THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

VOL. III. APRIL, 1884. NO. 8.

THE HEBREW POEM OF THE CREATION.

BY PROF. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D. D.,

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The first chapter of the Bible gives a representation of the creation of the world. This has been studied for ages by all classes and conditions of men. It has been justly admired for its simplicity, picturesqueness and sublimity of style. It is a master-piece of literature as well as of religious conception. In our century it has been the chief battle ground between science and religion. Theologians have sought in it the mysteries of the origin of the universe, and the order and time of the work of creation. Men of science have sought in it a reflection of the facts that have been discovered in the history of the rocks and the stars The strife of theologians and scientists has made this chapter—which is one of the most precious gems of biblical literature —a *crux interpretum*, that is a means of torture to the biblical scholar who is forced to reconcile the claims of dogma with the claims of science; and yet maintain his integrity as an interpreter of scripture.

So far as the questions between science and dogma are concerned, the candid scholar should admit that the contest is undecided. The interpreter of scripture who is neither a scientist nor a dogmatist ought to see in this first chapter of Genesis a magnificent piece of literature, the grandest representation of the most important of all events, the origin of the world and man, which these combatants are doing their best to tear in pieces and patch together in their dogmatic theories and their scientific conjectures. The chief error in the use that is ordinarily made of the first chapter of Genesis is a mistake as to the point of view and scope of the representation together with a neglect of its literary form. It has been generally held that the author designs to give us the doctrine of the creation of the universe

in a simple prose narrative, stating the creations as they occurred day after day in their orderly succession until the whole universe was completed with all its contents in six days. Science has determined the great outlines of the history of the heavens and the earth, in the study of the stars and the rocks and the forces of nature. The problem has been to compare these two representations and see how far there is agreement and how far there may be difference and disagreement.

But the author of the first chapter of Genesis does not propose to give us a history of the *creation of the universe out of nothing*. He represents in a few graphic touches the origination of the beautiful organism of our earth and heaven out of a primeval chaos. He does not propose to give us a narrative of the method of the origination of all things, but to describe the *appearance* of certain great classes of objects in their appointed place in this beautiful organism. He does not give us a prose history or a prose treatise of creation, but he presents us with a *poem of the creation*, a graphic and popular delineation of the genesis of the most excellent organism of our earth and heaven, with their contents; as each order steps forth in obedience to the command of the Almighty Chief; and takes its place in its appointed ranks *in the host of God*. Our Poem of the Creation rises above the strifes of theologians and men of science and appeals to the esthetic taste and imagination of the people of God in all lands and in all times.

The Poem of the Creation has all of the characteristic features of Hebrew poetry. (1) The *feature of parallelism* which Hebrew poetry shares with the Assyrian and ancient Akkadian, is characteristic of our poem in its varied forms of synonym, antithesis and synthesis. The first strophe is composed of a tetrastich and tristich. The tetrastich is a specimen of introverted parallelism, the tristich of progressive parallelism. The second strophe is composed of a synonymous tristich, followed by a minor refrain, then a progressive tetrastich. The third strophe has first a pair of distichs, then a pair of tristichs. The fourth strophe has two pentastichs. The fifth strophe has a tristich, a tetrastich and tristich. The sixth strophe is the most symmetrical of all, having a pair of distichs and a pair of tristichs making the first half; and a tetrastich and hexastich making the second half.*

(2) The measurement of lines by words or word accents is as even and regular in our poem as in the best specimens of Hebrew poetry. It has five poetic accents with the cæsura-like pause between the three and the two or the two and the three, which is

* *Biblical Study*, p. 265, sqq.

characteristic of all poems of this number of accents. We present the first strophe as a specimen :

*בראשית ברא אלהים ו את־השמים ואת־הארץ
והארץ היתה תוהו־ובהו ו וחשך על־פני תהום
ורוח אלהים מרחפת על־פני המים
ויאמר אלהים יהי־אור ו ויהי אור
וירא אלהים את־האור ו כי טוב
ויבדיל אלהים בין־האור ו ובין החשך
ויקרא אלהים לאור־יום ו ולחשך קרא־לילה
ויהי־ערב ויהי־בקר ו יום אחד

(3) It has a considerable number of archaic words such as we find elsewhere only in poetry. These are מרחפת, תהום, תהו ובהו (v. 2), יקוו (v. 9), מקוה (v. 10).

(4) It has strophical organization. It is composed of six strophes or stanzas which are indicated by the refrain, "*And evening came and morning came*," varying only in the *number* of the day. These strophes, while they do not have exactly the same number of lines, vary within definite limits, e. g., strophes I. and II. have seven lines each and the refrain ; strophes III., IV. and V. have ten lines each and a refrain. The last strophe, the VI., has twenty lines and a refrain—or in other words is a strophe with a *double refrain*—such as we find for example in the allegory of the vine in the LXXX. psalm.†

(5) There are certain catch-words or secondary refrains also characteristic of Hebrew poetry, especially in the Song of Songs and Hosea, e. g.: (1) *And God said,* which begins each item of Creation in its turn. (2) *And it became so.* (3) *And God saw that it was excellent.*

(6) Our Poem employs poetic license in the use of archaic endings, of suffixes and cases to soften the transition from word to word and make the movement more flowing. This is also to be noted in the order of the arrangement of the words in the lines. The archaic forms are the ending ו in היתו ארץ (v. 24) and the suffix הו in למינהו (vs. 12, 21). The poetic order of words is seen in v. 10.

> And God called the dry land earth
> And the gathering of the waters called he seas.

Here the words which begin the first line close the second line and

* See my *Biblical Study*, p. 282. †See *Biblical Study*, p. 277.

vice versa.* We should also mention the half lines which occasionally occur to change the movement, e. g., (v. 7).

> And God made the expanse

and especially in v. 27.

> And God created mankind in his image
> According to the image of God he created him
> Male and female he created them.

Here the movement becomes more deliberate by the balancing of the two against two instead of three against five.†

(7) The language and style are simple, graphic and ornate such as we find everywhere in poetry, but are regarded as unusual and especially rhetorical in prose.

(8) There is a simple and beautiful order of thought which harmonizes in the several strophes: God speaks, the creature comes forth in obedience, the Creator expresses his delight in his creature. The Creator then works with the creature and assigns its place and functions. The day's work closes with its evening; and the break of the morning prepares for another day's work. All this gives a monotonous character to the story if it be regarded as prose, but it is in exact correspondence with the characteristic parallelism of Hebrew Poetry, which extends not only to the lines of the strophe but also to the correspondence of strophe with strophe in the greater and grander harmonies of the poem as a whole. These eight characteristics of the first chapter of Genesis are all poetical characteristics, and we make bold to say that there is no piece of poetry in the Bible which can make greater claims than this to be regarded as *Poetry*.

We have another *Poem of the Creation* in the CIV. psalm. This is not a descriptive poem like ours, but a song of praise. The lines are shorter—three accents for the five of our poem. The strophes are still more irregular than ours. This Creation hymn is divided into eight strophes having in their order 9, 10, 8, 12, 10, 8, 9, 10 lines. These have no refrain. The order of creation is the same as in our poem. If we compare the created objects with ours, the first and second days are embraced in the first strophe of nine lines; the third day's work in three strophes, *thirty lines* in all; the fourth day's work in one strophe of ten lines, the fifth in one strophe of eight lines, the sixth in one strophe of nine lines. This is far more irregular and much less symmetrical than in our poem. The CIV. psalm is essentially a *hymn*. It is more *brilliant* but less *powerful* than the descriptive poem in the first chapter of Genesis. There is another *Poem of the Creation* pre-

* See *Biblical Study*, p. 266. † See *Biblical Study*, p. 267, sqq.

sented to us from the Assyrian carried down from the most ancient times. We propose to group these two poems, inspired and uninspired about the *descriptive poem of Genesis* I.

Our Poem opens with a representation of the condition of things when God began his six days' work. The earth was waste and empty —it was a great deep with darkness enveloping it—but over that chaos the Spirit of God, the divine energy, was hovering to bestow the generative and organic force which was to fill this waste and empty and dark deep with an organized host under the dominion of God. This was the condition of things when God uttered the first creative word and light sprang into being as the first of the host of God in this world of ours. We have no absolute creation here—no creation of the universe, no creation out of nothing. These ideas rest upon mistakes in Hebrew syntax and etymology. בָּרָא does not mean creation out of nothing, but creation by divine activity without regard to material. It is false syntax to make the first verse an independent clause and translate: *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.* It is rather the protasis of a temporal clause giving the time when God said, *let light come forth;* and the intervening clauses are circumstantial clauses giving the circumstances in which the earth was when God called the light into being. The first act of creation is, therefore, the production of *light.* God commands. His Spirit begets the light and it appears as the first great dominant force in our world.

I.

7 In the beginning when God created the heaven and the earth,
The earth being waste and empty and darkness upon the face of the deep
And the spirit of God hovering over the face of the waters,
God *said*, let light come forth and light came forth.
And God *saw* the light that it was excellent
And God *divided* between the light and the darkness
And God *called* the light day and the darkness he called night.

REFRAIN.—*And evening came and morning came—one day.*

We note here (1) the divine command, God said *let light come forth*, or appear; (2) the obedience of the light, *and light came forth;* (3) the divine admiration of it, *And God saw the light that it was excellent*, good in the esthetic sense; (4) the assignment of the place of light, *And God divided between the light and the darkness;* (5) the *naming* of the two, *And God called the light day and the darkness he called night.* This is *poetic* representation. Light is personified as the obedient servant of God. It is admired, named and assigned its place. There is no representation of the *method* of creation, or of the

force out of which light sprang or of the *time* that it took to produce it. The generative spirit is suggested as the agent in the production. Let science explain the origin of cosmic light as it will, or the origin of light in this world of ours and its functions in reducing the world to order, it cannot in any way contravene these few simple descriptive touches of our Poem of the Creation. The Poem represents the light as the first of the creations. Science agrees with this and there is no further room for discrepancy. The CIV. psalm is exceedingly brief here:

> "Jehovah my God thou art very great,
> With majesty and glory thou art clothed,
> Wrapped in light as thy mantle."

The poet here conceives of light as a mantle, or cloak with which the Creator wraps himself. The light is here parallel with the divine majesty and glory. The Assyrian poem reads here as follows (according to the translation of Lenormant, *Beginnings of History*, p. 491, sqq.):

> When above the heavens were not yet *named*,
> and, below, the earth was without a name,
> the limitless abyss (apsu) was their generator
> and the chaotic sea (Mummu Tiamat) she who produced the whole.
> Their waters flowed together in one,
> no flock of animals was as yet collected, no plant had sprung up.
> When none of the gods had as yet been produced,
> when they were not designated by a name, when no fate was as yet [fixed,
> the great gods were then formed
> Lulmu and Lahamu were produced [first
> and they grew in [solitude
> Asshur and Kîshar were produced [next
> Then] rolled on a long course of days [and
> Anu [Bel and Êa
> were born] of Asshur and of [Kîshar.

This poem represents the Creation as consuming a *long course of days* and that the several objects were named after they were produced. Here the Tiamat, or sea (corresponding with the great deep of our Poem) is represented as the mother of all creations, e. g., heaven, earth, plants, etc. The structure of the sentence is the same as that of our Poem. A protasis of a temporal clause with a long circumstantial clause before the apodosis of the creation itself. The chief difference between the two is that the circumstantial clause of the Babylonian poem contains a picture of what is coming in the subsequent stanzas of the poem.

Before passing from the first day of creation we have to consider the refrain. This has ordinarily been taken as if evening and morning represented the two halves of a day and therefore a complete day of twenty-four hours. Evening (ערב) represents always the close of the day-light, and morning (בקר) the break of the day-light. The representation therefore is that: "Evening came and morning came." The evening is the close of the day's work, the morning the break of day for new work. The night is not mentioned. It is passed over because it is not a time appropriate to the idea of work either to the Creator or to man. As the creation psalm represents it:

> "The young lions roar for prey,
> Seeking from God their food;
> When the sun riseth they retire,
> And into their dens they crouch:
> Man goeth forth to his work,
> And to his labor until evening."

It is the usage of Hebrew prose, and especially of poetry, that the evening is the time for the close of the day's labor and the morning the time for the beginning of another day's labor. That is the conception here. The refrain says, "And evening came"—the first day's work was done; and then "morning came"—another day had dawned for work; and finally in the climax, *one day* is mentioned as the period of the first work. We are left then to the term *day* itself to determine its length. But there is nothing in the word itself to decide. We are referred then to the context. But the context does not decide, for the element of time is not in the strophes—it is confined to the refrain. The refrain represents one day's work for God. The Hebrew poets elsewhere do not think of limiting the days and times of God.

The XC. psalm gives us a sublime representation:

> For a thousand years in thine eyes
> Are like yesterday when it is passing away;
> And a watch in the night.
> Thou washest them away. A sleep they become.
> In the morning they are like grass that passeth away.
> In the morning it glanceth forth and passeth away.
> In the evening it is cut down and withereth away.

Here human life is compared to a day and its evening, and indeed the day of the grass of the field; and it is contrasted with the time of God where a thousand years are but as fleeting yesterday. So in our Poem of the Creation the work of God has its morning and its evening, with the same figurative significance. There is no more propriety in limit-

ing the term in the one case than in the other. In the morning God begins his work. In the evening the divine work of the day is over.

II.

And God *said* let an expanse come in the midst of the waters,
To become a divider between waters and waters.
(And it became so and God *saw* that it was excellent.)
7 And God *made* the expanse;.....
And divided between the waters which were above the expanse
And the waters which were below the expanse.
And God *called* the expanse heaven.

REFRAIN.—*And evening came and morning came—a second day.*

The third line we have inserted in the Hebrew text for these reasons: (1) The Greek (LXX.) Old Testament, the most ancient version, has the phrase, *and it became so*, there, while the Massoretic Hebrew text has it at the end of the sixth line. (2) This phrase is associated with the divine admiration in the previous strophe and the following strophe. It seems inappropriate that it should not occur here. It is given in the LXX. before the refrain. It was probably omitted here by an ancient copyist's mistake. We do not hesitate to restore it in accordance with the LXX. and combine the two here. We have then two lines of divine command, one of the obedience of the creature and the divine admiration, three lines of the divine making and one of the divine naming, and our second strophe corresponds in its movement with the first, and is, indeed, its anti-strophe.

The second of the host of God is the *expanse* which springs forth and spreads itself as a divider between the waters of the earth and sky. It is assigned its function and named by the Creator heaven.

The CIV. psalm thus describes this work:

Stretcher out of heaven as a curtain,
He who erects in the waters his storied chambers,
He who sets the clouds as his chariot,
He who goeth on the wings of the wind,
Making the winds his messengers,
The flaming fire his servants.

The poet here connects with the expanse of heaven which he compares to a curtain spread out upon the earth, the clouds and storms with their winds and lightnings. The second strophe of the Assyrian poem has not yet been discovered.

III.

And God *said* let the waters assemble from under the heaven,
Into one place that the dry land may appear; *and it became so.*

And God *called* the dry land earth,
And the assembly of waters called he seas.

And God *said* let the earth cause grass to sprout,
The herb scattering seed, the fruit-tree yielding fruit,
Whose seed is in it on the earth; *and it became so.*

And the earth brought forth green grass, herb scattering seed after its kind.
And tree yielding fruit whose seed is in itself after its kind.

And God saw that it was excellent.

REFRAIN.—*And evening came and morning came—a third day.*

The third strophe is ten lines in length and is composed of two parts—the first represented by four lines, the second by six. Both the Massoretic and LXX. texts give the words of divine admiration at the end of v. 10, making two acts of divine admiration with reference to two distinct works. We think this is an ancient insertion, based on the theory of two distinct works, a theory which we deem a false one. We would, therefore, blot out those words from v. 10. In v. 11, we would blot out לְמִינוֹ as a later addition. The poem uses elsewhere the archaic לְמִינֵהוּ. The first part presents the divine command to the waters to assemble; and the naming of the dry land and the seas. The second part gives the divine command to the earth to bring forth the various classes of vegetation; the obedience of the earth and the divine admiration of it when it appears covered with its vegetation. The third great line of the host of God is the earth and its vegetation. The vegetation is subordinate to the producing of the dry land which is personified and brings forth in obedience to the divine command. So previous to this the waters are personified and assemble themselves into one place in obedience to the Creator's word. The seas are constituted by the assembly of the waters. The dry land is left bare by the returning waters. The dry land sprouts forth with vegetation. There is no scientific classification of rocks or soils or vegetation here, but merely a popular representation of the three most striking forms of vegetable life, e. g., grasses, herbs and trees. It is not said that they all sprang up like magic; as the dragon teeth in the Grecian story of Medusa sprang up armed men. God commands and the earth obeys and becomes productive. It begins to produce through the organized life that was imparted to it by the hovering spirit. It goes on in obedience to the commands of God ever after. It obeys him in producing

to-day. The author of our poem does not represent that all kinds of vegetation were produced in a moment, but that the vegetable world began with the emerging of the dry land from the waters. Science confirms this and is at liberty to arrange and classify the rocks, soils and vegetation as it will, without marring the beautiful picture of our poem.

The CIV. psalm is very full and beautiful here :

"He founded the earth on its bases;
It cannot be moved forever and ever,
With the deep as a garment thou didst cover it.
Above the mountains the waters were standing;
At thy rebuke they fled,
At the sound of thy thunder they hasted away.
The mountains rise, the valleys sink,
Unto the place thou hast founded for them;
A bound thou didst set which they cannot pass;
They cannot return to cover the earth.

Thou who sendest out springs into the valleys,
Between the mountains they flow,
They give all the animals of the field drink;
The wild asses quench their thirst;
Above them the birds of heaven dwell;
From the branches they give forth song.
Watering the mountains from his chambers,
With the fruit of thy works the earth is satisfied.

Causing the grass to grow for thy cattle,
And herbage for the service of man,
To bring forth bread from the earth;
And with wine he rejoiceth the heart of frail man,
Making his face to shine with oil,
And with bread the heart of frail man he sustaineth.
The trees of Jehovah are satisfied,
The cedars of Lebanon which thou didst plant;
Where the birds build their nests,
The stork her nest in the cypresses;
The high mountains are for wild goats,
The rocks the refuge for conies.

We observe that the Psalmist connects the animal and vegetable worlds both of them with the separation of waters and dry land. In the first strophe he gives a graphic and picturesque representation of the separation. In the second strophe he represents the animals satisfying their thirst with the waters. In the third strophe the vegetation is represented as growing forth from the earth and providing food and shelter for animals and birds and man, and the earth itself with

its mountains and caves affords places of refuge for the animals. As the Psalmist subordinates the animal and the vegetable to the conception of the dry land and the waters, so the first chapter of Genesis subordinates the vegetable world to the dry land and conceives of this day's work, not as the creation of the dry land as bare rock or soil, but as robed with vegetation.

The Assyrian stanza for this part of creation is very fragmentary, but enough is preserved to show the production of the dry land. But here the dry land is conceived as the abode of man and the place of cities and temples. From the analogy of these other poems we conclude that this strophe of the Poem of the Creation does not describe two works, but one work with two parts.

IV.

And God *said* let luminaries appear in the expanse of the heaven
To divide between the day and between the night,
And be for signs and for seasons and for days and years,
And be for luminaries in the expanse of heaven to shine upon the earth.
And it became so and God saw that it was excellent.

And God made the two great luminaries;
The greater light for dominion over the day,
The lesser light for dominion over the night;
And God put them in the expanse of heaven to shine upon the earth,
And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide between the light and the darkness.

REFRAIN.—*And evening came and morning came—a fourth day.*

The fourth line of the host of God is assumed by the luminaries of the earth, especially the sun and the moon. It is doubtful whether the stars (v. 16) were in the original poem. We have transposed the order of divine admiration from v. 18 to follow "and it became so" of v. 15 in accordance with the general usage of our poem that this should be connected with the creative word and not with the creative acts. The LXX. and Massoretic texts both agree in this ancient transposition. These heavenly lamps are not considered as moving in their orbits in the vast regions of the sidereal spaces, but only as the luminaries of our earth. The author does not transcend the scope of representing them as appearing in their places as luminaries in the expanse of our heaven to fulfil the functions assigned them—to serve for signs and seasons and days and years, in other words, to determine the order of times for our earth. Their absolute creation is not contemplated, but only their production as luminaries. Nothing is said of them or conceived of them beyond these their functions for our earth. The author has nothing to do with their origin as members of the sidereal

system, with their organization in accordance with the nebular hypothesis in the distant oceans of time. All that he tells us is, when they became the luminaries of our earth. Science does not in this regard teach any different from our poem. The separation of the dry land from the waters; the unclothing of the earth from its garment the deep, was necessary ere the sun and moon could be luminaries for the earth. And with the appearance of the dry land the vegetable world appears also. This strophe is like the previous one composed of ten lines, and is indeed its anti-strophe. It is composed of two parts of five lines each—the first five give the divine command with the obedience of the luminaries; the second five give the divine making and assigning them their place and offices.

The CIV. psalm gives this day's work:

He made the moon for seasons,
The sun knows his setting.
Thou makest darkness that it may be night,
Wherein all the animals of the forest creep,
The young lions roar for prey
Seeking from God their food;
When the sun riseth they retire,
And unto their dens crouch;
Man goeth forth to his work,
And to his labor until evening.

The fourth day's work is quite fully given in the Assyrian poem:

Excellently he made the mansions [twelve] in number for the great gods.
He assigned to them stars and he established fixedly the stars of the Great Bear.
He fixed the time of the year and determined its limits.
For each of the twelve months he fixed three stars,
from the day when the year begins until its end.
He determined the mansions of the planets to define their orbits by a fixed time,
so that none of them may fall short, and none be turned aside.
He fixed the abode of Bel and Êa near his own.
He opened also perfectly the great gates (of heaven),
making their bolts solid to right and to left;
and in his majesty he made himself steps there.
He made Nannar (the moon) to shine, he joined it to the night.
and he fixed for it the seasons of its nocturnal phases which determine the days.
For the entire month without interruption he settled what should be the form of its disk.
"In the beginning of the month, when evening begins,
thy horns will serve for a sign to determine the times of the heavens.
The seventh day thou wilt be in the act of filling out thy disk,
but the * * * * * * will [partly] expose its dark side.

When the sun descends toward the horizon at the moment of thy rising,
the limits exactly defined [of thy fulness] form its circle
[Afterwards] turn, draw near the path of the sun,
.....turn, and let the sun change
[The side where may be seen] thy dark part
.....walls in its path
[Rise] and set, subject to the law of its destiny.

The stars are mentioned first in this poem, the moon second and the sun last; the reverse of the biblical order. The luminaries have the same offices as in the Hebrew poem to rule the day and night, give light and regulate the times and seasons. But the Babylonian poem is more detailed in its representation and adds to the idea of luminaries, the conception that they were the *abodes of the gods*.

V.

And God *said*, Let the waters teem with teeming creatures,
And let birds fly above the earth upon the face of the expanse of heaven.

And it became so and God saw that it was excellent.

And God *created* the great monsters,
And all the living breathing creeping things,
Those with which the waters teem after their kind,
And every winged bird after its kind.

And God *blessed* them, saying, be fruitful,
And multiply and fill the waters in the seas,
And let the birds multiply in the earth.

REFRAIN.—*And morning came and evening came—a fifth day.*

The fifth line of the host of God comes forth in the inhabitants of the water and the air. We make the third line by transferring the divine admiration from v. 21 to v. 20 and inserting "and it became so" before it. The LXX. agrees with the Massoretic text in having the divine admiration in v. 21; but it differs from it by giving "and it became so" in v. 20. We prefer to regard נפש חיה of the first line as a later addition. There is no classification of creatures here, but simply the popular conception of sea monsters, the teeming life of the waters and the birds. We have no account of the method of their origination. God speaks and the waters are seen teeming with animal life, and in the face of the expanse the birds are seen flying. It is not said that all the inhabitants of the air and sea were then created once for all. It is not stated that there was no animal life in the waters and in the air before. It is not said whether there were subsequent creations or not. The representation is simple, graphic and natural.

We observe that these creatures are *blessed* and not *named* as were the previous lines of the host of God. They were also commanded to be *fertile* and multiply in the earth. The CIV. psalm is briefer here:

> How many are thy works! Jehovah
> All of them in wisdom thou didst make!
> The earth is full of thy riches!
> Yon sea great and broad on every side;
> There are creeping things innumerable,
> Animals, small together with great;
> There the ships sail;
> Leviathan which thou hast formed to sport therein.

In thinking of the inhabitants of the sea the Psalmist brings in the ships.

The corresponding Assyrian and Babylonian strophe has not been found.

VI.

2 — And God *said*, Let the earth bring forth the living breathing thing after its kind.
Cattle and creeping thing, animal of the earth after its kind. *And it became so.*

4 — 2 — And God *made* the animal of the earth after its kind
And the cattle after its kind and all creeping things of the ground after their kind.

10 — 3 — And God *said*, Let us make man in our image and according to our figure,
That they may have dominion over the fish of the sea and the birds of heaven and the cattle,
And over all the earth and over all that creep upon the earth.

6 — 3 — And God *created* mankind in his image,
In the image of God he created him,
Male and female he created them.

4 — And God blessed them and said to them
Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it;
And have dominion over the fish of the sea and the bird of the heaven,
And over all the animals which creep upon the earth.

10 — 6 — And God said, Lo! I give you all herbage,
The seed scatterer which is on the face of the earth,
And all the trees in which is the fruit of the tree scattering seed.
For you shall it become food and for all the animals of the earth,
And for all the birds of the heaven and for everything creeping upon the earth;
In whatever there is breath of life—all the greenness of herbage have I given for food.

REFRAIN.—3
And it became so and God saw all that he had made and it was very excellent.
And it became evening and it became morning—the sixth day.
And the heaven and the earth and all their host were completed.

This is a double strophe of twenty lines, with the concluding refrain in three lines. It is broken up into two parts each of ten lines. The first ten lines embrace two lines of command to the earth to produce the land animals, with the obedience of the earth. This is followed by two lines of the making of the animals. These are simply indicated as the wild animals, the domestic cattle and the creeping things—no exhaustive classification, but a primitive and natural popular discrimination. These four lines assigned to the creation of the land animals are followed by six lines in the creation of man. These are in two parts: three lines of divine consultation which takes the place of the word of command of the previous creations; then the divine creation itself in three lines. These three lines are changed to three toned lines, making the movement more rapid. Man is created as a race—male and female, in the image of God.

The second half of the strophe is taken up with the divine blessing in four lines, and the divine promise for the support of animals and man in six lines. Man is blessed with fertility and dominion over all the creatures of the earth; and the seed scattering vegetable and tree are given to animal and man for food. The refrain is enlarged by an initial line of the divine admiration of the whole creation as very excellent, and a closing line representing the completion of the heaven and the earth as a host of God.

Psalm CIV. is brief here:

"All of them wait for thee,
To give them their food in its season;
Thou givest them, they gather it;
Thou openest thy hand and they are satisfied with good things;
Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled;
Thou withdrawest their spirit—they expire
And unto their dust they return;
Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created
And thou renewest the face of the ground."

The Psalmist does not allude to the creation of animals or man, except indirectly—as from the *dust* of the ground and from the spirit of God—but he lays stress upon the divine provision for their support and their absolute dependence upon his bounty.

The Assyrian poem is here fragmentary and unsatisfactory. It gives the same classes of animals as the biblical poem, wild animals, cattle and creeping things, and apparently also the human pair.

It is worthy of notice that the Babylonian poem and the Psalm of the Creation contain no strophe for the Sabbath. We are constrained to think that this was the case with our poem of the creation likewise, for the vs. 2–3 of chap. II. referring to the Sabbath with the title of the whole are prose narrative. This section reads thus: "And God completed on the seventh day his work which he made. And rested on the seventh day from all his work which he made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because on it he rested from all his *work* which God created by making. These are the generations of the heaven and the earth when they were created."

There is a different conception here. The creation is not by saying (אמר) but by making (עשה). The creation is not a host of God (צבא) obeying his command to come forth, but a work מלאכה which he makes as a workman. He completes this work and rests from it as a workman. The מלאכה is thrice repeated in this brief statement. The Elohistic narrator has used the more ancient poem of the creation. He has edited it and modified it here and there as is the custom with all the narratives when they use poetical extracts or ancient pieces of poetry. He has appended to it the doctrine of the Sabbath, in accordance with the fourth commandment.

Thus our inspired poet represents the creation of our world. The poem throughout is simple, graphic, beautiful, grand, sublime. The one God, the creator, is represented as saying his creative word to the obedient creature. The one God is represented as admiring the beauty and excellence of his creatures. The one God is represented as working upon them and assigning them place and functions, giving them their names and endowing them with his blessing. The creatures march forth at the word of command line after line, beginning with the light and closing with mankind. There is an order of rank in which there is a rising higher and higher until man in the image of God appears the appointed sovereign of Nature. This poem is pure from the mythological elements of the traditions of the nations. It is free from the conceits and fancies of the ages which knew nothing of modern science. It rises up in its majestic grandeur above all the conflicts of human opinion. Nothing has been able to disturb the stately order of its strophes of creation. Nothing can mar the wondrous harmony of its representations. It is a series of six panoramic sketches, so simple, so true, in such grand and comprehensive outlines, with such bold and vigorous coloring, that none but an inspired poet could frame it in his imagination and fancy and then represent it in the forms of human utterance and composition.

DID THE PROPHET EZEKIEL WRITE OR EDIT OR REMODEL ANY PORTION OF THE PENTATEUCH?

BY REV. R. P. STEBBINS, D. D.,

Newton Centre, Mass.

Some modern critics have asserted with unqualified assurance that Ezekiel was the author of much of the priestly code in the Pentateuch, and that Lev. XVIII.-XXVI. was most certainly from his pen.

Such strong affirmations should be accompanied and sustained by unquestionable evidence. They are not. No proof which would be accepted as valid in any historical inquiry is adduced in support of these confident affirmations. The rules of historical criticism are entirely disregarded, and this most unsupported hypothesis accepted in their stead.

It need hardly be said that there is not a syllable of historical evidence which affirms or implies that Ezekiel had anything whatever to do either with composing, or editing, or re-arranging the contents of the Pentateuch or any part thereof. It is pure hypothesis as far as any historical evidence is concerned. His name is mentioned but once in the apocryphal writings, and he is spoken of only as the "one who saw the glorious vision, which was showed him upon the chariot of cherubim." Not a word is said of him as a law-giver or editor of the Law of Moses. If it had been supposed that Ezekiel was the editor of this law, much more the author of any portion of it, would his name not have been written among the writers named in the book of Esdras 200 A. D., and would not his great work as law-giver have been spoken of in Ecclesiastes as well as his less important work as seer of visions? At any rate, there is not a scrap of historical evidence that Ezekiel had any hand either in the composition or editing of the Pentateuch. More than this. This prophecy and its author appears not to have been held in very high esteem by the Jewish nation, which seems incredible if they believed him to have been the author or reviser of their wonderful ritual. Indeed, Ezekiel is not once named nor is his prophecy quoted in the New Testament. The great Rabbis, subsequent to the return, appear to have distrusted the book for some reason, either for the obscurity of its style or the distastefulness of some of its symbols, and it was forbidden to be read by those under thirty years of age, which would seem incredible if its author had been thought to be the author or restorer of their wonderful ritual. It cannot be that so great a name should have perished from the lips and pens of succeeding generations.

Nor is there any evidence to this effect in the literature or style of

the Pentateuch and that of Ezekiel, but most decidedly the contrary. The archaisms which separate the Pentateuch from all the other books of the Old Testament and especially those of the time of the captivity are not found in Ezekiel. His style is of the age of the captivity, and he could not have written any portion of the Pentateuch unless he had had more than the skill of a Chatterton to imitate old writings, and had deliberately committed forgery. Such a charge should not be made without the most overwhelming evidence.

These two facts ought to set the question of Ezekiel's relation to the authorship of the Pentateuch, or any portion of it, at rest forever. The absence of every shred of historical evidence, and the decisive testimony of his style should be accepted as final, and they would be in the case of any classical author.

An appeal is, however, sometimes taken to the brief fragments of law contained in his vision at the close of his prophecy, chaps. XL.–XLVIII. It is obvious, however, upon the most cursory reading that these civil and ritual directions were given as merely a portion of the *ideal* polity of the remnant of the people who would return to the land of their fathers after the captivity. The division of the land, the situation and construction of the temple, the location and form of the city, the land of the Prince and the inheritance of the priests and Levites are most certainly purely ideal. No such temple was ever built or undertaken to be built; no such location was ever chosen for the city or proposed on the return of the captives from Babylon; no such division was ever made of the land among the returning tribes; no such land was set apart for a Prince, nor was any such disposition made of the priests and Levites. In the account given of those who returned under Zerubbabel and Ezra there is not the remotest reference to this ideal temple and division of the land, which could not have been so entirely overlooked and disregarded had any one supposed this visionary system of Ezekiel was to be made a reality. Indeed, it would have been impossible to construct such a temple as he describes.

It may be said, however, in the face of all this, that the laws and ordinances that Ezekiel incorporated into the ideal description of the new temple and division of the land were a new legislation and were intended to be adopted and enforced. It may not be wholly a work of supererogation therefore to examine the rites and ceremonies which he directs to be, or says will be observed, in the new ideal temple, for the temple is certainly ideal whether the ritual to be observed in it is ideal or not.

It is necessary to observe in the start that the command to build the temple and the city and divide the land are just as explicit and em-

phatic as the command to prepare such and such vessels for service, and such and such garments for the priests, and offer such and such sacrifices on the altar, with such and such ceremonies on the prescribed days. It cannot, therefore, be legitimately inferred that the ritual of his vision was intended by Ezekiel to be literally observed because specific directions are given for its observance, since the same specific directions are given respecting the building of the temple which never was observed in the building, nor indeed could have been. The same is true of the location and form of the city, and of the division of the land among the princes, priests, Levites and tribes. The people when they returned never paid the slightest attention to these directions, commands of Ezekiel, nor did they, as far as we have any historical evidence, have the slightest regard to his fragmentary ritual contained in this vision. If any ceremonies here named were observed by them it was not because they found them described in this vision, but because they were identical with those found in "the Law of Moses," to which they appealed without a single exception when they adopted and scrupulously observed them. They never attributed their authorship to Ezekiel but to Moses, and surely they lived near enough to the time of Ezekiel to distinguish the work of Ezekiel from the work of Moses. The mere fact, therefore, that Ezekiel in the ritual of his vision *commands* its observance, is no proof that it was observed, or that he intended it should be observed, but it is only in conformity with the rest of the vision that the glorious picture of the temple, city, people might be illustrated before the eyes of the captives longing for the day of deliverance. The whole is a vision, purely ideal, declared to be such from beginning to end, and to select the ritual part of it as a real enactment to be literally observed is a gross transgression of every accepted law of sound interpretation. The dry bones of the prophets vision of "the valley of dry bones" were as much the bones in the bodies of the returning captives as the temple, the ritual, the land-division, of this last vision were the real temple they were to erect, the real ritual they were to observe, the real land-division they were to make. Both are merely visions to illustrate a great truth, the return from captivity and the restoration of their temple, their city and their worship. As there was no real stream which issued from the temple as described in chap. XLVII., 1–12, so there was no such real ritual observed as described chiefly in chaps. XLV., XLVI. Here I might stop, but for further illustration of the baselessness not to say absurdity of this hypothesis, I will examine a few of these ritual observances in connection with the rest of the vision. Chapters XL.–XLVII., contain the measures of the temple and its various parts and altars. Only

two verses XLII., 13, 14, have any reference to the ritual, and these describe the rooms where the sacrifices shall be laid and the garments of the priests kept, and the priests eat "the most holy things." But what these "most holy things" are, Ezekiel never tells the priests; they are described in the Law, Lev. II., 3, 10, VI., 17, X., 12, and a knowledge of them is assumed on the part of the prophet to be in possession of his readers.

In XLIII., 1–12, Jehovah is seen to enter the temple which was filled with "the glory of the God of Israel." The prophet is directed to show "this house" as described to the house of Israel, that "they may measure the pattern" to build one like it. In chap. XLIII., 13–17, the altar of burnt-offering is described, and in vs. 18–27 the service of its dedication is given as to continue through seven days. There is no such service described in the history as having been rendered on the erection of the altar in the new temple, nor is the ritual as here given original with Ezekiel, but is made up of different ceremonies performed on different occasions and for different purposes as required by the "law of Moses," such as putting the blood of a young bullock on the four horns of the altar, and on its corners. Also the offering of a he goat and a ram, and casting salt upon them, and continuing this for seven days—all these items go to make up a pretty ceremony ideally, but there is not a shadow of evidence that this was done by the builders of the second temple. All the items are culled from the old Mosaic Ritual. Nothing is original with Ezekiel but this grouping for this dedication of the altar, Lev. VIII.; Ex. XXIX. In v. 21, there is most obviously a reference to an existing law, "and thou shalt take the bullock of the sin-offering, and it shall be burned in the *appointed place* of the house without the sanctuary." What place this was is not defined, but some place had been used for this purpose very clearly in the old temple.

In chap. XLIV. are clustered divers directions for the priests and the prince. No strangers are to enter the sanctuary, and the priests must wear linen garments; they must not shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long, but to shear them. They shall not drink wine when they enter the inner court, they must marry prudently, and avoid all unclean things, and their food shall be of the offerings. Every item of ritual here named is to be found scattered about in Ex., Lev., Num., and Deut. Lev. XVI., 71, XXI., 6, XXII., 9; Num. XVI., 9, XVIII., 3, 4; Deut. X., 8; Lev. III., 16, XVII., 5, 6; Ex. XXVIII., 39; Lev. VI., 27, XXI., 5, X., 9, XXI., 1; Num. VI., 10, XIX., 11; Lev. IV., 3; Num. XVIII., 20; Deut. XVIII., 12; Lev. VI., 18, 29, VII., 6; Num. XVIII., 14; Ex. XXII., 29, 30; Num. XV., 20, X., 37; Lev. XXII., 8.

Ezekiel, the poet prophet, has arranged them according to his taste and purpose.

In chap. XLV., 1–8, the portions of land for the temple, the city, the priests and the Levites and princes are described—and in XLVII., 13—XLVIII., the further division of the land among the tribes is described. About fifty miles square, near the centre of the land, was set off for the Levites, priests, and city operatives, and both on the east and west side of this division was a large portion for the princes. The city was in the southern portion of this division and not in any tribe, and was about *ten miles square*. The temple was in the middle portion of this division and was *a mile square*. Then north of the division in which was the temple was the land of the Levites. Then north and south of this great portion, fifty miles square, were the portions of all the tribes in lots of equal width, extending across the whole country from east to west, five tribes on the south side and seven on the north. It needs no words to show that all this was visionary. Chap. XLV., 9–12, describes the measures and weights to be used; vs. 13–20, certain offerings are described like those in Leviticus. Lev. I., 4; Ex. XXX., 14, 15; Lev. XVI., 16, IV., 27; and in vs. 21–25, the Passover offerings are described and those of the Feast of the Tabernacles in brief, but they are picked out of Lev. and Ex., Num. and Deut. Ex. XII., 18; Lev. XXIII., 5, 6; Num. IX., 2, 3; Deut. XVI., 1, 2; Lev. IV., 14; Num. XXVIII., 15, &c., XXIX., 12; Deut. XVI., 13. Chap. XLVI., 1–18 is almost exclusively devoted to the offerings of the princes; vs. 11–15 only referring apparently to the people generally. As in other cases the ritual is selected from various places in the law of Moses in Ex., Lev., Num. and Deut. V. 4 directs the princes to offer "*six* lambs without blemish and a ram without blemish" on the Sabbath day. Numbers XXVII., says *two* lambs and says nothing of a ram, thus distinguishing the princes from the people, and the "flour-offering" in v. 5 is defined in Num., *idem*. In v. 6 a "*young* bullock and *six* lambs and a ram" are commanded to be offered, but in Num. XXVIII., 11, "*two* young bullocks, one ram and *seven* lambs are to be offered." The directions, v. 9, at which gate to enter and by which to leave the temple-service are not, of course, given in the Mosaic law. V. 12 refers to a voluntary offering by the prince. See Lev. VII., 16, where voluntary offerings are spoken of. Vs. 13–15 the daily burnt-offering of a lamb of the first year, and a flour-offering of a sixth part of an ephah, and the third part of a hin of oil are commanded for a morning sacrifice, and nothing is said of the evening, but in Num. XXVIII., 3, *sqq.*, *two* lambs are spoken of, one for the *morning* and the other for the *evening* sacrifice, and a *tenth* part of an ephah of flour instead of a *sixth*, and a *fourth*

part of a hin of oil instead of a *third*. It is simply incredible that Ezekiel, if he prefaced or even edited the Torah would have made these discrepancies if he had intended his vision-ritual as law. Vs. 16–18 treat of the inheritance of the prince and its descent to his sons, and contains nothing ritualistic. Vs. 19–24 describe the rooms where the offerings are to be boiled and baked, their size and arrangement.

Chap. XLVII., 1–12, describes the waters which issued from the threshold of the house eastward, and their healing properties. There is nothing ritualistic here, nor was there ever such a stream as is here described. It is purely imaginary, like all the rest of the vision. Vs. 13–23 contain a description of the borders of the land, its division by lot, and the rights of strangers. No such boundaries of the land are given elsewhere, and it is as certain as history that no such borders were in existence after the return from captivity—illustrating still again the purely ideal and non-legislative character of this portion of Ezekiel.

Chap. XLVIII. contains the specific division of the land included in these borders, among the tribes, the prince, the Levites, the priests, and the sections reserved for the temple and the city, as stated before, p. 290. The gates are described also, three on each side of the four square city, and named after the tribes. I will not insult the good sense of the reader by saying that no such gates were ever built or named. The gates and names are very appropriate to the purpose of the vision, but are purely of the vision, and were never a reality.

It goes without saying that these scraps of ritual observances are not the origin of the priestly ritual contained in Leviticus and other portions of the Pentateuch. There is just as much and no more of ritual as was necessary to round out and give symmetry to the description of the gorgeous temple which the prophet had described. He omits all the minutiæ of the manner of killing and offering the various sacrifices ; says nothing about many ceremonies prescribed in the so-called Mosaic ritual ; omits all mention of incense, shew-bread and golden candlestick. The ark of the covenant is not mentioned, nor the mercy-seat, nor the overshadowing cherubim. The prophet evidently attended as little as possible to the *particulars* of the old ritual, and refers to them and speaks of them not in the terms which are used of them in the old ritual. In a word, his temple is ideal, its service, so far as he refers to it, is ideal, the division of the land and the location of the tribes are ideal and only ideal. There is not a shadow of evidence to be derived from this vision that its author had anything whatever to do with the composition or revising of the priestly ritual. The contrary appears in the special topics treated, and in the purely

ideal character of the whole composition. That such a work would give courage to the desponding captives and revive their hope of again rebuilding the walls of their holy city and the altars of their destroyed temple is evident. For this end was this prophecy written. For this purpose was this vision proclaimed. While it furnishes no proof that the prophet was the author of the priestly ritual, it does reveal him as an ardent patriot, a profound lover of his nation, cherishing a conviction as firm as rooted Lebanon, and as satisfying as fragrant Carmel, that God would deliver his people and build again the ruins of their cities, and plant again their devastated vineyards and there be no one hurt or destroyed in all the land; and it would, also, both solace the heart of the sorrowing captive, and set his soul all aflame with a desire to recover the sacred soil of the fathers and make such sacrifices as were necessary to gratify it. A sufficient reason is, therefore, found for the composition of this prophecy, and especially for the record of this vision, or this truth under the symbol of a vision, without looking at these fragments of a ritual as the foundation of the priestly code, or evidence that their author or collector was the composer of that code. It is high time that criticism took its stand upon the rock of fact and sound inferences.

STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

By Rev. Justin A. Smith, D. D.,

Editor of the *Standard*, Chicago.

I.

Introductory—Pre-historic Literatures, and the Origin of Religion.

It is proposed, in a few monthly papers, to study in their relations to each other and in some of their practical aspects the two allied subjects, Archæology and Comparative Religion. Two preliminary topics require attention, as introductory: those Pre-historic Literatures now receiving so much attention from scholars, in which at once so much of archæological interest appears and in which so much is found of great value in the history of religion; and certain questions of a fundamental nature relating to the Origin of Religion itself.

Literature as Pre-Historic.

Of course, the word "literature" is used in a somewhat special sense in application to what may be termed the intellectual product of pre-historic times. Strictly speaking, and using the word as we now commonly use it, there began to be a literature only when there began to be books, and that which we now mean by a book belongs to the historic period. There is, however, another sense in which the word may be carried back to a very early date; in the sense, that is to

say, of an effort to record events in either history or legend, to express thought, to connect with the work of the hands some work, however primitive and rude, of the intellect. Whatever the form given to it—the tablet of the Chaldean, the monumental inscription or papyrus of the Egyptian, the Aryan hymn or the Hindu epic—the deeply interesting fact is that not even any ascertained or even probable date can be named, even in what are called the pre-historic ages of mankind, where we do not find traces of intellectual activity of the same sort, essentially, as that which now floods the world with literature.

Of course, men had to learn to put their literature in its most desirable form, as well as how to produce the highest quality of literature itself. It was with this as with all the other arts of life. The making of paper and books as we now have them was not a thing likely to suggest itself all at once; although the Egyptians seem to have very early learned to utilize in this way that papyrus reed which grew so abundantly in the marshes of the lower Nile. The most natural suggestion was to use for material that which came readiest to hand. The Chaldeans in the valley of the lower Euphrates, after they had begun to employ for building purposes the clay so abundant and so available there, could not have been long in perceiving how easy it was to engrave upon the brick in its soft state whatever picture or record they might wish to make, and then baking this, or drying it in the sun, just as they did with bricks intended for their buildings, in this way provide themselves with what should answer to them many of the most essential ends of books. And the Egyptians, after they had begun to quarry the rocks in the adjacent Lybian hills for temples, palaces and tombs, must have found the suggestion a ready one how upon these might be engraved and painted whatever record of warlike achievement, or of national vicissitude, or tribute to ancestors, or of praise or prayer to their deities they might wish to have in permanent form. In fact, we cannot fail to see how in all this designs of Providence cooperate with human need and human invention; for while the books of that primitive time, supposing books such as now fill the world's libraries to have been possible, might have all perished, and probably would have done so, the Chaldean brick, and the Egyptian gate-way or column, or wall, even the papyrus roll, survive the tremendous cataclyms which have tumbled palace, and temple, and whole cities into heaps of ruins. The page on which the writing was made is found, perhaps, in fragments, but it is there, while of other material there might now remain only undistinguishable dust.

EARLIEST FORMS OF WRITTEN LANGUAGE.

It is now regarded as fully settled, I believe, that the earliest form of writing was the hieroglyphic. How ancient this is, no one seems prepared to say. Back as far as to what is called the Fourth Dynasty, in Egypt, the date of which is fixed at about B. C. 2450, inscriptions in this character are found, those in the great pyramid of Ghizeh being examples. Tradition makes it earlier still. One can see how writing should first of all have this form. It is the natural first step in the construction of a written language. As in the early growth of spoken language—supposing it to be a growth, as it probably was—the poverty of words would be remedied by signs and gestures; so in beginning to write, the natural first step would be to represent the idea by a picture. It does not, in fact, seem at all likely that the formation of words in writing by means of letters and syllables would be the first thought of a primitive people. The letter and the syllable

represent a considerably advanced stage in the construction of written speech.

It does not appear to be quite settled, whether this primitive mode of writing began with the Egyptians or Chaldeans. In the oldest literary remains of the latter the cuneiform characters, made up of wedge-shaped lines and strokes, are already an alphabet; while the oldest remains of the Egyptians are still in hieroglyphics. Traces of the hieroglyphic, however, are still observable in the cuneiform alphabet. Thus, in the second letter of the alphabet the oblong figure representing the ground plan of a house is very plainly seen, although not complete, just as in the second letter of the Hebrew alphabet; and it is noticeable that the word for house originally represented, in Chaldean as in Egyptian, by the oblong figure, is "b i t," closely resembling, as is evident, the Semitic one. This hieroglyphic, which in the time of the oldest Chaldean writing had thus changed to a letter is in the oldest Egyptian writing still a hieroglyphic. There seems therefore ground for what Sir Henry Rawlinson says, that with the race whose most ancient literature is now read upon those Chaldean tablets, thousands of years old, "the art of writing," as well as "the building of cities began." He calls them the great Hamitic race of Accad, of which the Chaldeans were a branch; and we remember this name, Accad, as that of one of the cities mentioned in Genesis X. as "the beginning" of the kingdom of Nimrod. In another place, a marginal note in his brother Canon Rawlinson's Translation of Herodotus, Sir Henry expresses the belief that this earliest form of picture-writing, subsequently changed into the cuneiform alphabet, was practiced at a time when the several families of language as we now find them, Aryan, Semitic, Hamitic or Turanian, were one family. He thinks it probable, he says, that "the distinction between Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian tongues had not been developed when picture-writing was first used in Chaldea, but the words then in use passed indifferently at a subsequent period, and under certain modifications, into the new families among which the languages of the world was divided."

It seems very wonderful that the patient labor of modern scholars should put in our hands, rendered in our own tongue, what was written certainly within the period, possibly not very far from the time of those events described in the eleventh Genesis; and that thus that primitive soil of Chaldea, where the posterity of Noah seem to have built their first homes, and cities, and temples, should yield up this testimony to the truth of a Scripture narrative which tells how the speech of mankind was at first *one*, and how it became *many*.

CREATION OF ALPHABETS.

The change of the hieroglyphic to the letter and syllable was a perfectly natural one. Even in Egypt this change began, evidently, at a very early period. Why the cumbrous picture-writing should very soon cease to be a satisfactory mode of expressing ideas is very evident. It is, certainly, a picturesque way of expressing the idea of wickedness, to draw the picture of a man beating his own head with an axe or club; and whether this picture represented the idea of wickedness because of "suicide being considered the most wicked action of man," as Sir Gardner Wilkinson thinks, or whether we find under it the conception of wickedness as more damaging to the wicked person than anybody else,—in either case the picture while admirable for illustration is awkward enough for purposes of writing. So also of the hieroglyph for "deceit"—a man with his leg caught in a trap, and that for anger, the figure of an ape, as the most irascible of all animals.

But words, not pictures, the words we speak, are the proper representatives of ideas, and so, very speedily, words took the place of pictures.

For an initial step, it would seem, the hieroglyph was used to express the initial sound of the word representing the name of the object figured,—as the figure of an eagle, a k h o m, instead of standing for a k h o m, was made to stand for "a," the initial. Then next, instead of the complete hieroglyph would be only certain shapes bearing a resemblance to it, as in the case of the second and third letters in Hebrew. Thus was formed, apparently, the cuneiform alphabet (syllabary may be the more proper term) in Chaldea, and in the same way the hieratic for the priests, and the demotic for the people, in Egypt. Other written languages besides those mentioned, as the Phœnician, from which so many alphabets seem to be in part derived, had, at the date of the earliest remains of them yet known, already passed from the hieroglyphic stage. Yet the opinion of scholars seems to be that nearly all written language—the Chinese, and perhaps some others, being excepted—began, more or less, with the hieroglyphic.

A SPECIMEN OF PRIMITIVE GRAMMAR.

Mention was made, a little way back, of what in the light of present evidence is thought to be the primitive speech of those with whom post-diluvian history began, on "the plain of Shinar." A peculiarity of that ancient language is mentioned by Canon Rawlinson, who speaks of it as now without parallel anywhere, or in any known tongue, unless it should be that of one Tartar tribe. The preposition "with" is represented in Accadian by the word k i t a. Now, when this preposition is used with the personal pronoun, instead of being placed either before or after the pronoun, it is divided, one part being used before and the other after. Thus, the first, second, and third persons of the pronoun being m u, z u, and n i, "with me" is represented by k i-m u-t a, "with thee" by k i-z u-t a, "with him" by k i-n i-t a. The same in the plural, where "us" is represented by m i, "you" by z u-n i n i, and "them" by n i n i. The second person plural has itself a noticeable form, being made up of the second person singular z u, "thee," and the third plural, n i n i, "them,"—z u-n i n i, or "thee-them." Here, perhaps, is a glimpse of the oldest and most primitive of all the varieties of human speech of which any remains survive. This language had become extinct in the seventeenth century before Christ, that is, according to the usual chronology, not far from two hundred years before the time of Moses himself.

A WONDERFUL ACHIEVEMENT.

The decipherment of the inscriptions and other writings in Egyptian hieroglyphic and Chaldean and Assyrian cuneiform is one of the most remarkable achievements of the present century. When those engineers of the first Napoleon, in 1798, digging for the foundation of a fort at Rosetta, near one of the mouths of the Nile, turned up that broken stone with its strange inscription, they little realized what had happened. The inscription on the stone was in Greek, in Egyptian hieroglyphic, and in hieratic. The French scholar, Champollion, conceiving at once that the inscription was one, although in this trilingual form, applied himself to the task of comparing these several copies of it and soon found that not only could all these be read with the help of the Greek, but that in the correspondence of the Greek characters and the hieroglyphic figures he had the

key to a mystery which, up to that time, had seemed hopeless of solution. The discovery, later, of another similar stone, in a more perfect state and with a more extended inscription enabled other scholars to complete the work, and the Egyptologist now reads hieroglyphic as readily as the child his alphabet.

And so that famous rock Behistun, or mountain rather, east of Babylon and on the border of ancient Media, a land-mark on the road by which Assyrian and Babylonian kings marched in their earlier wars, and on one of whose steep escarpments monarch after monarch recorded his triumphs in boastful inscriptions—famous as it was in ancient times, recent events have made it more famous still. It was in the decipherment of an inscription by Darius Hystaspes, in three languages, Persian, Median, and Assyrian, that Sir Henry Rawlinson perfected the clue to the cuneiform alphabet. Since that time the labors of Rawlinson, Loftus, George Smith, Birch, Sayce, Fox Talbot, Oppert, and others, have put within the reach of any one of us the literature of the world's most primitive races, and enable us to know how men thought, and wrote, and lived and prayed at a time when the story of the flood itself was still recent, though already corrupted into polytheistic legend*.

EXAMPLES OF ANCIENT LITERATURE.

For the purpose of illustrating the character of this old literature, and its connection with questions such as are before us in our present study, I will copy first a few lines from an Accadian Penitential Psalm. The tablet upon which it is written was found in excavating on the site of an Assyrian city, but as the language, is Accadian, it is assumed to have its date earlier than that at which that language became extinct, that is the seventeenth century before Christ. The translator, Rev. A. H. Sayce, of England, one of the most distinguished of living cuneiform scholars, says that "an Assyrian Interlinear translation is attached to most of the lines"; this also suggests that it must have been brought to Assyria, like a great many other of these tablets, from Chaldea, and that at the time the Accadian was already a "dead" language, requiring to be translated in order to be understood, Mr. Sayce calls attention to some remarkable resemblances in it to Hebrew poetry, especially to some of the penitential psalms of David. Some passages in it, also, give occasion for the remark by him that "seven was a sacred number among the Accadians"; a fact which bears testimony to the great antiquity of the division of time by weeks, and especially, perhaps, the Sabbath institution. It will be noticed in the lines quoted, that the parallelism of Hebrew poetry is seen in that of the Accadians; a feature which Mr. Sayce speaks of as "copied" from the Accadians by the Assyrians and the Hebrews. As, however, the Song of Lamech, in Genesis, has the same characteristic, we may be justified in saying that this peculiar form of poetical expression is much older than any Accadian date, we may say, even, antediluvian. Resemblances will be noticed, as mentioned, to some of David's psalms, laying apart, of course, the polytheistic

* I may perhaps mention, here, that these old literatures are made accessible to the many who are not experts in such studies, in a collection of small volumes, the twelfth of which has recently appeared, the entire compilation bearing the title of "Records of the Past." They are translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments, and published under the sanction of the Society of Biblical Archæology in England.

tone of this Accadian one, I select a passage where this resemblance is especially marked; notice, also, the parallelism:

"O, my Lord, my transgression (is) great, many (are) my sins.
O, my God, my transgression (is) great, many (are) my sins.
O, my goddess, my transgression (is) great, many (are) my sins.
O my God, that knowest (that) I knew not, my transgression (is) great, my sins (are many).
O my goddess, that knowest (that) I knew not, my transgression (is) great, my sins (are) many.
The transgression that I committed, I knew not.
The sins that I sinned, I knew not.
The forbidden thing did I eat.
The forbidden thing did I trample upon.
The Lord in the wrath of his heart has punished me.
God in the strength of his heart has overpowered me.
The goddess upon me has laid affliction and in pain has set me.
God who knew (though) I knew not, hath pierced me.
I lay on the ground no man seized my hand.
[More literally, "extended the hand."]
I wept, and my palms none took."

We readily recall David's "No man cared for my soul"; also where it reads, "The sin that I sinned I knew not", we are reminded of the words: "Thou hast set my sins before thee, my secret sins in the light of thy countenance." Perhaps more especially this: "Who can understand his errors; cleanse thou me from secret faults." In another part we read:

"O my goddess, seven times seven (are) my transgressions
O God, who knowest that I knew not, seven times seven are my transgressions.
My transgressions are before me; may thy judgment give me life.
May thy heart like the heart of the mother of the setting day to its place return.
Like the mother of the setting day (and) the father of the setting day to its place (may it return).

This seems like drawing from the order of nature and the steady and beneficent return of day after night, a hope that in like manner divine favor, though for a time withdrawn, may be given back. Mr. Sayce speaks of the seven times seven as having a resemblance to that place in Matt. XVIII., 22, where our Saviour is asked if one shall forgive his brother unto seven times seven, and answers, "unto seventy times seven."

I will copy, again, a brief passage or two from a document of quite another sort. It is the Egyptian "Praise of Learning" found in two papyri supposed to be at least of a date as early as B. C. 2400, possibly still earlier. The translation, as I have it in "Records of the Past," is by Dr. Birch, of the British Museum. Its purport reminds us of what we read in the Bible of "the wisdom of the Egyptians." It extols the dignity and worth of "the scribe," or the learned man, as compared with men engaged in other pursuits. These lines remind us of some passages in Proverbs:

"Love letters as thy mother.
I make its beauty go in thy face,
it is greater possession than all employments.
It is not a word [meaning a mere word] on this earth.
He who has commenced to avail himself (of it) is from his infancy a counsellor.
He is sent to perform commissions [that is, secures civil employment].
He who does not go, he is in sackcloth."

We then have various trades and occupations described in a disparaging way, the purpose being, evidently, to show how much superior are those to which learning introduces:

"I have not seen a blacksmith on a commission,
a founder who goes on an embassy.

I have seen the blacksmith at his work
at the mouth of his furnace,
his fingers like things of crocodiles [meaning black and hard].
The stone-cutter, he searches for employment
in all kinds of stones.
He has made the completion of the things,
his arms are fatigued, he is at rest
seated at the bread of the sun:
his knees and his back are broken.
The barber is shaving till evening,
when he places himself to eat he places himself on his elbows;
He places himself at street after street.
The little laborer having a field
he passes his life among rustics;
he is worn down by vines and figs
to make his kitchen of what his fields have;
his clothes are heavy with weight;
he is tied as a forced laborer:
he goes into the air, he suffers,
coming forth well from his fire-place.
He is bastinadoed by a stick on his legs.
He saves himself.
Shut against him is the hall of every house,
drawn are the chambers."

So of the builder, the gardener, the poulterer, the weaver, the maker of weapons, the courier, the dyer, the sandal-maker, the washerman, the fisherman, who "suffers more than any employment";—all these are in one way or another disparaged, and only "the scribe who knows letters" is praised and felicitated. It is a curious picture of ancient Egyptian life, and ways of thinking. According to Brugsch, what was called "mysteries," that is knowledge of various kinds, was distributed among "teachers," called "mystery-teachers," each of whom gave himself entirely to his own line of research and instruction. With such a division of labor among the learned, each guild devoting itself exclusively to its own sphere of study and teaching, we cannot be surprised that "the wisdom of the Egyptians" became something so really marvellous for that age, and such in a later age as to draw thither men ambitious of learning from even far distant countries.

Something like this was also true in Chaldea; the tablets showing very considerable attainments in many branches of knowledge; especially, as is well known, astronomy. With other races the case was different. The Hebrew literature was such as we very well know, concerned with primitive history, with revealed religion, and the biographies of those men in whose line the Messianic genealogy was preserved;—while those Aryans, north of the Himalayas, to whom we trace our own ancestral line, being a nomadic and agricultural people, have left us no such monument of acquired learning. The poetical stimulus was strong with them, and their Vedic literature only shows us how they were inspired by the grandeurs of the natural world, and how their conception of deity took shape from the impressions made upon them by the magnificence of the firmament, the terrible sublimity of storms, the grateful interchanges of day and night, and the coming and going of the seasons.

ORIGIN OF RELIGION.

Leaving all this, now, I will add a few words upon the other preliminary topic proposed in this connection. It is a notable fact that among the nations of high

antiquity, the first act in the founding of a city was the building of a temple. This was, says Brugsch, "the centre of the future town." When new temples were erected in the same general locality, these also became centres, around which clustered the dwellings of the people. Thus a great city, like Babylon, or Memphis, or Thebes, was more like a cluster of cities, although all enclosed in one defensive wall. As far back as existing remains carry us, even in the oldest of those buried cities along the Nile or the Euphrates whose ruins are coming to light through the labors of excavators, this fact, of the first and the foremost place given to the temple, appears. And it is further evident that to the temple was consecrated the most solid and durable material, and upon it lavished the best art of the builder. In whatever respects the religion of these ancient races may have been blinded and false, this is certain, that to them it was a very real and a very momentous thing. Evidence to a like effect appears in their literature. Their litanies, their hymns and prayers, make a large part of their literature, and however mistaken they may have been as to the nature of the being addressed, or as to the form of the devotion, though it is a superstition, and often a degrading one, nevertheless no one can reasonably doubt that those worshipers of so many thousand years ago were intensely in earnest. That these faiths, besides, had elements in them indicative of ideas much above the grade of mere superstition, I hope to show hereafter.

Such is man, as a religious being, at the moment when, in primitive history, we first make his acquaintance. Such we find him in the oldest remains of him in that part of the globe where, according to all evidence thus far, his career on earth began. In other portions of the globe a different class of facts appears. Man is found there as a savage, with scarcely any acquaintance even with the rudest arts of life. His religion is a degraded, and a degrading superstition. In some instances it has been doubted if he have any religion at all, or any idea of the supernatural which may be supposed to contain even the germ of religion; although more thorough inquiry has so often resulted in finding that this appearance of destitution of even germinal religious ideas or impressions is an appearance merely, that we seem justified in concluding that in all cases it is due to the difficulty savages have in expressing such ideas, and also to the suspicious temper which makes them reserved and reticent in the presence of civilized men. Without going into that question, it suffices to note, here, the contrasted fact:—the low and brutal forms of religion among existing savage races, as seen in contrast, not only with existing civilized ones, but with ancient races, such as those of which I have been speaking.

Which, then, of the two classes of facts thus brought to view, shall be taken as representative of the religion of primitive man; of religion in its absolute origin and primeval nature, in the history of the human race? The answer to this question given by a certain class of physical scientists and by those who receive them as authority, is well known. Indeed, it follows necessarily from the theory which makes man a *development*, rather than a *creation*, that, beginning as a savage, one step in advance of the brute, his religion must have been a slow growth, having its origin in impressions of wonder or admiration made upon him by phenomena of the physical world, then advancing to dim suggestions, resulting in more or less clear conceptions, of a something supernatural, behind or in the phenomena, and so rising up to the conception of God, and all the beliefs and theologies that have formed around that centre.

Now, as regards this I will simply say these two things: (1) The first is, that the possibility, even, of such an evolution of civilization out of savagery, and of religious ideas out of the mere sensation of brutish wonder, is a pure assumption. Some years ago, Archbishop Whatley said this: "We have no reason to believe that any community ever did, or ever can emerge, unassisted by external helps, from a state of utter barbarism into anything that can be called civilization." Again he says: "Man has not emerged from the savage state; the progress of any community in civilization, by its own internal means, must always have begun from a condition removed from that of complete barbarism, out of which it does not appear that men ever did or ever can raise themselves." Various attempts have been made, by Sir John Lubbock for one, to break the force of this statement and the argument based upon it, but with poor success. It should be observed that the statement is that no tribe or race of men has ever risen from *utter barbarism*—meaning a condition of savagery such as the evolution theory must assume as the starting-point of human development—and *without external aid*, to a condition of civilization. The Germans and the Britons of early European history, were not savages; and in their progress to civilization they had the help of Christianity when introduced amongst them, and of that contact with ancient forms of culture which the invasion by the Romans first, and their own invasion and conquest of the empire afterward, brought about. We have also examples of Indian tribes on our own continent, and island races in the Pacific civilized by the instrumentality of Christian missions; but never without. The fact stands, undisputed and unimpeachable, that to assume the possibility, even, of an utterly savage race becoming, of itself, in any process of self-improvement, a civilized and cultured one, is to assume what has no one fact in all history to sustain it. The theory of the origin of civilization and of religion, in this way, is theory only, and supplies no basis whatever for the notion of religion as an evolution.

(2) The second point I would touch is this, that while all archæological indications, as well as all historical testimony, point to the far East as the cradle of the human race, the region where human abodes were first planted, the remains of antiquity there are the remains of a civilization, imperfect, no doubt, in certain directions, yet in others surprisingly advanced, with religious ideas distinctly formed, faiths, and rituals, temples and priesthoods, and with indications, at the same time, as I hope to show in future studies, that those religions themselves, instead of being a growth from below upward, were really deteriorations of a religion such as the best light of the present warrants us in holding as the true one.

It is one part of the aim proposed in these studies to produce evidence in support of the proposition, that religion came to man direct from God; first in the gift of a religious nature, constituting for him infinitely his richest and most precious endowment, as man; and secondly, in a revelation, germinal in its beginning, yet even thus sufficient, only for his depraved heart, to keep him in right relations with God, and developing, age by age, and century by century, until it became that magnificent growth, laden with perennial blossom and never-failing fruitage, which we have in Christianity. I shall hope that it may further appear that even amongst the polytheistic nations, the one God did not allow himself to be wholly lost out of view; that even in their darkness, there was in those nations a kind of unconscious struggle toward the light: yet that no religion has ever an-

swered the end of such, or was ever a blessing to the world, save that one whose revelations all centre in Christ and his cross.

Subsequent studies will have for special topics: Tradition in its Relation to History: (1) To History in General, (2) To inspired History; The beginnings of Nationality and Empire; The Idea of God in Historical Religions; Worship and Ritual;—with, possibly a continuation, later, of the same line of inquiry under other headings.

THE THEOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph. D.,
Columbus, Ohio.

The remarkable interest which the American church has of late years been taking in the Old Testament must be a source of great pleasure to every biblical student. The fact that in earlier decades such an interest was not shown cannot be attributed to a Schliermacher-like inability to understand and appreciate the revelation given through Moses and the prophets, but this was the case rather because the pressing needs of the hour and the missionary and pioneer character of the American churches was not favorable to the development of a theological discipline of a more purely intellectual character, and, of one that apparently could find so little immediate appreciation in pulpit and pastoral work.

That matters have changed in this regard, and that theological science is studied for its own sake and without constant reference to the practical work of the church is a subject of congratulation; and that a number of circumstances have combined to make the Old Testament the chief gainer by this change just at present, is not to be regretted. Even if the marked attention now paid to the books of the old covenant has not in all cases pursued the methods and attained the results which conservative Christians would wish or can favor, that matters not so much. The lessons of church history and our faith in the power of truth should reassure us that the outcome of the controversy can be only beneficial to the church. It is not many years ago since Baur and his Tübingen school of destructive criticism proclaimed loud and long that their crucible had reduced the New Testament and early Christian literature to myths and fables. The New Testament has come out of the furnace of criticism a divine gold purer and brighter than ever, while no one now is so bold as yet to subscribe to the extravagant claims of a school that was but a generation ago all powerful and boldly declared its dicta "sure" results of criticism. Wellhausen with his naturalistic method and revolutionary results may now find many adherents and proclaim his victory loud enough to scare even the thoughtful, yet if he has not truth on his side he cannot prevail. The victory is not to the rash, but to truth and the right. There can be no doubt that the result of the whole rigid and searching examination to which the Old Testament books are now being subjected will result in their being better understood and appreciated than ever before. The microscope of criticism is sure to find in them jewels of truth not yet discovered. And no one can deny that the Word of God should be subjected to such an examination. It claims to

be a revelation from God for the guidance of mankind. This claim, for the sake of truth and for the sake of the consciences of believers, must be examined. If it cannot stand honest criticism and fair methods, it does not deserve credence, it is then no revelation and not binding; if it is a revelation, then no attack can really or permanently harm it. So then it must be regarded as a healthy and happy sign that theological science is daily devoting itself more and more directly to the sources of Christian faith and doctrine.

But the work that has been done in the Old Testament department of late is, at best, but preparatory; and even this has not yet been brought to a conclusion. The discussions in books, pamphlets and papers has been almost exclusively of a literary character. The object has been to study the Old Testament as a complex of literary remains, to investigate the origin, integrity, date and author of certain books, for the purpose of discovering the order and succession of the various strata in Old Testament literature, and then in Israel's political and religious history. The pentateuchal sphinx has made the whole literature of the chosen people a riddle, and to give a satisfactory answer to this riddle has been the aim so far. Moses and the prophets were studied as we study the Vedas, Homer, and the Eddas; the Old Testament was to be put into its proper historical setting, and receive its true historical background; its various books were to be made the true index for the development of the religion of the people. The problems, and the work performed in the solution of these problems, were purely literary; they were undertaken as such and must be judged as such. True their bearing on the doctrinal contents, or the Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, was not entirely overlooked; but this feature was urged chiefly by those opposed to the claims of advanced criticism, and then generally as side lights for the literary argument. Taking the whole discussion as such, it was and is the literary study of the books of the pre-Christian revelation.

Important and necessary as all this is, especially at present, yet the literary examination of the Old Testament by no means exhausts the sacred records; it is not the most satisfactory or fruitful method of studying them, nor should it be the governing principle in this study. The Old Testament is more than a mere collection of literary records of the Israelites, and the highest aim in studying them should not be to discover in them the history of a literature. The Old Testament is above all a revelation and the history of a revelation. This is what it claims to be; this is the view taken of it by the New Testament; this is the view that must act as regulative and corrective in every investigation that would do justice to its contents. The Old Testament is by no means the history of the Jewish people in the sense in which Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon portray Greek, or Livy and Tacitus, Latin history. Nor is it, on the other hand, a random collection of literary works, an accidental conglomerate of remains of the literary activity of an interesting people, which serve only to determine the status of philosophy or culture of the various stages of the people's history. According to their own testimony, and that of their best commentator, the New Testament, the books of the Old Testament contain the records not of a people as such, but of an idea and a fact, and of the development of this idea and fact in the course of Israel's history. This idea and fact is the history of the Kingdom of God in its preparatory state. As Augustine, whose terse and epigrammatic statements of great truths are well known, says, "In Veteri Testamento Novum latet, in Novo Vetus patet;" the old and the new are the two halves of one whole,—records of God's Kingdom on

earth, the former presenting it in its preparatory stage, the latter in its completed. The Old Testament begins with the creation and fall of man; its whole subsequent details constitute the record of God's plan and work to restore and redeem the fallen race. The history of the Theocracy, from the covenants with Noah and Abraham down to the time when in Malachi the voice of prophecy was hushed, is the burden of the Old Testament canon; and everything that finds expression in its pages stands in some relationship, be this near or distant, to this one central thought of the sacred volume, the establishment and gradual unfolding of God's Kingdom within national bounds and limits, and in the form of a theocracy in Israel; and everything the Old Testament states must be judged as to its importance by the relationship it bears to this fact. Newer criticism is decidededly correct when it claims that not all the books of the Old Testament are of equal value, or are to be equally esteemed. This thesis is no new wisdom; the Rabbis of the Mishna were well aware of this fact. But the measure of importance and the guage of value does not lie in the literary character of the composition, nor in the degree of light which it may throw on the history of the people as a political body with a peculiar culture or social qualities, but rather in its bearings on the character and shape of the Theocracy. There is an element in Old Testament history that has given it peculiar form and character, entirely different from any development that we find in the history of other nations, and this is the divine factor, which has been not only the directing influence in the establishment and maintenance of the covenants of which the whole Old Testament speaks, but must also be supposed to have directed the compilation and character of the written records of this peculiar process. The God of Israel's history was also the God of Israel's revelation. As the selection of Israel to be the chosen people, and as the development of the people in the course of centuries in the fulfillment of this mission was under the direct guidance of Providence, thus, too, were the records and expressions of this history providential in original character. They are the inspired records of a development unique in history, but as real and true as unique, and being such they receive their importance and must be judged from this standpoint, as the inspired account of a divinely founded unfolding of the Kingdom of God in its preparatory state in and in the midst of the people of Israel.

These views of the Old Testament may be conservative and old-fashioned, but their correctness has not yet been successfully impeached or imperiled. Certain it is, that such is the view which Christ and the Apostles, and with them the whole New Testament, take of the Old Testament; they in unequivocal terms declare it the account of God's dealing with men for their deliverance from the curse of sin, and see in it primarily the record of revelation. And the day has not yet come, nor will it ever come, when the New Testament authority in the interpretation of the Old, will be wantonly thrown aside to give way to some pet theory or vaporous hypothesis. As yet American theology is biblical in tone and spirit, and from present indications will remain so.

Such being the true character of the Old Testament canon, it is scarcely a matter of doubt or debate that the theological study of these books must remain paramount. Whatever light they will throw on the political and intellectual history of the Israelites and on the importance of this peculiar people in the complex of oriental nations, and whatever aid the Old Testament will thus afford the student of ancient history and literature, must be thankfully received. But regarding them only from this side is taking but a superficial and one-sided view. The entire and

chief contents, especially for the Christian scholar, pastor and congregation, must remain the religious features, the account of the plan of redemption, the shape and form which this plan assumed in the covenant between Israel and Jehovah, the life of the people under the spirit and guidance of the theocracy as this finds expression in prophecy and the psalms, the growth of revelation from the proto-evangelium in Genesis III. to the evangelistic flights of Isaiah LIII., and similar features. In short, the theological study in all its aspects and features is the study of the Old Testament that is the most thankful and fruitful. The history of Old Testament revelation is higher than and above the history of Old Testament literature.

Not that we would for a moment disparage or discourage the literary study of the Word of God, for no one could be more convinced of its importance and take a greater delight in its pursuit. But it seems that without the theological study and appreciation of the biblical books as a corrective and guide, the purely literary study becomes one-sided and unjust. The Old Testament must not be considered a citadel, which the critics are in duty bound to destroy, if possible, and in whose walls the least break is to be welcomed with a shout of triumph; true criticism, in the best sense of the word, can never be antagonistic, not even "neutral" (which is an obstruction, but never a fact), but must be friendly and fair. To judge of the merits of the Old Testament we must stand within and not without it, must breathe its spirit, must feel the pulsation of its soul, and then only are we competent to judge. This *habitus practicus* is necessary also for the literary critic, if he would be impartial; and to acquire it, he must be guided by the principle that the Old Testament is primarily a revelation, a book entirely different from any other product of the human soul. We say that he must pass judgment upon its claims standing in the Old Testament, and not standing in a peculiar dogmatic system—frequently two things entirely different. There seems scarcely a doubt that the extravagant claims of the new rationalistic school and its heartless lack of sympathy for the books it criticises, is to a great extent to be attributed to this severance of methods, or rather to the unlawful emancipation of the literary study from the theological study of the sacred volume. It is only on this supposition that we can understand how the adherents of this school can treat these books, not as a source of light and life, but only as interesting subjects for the critical scalpel. Even aside then from the great practical benefits for pulpit and pew which result from such a theological study of the Old Testament, it seems demanded by fairness in research that a broad, comprehensive, and above all, a just literary study of the Old Testament, should not spurn its assistance, but gladly consent to be guided and assisted by it in its investigations.

Nor is it necessary that the whole field of literary discipline be traveled over before we are prepared to study the Old Testament from this standpoint. It would be sad indeed, if the biblical student would have to solve each and every riddle of Old Testament literature before he could study the Old Covenant and its revelation. At that rate nobody would ever be apt to begin this study. But in reality, the claims of criticism seldom rob to a marked degree the Old Testament of its character as revelation. It is only when thoroughly anti-biblical views are allowed to guide the whole investigation that this is the case, as when Kuenen, Wellhausen and *Consorten* permit the philosophical idea of natural development to turn the Old Testament upside down, and empty it of all divine contents and character, and expel God from the midst of his people. But for more moderate critics

this danger does not exist, either because they still bow to the great truths of God's Word, or, in case their theories are under the spell of some un-biblical idea, are fortunately inconsistent. Delitzsch, Strack, Bredenkamp, and others in many points yield to the critical cries; but for these the Old Testament remains a revelation from God. The danger to Biblical Theology does not lie so much in any new chronological arrangement of the Old Testament books, but rather in the introduction of false ideas that make the revelation of God a mere phrase. Criticism thus is by no means an obstacle in the way to the discovery of the religious teachings of the Old Testament, but rather the two, literary and theological study, should go hand in hand, mutually complementary and supplementary, the aim though in all cases being the higher and nobler, namely to learn the thoughts and the ways of God for the salvation of mankind.

CONTRIBUTED NOTES.

"Daniel and the First Resurrection."—The *Presbyterian Review* for January 1884 contains an elaborate and scholarly contribution on Dan. XII., 2 by the Rev. Nathaniel West, D. D., of which a separate copy has, since the issue of the *Review*, been printed. Those who have read other articles from the same pen, and especially a notable one entitled "No Preaching to the Dead" founded on 1 Peter III., 18–20, need not be told that his discussion of Dan. XII., 2 is, like all his work, both thorough and exhaustive. He has surveyed the whole field, and he has here published the results of a remarkable research into the literature of the passage, ancient and modern, Christian and Jewish.

In a brief notice such as this must be, no more than the barest summary of the argument of this very able paper can be given.

One very commendable feature of Dr. West's book is his honest endeavor to ascertain what the text teaches, what the revealing angel actually says. While the author has very decided views on the eschatology of Daniel's Apocalypse as well as on that of John, he nevertheless comes to this passage with no arbitrary presupposition as to its import. This posture of mind, it may be noted, is a prime requisite in the interpreter of God's word.

Nothing is more fatal to a right understanding and exposition of Scripture and more particularly of prophecy, than to project upon it a foregone conclusion—a habit which, indulged and applied, neutralizes all significance in language and wipes out all prophecy "as a definite testimony to anything." Literalism, i. e., the effort to discover what an inspired writer really *says*, and not a preconceived opinion of what he ought to say, is happily becoming a recognized canon of biblical exegesis. Delitzsch's maxim quoted by Dr. West is of supreme importance in the study of prophetic Scripture: "*Application is not interpretation.*" Application is manifold; interpretation is but one.

The logical divisions which exhaust the possibilities of the resurrection affirmed in Dan. XII., 2, Dr. West marks thus: "either Total, Partial, Totopartial, or Parti-partial, i. e., either all, or some, of both classes—viz., righteous and wicked; or all, or some, of but one class." He undertakes to show, and in the judgment of the present writer, does actually and triumphantly show, on the grounds of "the lexicon, linguistic usage, normal syntax, the context,

the unity of prophecy, the economy of the ages, the analogy of faith, and the consensus of both Testaments," that the passage does not teach a simultaneous and universal resurrection of the dead, both righteous and wicked; that, on the contrary, it teaches exclusively the resurrection of the righteous and of all the righteous, "at that time." By a keen scrutiny of both text and context; by a searching and exhaustive study of the Hebrew of the text; by a judicious and copious use of the utterances of the prophetic spirit throughout the Bible bearing on the general subject; and by cogent reasoning fortified by the labors of German, English, and American scholars, he reaches the conclusion indicated above: viz., the out-resurrection of the righteous from among the dead, *the* central truth of Dan. XII., 2.

Of course we cannot, in a short notice such as this, give even an outline of the method pursued in the article, nor so much as the exegetical steps by which the conclusion is reached, and the profound significance of the passage as thus demonstrated.

The attention of the reader, however, is directed to three words in the passage, which, perhaps, enter more largely than any others into the question of its interpretation.

The first of these is the word *many*, with which the text opens: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth"—(A. V.). On this word Dr. West expends much labor and research. What does it mean? *All*, or *some?* Is it partial, or universal, selective or comprehensive of the whole mass of the sleepers in the earth dust? The word itself certainly does not suggest the idea of totality, but partiality. Barnes (com. *in loc.*) thus writes of it: "The natural and obvious meaning of the word *many* here—רַבִּים—is that a large portion of the persons referred to would thus awake, but not all. So we would understand it if applied to other things, as in such expressions as these, "many of the people," "many of the houses in a city," "many of the rivers of a country," etc. In the Scriptures, however, it is undeniable that the word is sometimes used to denote the whole considered *as* constituted of many." And he goes on to fortify his exposition of *many* as equal to *all* by Rom. v., 15, 19. So Newton said before him. But the difficulty with this explanation is twofold, and apparently insuperable: 1. רַבִּים is anarthrous. Had the angel meant *all* by this term it is reasonable to suppose he would have employed the article: and the absence of the definite article is unaccountable had the resurrection of all the dead been the subject of the statement. That *many* is not equivalent to *the many* the Alexandrian translators clearly saw, for they have rendered it *καὶ πολλοὶ*—and surely no one would venture to impeach their knowledge either of Hebrew or Greek. 2. The texts in Rom. v., 15, 19 make squarely against the position of Barnes; for the apostle inserts the article *οἱ* before *πολλοὶ* in each case; it is "the many" he declares to whom the grace of God, and the gift by grace did abound—"the many" that were constituted sinners, and "the many" made righteous. So the Revisers have properly rendered the words *οἱ πολλοὶ*.

A second word is the "sleepers"—"them that sleep in the dust." After a careful study of his forcible criticism of this term, it seems simply impossible to escape the conviction that in it we have the parallelism, if not the genesis, of the pregnant expressions of the N. T.—*ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐξανάστασις νεκρῶν, ἐξανάστασις*

ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν etc. (Phil. III., 11, true text). It is not "many *of* the sleepers," but "many from among the sleepers" that shall awake. It is an eclectic resurrection that is predicted.

The third word is the verb translated "shall awake," the radical meaning of which he says is to "cut off," "remove," "make an end of any existing relation of a part to a whole," whether as to "persons, states, or things;" and here it conveys the idea of the separation of the "many," not only from their place of death, not alone from the state or condition of death, but more intensely from their *relation to*, and *fellowship with*, *the dead*.

Here, then, is a threefold limitation put upon the resurrection foretold in Dan. XII., 2; and on the ground of this limitation as well as for other cogent reasons Dr. West finds it out of the question to carry over the predicate "shall awake,, into the second member of the sentence. For it is beyond dispute that if this predicate be carried into the latter half of the verse, then "many" does mean *all*. But the anarthrous word for "many," the construct state of the noun for "sleepers," together with its prepositional affix, and the radical significance imbedded in the verb for "shall awake," all combine and conspire to forbid the thought that "many" means *all;* and therefore the verb does not belong to the second member of the sentence.

Moreover, all this careful exegesis justifies and compels him to adopt the following critical rendering of the passage: "And many shall awake from among the sleeping ones of the dusty earth; these (shall be) unto life everlasting, but those (shall be) unto shame and contempt everlasting."

But enough has been said to indicate the general result attained. Those who are concerned to learn all that God has been pleased to reveal of His gracious purposes touching His people will be deeply interested in this masterly exposition of Dan. XII., 2. W. G. MOOREHEAD.

The Term Higher Criticism.—For the benefit of readers who are unfamiliar with the history of enquiry concerning the O. T., we append what we consider as correct definitions.

Biblical criticism is that branch of historical criticism which deals with the biblical books as literary productions. It may be divided into two great branches, Textual Criticism and Higher Criticism.* Textual Criticism is that science which seeks to establish the exact text of the biblical writings as they left the hands of their authors. This is done by a careful comparison of MSS., versions and citations from subsequent authors.

Higher Criticism sets out from the results of Textual Criticism and enquires as to the authenticity (authority), genuineness (relating to the proof or disproof of alleged authorship), sources and character of the several books of the Bible. It asks and seeks to answer such questions as these: Is the writing so attested that we can rely upon its statements? Is the author candid, trustworthy? What are the materials from which he drew, and are they reliable? Who is the author or authors? What is the time, place, occasion of composition? Was the nature of his work *revision* or original composition? What literary form has this work assumed?

It is very plain that the nature of the reply which scholars give to these ques-

*See Briggs' Biblical Study.

tions cannot constitute them Higher critics or the reverse. Higher criticism is to be distinguished from Textual (Lower) Criticism, and if the name *Lower* had been applied to the introductory science, confusion would not have arisen in regard to the one appropriately designating the advanced science. A Delitzsch, or a Green, or a Bissell, who seeks to answer the above questions is a Higher Critic; so is a Wellhausen, or a Smith, or else a scholar who is conducting such investigations cannot be placed at all until he has reached his conclusions; and, then, from the point of view of such scholars as attach a stigma to the term, he is to be called a Higher Critic, should he have departed in his conclusions from conservative views; while with those who deny the right of Wellhausen and his school to the name Higher Critic, our enquirer would be excluded from the class. The confusion on both sides is removed by making the term refer, not to the results, and not altogether to the methods, but to the character of the questions, which the critic of all beyond the mere text proposes.

Higher critics may be divided into conservative critics, evangelical critics, extreme critics, rationalistic critics, etc. If a term is desired to describe the extreme critics of Germany and elsewhere, "newer" is temporarily unobjectionable; but it is not right to destroy the meaning of a carefully chosen word by applying the term *Higher* exclusively to Wellhausenism, nor, on the other hand, should we exclude from our class men of his stamp simply on account of their conclusions, and this not because Wellhausenism is praiseworthy, but because the term Higher is to be used as distinguished from Textual and refers to a special form of enquiry. C.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Critical Study.—Why should theological students and ministers who are to devote their lives to the practical work of saving souls, spend time either in working out, or in following out questions which demand careful and exhaustive study, and which do not have a direct and practical bearing upon the work they have in hand? Is not such work to be done by specialists? Can anything more be expected than a knowledge, perhaps, of the more important of the results reached by specialists? Away then with all study which looks toward a familiarity with the meaning of Hebrew words, or with the niceties of Greek syntax.

Who has not heard such thoughts expressed again and again? But have those who feel thus ever stopped to consider all that is involved in this? It would be difficult, we believe, to find a train of thought more demoralizing, or more vicious in its tendency.

No man is fair to himself, or true to the religion which he professes, who does not avail himself of all possible means to ascertain the exact meaning of the Book which he preaches, or, at least, of the particular text which is under treatment. It is no excuse to say that he has no time for the critical and exegetical study of the Bible. The clergyman who will substitute for this study, the study of science, or of literature, or of history, or who will allow the direct and pressing work of his parish, important though it be, to cause him to give up or neglect critical and thorough study of the Bible, comes far short of being a *true* minister.

The man who neglects to do for himself a fair amount of thorough Biblical study, need not attempt to satisfy himself that it is sufficient for him to accept the results of others. For he should remember that, unless he himself has conducted similar investigations, unless he has learned how to go to the root of matters, he need not expect to have any clear or accurate knowledge of results reached by this kind of work. One cannot, in fact, entirely separate "results" from methods and from the means employed to obtain them. It is only the superficial mind that is satisfied with ascertaining the mere results without endeavoring to follow out, at least in part, the means adopted to gain the results. Unless, therefore, the minister is, to some extent, able to employ the means, the results have not for him the same force. The man who is careless about means and methods is also careless about "results." The more nearly he approaches a specialist in his ability to follow or work out the results, the more clearly he will appreciate and understand results which he may not have worked out.

That there is a work for specialists to do is as certain as that ministers and laymen cannot do such work. But let us note two things: As the minister is liable to go to one extreme, the specialist is liable to go to the other. The scholar who confines himself to a single line of work, who does not have true spiritual discernment, who does not observe the practical bearing of God's word upon men and events,—such a man's decision cannot be final. Ministers are unable to bring to the study of the Word, an exhaustive acquaintance with all the departments which throw light upon it; but they *can* bring that practical knowledge, that common sense which is invaluable, and without which learning is worthless. And again; there will be found specialists in no department of study in which there are not many students. It is not possible for every man who wills, to be a specialist. The specialist in a given field is one man in a thousand, engaged in work in the same field. Unless a large number manifest an interest, and a disposition to work, there is no hope that men will be led to devote themselves especially to a single line. Out of many, there will rise up a few, who have for such work a fondness and an aptitude.

In order that ministers may be true to the profession which they have chosen or to which they have been called, in order that they may be able to avail themselves of the results reached by specialists, in order that they may counteract the often dangerous tendencies of the specialist, and, on the other hand, make it possible for specialists to be raised up, let them do the largest possible amount of honest critical and exegetical study of the Word they preach; let them show their esteem for this divine revelation, by treating it as it deserves to be treated; let them *not* suppose that there is any work for which this work ought to be substituted, or any study which should push aside the study of God's Word.

The Old Testament Student and the "New Criticism."—The editor has received many letters, called forth by recent criticism of the position taken by the STUDENT in reference to the discussion of questions relating to "Higher Criticism." Of these he ventures to publish the following, which represents, it is believed, the opinion of a very large number of those who have given the matter careful consideration.

The position taken by THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT in respect to the so-called "new" or "higher" criticism would not seem to need any justification, had it not in several instances been misunderstood. As one of its earliest, and still deeply

interested readers, I would not see it take a different course from that which its editor has so clearly outlined. This "newer" criticism presents itself not to a few scholars simply, but through cheap literature, crude newspaper discussions, and still more ill-advised sermons, it obtrudes itself on the attention of almost every man who reads at all. Our religious weeklies are not proper vehicles for the free discussion of these views. These papers enter almost every Christian home, and should serve, as indeed they do, to counteract the evil effects of a popular presentation of these views elsewhere. But surely THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT is just the place for such discussion. It reaches only a class of readers who are already acquainted with the "results" of recent criticism; who have already in a large majority of instances read more of its literature than THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT will publish in many a year; and who, moreover, are in a position to judge somewhat for themselves as to the validity of these "results." Or, if not able to do this, they are with few exceptions readers who have sense enough to suspend judgment until the critics themselves show some unmistakable signs of arriving at harmonious conclusions. I may not agree with the results set forth in a "radical" article. Indeed, I would probably disagree with them *in toto*, and yet be much interested in reading the views set forth. We have no reason to shrink from the discussion of these views, where such discussion is proper. God's word is abundantly able to take care of itself. We have seen similar attacks, conceived in the same spirit, made on the integrity of the New Testament. There has been a great flourish of trumpets, and many a man's heart has "trembled for the ark;" but the result has always been the same. The theories have been hopelessly exploded before their authors died, and the integrity of God's word has stood out clearer than ever before. To make THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT a journal for free discussion, and to make it an "organ" for rationalistic and destructive criticism are two things entirely distinct. The former I welcome; the latter I should deplore.

P. A. NORDELL,
New London, Conn.

BOOK NOTICES.

KAMPHAUSEN'S HEBREW CHRONOLOGY.*

Wellhausen, Stade and W. Robertson Smith agree in finding the Chronology of the book of Kings an artificial system and so generally untrustworthy. According to their theory the endeavor was made to divide the history of Israel from the Exodus to the return from the Captivity into two periods of 480 years each, the dividing line being the building of the Temple (1 Kgs. VI., 1). Each of these periods would naturally fall into twelve generations of 40 years each. It is assumed, therefore, that the years assigned to each king are modified so as to conform to this scheme. And in fact the importance of the number 40 in biblical history is obvious to the most superficial reader. That its frequent recurrence is not necessarily a proof that it rests only on artificial composition or on arbitrary alteration by the editors, is proved by Kamphausen in his recent essay on the subject.

Kamphausen carries out the process of playing with numbers in order to show that we may discover "artificial schemes" in any series of dates. The Hohenzollern family, for example, have special reason to remember the years 1640, 1740, 1840—evidently the number 40 has influenced German annalists! French history

* DIE CHRONOLOGIE DER HEBRÄEISCHEN KOENIGE. Eine geschichtliche Uuntersuchung von ADOLF KAMPHAUSEN, Dr. und ordentl. Prof. der Theologie in Bonn. Bonn, 1883. 104 pages octavo. A summary is to be found in Stade's *Zeitschrift fuer die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1883, pp. 193-202.

is equally artificial. The first five Bourbons reigned 203 years (2+3=5, the number of monarchs)—here also we have in round numbers five periods of 40 years. The number 12, however, is more prominent in the later chronology.

The Republic	1792–1804	(12 years).
The Empire	1804–1814	(10 years).
Louis XVIII	1814–1824	(10 years).
Charles X	1824–1830	(6 years).
Louis Phillippe	1830–1848	(18 years).
The Republic	1848–1852	(4 years).
Napoleon III	1852–1870	(18 years).

Here we notice one 12, two 18 (= one and a half times 12), one 6 (half 12) one 4 (third of 12) and the other two were made 10 (nearly 12) so as not to awaken suspicion by too great regularity! These two irregular numbers taken together with the irregular number (4) make 24 or twice twelve. Who can doubt if we had such a series in the Bible it would have been characterized as the result of an artificial system?

The evident result of this showing must be to discredit the ingenious discoverers of schemes of chronology. If a series of numbers which stand in the full light of history submit readily to such play, we shall hardly have much faith in the play as an argument against any other series. This sort of refutation does not, however. directly prove anything regarding the biblical dates, or remove the difficulties in Hebrew chronology. That there are difficulties as yet unsolved and that they are increased rather than diminished by the Assyrian Eponym lists may be taken as pretty well known. After his preliminary computation of the theory of schematization therefore Kamphausen addresses himself to the serious problem. He begins by noting the following fact: the author of our book of Kings refers his readers often to the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah. It follows that he knew his data might be compared by any reader with the data of these official Chronicles. It is hardly probable, therefore, that he would have changed the dates he gives and so have laid himself open to the charge of falsification.

We cannot go over in detail Kamphausen's examination of the numbers in the book of Kings, but will append his table of dates.

	Saul Reigned B. C.	1037–1018.	
	David in Judah	1017–1011.	
	David over all Israel	1010– 978.	
Rehoboam	937–921.	Jeroboam I	937–916.
Abia	920–918.	Nadab	915–914.
Asa	917–877.	Baasha	914–891.
		Ela	891–890.
		Zimri	890.
		Omri	890–879.
Jehoshaphat	876–852.	Ahab	878–857.
Jehoram	851–844.	Ahaziah	856–855.
Ahaziah	843.	Jehoram	854–843.
Athaliah	842–837.	Jehu	842–815.
Jehoash	836–797.	Jehoahaz	814–798.
Amaziah	796–778.	Joash	797–782.
Uzziah	777–736.	Jeroboam II	781–741.
Jotham (regent)	750–736.	Zachariah	741.
Jotham	735.	Menahem	740–738.
		Pekahiah	737–736.

Ahaz	734–715.	Pekah	736–730.
Hezekiah	714–686.	Hoshea	730–722.
Manasseh	685–641.		
Amon	640–639.		
Josiah	638–608.		
Jehoahaz	608.		
Jehoiakim	607–597.		
Jechonia	597.		
Zedekiah	596–586.		

This table assumes six errors in the Massoretic text, to wit: Amaziah's 29 years are to be reduced to 19, Uzziah's 52 to 42; Ahaz receives 20 instead of 16, Manasseh 45 for 55, Menahem 3 instead of 10, Pekah 6 instead of 20. When we consider how liable figures are to corruption in manuscript propagation, we shall not find this a large number, especially when we consider the hypotheses of other writers. Duncker, for example, in his History of Antiquity makes thirteen alterations. Others go so far (as already seen) as to make out that so far as chronology goes, we are in the Old Testament on entirely uncertain ground.

It is a matter for rejoicing that a cautious and at the same time impartial scholar has administered this decisive check to the hasty generalizations of the Wellhausen school. While all the suggestions of Kamphausen may not commend themselves to others (he himself asks that the sharpest scrutiny be given his work), it is yet certain that he has contributed to the final solution of the problem.

H. P. SMITH.

GUYOT'S CREATION.*

This valuable little book is a result of the studies and research of a lifetime, by one who was at the same time an eminent scientist, a clear thinker, and a devout Christian. It is refreshing amid all the skepticism of the present day, even within the church itself, to see a statement so learned and so positive, of the perfect agreement between science and the Mosaic account of creation. Prof. Guyot says of the Bible-account: "By its sublime grandeur, by its symmetrical plan, by the profoundly philosophical disposition of its parts, and, perhaps, quite as much by its wonderful caution in the statement of facts, which leave room for all scientific discoveries, it betrays the Supreme guidance which directed the pen of the writer and kept it throughout within the limits of truth." Thus the first three days are believed to refer to the "era of matter," and the last three days to the "era of life." First we have creation of the material substructure, then the vegetable kingdom from the lower to the higher orders of plants, then the animal kingdom from the lower orders of the marine fauna to the higher orders of mammals, and finally man who is the introduction of a spiritual kingdom. This arrangement is philosophical and agrees perfectly with the well established leading facts of geology. Even in smaller details there are marked correspondences. The progress from the lower to the higher is not by natural evolution but by creation. בָּרָא is used

* CREATION, OR THE BIBLICAL COSMOGONY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE. By *Arnold Guyot, LL. D.*, Blair Professor of Geology in the College of New Jersey. Author of "Earth and Man." Member of the National Academy of Sciences of America. Associate member of the Royal Academy of Turin, etc., etc. New York: *Chas. Scribner's Sons.* Chicago: *W. S. M. Silber agent.* Pp. 136. Price $1.50.

with marked discrimination, for the origination of matter, of animal life, and of spirit-life. The idea of creation enters also elsewhere.

Prof. Guyot carries the Nebular theory all the way up to the latter part of the third day, which is unusual, and introduces some marked peculiarities in the interpretation of details. His conceptions are grand, yet, perhaps, another interpretation of the three first days, referring them to the condition and development of the earth, after it had assumed its globular form, will in the end be found preferable. Whatever shall be at last the detailed interpretation of Gen. I., it is a matter of greatest interest to find already with certainty its perfect agreement with the leading and well established facts of geology.

J. A. EDGREN.

HERODOTUS AND ANCIENT HISTORY.*

Dr. Sayce stands among the leading philological and oriental scholars of the times. He has laid many obligations upon the common literary world by his numerous efforts to popularize the results of learned investigation. This work is a fruit of these efforts. Its existence is justified, as he remarks, on three grounds.

"First of all, it tries to place before the public the results of the researches made up to the present time in the monumental records of the ancient civilized world. Dislocated and hidden away as most of the materials are in numerous learned periodicals.....the task of bringing them together.....becomes a duty of those who have especially devoted themselves to Oriental matters. In the second place, I can speak at first hand about a good deal of the material worked up in the present volume and can claim to have contributed some portion of it myself to science; while both in the notes and appendices new facts will be found which have not hitherto made their way into print elsewhere. Then, thirdly, I have traveled over a considerable part of the ground on which the history described by Herodotus was enacted. Indeed, with the exception of Babylonia and Persia, there is hardly a country or site mentioned by him in these first three books which I have not visited."

The work consists of (1) an Introduction on the Historical Credibility of Herodotus; (2) The Greek Text of the three first books with notes; (3) Appendices on Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, the Phœnicians, Lydia, the Persian Empire. The latter cover one hundred seventy-five pages and are simply invaluable to the student of Oriental History. We wish that they could be printed separately as a manual of early Oriental history. As it is, few persons will desire to buy the Greek of Herodotus for the sake of the Appendices. They treat of the race, history, religion, manners and customs of the great nations of the ancient world. Dr. Sayce has a low opinion of the historical credibility of Herodotus. It may be feared lest his zeal for the monumental and other original sources of history has made him quite willing to disparage Herodotus. "The net result of Oriental research in its bearing upon Herodotus is to show that the greater part of what he professes to tell us of the history of Egypt, Babylonia and Persia, is really a collection of 'Märchen,' or popular stories, current among the Greek loungers and half-caste dragomen on the skirts of the Persian Empire."

The book is printed and bound in the superb style of MacMillan and Company. It is a positive pleasure to look into it.

*THE ANCIENT EMPIRES OF THE EAST. HERODOTUS I.—III., by A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Deputy-Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford. 1 vol., 9x6. pp. XL. 492. New York: *MacMillan and Company*. Price $4.00.

GROUNDS OF THEISTIC AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF.*

What more can be said even by Prof. Fisher on the well worn themes of apologetical theology which has not already been given out? What is there in this book which may be called the reason of its existence? Does it bring forward new and strong defences, powerful enough to beat back modern assailants or is it simply a re-statement in new forms of that which is somewhat familiar? Necessarily the latter. The author is especially blessed with a power of vigorous and simple expression. Puzzling objections are here clearly stated and as clearly answered. Most books on the Evidences are painfully dry reading. The student of this argument will find his interest and attention excited as well as his mind aroused. Prof. Fisher permits no drowsiness.

The book is valuable, too, because of its comprehensiveness. The first few chapters deal with the philosophical grounds of Theism. The middle chapters contain the biblical argument. The closing ones present the historical and general considerations in favor of Christianity. Few questions can be stated which are not considered directly or indirectly in these pages. The arguments for them and the opposing theories, the possibility and function of miracles, the trustworthiness of the Gospels, the argument from Prophecy, from Christian Doctrine, from Christianity in the world, from its comparison with other religions, Biblical Criticism, the Canon, Christianity and Science, are a few of the topics which are treated. Dr. Fisher is sound, liberal, progressive and yet eminently judicious in his views of Christianity. The clergyman who reads and digests this book will find it full of the best kind of tonic.

TRANSCAUCASIA AND ARARAT.†

In the autumn of 1876, Professor Bryce and a companion started from England for a tour through Russia, the countries of the Caucasus and the Turkish empire. Foremost among the purposes of their journey was the ascent of Ararat. It is of course a question whether the real Ararat is in Armenia as the Biblical statements seem to imply, or according to the Chaldæan legend in the land of Gordyene. Full liberty, at present, is allowed the student to identify it with either mountain. It was the Armenian Ararat which Mr. Bryce succeeded with much difficulty in scaling, being the third who ever accomplished that feat. Little indeed was gained for Biblical study in the expedition. The ark itself still remains to be discovered. The narrative of travel through these little-known lands is very pleasantly told by the author, whose ability in historical investigation makes his political observations and reflections of much value.

---

* The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief. By Geo. P. Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. One vol., 8x5, pp. xviii., 488. New York: *Chas. Scribner's Sons.* 1883. Price $2.50.

† Transcaucasia and Ararat, being Notes of a vacation tour in the autumn of 1876. By James Bryce. Pp. 420. London and New York: *MacMillan & Co.*, 1878. Price, $2.00.

REVIEW NOTICES.

If the first four numbers (Jan.–April) of *The Andover Review** be taken as a promise of its future, it is bound to occupy a very high position among religious and theological periodicals. Our space permits merely a notice of contributions to Old Testament Study. Prof. J. P. Taylor in his Archæological Notes (Jan. No.) touches on many facts interesting to the student of ancient history and sacred literature. Equally valuable to the minister are the very carefully prepared notices of books in this department by Profs. Harris, Moore, Taylor and others. In the April No. Prof. Francis Brown discusses "The Books of Chronicles, with especial reference to those of Samuel," in a very temperate, careful and scholarly article. His conclusions are stated as follows: "1) That the chronicler should have his particular standpoint is not to his discredit. 2) The point, or points of view which he is thought to have had are natural and justifiable. 3) The question whether he has warped facts to favor his theory should be distinguished from the question whether he has made any mistakes. 4) As far as appears from a comparison of those parts of the books of Chronicles and Samuel which run parallel to each other, there is no sufficient ground to charge the chronicler with such warping of facts. Hence it is entirely wrong to deny to the books of Chronicles a genuine and great value for the history of the times of which they treat."

In *The Modern Review* for January, Professor Sayce furnishes a brief but suggestive article on "The Names of the First Three Kings of Israel." It is thought that the names Saul, David, and Solomon were really popular designations, "nicknames." The name *Saul*, "the demanded one," says the Professor, "when taken in connection with the circumstances that led to the foundation of the Israelitish monarchy, gives rise to suspicions." Israel was in a peculiar situation politically, "threatened on all sides by enemies;" Samuel, "who seems to have had no military capacities," was forced to yield to the cry of the people and give them the leader "that was asked for." Hence, although the conjecture has no other basis, we may suppose, according to the writer, that the name Saul was merely a "nickname," his real name being nowhere mentioned. In David's case, there is a better basis. No one else in ancient Jewish history bore this name. It is not a personal name. "It was a divine title applied to the youthful Sun-god, who was worshipped under the manifold names of Tammuz, Adonai, Hadad, and by the side of whom stood his female double and reflection Dido." This divine title, says Sayce, was given by his followers and people to the beloved founder of the Hebrew Empire. He endeavors to show that this is true, (1) from the fact that this appellation "beloved," was given to God by the Israelites, Isa. v., 1, the term "city of David" signifying not "the city which David captured, but the city of the God who was worshiped on the spot and whose title, 'the beloved one,' had become a sort of proper name"; (2) from the fact that the origin of the name is easily explained, since David was a favorite, "loved" by all, the idol of outlaws

* THE ANDOVER REVIEW. A Religious and Theological Monthly. Vol. I., Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. Edited by E. C. Smyth, J. W. Churchill, W. J. Tucker, G. Harris, E. Y. Hincks. Boston: *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.* Yearly subscription, $3.00.

and desperadoes, the beloved of God, etc.; (3) from 2 Sam. XXI., 19, the best interpretation of which goes to show that the real name of David was El-hanan. From 2 Sam. XII., 24 we learn that the proper name of Solomon was Jedidiah, "the beloved of the Lord." Solomon, "peaceful," was only his popular name. While this name is used of no other person in the O. T., we find a king of Moab called Solomon, as well as a king of Assyria. Like David it may have been a name for the Deity, and so, as in the case of David, not have been used as a personal name.

The article closes with some remarks upon the length of these first three reigns. Saul's is placed at five years, Solomon's at twenty-five; the Biblical account assigning to each forty years. The length of David's reign as indicated in the Biblical record (2 Sam. v., 5) is accepted.

There is much that is interesting in this conjecture, but is there really any ground for accepting it? Is it not largely a fancy? What is implied in all this as to Prof. Sayce's views of the reliability of the Scripture record so far as concerns historical details?

The Alpha, published monthly at the University (of Boston) offices, 12 Somerset St. (Vol. II. No. 1) contains a paper by Rev. E. C. Ferguson, Ph. D., on *Why should young ministers keep up their Hebrew?* The reasons assigned and discussed are these: (1) It is a comparatively easy and simple language; (2) The student of Hebrew finds ready to his hand the most perfect tools to work with in the shape of Grammars and Lexicons; (3) The literature is all contained in one volume—the Old Testament; (4) The Hebrew literature, small as it is, is of immeasurable interest and importance; (5) The chief claim of Hebrew upon the minister is its direct bearing upon his own profession. All these points are well presented, except the second; the fact is that in the study of no language are really *practical* text-books so scarce. It is an evidence of increased interest in this department, to find such a topic as this discussed in such a place. This paper was read before the Alpha Chapter of the Alumni of Boston University.

It is pleasant to note that this subject has been discussed in a College Paper, *The Roanoke* (Va.) *Collegian*. Rev. J. E. Bushnell, of Prosperity, S. C., urges forcibly "The Value of Oriental Culture." Mr. Bushnell will find it hard to prove that the Hebrew "is the oldest form of human speech known to us" or that it has "preserved the purest form of the Semitic family of languages." He allows himself to become quite eloquent sometimes, in presenting the claims of this much neglected department of study. He is most correct in saying that "the value of Oriental culture must be rightly esteemed by our American Colleges, if we are to have a deep and broad religious life." The article is vigorous, and the writer shows a scholarly interest in the subject.

SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

REUSS, E., History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Church. New York: *E. P. Dutton & Co.*.....$3.00

RAWLINSON, CANON G., Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World. Students' Edition. Five vols. New York: *Dodd, Mead & Co.*.....$5.00

An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. Vol. IV., Job—Isaiah. Edited by Bishop Ellicott. New York: *E. P. Dutton & Co.* 8vo. pp. 588,.$6.00

CLODD, EDW., Growth of Myth. Humboldt Library..... .. ..15c.

STEARNS, O. S., D. D., A Syllabus of the Messianic passages in the Old Testament. Boston: *Geo. H. Springer.* Paper, pp. 70.

BAKER, REV. L. C., D. D., The Mystery of Creation and of Man. To which is added a new view of Future Punishment. Philadelphia: *J. B. Lippincott & Co.* 12mo.....$1.00

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

THOMAS, DAVID, The Book of Psalms. Sixty-seven homiletic sketches and eighty-three sermonic slippings. Vol. III., 8vo.....$4.20

RECENT ARTICLES.

BROWN, PROF. FRANCIS, The Books of Chronicles, with especial reference to those of Samuel. *Andover Review*, April '84, pp. 405–426.

GREGORY, PRES. D. S., Key to Bible Unity, No. 3. *Pulpit Treasury*, April '84, pp. 738–740.

PATTON, PROF. F. L., A Symposium on Evolution. No. IV. Is the Darwinian theory of Evolution reconcilable with the Bible? *Homiletic Monthly*, Apr. '84, pp. 404–411.

MORTIMER, REV, A. G., and NEWTON, REV. R. H., Recent Criticisms of the Bible. *North American Review*, April '84.

BROWN, PROF. FRANCIS, Assyriological Notes. *Presbyterian Review*, April '84, pp. 337–340.

REVIEWS.

BOHL, PROF. E., Zum Gesetz und zum Zeugniss: by Stade. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, March 8th, '84, c. 105–109.

PALEN, PROF. AUG., Die Lieder in den historischen Büchern des Alten Testaments: by Budde. *Ibid.*, c. 109–110.

DAY, GEO. E., Oehler's Theology of the Old Testament. By Starbuck. *Andover Review*, p. 462.

LADD, PROF. G. T., The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture: by C. A. Briggs. *Presbyterian Review*, April '84, pp. 376–388.

LAGARDE, PAUL DE, Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum pars prior: by H. P. Smith. *Ibid.*, pp. 348–352.