) circumstances in which the temple site was located, 24; 1 Chron. 21; 22:1; (6) preparations for the temple and its service, 1 Chron. 22-29:22a (including the first proclamation of Solomon as king, 1 Chron. 23:1 compared with 29:22b);* (7) Absalom's rebellion ("at the end of forty years," 15:7), chapters 15-19; (8) Sheba's rebellion, 20:1-22; (9) David's second cabinet, 20:23-26; (10) his roll of heroes, 23:8-39; 1 Chron. 11:10-47; (11) David's illness, and the second proclamation of Solomon as king, 1 Chron. 29:22b-30; 1 Kgs. 1.†

III. HISTORICAL, LITERARY AND BIOGRAPHICAL TOPICS.

1. **Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem** (6; 1 Chron. 13; 15; 16). (1) Note the details, and place the scene before the mind *in picture*. (2) Read carefully the Psalms which may be considered as illustrating the narrative, e. g. Pss. 15; 24; 68; 101; 132.‡ (3) Significance of the event as a *national* movement, as distinguished from a simple event in David's life; the nation's preparation for it; its consequences as seen in the religious life of the people; (4) (a) "The anger of the LORD was kindled against Uzzah," 6:7; why? (b) Was he a Levite? Was he conforming to Levitical ordinances? cf. Num. 3:29-31; 4:5,15,19,20; 7:9; (c) the peculiar need of obedience for the good of the nation at this time. (d) What about the divine severity alleged? (5) Why was not the *tabernacle* also brought to Jerusalem at this time? What is to be said of the two centers of worship (1 Chron. 16:37,39,40)?
2. **Tribal Jealousies**. (1) In connection with the rebellions of Absalom and Sheba, 2 Sam. 15:7-20:22, study the tribal jealousies in Israel, particularly as existing between the other tribes and Judah, see especially 15:7-12; 19:11-15,41-43; 20:1,2. (2) Were these jealousies

* The view of the history underlying this arrangement of topics is peculiar in the following respects: (1) in placing the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem after David's conquests (see note on last "study"); (2) in accepting as correct the phrase "at an end of forty years," 15:7, and holding that Absalom's rebellion broke out at the close of the fortieth year of David's reign, that is, at the beginning of the last year of his reign; (3) in recognizing the undoubted fact that there should be a paragraph division after the first clause of 1 Chron. 29:22 (see *Jour. of Soc. of Bib. Lit. and Exeg.*, 1885, p. 73); the sacrificial feast on such occasions belongs after the transaction of the important business, and not before; that clause closes the account of the first proclaiming of Solomon as king; the account that follows, that of his being made king the second time, is of a different and later event. These points being accepted, the order of the events will be seen to be that implied in the order of the topics given. Very likely the assembly when Solomon was proclaimed the first time, 1 Chron. 23:1; 28; 29, was at the close of the fortieth year of David, 1 Chron. 28:31, just before the breaking out of the rebellion, and the direct occasion of the outbreak. From the time of the death of Absalom, David was heart-broken; he soon fell into the condition of illness described in 1 Kgs. 1, and never rallied from it, except partially, to accomplish the coronation of Solomon.—W. J. B.

† In connection with these Biblical Lessons the attention of the student may well be directed to Bartlett & Peter's "The Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian," a book which in purpose and execution will be found most admirably adapted to the needs of a student of the Bible. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

‡ See *Intro.* to Klrkpatrick's 2 Samuel, pp. 46, 47.

- recent? cf. Judges 8:1; 12:1, etc. (3) Trace their influence, subsequently, in the history of Israel.
3. **Various Readings.** Note the readings from the LXX. as found in Kirkpatrick's 2 Samuel, especially the following, 6:2,3,4; 7:23; 13:16,21,34; 15:18,27; 21:1; 24:23.
4. **Parallel Pentateuchal Passages.** (1) Compare and state the results of the comparison, 2 Sam. 6:2 with Lev. 24:16; Deut. 28:10; (2) 2 Sam. 14:7 with Num. 35:19; Deut. 19:12,13; (3) 2 Sam. 18:17, with Deut. 21:20,21; (4) 2 Sam. 19:21 with Exod. 22:28; (5) 2 Sam. 21:1 with Num. 35:33,34; Deut. 21:7-9; (6) 2 Sam. 21:2 with Exod. 34:11-16; Deut. 7:2; (7) 2 Sam. 21:3,4,6 with Num. 35:31,32; Num. 25:4. Add any other passages you have discovered in your study.
5. **Nathan's Prophecy and David's Prayer.*** 2 Sam. 7. (1) Examine the following characteristic peculiarities of the phraseology, and their effect on the interpretation of the chapter: (a) "Jehovah having given rest to him from round about, from all his enemies,"† verses 1, 11, compared with Deut. 12:10, and these with Deut. 25:19; 3:20; Josh. 1:13; 22:4; 21:44; 23:1; Heb. 4:8; (b) "who will come forth from thy bowels," verse 12, compared with Gen. 15:4, and these with 2 Sam. 16:11; Isa. 48:19; 2 Chron. 32:21; (c) "to thee for a people," "thou art to them for a God,"‡ verse 24, compared with Deut. 26:17,18; Lev. 26:45, and these with Gen. 17:7, and these with all later passages in the Old or New Testaments, where Israel or Christians are spoken of as God's people; (d) "And who are as thy people, as Israel, one nation in the earth?" etc., verse 23, compared for syntax and for contents with Deut. 4:7,8; (e) "I will be to him for a father, and he will be to me for a son," verse 14, compared with Exod. 4:22; Deut. 32:6, and these with Ps. 89:19-34, and with all later passages in which Israel or the Messiah are spoken of as the son of God. (2) What is "the law of mankind," "the upbringing law of mankind" (paraphrased in the versions), verse 19, 1 Chron. 17:17? (3) Which is made prominent here, the house that is to be built to Jehovah, or the house that Jehovah will make for David? verse 11 and those that follow. (4) Compare verses 14, 15 with Ps. 89:30-34, and these with Lev. 26:44,45, etc. How much stress is to be laid on the "forever" so often repeated in these accounts of Jehovah's covenant with David, with Abraham, and with Israel? (5) Formulate your conclusions as to the Messianic character of this chapter. (6) Indicate the relation of the prophecy to subsequent prophecies. (7) Show how disappointment as to its fulfillment in a lower sense led to a higher, brighter and more spiritual hope and anticipation.
6. **Absalom, Ahithophel, etc.** (1) Consider from material gathered from those portions of the narrative in which his actions and words are recorded,‡ the character of *Absalom*; in connection, particularly, (a) with the provocation of Amnon's unpunished offense and (b) the wavering and unwise policy of David in punishing his sin, as influencing and calling into play unfortunate and evil natural tendencies of his disposition. (2) *Ahithophel*; particularly his ambition, pride and the circumstances of his death, drawing the parallel between his treachery and suicide and those of Judas. (3) *Mephibosheth* and *Ziba*; are there reasons for supposing that Mephibosheth may have been false to David? (4) *Nathan*; considering (a) his courage, devotion, wisdom; (b) his relations with David, particularly on the three occasions of David's sin (2 Sam. 12), his proposing to build a house for the LORD (2 Sam. 7), and the proclamation of Solomon as king (1 Kgs. 1).

* See Briggs' "Messianic Prophecy," chap. 5, especially pp. 126-132; von Orelli's "O. T. Prophecy," pp. 150-152; Kirkpatrick's 2 Samuel, appendix, note 1, p. 233.

† Where the translation here given of these phrases differs from that in the versions, the difference is for the purpose of showing the technical form of the Hebrew.

‡ The student must exercise care and determination not to form his opinions regarding these and other Scripture characters from general knowledge, but should very thoughtfully study the Scripture text.

- 7. David's Character.** (1) Study the character of David as disclosed in his relations with his sons, particularly Absalom. (2) Show, in this connection, the peculiar evil which polygamy wrought in the family of David. (3) Contrast the family relations of Saul with those of David, especially the relations of Saul and Jonathan with those of David and Absalom. (4) Show how the character of David is revealed in the experiences of the rebellion of Absalom, (a) in connection with *Ittai* (2 Sam. 15:19-22); (b) *Zadok and Abiathar* (verses 24-29), (c) *Shimei* (2 Sam. 16:5-14; 19:16-23; 1 Kgs. 2:8,9), (d) *Barzillai* (2 Sam. 17:27-29; 19:31-40), etc. (5) Discover the inner workings of his mind at this period, how he regarded his experiences as related to his sin, and in this light consider his anguish over the death of Absalom.
- 8. Numbering of the People.** (1) The circumstances relating to the numbering of the people, the plague, and the location of the temple site, 2 Sam. 24; 1 Chron. 21; 22:1. (2) Compare the narrative of 2 Samuel with that of 1 Chronicles. (3) What was the nature of David's sin? Why did "David's heart smite him"? How was the sin that of the people as well as of David? (4) The narrative in its relation to the topography of Jerusalem.
- 9. David's Reign and Life.** (1) Compare in general the reign of David with the previous reign of Saul. (2) Show wherein the nation made permanent advancement, materially and morally. (3) Show the elements of weakness, danger and disintegration which existed in the national life at the close of David's reign. (4) Estimate the life of David in its larger relations to the world's history and to the history of the kingdom of God.

III. GEOGRAPHICAL.

1. Indicate on the map the route of the bringing up of the ark and the localities of the two centers of worship (1 Chron. 16:37,39).
2. Indicate the places connected with the career of Absalom.

IV. QUESTIONS FOR PRACTICAL WORK.

1. Show the difference between receiving forgiveness of sin and escaping its consequences. Emphasize, in the light of this distinction, the danger and terribleness of sin.
2. Notice the interpenetration of life, both individual and social. Emphasize, in this connection, the great responsibility for its consequences which sin brings with it.
3. In view of the wide-reaching influence of even a single life upon the progress of mankind and the divine plan for the world, point out the absolute necessity of reliance upon *divine grace* that *we fall not into sin*.

* See Kirkpatrick's 2 Samuel, appendix, note 5, *The Numbering of the People*.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

Isaac Salkinson's Hebrew translation of the New Testament has been reprinted at Vienna, in a second edition of 120,000 copies.

Cyrus Adler, who passed his Dr. phil. examination at Johns Hopkins last year, will act as Prof. Paul Haupt's assistant in the Semitic languages during the coming year.

In the Sept. number of the *Knox College Monthly*, Prof. J. F. McCurdy, of University College, has a very interesting and instructive article on "Neglect of Hebrew among Ministers and Students: I.—The Evil; its nature and extent."

Prof. C. C. Hersman has been appointed Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Interpretation in the Columbia Theological Seminary, South Carolina, which was re-opened on Monday, Sept. 19, with three professors and fourteen students.

Among 1326 University Professors in Germany 98 are Jews, and among 529 *Privat-docenten* there are 84 Jews. The Universities of Berlin and Breslau have the largest number of Jews. There are 29 among the 145 Professors and 45 among the 124 *Privat-docenten*.

During the past year Hebrew has been an elective study at Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., with Professor Blaisdel as instructor. Mr. John L. Richardson, of the class of '87 (Beloit), took the first prize in Hebrew of \$100 at the entrance examination of the Chicago Seminary last week.

Dr. Hitchcock, late president of Union Theological Seminary, New York, whose recent death has called out so many encomiums to his manifold worth, was perhaps better known by his "Complete Analysis of the Bible," published in 1869, than by any other of his many writings for the press.

Every student who is interested in the question of Pentateuch criticism should read Reginald Stuart Poole's article in *Contemporary Review* for September, on "The Date of the Pentateuch, Theory and Facts." It will prove to be one of the most telling discussions of the subject that has thus far been presented.

The October number of *Hebraica* will be a notable one. It will contain, among others, the following articles: Prof. A. H. Sayce on "Balaam's Prophecy (Num. 24:17-24) and the God Sheth;" Prof. Hartwig Derenbourg on "The Greek Words in the Book of Daniel;" Dr. Richard J. H. Gottheil on "An Arabic Version of the 'Revelation of Ezra;'" Dr. Robert F. Harper on "Cylinder C, and other Unpublished Inscriptions of Esarhaddon;" Dr. Morris Jastrow, Jr., on "Jewish Grammarians of the Middle Ages;" Amiaud's and L. Méchineau's "Tableau comparé des écritures Babyloniennne et Assyrienne archaïques et modernes," etc., and Delitzsch's "Assyrisches Woerterbuch" will appear in the list of Book Notices.

As a literary language Hebrew is holding no insignificant place in south-eastern Europe. The new Jewish-Christian movement in Bessarabia, led by Rabinowitz, issues its official documents in Hebrew. In that same language appear newspapers and periodicals of all descriptions, many with large circulations; as also good linguistic works, like Weiss's grammar of the Mishna. Into it have been translated Goethe's *Faust* and Milton's *Paradise Lost*, to say nothing of the New Testament left in manuscript by Salkinson and edited by Ginsburg. Nay, even Sue's *Secrets of Paris* and similar sensational works have arrayed themselves in Hebrew garb. Indeed, among the Jews of south-eastern Europe, an author can hope to secure a hearing only when he writes in Hebrew; so that missions made slow progress in that region before the issue of Delitzsch's classical Hebrew translation of the New Testament.

Professor Paul de Lagarde, of the University of Göttingen, whose real name is Böttcher (Cooper), but whose mother's French name is the one of his choice, in his personal relations is said to be an amiable gentleman, and in Semitic scholarship is rightly ranked among the best men that Germany has produced. His writings are numerous and excellent. But he is a bitter controversialist; and this controversialism is not the exuberance of youthful ardor, for he is sixty years of age; but it is the settled habit of a vigorous mind that has always been clamorous for proof. And so he antagonized Weber, the Berlin Sanskrit scholar, in page after page of the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*. He has taken a belligerent stand against the Halle revision of Luther's translation of the Bible, asserting that the revisers did not know how to use the German language. Lately he has directed his attacks against the Jews, and has declared that "the Jewish race has not produced a single man of eminence, excepting Spinoza." Not content to confine his conflicts to Germany, he has written a pamphlet in English in which he argues that the English parliament is wrong in refusing to adopt the wife's-sister marriage bill.

Two years since, several gentlemen, residing in Amherst, formed a club for the prosecution of Hebrew study. On looking over the field they decided to take up the Book of Ecclesiastes, to study it thoroughly, and to prepare a new translation of the book, with a suitable introduction, and critical and exegetical notes. They have held weekly meetings for the most part, and have bestowed upon the book much independent and original investigation. They have sought to reach the underlying facts, and to grasp the ideas as they lay in the mind of Koheleth, the author. The new translation, with its critical apparatus, will be given to the public in due time. The club, however, does not propose to rush into print prematurely. They will allow themselves sufficient opportunity for elaborating the work. They hope to issue a translation which, for conciseness, euphony, and fidelity to the original, will fall behind none as yet published. The club comprises Rev. J. F. Genung, Professor of Rhetoric, who studied Semitic languages under Professor Franz Delitzsch at Leipzig; Mr. L. H. Elwell, Instructor in Greek and Sanskrit, and Rev. J. W. Haley, author of "*Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*." Latterly, Rev. G. S. Burroughs, Professor of Biblical Interpretation, has joined the club.

→BOOK :NOTICES.←

INTRODUCTION TO HISTORY OF ISRAEL.*

This book is intended to present the *results* of modern "destructive" criticism. It accomplishes its purpose, and this perhaps is the best thing that can be said for it. To read and accept the views of this book is to give up all belief in the value of the Old Testament either as a book historically true, or a book containing religious teaching. It is interesting to note how willingly and thoroughly our author accepts even the most doubtful of the modern hypotheses. One could not suppose from the reading of this book that there was an individual in the entire world who had any sort of faith in the general accuracy of the Bible. Such arrogance, as a rule, accompanies radicalism. There are some radical writers who occasionally use the expressions "perhaps," "probably," "it would seem," etc. Mr. Oxford indulges in no such weaknesses.

THE STORY OF ANCIENT EGYPT.†

Egypt is not wanting in material for a most interesting story, and Professor Rawlinson has long since demonstrated his ability to weave such material into an attractive fabric. Throughout the book before us the fact is never lost sight of that it is the *story* of a nation which is to be told; so that the savant and explorer, indispensable as are his labors to the frame-work of satisfactory history, is not here allowed to disturb the narrative with his prosy accuracies. It is a question, however, whether even in the *story* of Egypt, the account should flow right on without any giving of whys and wherefores for certain assumptions. In some of the most important assumptions, should there not be foot-notes or appendices to account for what the text of the narrative takes for granted? For instance, there is the assumption that Joseph was the vizier of one of the Shepherd Kings. This is woven into the story as if it were a matter of course, although there is much to be said in favor of associating him with a native Pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty, perhaps Amenophis III., or some Pharaoh of the same dynasty but a little antedating this Amenophis. No hint, however, of any such possibility appears anywhere. But this is a small matter. In tone, the book is thoroughly evangelical (from such an author this is to be expected); and it is well adapted to the accomplishment of its purpose.

* A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT ISRAEL. By the Rev. A. W. Oxford, M. A., vicar of St. Luke's, Berwick Street, Soho. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 26 Paternoster Sq. 1887. 12mo, pp. 147. Price, \$1.

† THE STORY OF ANCIENT EGYPT (the Story of the Nations). By George Rawlinson, M. A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, etc., etc., with the collaboration of Arthur Gilman, M. A. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1887. 12mo, pp. xxi. 408. Price, \$1.50.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL OF HEBREW.

A page or more of each number of THE STUDENT will hereafter be devoted to the interests of the Correspondence School of Hebrew. This page will contain information which, while intended especially for the members of this school, will not be found uninteresting to the general reader of the journal.

The space thus employed will (1) furnish the Principal an opportunity of making important announcements to the school, (2) afford a medium for intercommunication between members, (3) make it possible to offer suggestions concerning work, hints about study, and indeed, to do much that will aid a work which has assumed so great proportions in so short a time.

A thing greatly to be desired, yet in correspondence work difficult to be attained, is a proper *esprit de corps*. If members had more of this feeling, there would be less lagging behind. One who is a member of a class numbering hundreds should never feel that he is working alone. What is the fact? Whatever hour of the day or night he may take up his Hebrew work, he does so knowing that at the same time others are engaged with him in the same work. His fellow-students may be in another state, or in another country; they may be in Canada, in China, in India, or in Australia. But whatever their location may be, they are doing the same work, studying the same books, writing out answers to the same questions. In a true sense, the Hebrew correspondence student *never works alone*.

What is the occupation of the members of our school? Are they all clergymen? By no means. One is a real estate agent; one, a compositor; one, a stationer; one, a commercial traveler; one, a drug-clerk; one, a book-keeper; two are editors; two, physicians; four are farmers; six are lawyers; ten are missionaries; thirty-five are students; fifty-eight are teachers; four hundred and fifty-five are ministers. Eleven are ladies. Seventeen have not reported occupation.

Where do they live? Alabama, 9; Arkansas, 1; California, 3; Colorado, 6; Connecticut, 13; Dakota, 4; Delaware, 1; Florida, 4; Georgia, 8; Idaho, 1; Illinois, 46; Indiana, 26; Iowa, 15; Kansas, 8; Kentucky, 13; Louisiana, 3; Maine, 3; Maryland, 3; Massachusetts, 27; Michigan, 18; Minnesota, 9; Mississippi, 4; Missouri, 16; Montana, 2; Nebraska, 14; New Hampshire, 7; New Jersey, 17; New York, 56; North Carolina, 11; Ohio, 56; Oregon, 1; Pennsylvania, 44; Rhode Island, 3; South Carolina, 7; Tennessee, 11; Texas, 15; Utah, 5; Vermont, 11; Virginia, 31; Washington Territory, 3; West Virginia, 6; Wisconsin, 7. In foreign lands: Australia, 1; Brazil,

3; England, 7; Hawaii, 1; India, 3; Ireland, 2; Mexico, 2; Scotland, 1; Syria, 1; Wales, 1; British Columbia, 1; Manitoba, 2; New Brunswick, 4; North-west Territory, 1; Nova Scotia, 9; Ontario, 11; Prince Edward Island, 1; Quebec, 3. In all, 42 states and territories, 8 Canadian provinces, and 10 other countries.

To what religious denominations do they belong? African M. E., 2; Associate Reformed Presbyterian, 5; Baptist, 103; Christian, 5; Church of Christ, 1; Church of England, 7; Congregational, 68; Cumberland Presbyterian, 6; Disciples of Christ, 2; Dutch Reformed, 4; Evangelical Association, 1; Evangelical Lutheran, 6; Free Methodist, 2; Free-will Baptist, 3; Friends, 1; German Methodist, 1; Lutheran, 11; Methodist Episcopal, 109; Methodist Episcopal, South, 9; Presbyterian, 120; Protestant Episcopal, 41; Reformed Church in America, 5; Reformed Church, German, 3; Reformed Episcopal, 1; Reformed Lutheran, 1; Reformed Presbyterian, 6; Seventh Day Adventist, 7; Seventh Day Baptist, 3; Southern Presbyterian, 20; Unitarian, 1; United Brethren, 2; United Presbyterian, 31; Wesleyan Methodist, 4; not reported, 17.

A new Correspondence circular containing fuller announcements of the work than have ever before been made will be issued early in October. This circular will contain some important matter touching the question of correspondence study in general. Copies will be distributed to members, to persons whose names may be sent in by members of the school, and to others who may apply. Send for a copy.

The First Advanced Course (see advertisement elsewhere in this number) promises to have a large number of students. Two members living in Ireland belong to it. It calls for work a good portion of which may be used in the practical work of sermonizing. Those who have begun this course are enthusiastic in reference to its excellence.

Will not the members of the school give special heed to the *printed letter* which has just been mailed? If it seems *severe*, and you feel that you do not deserve such words, please understand that it was meant for the man in Australia, or perhaps one of the men in India. If this letter, however, does contain anything which, *possibly*, may have been intended for you, please note it and act accordingly.

The new year is before us. It is the *ninth*. Shall it not be the best that we have yet had? It is for the members of the school to answer this question. With a reasonable amount of promptness and regularity, it will far surpass all preceding years.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- The Englishman's Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopaedia.* By Rev. Fassel. 4to. . . 10s. 6d.
Der Prophet Jesaja erlaeuert. Part III. By C. J. Bredekamp. Erlangen: Delchert. Part IV. M.3.50
Zur Geschichte der Juedischen Tradition. By J. H. Welss. M.6.
Tempel u. Palast Salomo's. By T. Friedrich. M.5.
History of Israel and Judah. By A. Edersheim. London: Bagster. 8s. 6d.
Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis. By G. J. Spurrell. 10s. 6d.
The Bible and Contemporary History. An epitome of a History of the World from the Creation till the End of the Old Testament. By W. H. Pinnock. London: Rceves & Turner, 2 vols. 18s
How we got our Bible. By J. Paterson Smyth. London: Bagster. 50c.
The Temple of Solomon. A Review of the various Theories respecting its Form and Style of Architecture. The Ethics of Art. Two lectures. London: Whittaker. 61 pp. with 6 plates. 3s. 6d.
Psalms LXVIII., eine Exegetisch-Kritische Studie. By T. Place and J. W. Point. Leyden: Brill. *Commentar zur Genesis.* By G. W. Gossrau. Halberstadt: Schimmelburg. 300 S. gr. 8. M.7.50

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- Le caractère historique de l'Exode II. III.* By M. de Broglie in *Annales de philos. Chrétienne*, June and July, '87.
The Limits of Legitimate Biblical Criticism. By Geo. H. Schodde in *S. S. Times*, September 24, '87.
The Neglect of Hebrew among Ministers and Students. By J. F. McCurdy in *Knox College Monthly*, September, '87.
The Moabite Stone. Ib.
The Writings of Ephraem of Edessa. By Hugh F. McElrone in *S. S. Times*, September 17, '87.
The Date of the Pentateuch. II. *Jewish World*, September 16, '87.
Chaldean, Babylonian and Egyptian Stone Records. By Geo. J. Stevenson in *Zion's Herald*, September 28, '87.
M. Clermont-Ganneau and the Rev. A. Loewy. *Jewish World* (London), August 26, '87.
The Prophet Amos. By A. B. Davidson, in *Expositor*, September, '87.
Der gegenwaertige Stand der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft. III. By H. Steiner in *Theol. Ztschr.* aus d. Schweiz, 3, '87.
Problems of Old Testament Discussion. By Geo. H. Schodde, in *Lutheran Quarterly Review*, July, '87.
The Book of Jubilees (Chap. xxxi.-xliv.). By Geo. H. Schodde, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1, '87.
The Book of Jubilees (chaps. xlv.-l.). By Geo. H. Schodde, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, '87.
De l'authenticité du Pentateuque. Réponse aux Objections de M. Wellhausen. By M. Vigoroux in *Le Contemporain* X. July, '87.
Neuere Fort-Studien. By J. C. Matthes in *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 4, '87.
L'Apocalypse Persane de Daniel. By J. Darmsteter in *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études. Sciences philol. et histor.* Fasc. lxxlii, '87.
The Higher Criticism and the Sunday School. In *the Critic*, August 27, '87.

- Les Explorations anglaises en Palestine.* By E. Jacquier in *Le Controverse et le Contemporain*, X. '87.
Notes from Jerusalem (with 2 plates). By C. Schick in *Palestine Exploration Fund*, July, '87.
Sayce's Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Babylonians. Academy, September 17, '87.
Sayce's Alte Denkmäler im Lichte neuer Forschungen. By Friedrich Delltzech in *Lit. Centralbl.*, September 17, '87.
Ueber Purim u. Purimfest. By P. de Lagarde in *Prot. Kirchengeltung*, No. 35.
Hades and Gehenna. By W. de Loss Love. Ib.
A Lost Empire Restored. By Angus Crawford in *Church Review*, August, '87.
Discussions on Genesis and Geology. By G. Frederick Wright in *Independent*, September 15, '87.
Vestiges of Job in the Hauran. September 22, '87.
The Traveler's Psalm. By Chas. Stanford in *Pulpit of To-day*, August, '87.
I. Modern Biblical Criticism—Its Spirit—Its Method. By C. H. Toy in *Unitarian Review*, September, '87.
Haifa and Carmel. By Laurence Oliphant in *Jerusalem Year-book*, '87.
Gilgal. By Baurath C. Schick, Ib.
Moab. Ib., Ib.
The Birds of Palestine. By Selah Merrill, Ib.
Recent Discoveries in Jerusalem. Ib., Ib.
The Boundaries of Palestine and Syria, with explanations of Biblical and Rabbinical References. By Rev. M. Friedman, Ib.
Explanation to Some Passages in the Bible and Rabbinical Writings. By M. Pines, Ib.
Canon Cheyne on the Book of Job. By Russell Martineau in *Christian Reformer*, July, '87.
The Revelation of God. By John Chadwick, Ib.
Rameses II. By F. Mabel Robinson in the *Magazine of Art*, August, '87.
The Interpretation of Genesis. First Chapter. By G. W. Samson in *Watchman*, July 21, '87.
The Invasions of Israel and Judah and Assyriology. By W. H. H. Marsh in *Examiner*, July 28, '87.
Professor Bickmore on the East. Ib.
"The Invasions of Israel and Judah and Assyriology," reconsidered. By Ira M. Price, Ib., August 18, '87.
A Bible Atmosphere. By J. E. Rankin in *S. S. Times*, July 30, '87.
The Rip Van Winkle of the Talmud. By A. S. Isaacs, Ib., August 20, '87.
The Creation of the World. By Charles S. Robinson in *Honilletic Review*, July, '87.
The Story of Man's Creation. Ib., Ib., Aug., '87.
Why we should Study the Human Side of the Bible. By W. W. Lovejoy in *Episcopal Recorder*, June 16, 30, '87.
The Astronomy of the Hebrews. By T. R. Strobbridge in *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, August 17, '87.
The Enchanted Prince. From an ancient Egyptian Papyrus. By George Ebers. Translated by Elizabeth Abercrombie. In *Independent*, July 28, '87.
The Assyrian Ideas of Death. By W. St. Chad Boscawen in *Pulpit Treasury*, July, '87.
The Pharaohs of the Oppression. By W. Taylor Smith in *Pulpit Treasury*, August, '87.
Letters of Travel. Isaac Errett in *Christian Standard*, July 30, '87.
Is Genesis Historical or Legendary. By Talbot W. Chambers in *New York Observer*, July 28, '87.
Jewish Sources of the Arthur Legend. *Jewish World*, July 1, '87.