

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT❖

VOL. V.

DECEMBER, 1885.

NO. 4.

THE AUTHORITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. J. G. MURPHY, D. D., LL. D.,

General Assembly College, Belfast, Ireland.

I.

The authority of the Bible is founded upon the single fact that it is the word of God. The proof of this fact is that the writers of this sacred book speak as the spokesmen of God, and that every thing else in these writings is in harmony with the honesty and validity of this profession.

I. *First*, the writers of the Bible speak as the spokesmen of God. This is evident on the face of it, and becomes more evident the longer we study the book. One of these writers says of the Old Testament,¹ "All scripture is inspired of God." He says of himself and fellows,² "Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, conveying Spiritual things in Spiritual terms." And accordingly another testifies,³ "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city and out of the things which are written in this book." Many other statements of the same import may be quoted. And the writers always speak in a mode corresponding with this claim. The mode, indeed, varies, according to the nature of the subject. Thus, Ecclesiastes writes of the experience of life in this mundane sphere, as it presents itself to a man of practical wisdom. The Book of Proverbs is composed as it is natural for a man to write proverbs. The historian pursues his narrative in the style of an ordinary compiler of history. But in these, and all other cases, there is displayed the calm assurance of men who know and speak the

¹ 2 Tim. iii., 16. ² 1 Cor. ii., 13. ³ Rev. xxii., 18, 19.

things of God. They do not think it necessary to be perpetually asserting that they are divinely inspired; but they uniformly speak with authority, as men who are near to God, who have the mind of the Spirit, and are charged with a message from heaven.

II. And *secondly*, every thing else in this unique volume is in keeping with the plain indication of the writers that they are the spokesmen of God. Let us mark the main characteristics of the book that bear on this point, as they present themselves to the observant reader.

I. It embodies a history of mankind which is not only true in itself, but exhibits many peculiarities which are not to be found in any other work of the kind. It goes back to the origin of man, and traces the progress of the race from the first individual till it came to be distributed into the nations of the earth. It declares the original goodness of the father of mankind, and relates the fall of man from a state of holiness into a state of sin. And from the very beginning, it rises to the relation of man to his Maker and to the dealings of God with the human race in all the stages of its development. It is in one respect a universal history, treating of the whole progeny of Adam in all the vicissitudes of its course during more than four thousand years. It notes only the heads of things, the moving principles and decisive events that give character and impulse to human conduct, omitting the long and otherwise uninteresting periods of human affairs that are the mere consequence of these, and thus telling the tale of human progress in a marvelously brief space. But in another respect it is a particular history, unfolding in a few simple touches the workings of sin and the counterworkings of grace in the individual and the tribe; and then recording the rise of a chosen family into a people trained by divine institutions for the worship of the true God, the preservation of the knowledge of his grace and truth, and the restoration and establishment of the kingdom of God among all the nations of the earth. In the course of this narrative, it maintains a strict impartiality, finds no immaculate character even among the heroes of the chosen race, and lays bare the blemishes of the best men whom it celebrates. At the same time, it enters into the minutest details of personal life, and gives some of the most exquisite biographical sketches of men who had a conspicuous part in the heavenly enterprise. And it ascends to a climax of supernatural vision, when it relates the miraculous birth, holy life, atoning death and rightful resurrection of him whom it calls Immanuel, that is, God with us; and then proceeds to record the scene on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit came upon the assembled apostles, and to give the

labors and letters of some of the chief founders of the Christian church. It is plain that this is a history which could only be composed by men who were illuminated by the Spirit of God.

This history is, moreover, true and worthy of credit in every particular. It is corroborated by contemporary writers of other nations, as far as they touch upon the same times and places. It has been, and is still, receiving striking and frequent confirmation of its statements from the undoubted monuments of the past, from the stamps on the bricks of Babylon, the arrowheads on the tablets of Nineveh, the hieratic writings on the papyri of Egypt, and the inscriptions on the stones of Persia, Media and Palestine. It is more remarkable still that the sacred history of the Bible is the most trustworthy source to which antiquarians can resort for substantial aid in the decipherment of inscriptions and the identification of places coming within the range of its records. The late discovery of Pithom, one of the treasure-cities built for Pharaoh by the Israelites, is a case in point. Hence, it appears that this history is not only true in itself, but at the same time detects and corrects history in other documents bearing upon the same events. And some even of its marvelous events are beginning to be attested by the conclusions of science. The Bible records the beginning of things; and it is now the general opinion of men of science, on purely scientific grounds, that the present order of things had a beginning. The Bible tells of a deluge that destroyed the existing race of man, with the exception of a single family; and the Duke of Argyle is bold to affirm that there are grounds from geological research, for the submergence of a considerable portion of the present dry land under water within the period of man's existence on the earth. The manifest veracity of the narrative adds to the evidence that the writers drew their light from a divine source.

2. It recounts facts concerning the Supreme Being which are not open to unassisted reason or observation. It assumes the existence, and constantly affirms the wisdom, holiness and power, of the Eternal Spirit. It records the primary creation of the universe under the two-fold division of the heavens and the earth. It then describes a waste, void and dark abyss of waters on the surface of the earth, and depicts a subsequent creative process on this chaotic scene. This secondary creation lasts six days, and ends with the creation of man. All this was antecedent to the existence of man, and therefore beyond the range of human experience. It sets forth the providence of God as the foreordination of all events according to his eternal purpose; and it has no hesitation in including miracles, or supernatural acts, among the incidents of the divine government. It announces the mercy of

God to repenting sinners, the atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ as the legal condition of forgiveness and its attendant blessings, and the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit by means of these two unspeakable boons. Along with these three essential elements of salvation, it reveals that there are three persons in the one God,—the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, all equally necessary to the eternal essence of the Godhead. It is obvious that all these facts concerning the nature of God, the origin of things, and the salvation of man are, in their full certainty and significance, beyond the reach of the intuition of reason or the observation of the human understanding. The men who write familiarly and habitually of such deep things of God must speak by the Holy Ghost.

3. It contains a chain of prophecy consisting of many links and extending from the fall to the very last day of human destiny. The main element of this series is the advent of the Redeemer, and the rise, progress and universal triumph of the kingdom of grace and salvation, carried on through all generations, till the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment of the quick and the dead at the last day. The heavenly deliverer is called the seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, the Son of David, the Son of God, and the Messiah, or anointed of the Lord. The series of predictions concerning him runs from the first book of the Old Testament to the last book of the New. It may be divided into three volumes, the first of which culminates in Isaiah, the second in Daniel, and the third in the Revelation of John. The Messiah is described throughout as a king, a priest, and a prophet. The time and place of his birth are so plainly indicated, that men were expecting him when he came. He is declared to be the Son of Man, but at the same time the Son of God. Collateral predictions concerning persons or kingdoms that come into contact with him or his people are communicated with the utmost ease and certainty. The most striking examples of this are the future of the Jews and the destinies of the four world-monarchies. As we pass along the stream of actually past time, we can note the fulfillment of successive parts of this great system of prognostication. A culminating point in the progress of events was the birth, life and death of Immanuel, in which he performed the great priestly act of offering himself a sacrifice for sin, so becoming the propitiation for the whole world. And we are beginning to be aware that we are fast approaching another great crisis, when the Spirit of truth will at length have convinced the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment, and the reign of the saints of the Most High will begin. A third consummation is in the distance, when the great Judge of all the earth is to raise the dead,

and pronounce the sentence of acquittal on those who have returned to God, and the doom of condemnation on those who have persisted in enmity against him. Such are the sublime and solemn contents of prophecy, which up to this day have been receiving a continuous and conspicuous fulfillment. None but holy men of God, moved by the Holy Ghost, could reveal the several parts of this connected and consistent whole.

4. It enunciates the principles of an exalted and perfect morality. Ethics is that branch of metaphysics which relates to duty. All metaphysic has its root in reason, the faculty of intuition. It has two fields, the intellectual and the moral. The intellectual field of intuition is chiefly, but not exclusively, occupied with mathematics. The Scriptures abound in metaphysics. This is manifest whenever you reflect that you cannot take the first step in realism without intuition. For existence, substance, quality, thing, person—are all due to intuition, based on sensation. And the knowledge of one and all depends on such axioms as these:—that which acts exists; that which acts subsists; that which acts so, has a quality such as enables it to act so. That which thinks exists and is a person; that which acts without thinking, that is, without will or intention, exists, and is a thing. Hence, it is plain that the metaphysics of realism forms a large part of our thinking and speaking, and an equally large part of Scripture.

But ethics is a direct, not an incidental, element of the teaching of Scripture. The proclamation of the moral law from mount Sinai is the most clear, simple, concise and complete code of ethics ever published. It is complete as a whole; for it contains our duty to God and our duty to man. It is complete in the duty to God; for it inculcates the acknowledgment of his unity, his spirituality, his deity and his supremacy. It is complete in the duty we owe to man; for it enjoins the obligation of equity and charity towards inferiors, superiors and equals, with regard to their life, person and property, in deed, word and thought. Its clearness, simplicity and amazing brevity nobody can deny. It contains one commandment which expresses, in a special case, the great principle of equity which runs through the whole decalogue, namely, "Thou shalt not steal." And the law of charity glances through, from behind the law of equity, in the beautiful clause, "And showing mercy unto a thousand generations of them that love me and keep my commandments." There is no match for this piece of legislation in the whole range of human literature. Equity and good-will are the two axioms of ethics. They are expanded in the briefest possible form in the decalogue. They may be expanded into a moral science of any extent. But there is not a prop-

osition in the whole theory of conscience, which may not be traced back to these two spring-heads of ethical truth. And even these two are simply the negative and positive poles of the one great moral principle, Whatsoever ye would that others should do to you, do ye even so to them. This is the one uniform and often repeated and exemplified morality of the Bible. All human examples, indeed, are imperfect. But there is one perfect and sublime exemplification of this axiomatic principle of moral science, which we might say it was the chief object of the Bible to set forth. It is touchingly expressed in the following sentence: "Herein is love, not that we love God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." This will for ever be the wonder of wonders in the grandeur of goodwill at least to the family of man. The book that contains the absolute theory of moral obligation, and the only unexceptionable example of disinterested benevolence, is in this respect worthy of God, and can only come from men who are the spokesmen of God.

Three other important characteristics, bearing upon this point, will be treated in a second article.

THE REVISED PSALTER.

BY PROFESSOR EDWIN CONE BISSELL, D. D.,

Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

I.

The object of this paper is simply to call attention to a few of the more important changes made by the Revisers in the Book of Psalms. I understand that I am at liberty to express approval or disapproval of these changes, as I may think best. I cannot feel at liberty, however, to be out of sympathy with the undertaking to improve our English Bible. I cannot look upon the company of noble men who have been engaged in it, otherwise than with the highest gratitude and respect. No other Christian scholars of this generation, I believe, were better fitted for the task. None would have accomplished it more successfully, or to the greater satisfaction of the Christian public. I am inclined, in fact, for one, to accept the work they have given us as, on the whole, the very best that was possible at this time and under these circumstances. What was ideal was not striven for, but only what was practicable. In some respects the result is a disappointment; it could not well be otherwise. In general, it is a source of peculiar gratification and encouragement.

If, in some rare cases, accordingly, I venture to dissent from conclusions reached, it is in no spirit of captiousness. It is simply as an outsider who may be assumed to be ignorant of many of the reasons which influenced this body of men in what they have done or left undone. Nor do I forget that, in such instances of dissent, I may be merely giving my vote with an actual majority of the Revisers themselves (see preface to the Old Testament, p. ix). It should not be overlooked, in fact, by any one, that the marginal notes form a constituent, and by no means an unessential, part of the Revision. They stand but a single step removed from the text, and, like some of their honored predecessors in the Bible of 1611, not a few of them merely await the more general invitation which, after a time, is sure to come, to take their more appropriate place within it.

The revised Psalter is certainly a great improvement on that of two hundred and seventy-four years ago. One who reads the two side by side will be surprised to discover how many really important changes have been made. One who reads the Revision by itself, while noticing, possibly, no great difference in sound or sense, will still wonder at the ease with which he comprehends some hitherto beclouded texts, and, here and there, will be at once startled and charmed by the new light that bursts upon him from quite unexpected places. Only a very small proportion of the more than two hundred instances I had marked, where changes worthy of special note have been made, can be here reviewed. Where exception is taken to changes made or not made, it will be uniformly indicated in a foot-note.

Psalm II., 12.—The rendering "For his wrath will soon be kindled" (RV.) is to be preferred to "When his wrath is kindled but a little" (AV.), especially for grammatical reasons. The Hebrew word in consideration, when standing by itself in the Bible, is commonly made to refer to time and not to quantity (cf. Isa. XXVI., 20). The statement of Lange's *Bibelwerk, in loco*, that it does not have the meaning of "soon," in hypothetical connections, is false. Cf. Ps. LXXXI., 14; Job XXXII., 22. Are we to understand that the Revisers, in leaving out the capitals with "he" and "his," meant to indicate that, in their opinion, the Son, and not Jehovah, is referred to in this language?¹

¹ In Ps. II., 1, the marginal rendering appears to me to be much nearer the original than is the text: "Why do the nations tumultuously assemble, And the peoples meditate a vain thing?" The Revisers, moreover, by rendering the word *regesh* "throng" in Ps. IV., 14 (cf. also LXL., 2; Dan. VI., 11, 15), offer a justification for the margin here, while the AV. translates *haghab* by "meditate" in Ps. I., as frequently, and never anywhere else by "imagine," except in Ps. XXXVIII., 12, where also the Revisers seem to have neglected a good opportunity.

Ps. v., 3.—The latent reference to the morning sacrifice, which the original contains here has been happily brought out by rendering: "In the morning will I order (AV., direct) *my prayer* unto thee, and will keep watch" (AV., look up). The Hebrew word for "order" is the one especially used of the arranging of the wood and the victim on the altar. And the psalmist says that when he had done this he would keep watch, that is, for the answering fire from heaven to consume his sacrifice. In verse 4, "Evil shall not sojourn with thee" is a more correct and a much more significant declaration than "Evil shall not dwell with thee" (AV.). And the same is true of "Hold them guilty, O God" (verse 10), substituted for "Destroy thou them, O God." The Hebrew verbal root concerned carries in itself the idea both of sin and the punishment of sin. In the Qal form it means either to incur guilt or to suffer for it. In the Hiph'il, accordingly, it should be rendered by "hold guilty," "condemn," or, "give up to punishment as guilty." The LXX. have properly translated by *krinon autous*.

Ps. VII., 6, 7.—Grammatical considerations, as well as the context, required an essential modification of the thought at this point. In magnificent imagery, the poet represents Jehovah, who had descended to interpose in his behalf, as ascending, after the sentence had gone forth, from the earthly judgment-seat to his heavenly domain, in view of the assembled peoples (cf. Gen. XVII., 22; Ps. LXVIII., 18). Hence, he does not say: "Awake for me *to* the judgment *that* thou hast commanded" (AV.), but "Awake for me" (RV.). And then, with the response of faith, "thou hast commanded judgement. And let the congregation of the peoples compass thee about: And over them return thou on high" (AV., "for their sakes therefore return thou," etc.). Again, in verse 11, it is a decided improvement, from the point of view of the original text, to say that God is One who has "indignation every day," (RV.), rather than that "God is angry with *the wicked* every day" (AV.). The thought is not general. The connection shows that what is meant is that God, as a righteous judge, is always observing and always indignant at wrong-doing, though there may be delay in visiting punishment upon it. And in verse 13, an evident mistake has been properly corrected. The reference, undoubtedly, is to arrows used in sieges, which were often dipped in some inflammable substance. Cf. Eph. VI., 16. The AV. renders: "He ordaineth his arrows against the persecutors." It should be: "He maketh his arrows fiery *shafts*." The LXX., and others of the old versions, are in the same condemnation as our own (LXX., *tois kaiomenois*).

Ps. VIII., 5.—The new rendering here "For thou hast made him but little lower than God" (AV., the angels) will come near having

a startling effect on some readers. It is, however, not only justified by the Hebrew, but really required by the context, which undoubtedly has in view the account of man's creation given in Gen. 1., 27.

Ps. IX., 7.—The Hebrew verb *yashabh* does not mean "to endure" here, or anywhere else in the Bible. The AV. has often missed one of its commonest significations "to sit as king," "to be enthroned." The Revisers have done well in this place, therefore, to change the almost tautological "But the Lord shall endure for ever" into "But the Lord sitteth *as king* for ever."

Ps. X., 3, 4.—Quite a new turn has been given to the thought in this difficult psalm, in a number of instances, and greatly to its advantage in clearness and force. The necessity for such changes had long been felt by scholars, and now, that they are made, they will, no doubt, commend themselves to all as at least suitable to their connection. It is not said, for example, of the wicked that he "blesseth the covetous *whom* the Lord abhorreth;" but, as the parallelism requires, he is put on a level with the covetous, and it is declared of him that he "renounceth, *yea*, contemneth the Lord." That is, the verb *barak* is used here, as in Job I., 11, and elsewhere, in the sense of "take leave of," "renounce," and not in its ordinary sense of "bless." And so in the following verse, which carries on the same thought, we read in the Revision, "The wicked in the pride of his countenance *saieth*, He will not require it. All his thoughts are, There is no God." The AV., far less happily, "The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek *after* God: God is not in all his thoughts."

Ps. XI., 7.—The weight of probability is largely in favor of the Revised Translation, "The upright shall behold his face," in place of "His countenance doth behold the upright," although, grammatically speaking, the latter is quite as correct as the former. For the possibility and desirability of beholding the face of God is a common sentiment of the Psalter, as well as of the other Scriptures (Ps. XVII., 15; CXL. 13), while the representation of the face as seeing is foreign to them.

Ps. XVI., 2, 3.—None will be found to regret that the original text did not justify the tame and dubious expression "My goodness *extendeth* not to thee. *But* to the saints that *are* in the earth, and *to* the excellent, in whom *is* all my delight;" but calls rather for the logically lucid and scripturally correct statement, "I have no good beyond thee. As for the saints that are in the earth, They are the excellent," etc.¹

¹ In verse 4, there is a lexical difficulty with the word *mahar*. The idea of exchange may, it is true, be derived from it, and has a slight support in Jer. ii., 11. But a more correct rendering, as it seems to me, would be that of the margin ("give gifts for"), the reference, apparently, being to the gifts made by the betrothed on account of his bride. De Witt even renders, "Their griefs shall be many who wed with other gods." See *Praise Songs of Israel*, New York, 1884, p. 18.

Ps. XVII., 5.—AV., "Hold up my goings in thy paths." An Infinitive absolute is rendered as an Imperative, which is allowable in certain circumstances; but here it was obviously intended to take the tense, and be subordinated to the form, of the preceding and following verbs. Hence the RV., more properly, "My steps have held fast to thy paths." And in verse 11, an Infinitive construct with *l'* has been restored to its right sense as expressing a purpose, "They have set their eyes to cast *us* down (AV. bowing down) to the earth." Still again in verse 13 seq., there is a gain in literalness, as well as in force, in the rendering "confront him," that is, the wicked, instead of the "disappoint him" of the AV. And while it would not be positively out of harmony with the teaching of the Scriptures to call the wicked the sword of Jehovah, or to speak of men, rhetorically, as his hand (AV.), still the context clearly demands the change: "Deliver my soul from the wicked by thy sword; From men by thy hand, O Lord." It is not against God's judgments that the psalmist is praying, but against man's injustice and cruelty.

Ps. XVIII., 2.—As in several other passages, the AV. has mistranslated the word *maghen* here, which never means any thing else than shield, by "buckler" (*socherah*, Ps. XCI., 4), and the Revisers have corrected accordingly, as also at verse 30, and Ps. VII., 10 (AV., "defence").¹

Ps. XIX., 3.—This verse explains in what sense it is understood that the heavens do not speak: "There is no speech nor language; their voice cannot be heard." Nevertheless, there is intelligible communication. The AV., accordingly, says just the opposite of what it ought to say, "There is no speech nor language *where* their voice is not heard." So in verse 5, valuable service has been rendered in indicating that the original is not responsible for the irrelevant thought that the sun "rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race," but only for this, that it "rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course," though it may seem to take him around the inhabited globe. Again, in verse 7, the AV. is brought into harmony with itself in Ps. XXIII., when it is made by the Revisers to say of the law of the Lord that it restores (not "converts") the soul. And in verse 12, where there was danger of one's theology becoming somewhat befogged on the great doctrine of sin, if he were to trust the common English version, the opening

¹ I am wholly unable to explain why the Revisers have substituted "brass," in verse 34 of this psalm in place of "copper" or "bronze" for "steel," or why they have retained the word in other places in the Old Testament. It seems not unlikely that men were already acquainted with steel, or something answering to it, (cf. Jer. xv., 12); but we have no knowledge that they employed brass. At Nahum II., 3 (Revelon) there is a recognition of steel, though the original word is not that which is used here.

of God's Word as it really is, has again given light (Ps. CXIX., 130). It should read, "Who can discern (AV., understand) *his* errors? Clear (AV., cleanse) thou me from hidden *faults*."

Ps. XXI., 6.—In XVI., 11, the psalmist, who seems to be David, speaks of "fullness of joy" in the divine "presence." Here, in a psalm, likewise ascribed to David, the expression recurs, in part, "Thou makest him glad with joy in thy presence." The AV., however, without reason, and with a clear loss to the rhythm, changes it to "Thou hast made him exceeding glad with thy countenance."

Ps. XXII., 29.—The unintelligible "And none can keep his soul alive" (AV.) is brought into harmony with its context by the new rendering, "Even he that cannot keep his soul alive" (RV.). That is, not only the rich and mighty, but also the poor and helpless are to submit themselves to Jehovah.¹

Ps. XXIII., 3.—It is gratifying that, in this delightful psalm, but a single change was found necessary. The Revisers would render, "He guideth me (AV., leadeth me) in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake." In the preceding verse a different Hebrew word was translated by "leadeth." While elsewhere the AV. itself translates this one by "guide." In the interest of exactness, therefore, and of Hebrew synonymy, the alteration was called for (see Ps. XXXI., 3; XLVIII., 14; LXXVIII., 26, 52).

Ps. XXIV., 6;² XXVII., 3.—The removal of obscurities in a version is scarcely less important than the correction of false renderings. Here the ambiguous "In this will I be confident," possibly understood as referring back to the declaration in verse 1, has given place to "Even then will I be confident," that is, obviously, though war should rise against me. Cf. the rendering of the same expression in the AV. at Lev. XXVI., 27 ("for all this").

Ps. XXIX., 9, 10.—A magnificent passage that has so often stirred us in the old version, will stir us yet more in the new. The former's vagueness, notwithstanding its antiquity, we shall part with without protest, in the presence of the latter's directness and perspicuity.

⁹ "The voice of the Lord maketh the hinds to calve,
And strippeth the forests bare (AV., discovereth the forests);

¹ In verse 16, in the translation "They pierced my hands and my feet," the Revisers acknowledge that they have followed the Sept., Vulg. and Syr. (Am. Revisers add, "etc.") against the Hebrew text, and so contrary to their usual practice. It might appear like an evasion, as the text is theologically important, if another pointing of the Hebrew did not give much the same meaning as the Versions. Still, it is unfortunate that, of the few readings adopted on the authority of the ancient versions, one of them should be of this character.

² Here, again, the Revisers have abandoned the Hebrew text to follow the LXX., Syriac and Vulgate Versions. We see no just ground for it, and should vote decidedly with the American Committee, who would substitute the margin "even Jacob" for the text. The harshness of the Hebrew construction is itself evidence of its originality.

And in his temple every thing saith, Glory (AV., doth every one speak of his glory).

10. The Lord sat *as king* at the Flood (AV., sitteth upon the flood);
Yea, the Lord *sitteth* as king for ever."

Ps. xxx., 4.—As might have been expected, the sublime declaration of Jehovah to his servant Moses, found in Exod. iii., 14, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you," is made the subject of allusion by the biblical writers (cf. Ps. xcvi., 12). There is such an allusion here. The AV., however, betrays not the faintest indication of it in its "give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness." The Revisers come appreciably nearer to the sense in rendering "Give thanks to his holy name."¹ Verse 5.—Human suffering finds no alleviation like that which comes from the Scriptures; its promises, its encouragements to faith and hope. Consequently it is no unmeaning change, to read in place of "Weeping may endure for a night," the more comforting "Weeping may tarry [as a sojourner] for the night, But joy *cometh* in the morning."

Ps. xxxii., 8, 9.—If, for the sake of coming nearer to the actual truths of the Bible, we are willing to sacrifice some favorite passages from our familiar English Version, we shall not suffer it to alarm or deter us if we find that those truths, in their inspired original form, prove to be out of harmony with many a well-wrought sermon or many a popular hymn. Jehovah did not just say—difficult as it may be to work the new thought into the old song that says he did—"I will guide thee with mine eye" (AV.), but something equally tender and beautiful: "I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee" (RV.). And the comparison of human intractability with that of the horse or the mule loses none of its suitableness or effectiveness by the decided change of form it undergoes in the hands of competent modern scholars. The psalmist does not assert of these animals that their mouth must be "held in with bit and bridle lest they come near unto thee" (AV.); but, in stricter harmony with his own context, "Whose trappings must be bit and bridle to hold them in, *Else* they will not come near unto thee" (RV.).

The foregoing corrections in the first thirty-two psalms, with many others left unnoticed by us, may seem to some minds somewhat trivial and unimportant; but they are far from being so. "The notion that slight errors, and defects and faults are immaterial," says Archdeacon Hare, "and that we need not go to the trouble of correcting them, is one main cause why there are so many huge errors and defects and faults in every region of human life, practical and speculative,

¹But the American Committee have brought out the idea precisely in translating: "Give thanks to his holy memorial name."

moral and political. No error should be deemed slight which affects the meaning of a single word in the Bible ; where so much weight is attached to every single word ; and where so many inferences and conclusions are drawn from the slightest ground. Not merely those which find utterance in books, but a far greater number springing up in the minds of the millions to whom our English Bible is the code and canon of all truth. For this reason, errors, even the least, in a version of the Bible, are of far greater moment than in any other book, as well because the contents of the Bible are of far deeper importance, and have a far wider influence, as also because the readers of the Bible are not only the educated and the learned, who can exercise some sort of judgement in what they read, but vast multitudes who understand whatever they read according to the letter."

THE VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A CORRECT KNOWLEDGE OF THE NEW.

BY PROFESSOR S. BURNHAM, D. D.,

Hamilton Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.

[This article is the *fourth* in a series on "The Value of the Old Testament for the Work of the Pastor," of which the first appeared in Vol. IV., No. 3, the second in Vol. IV., No. 4, the third in Vol. IV., No. 6.]

We are to consider what is the value of the Old Testament for the pastor, because of the aid which may be derived from it for the correct apprehension of the teachings of the New Testament. This value of the Old Testament for a correct knowledge of the New, is twofold.

1. The first element of value is the fact that the doctrinal teachings of the New Testament, and the meaning of its facts, are only fully and accurately to be known in the light of the facts and truths presented in the Old Testament.

It has already been shown, in treating of the first kind of Old Testament homiletical material,—namely, the History of the Central Preparation for the Incarnation,—that Jesus and his doctrines are only to be rightly understood and correctly known, when he and they are studied in the light of the history of Israel, and this history itself is regarded as the result of a continued divine on-going in human life towards the coming Incarnation. What is now claimed is similar to this, and yet different from it. It is now maintained, not only that Jesus and his teachings are not to be understood if the Old Testament is left out of account, but that all the New Testament writings

can only be fully and truly interpreted in the light of Old Testament truths and facts. It is, moreover, meant that the knowledge of the history of Israel is not alone sufficient for the man who would know the true meaning of the New Testament, but he must have also a knowledge of the doctrines taught in the Old Testament, and understand the real import of the various facts of religious and spiritual significance which it presents.

For the New Testament teaching is simply the complement of that of the Old. The New Testament has, in no sense, superseded or abrogated the Old; nor is its teaching a different teaching from that of the Old, if, by different, it is meant to imply any degree of opposition. God and man in the Old Testament are not other than they are in the New. The God of the Old Testament is, in his character, and in his essential relations to man, just what God is declared to be in the New Testament. There is not one way of salvation, one law of life, one code of ethics, in the Old Testament, and another, or a different, in the New. God is not doing one work in the world according to one set of principles, as he is presented to us in the Old Testament, and another according to new and different principles, as seen in the New. The work is, in both cases, essentially the same. The form of it may change indeed; but even thus, the new form is only the result and development of the old form. God's purpose for man is ever the same; His essential relations to him always unchanged; the principles on which He deals with him for good or for ill, eternally fixed, for they lie in His own immutable nature. It must be, therefore, that the New Testament doctrine owes both substance and form to the same essentials that underlie and shape the teaching of the Old Testament. Revelation is a unity.

But it is also a development. Like creation, revelation is a thing of gradual completion. In it, as in nature, the highest forms have appeared last. But these highest forms are not separate from and independent of the lower. On the contrary, they are possible only by the pre-existence of the lower forms, and in a certain sense, are the product of these lower forms. In essence and in determining factors, they are largely identical with the lower forms that have made them possible. They are, consequently, only to be understood by first comprehending well these lower forms. The zoologist must study the mollusca, if he is to give the full interpretation of man, and must not be ignorant of the larva, if he would rightly unfold the life-history of the butterfly, and explain its structure. So, too, the interpreter of the New Testament, to be truly successful in his work of unfolding these last teachings of the Spirit, must have a knowledge of the real mean-

ing of the facts and doctrines of the Old Testament, in which the lower forms of the great truths of revelation appear.

It must be useless to expect to enter into the real centre of Christianity but as the race entered it. The fact is that, in a very broad and deep sense, "Salvation is of the Jews," as our Lord himself declared. The Son of Man was a Jew, Paul was a Jew, the New Testament writers were all Jews. All these had their thinking and their teaching continually shaped by the institutions and ideas of the Old Testament. From the Old Testament they drew the greater part of what they taught. To attempt, therefore, to reach the real meaning of the New Testament without recognizing, not merely that there is a connection between it and the Old Testament, but as well that Old Testament ideas are the very centre and soul of it, is to ignore all the facts relating both to the historical development of Christianity itself, and to the gradual reception of the New Testament as authoritative and divine.

In support of the view which has been taken in regard to the necessity of the knowledge of the real meaning of the Old Testament for the right understanding of the New, and for the confirmation of the statements on this head, which have been somewhat dogmatically made, the following considerations are presented:

(1) The early church, in the days of the apostles and their immediate successors, saw in Christianity, if we may not say merely the religion of the Old Testament, then certainly a religion based on the Old Testament, and for whose contents the Old Testament was a sufficient and satisfactory warrant. This is shown by the fact that, while the Old Testament Scriptures were always received in the church of this period as authoritative and divine, the writings of the New Testament only gradually came to be acknowledged as a body of inspired Scripture, and as equal in value and authority to the Old Testament. In reference to this historic fact, which no student of the history of the early church can doubt, Westcott remarks (*Canon of the New Testament*, p. 1):

"It seems no less important to trace the gradual recognition of a written Apostolic rule as authoritative and divine, to observe the gradual equalization of 'the Gospel and Epistles' with the 'Law and the Prophets.'"

The same writer also says, in his article in Smith's Bible Dictionary (Article *Canon*):

"The sense of the infinite depth and paramount authority of the Old Testament was too powerful even among Gentile converts to require or to admit of the immediate addition of supplementary books. But the sense of the peculiar position which the Apostles occupied, as the original and inspired teachers of the

Christian church, was already making itself felt in the sub-apostolic age; and, by a remarkable agreement, Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, and Barnabas draw a clear line between themselves and their predecessors, from whom they were not separated by any lengthened intervals of time."

It is clear, then, that neither Christ nor the apostles intended it to be understood that the religion and the doctrines which they preached and taught were, in any way, to abrogate, supersede, or even stand over against the Old Testament. On the contrary, they must have found in the Old Testament itself the essential elements of what they taught, and must have based all their teachings on its contents; so that their doctrines and the religion based upon these, were such as could only be completely and accurately understood in the light of the Old Testament teaching. Else the apostolic, and the sub-apostolic church, would not have accepted, with such unanimity, the Old Testament Scriptures as an authority for the contents of the Christian faith, and only gradually have given to the gospels and the epistles a rank and an authority equal to those of the law and the prophets.

(2) The apostles themselves speak of the teachings of the Old Testament in such a way as to show that they considered them to be, at least in essentials, the teachings of Christianity, and a complete guide and authority for beginning and perfecting the Christian life. Paul, for example, in 2 Tim. III., 14, 15, declares that, in the Old Testament is made known, with all needed clearness, (a) the Christian way of salvation, (b) the nature and true object of Christian faith, (c) the manner and means of true reformation of life, and (d) the way to attain perfection of Christian character. But this is only to say that the Old Testament is, "for substance of doctrine," the creed of Christendom, at least so far as concerns the great outlines of the Christian faith. Christianity, therefore, was not intended to supersede the Old Testament, still less to stand in any attitude of hostility to it. Christian doctrine is its complement, making clear its true meaning, and, in turn, made to be thoroughly understood only by its aid.

(3) Christ himself, as we are told in Matt. v., 17, declared that his teaching was not, in any sense, an abrogation of the Old Testament, but was only the outgrowth and complement of the teaching to be found in it. This will appear if we consider what must be the meaning of the word *Pleroo*, as used in this passage. The etymology of this word, the evident opposition in which it stands, in this passage, to *Kataluo*, and the clear intent of the speaker, as determined by the context, all unite in showing that it can here have no other meaning than that of *fill out*, or *complete*. What Christ meant to say, then, surely was, that this teaching was only the complement of the teach-

ing of the Old Testament, founded upon it, and, in essentials, identical with it. This teaching of his, and the religion to which it gave birth, are, then, only to be correctly understood as they are studied in the light of the Old Testament teaching.

All these considerations surely establish the truth of what was claimed at the beginning, that the doctrines and facts of the New Testament are only to be apprehended as they are approached along the way of the Old Testament teaching. Any attempt to know the truth that lies in the New Testament, if it ignores this one true way of finding it, can only end in more or less of mistake and error. The preacher, who neglects the study of the Old Testament, must either preach only some part of the glorious gospel of the Christ who interpreted in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself, or some perversion of that gospel, some "other" gospel. To do either of these things, is to fail to be the true pastor, duly feeding the flock of God.

EGYPT BEFORE B. C. 2000.

BY PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D. D.,
Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

I.

It is common now for writers on the history of the east to speak of times three, four and five thousand years before Christ. They speak with so much assurance, that one might suppose there was no rational doubt of these dates. While there is much to be said in favor of these extreme dates, it is well for us to be assured that they lack for their proof indubitable contemporary monuments which have come down to our days. The tradition of a people, or rational inference from later monuments, is very uncertain ground for the firm tread of history. We may have good reason to believe that the tradition represents facts, and that our inferences are correct, but, if we possess no monumental proof, tradition and inferences should be painted as nebulae and nothing more.

I shall not deal with nebulae, but with simple, hard facts, that have been verified and reverified by numerous proofs, now extant, in sculptured stone, paintings, architecture, articles of dress, of domestic and agricultural use, and of all the employments of life. These proofs do not rest on any single monument, but are checked and stamped by many monuments and by their undesigned, yet undeniable, coincidences, the strongest of proofs.

I have no theories about the pyramids, nor am I a chronologist to fight the battle of dates. I shall not discuss either.

By the testimony of architecture, archæology and philology, most of the oldest extant monuments of our race are found in Egypt. There by a process as simple and as sure as the addition of known numbers, we reach monuments of the human brain and hand at least five hundred years anterior to any others now known, which form the bound to the utmost reach of positive history of man, outside the Bible.

For the period of which alone this paper treats, the first six dynasties, I have put the date, B. C. 2000, five hundred years later than the calmest of the archæologists of Egypt put it, while others move it back 2500 to 3000 years anterior to B. C. 2000. Having little faith in dates which cannot be proved, I have marked a terminus previous to which the period spoken of must have passed away.

We are driven back beyond B. C. 2000 by the testimony of long walls inscribed in bas-relief and painted, by inscribed sarcophagi, by numerous memorial tablets or steles, by many granite, diorite and basalt statues, by inscriptions and bas-reliefs on rocks in all parts of Egypt. Besides these, there are six different, yet generally concurring lists of pharaohs; five of which were inscribed before B. C. 1200, in different parts of Egypt. The papyrus of Turin (age of Ramses II.), the inscription of Seti I. at Abydos, the inscription of Ramses II. at Abydos, the tablet of Sakkarah (time of Ramses II.), the inscription in the hall of the ancestors at Karnak, now at Paris, and the list of Manetho.

By no credible supposition of contemporaneous dynasties can the first six dynasties be brought below B. C. 2000. Before Ramses II. (1500-1300 B. C.) there were more than seventy pharaohs, who ruled over upper and lower Egypt. From the last pharaoh of the third dynasty to and inclusive of the sixth dynasty the extant monuments are so many and various that we are better acquainted with the manner of life under these dynasties than under any of their successors.

Besides these lists of kings, there are also imperfect lists of the royal architects and hereditary priests of these early times, found in upper and lower Egypt.

The temples, tombs, steles, pyramids, statues, vases, bas-reliefs, tell their own story of their age. Just as one acquainted with the archæology of art in Europe, can with certainty assign works to their period, and would never mistake works of the Renaissance for those of the early Christian centuries, or place the Tanagra figurines within the Christian centuries, so the extant monuments of Egypt range them-

selves necessarily in their proper order, and lead us beyond B. C. 2000, as the period of the first six dynasties.

It is easy to say B. C. 2000, but it is very difficult to realize it. B. C. 2000 is more than 1000 years before Homer ; as far beyond Homer into the preceding ages as we are removed from Gregory the Great and Mahomet. B. C. 2000 is more than 2000 years before the reindeer departed from France and Germany, and 1500 years before the elephant left his grazing ground in Mesopotamia. It is 1200-1300 years before Greek and Roman history begins. It is 1000 years before the earliest known period of Indian history. It is 1000 years before the reign of David in Israel, when the present fashionable philological criticism tells us the history of Israel begins. It is 500 years before Moses led Israel out of Egypt and 500 years before the book of Genesis was written. It is 250 years before Joseph went down to Egypt, and 50 years before Abraham sought refuge there.

This is a long time ago, and in our conscious superiority of the 19th century we are apt to lay our hands upon our heads and pity the supposed poor creatures, ignorant as beasts, existing, not living, who were condemned to subdue this earth for us immeasurably their superiors. A closer acquaintance with the world's ancestors will abate this pride and dissipate this ignorance. Because we have the printing-press and railroads and telegraphs and telephones, we sometimes look back with contempt on the men of these early ages. But they were the men who, by the most compact logical deductions, made the grandest discoveries of all time, compared to which later inventions, great as they are, take their place in a lower sphere. The grandest of all inventions by human brain was that of the alphabet, and for that invention we must ascend towards these early years.

The ancient Egyptians rise up before us. They speak no word. Their works answer for them ; and, considering the current misapprehension concerning them, we do not wonder at the sad smile on the face of many an ancient statue.

Strong in brain and deft of hand were these early men, yet our knowledge of them is largely drawn from their peculiar weakness. From the first days of their manhood they were busied in building their own tombs, small temples in their way, built of hard fine-grained stone that took a polish and held the delicate tracing of bas-reliefs of scenes and of inscriptions explanatory of the scenes. On the inner walls of these temple-tombs they caused to be inscribed during their lifetime their own epitaphs, so as to avoid all mistake on that subject. And for elaborate self-laudation these epitaphs defy the competition of all later mortuary literature. These early Egyptians tell who they

are, whom they married, what office or offices they hold, how well they perform their duties, and what the pharaoh thought of them, what they possess, what they enjoy, and last, though not least, what they expect from the gods. If all they say of themselves was true, we need never hope to see them in the next world, and the present long disappearance of Osiris from the world's history can be easily accounted for by his bankruptcy from endeavoring to reward such merits. But this very vanity and selfrighteousness spreads before us on the enduring stone the glowing picture of their life and its accompaniments, so that now the most accurate account of B. C. 2000 is the simple recital of pictures any child can read. Most of the tombs of these early days are found west of the site of ancient Memphis, stretching for miles along the desert and in the immediate neighborhood of the pyramids.

At the earliest point of history we find Egypt a compact, well organized State under its pharaohs. Its territory extended from the first cataract (Elephantine) to the sea, 600 miles north and south. It was already divided into upper Egypt, from Elephantine to near Memphis, and lower Egypt, from Memphis over the Delta. Not only do we read the orders of the earliest pharaohs concerning this territory and its government, but the stones themselves, transported hundreds of miles at the orders of the pharaohs, tell of their original home far away. At this time Egypt was divided into nomes, or counties, and each nome had its name, its well-defined boundary, its system of irrigation, and its governor and judges. Over a number of nomes or counties a higher officer was placed.

Egypt, well regulated within, was rich and strong enough to seek conquest abroad, for no other purpose than to increase its luxury. The first monument of the pharaohs is found, not in Egypt, but high up on the rocks of the Wady Maggarah, in the peninsula of Sinai, above one of the openings into the copper and turquoise mines. In this valley and near these mines there are fifteen other inscriptions of the successors of this pharaoh. These mines could produce nothing but copper and turquoise, they were 250 miles away from the capital of the pharaohs, Memphis, and 100 miles from their eastern boundary and beyond a burning desert, yet the Egyptians conquered this land and held it by garrison, to obtain copper and the jewel, though of this jewel comparatively little use was made.

The Nile then was the Nile of to-day. Under a pharaoh of the sixth dynasty an officer goes to the first cataract and procures timber from farther up the river and builds four dockyards, and at one time with "six broad ships, three tow-boats, three rafts and one vessel of

war" brings down to Memphis "a sarcophagus," "granite doorway sills" and "a statue" (Inscrip. of Una, *Records of Past*, Birch, 2:7). These boats loaded with granite could only be brought down over the cataract at the time of the inundation, just as at the present time. De Rouge, *Recherches*, p. 117.

Egypt was then the gift of the Nile, for the early bas-reliefs and paintings represent the land as overflowed. Already instructed in the art of irrigation, of which we know so little, the people had furrowed the land with canals for irrigation and for navigation.

The population was dense and cities were found in all parts of the land and are mentioned in the inscriptions. With the earliest records Memphis is a great city, with temples and priests, not only within its limits, but in its vicinity.

From the numerous statues of the men and women of this period we gain a very clear idea of the form and fashion of the people. These statues are remarkable as portraits in stone. Some of them are colored. There is one statue in wood, which, when it was brought to light from the sand of Sakkarah, the natives immediately named the Sheik el Beled (village mayor), from its close resemblance to the living village sheik. The men were in general tall and thin in flesh, with large full shoulders, full chest, the arm strong and ending in a long, thin hand, the hips narrow, the lower leg thin, the muscles of the knee and calf largely developed, for they were great walkers, the feet long, thin, and broad at the toes. The brow square and rather low, the nose short and round, the eyes large and opening wide, the cheeks round, the lips thick, the mouth long and smiling (Maspero, p. 16). "According to Prof. Owen (*Trans. 2 Intern. Congr. of Orientalists*, Lond. 1874, 6, p. 370) the skull shows a highly Caucasian type and intellectual development" (Birch, *Bede Lect.*, p. 10, n.). There is nothing to distinguish the man of B. C. 2000 from races now existing. The statues of B. C. 2000 are portraits to the life of men of Egypt to-day.

These old Egyptians were not living mummies. Thoughtful, mindful of death and the judgment, and preparing in their way for it, capable of stupendous conceptions and able to build their wonders on the earth and under it, taking note of every item of income and expenditure, pertinacious in little things as well as in great works, yet "no people could be gayer, more lively, of more childlike simplicity, than those old Egyptians who loved life with all their heart and found the deepest joy in their very existence." "They were fond of biting jests and smart inuendoes; and free social talk found its way even into the silent chambers of the tomb." (Brugsch, *Hist.* p. 19.) They had their moral apothegms which bear a strange likeness to those we use

at the present day. They knew the worth of moral purity, of filial obedience, of humility in all stations, of the right use of wealth, of kindness especially to the poor; but, like men of later generations, they knew and preached more than they practised.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. W. J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

DECEMBER 13. THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR. Isa. LIII., 1-12.

DECEMBER 20. THE GRACIOUS INVITATION. Isa. LV., 1-11.

The last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah form a continuous literary work. This work may perhaps be best described as a didactic poem, a series of sermons in rhythm, full of feeling and poetic fire, though lacking the progressive action which would be essential in an epic or in a drama. The regular rhythm of the poem is stately, occasionally relieved by the insertion of brief lyric pieces, with an entirely different movement. See, for example, Isa. XLII., 10-12.

The poem has three main divisions, each of them containing three subdivisions, each of which consists of three parts. These twenty-seven parts are quite commonly called cantos, in the lack of a better term, by the scholars who have written on the book of Isaiah. The twenty-seven cantos differ somewhat in their limits from the twenty-seven chapters, as the latter are now divided.

Many commentators hold that the poem was written from the point of view of Israel in Babylon, just at the beginning of the conquests of Cyrus. Some of these hold that this point of view was adopted predictively, by inspiration, and others, that the book was written in the time of Cyrus. With all due deference to men wiser than myself, I cannot accept this opinion. Some parts of the work certainly refer to the period in question, Isa. XLIV., 24-28, and the opening verses of the next chapter, for example. But this is only an occasional mode of representation; the usual mode contemplates Israel as a political power, residing in Jerusalem and the cities of Judah.

These twenty-seven cantos are very much more used in the New Testament than is any other continuous portion of the Old Testament of equal length. Some other sections, the middle chapters of Genesis, for example, or a selected tract of the Psalms, might rival it in the number of citations, but the citations from these chapters of Isaiah are longer and fuller, and the imagery of Isaiah is carried over into the New Testament, to an extent altogether without parallel in these other writings. The name of Isaiah, as a concordance shows, is ten times mentioned in the New Testament, in connection with these twenty-seven chapters; in six of these instances, the words cited are attributed, verbally, at least, to the person Isaiah; and in the other four, to the book of Isaiah.

There is no historical testimony, either in the Bible or out of it, to the existence of any great prophet named Isaiah, except the one who lived in the days of Hezekiah. Scholars who disbelieve in the reality of miraculous prediction, of course hold that the poem we are now considering was not written by this Isaiah,

but by some author who lived as late as the reign of Cyrus the Persian. The same view is taken by some authors who do not deny the possibility of inspired prediction. According to their differences of view, different men hold either that the New Testament writers and their contemporaries were mistaken in attributing this work to Isaiah, or that the Isaiah to whom they attribute it was a second prophet of that name, living in the days of Cyrus or later, or that, when they say that Isaiah uttered certain words, they mean no more than that the words were to be found in the book of that name. It is a supposable theory, for example, that the present book of Isaiah is a collection of productions of different men, written in different centuries, and that the collector gave to his work the name of Isaiah, because the productions of that prophet predominated in his collection. As a section of the same theory, it is certainly imaginable that the second half of the book may be a collection of older poems, arranged by a subsequent hand into a single symmetrical poem.

These things, I say, are supposable, and imaginable. If they could be proved to be true, I do not see that they would necessarily conflict with any proposition dear to intelligent orthodoxy. Views of this sort are actually held by men who are so thoroughly competent and so thoroughly reverent, that we have no right to treat them with either contempt or bitterness. But while I wish to emphasize all this, the evidence in the case yet seems to me to preponderate immensely in favor of the conclusion that the twenty-seven cantos are the literary work of the Isaiah who lived in Hezekiah's time. For the discussion of the subject, see the introductions to Isaiah in the various commentaries, works on Biblical Introduction, and religious and other encyclopædias. Especially valuable are the articles published by the Rev. W. H. Cobb, in four numbers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in 1881 and 1882.

According to the division adopted by Prof. Franz Delitzsch, the first of the two Sunday School Lessons named above, with the last three verses of the preceding chapter, constitutes the fourteenth of the twenty-seven cantos of the poem. The subject is the contrasted exaltation and humiliation of the Servant of Jehovah, who is named in the first sentence in the canto. What I suppose to be the best received Jewish interpretation of the passage insists that the Servant, as here mentioned, is Israel; and points to the fact that the history of Israel is that of a people who have always been both suffering worse calamities, and achieving more magnificent successes, than any other people; and whose calamities have been, to a very remarkable extent, overruled to the benefit of the nations of the earth. We Christians are more or less in the habit of denying this interpretation; but the New Testament writers never deny it. Instead of denying it, they add to it the great truth that, in the person of him whom they present as preeminently the Messiah and the Servant, who came, humanly, out of Israel, and whose history is generically a part of the history of Israel, these utterances concerning Israel are fulfilled in an infinitely larger, grander, exacter sense, than in all the rest of the history of Israel combined. According to Isaiah and Paul, the Servant is not Israel as distinguished from the personal Christ, nor the personal Christ as distinguished from Israel, but the one as including the other. It is logically possible to use the term Christ as including, besides the person of the Redeemer, the whole work of redemption in all the ages, and therefore that part of the work of redemption which was wrought through the people of Israel; and the term is actually so used in the New Testament, Eph. i., 10, for example.

Again, it is logically possible so to use the term Israel as to include in it all the historical consequences which followed from Israel as an antecedent, and among these, both the Christian religion and the person of its Christ; and the biblical writers actually use the term thus, in a large proportion of the Messianic prophecies and of the apostolic comment thereon.

This canto sets forth a great truth concerning the divine government. This truth is, not that the innocent are ever punished for the guilty, in the proper sense of the term punishment, but that the innocent suffer for the guilty, and that God uses this state of things to bring about the most beneficent results; among other results, often, the repentance and the justification of the guilty. It is very likely true of the Israelitish people that, apart from the question of their own sins, they have suffered more for the sins of others, and with more beneficent effects to themselves and others, than any other people whose history we can trace. But I cannot find in considerations like these more than a subordinate and illustrative part of the meaning of the prophecy before us. Its full meaning can be realized in nothing less than the truly atoning death of the Savior of mankind.

The second of the above designated Sunday School Lessons constitutes, according to Delitzsch, the sixteen of the twenty-seven cantos. It is one of the shortest and in a literary point of view, one of the simplest and finest of them all. It was probably understood by those who first heard it, as a call to repentance and to the sharing of spiritual blessings, enforced by the doctrine that God had made a covenant with Abraham and with David, in virtue of which Israel was God's Servant, his chosen agent for blessing all the nations of the earth. Ethically, therefore, the gracious invitation was precisely the same to them as it is to us. If the matter referred to in the chapter is some local or political salvation, still the local affair is treated of by applying to it the general principles on which God deals with men; and it is no perversion of Scripture to apply these principles directly to the cases which arise in our own experience; provided, of course, we make the application correctly. The unlearned man, who understands these verses in precisely the same meaning which the words would have in the mouth of a modern revival preacher, is much nearer the truth than the critical scholar, if the latter desiccates them into mere statements concerning a certain crisis in Israelitish politics. The prophet exhorts the people whom he addresses collectively, and each individual of them, to accept Jehovah, because all things else, without Him, are unsatisfying. The Christian preacher makes the same exhortation, and gives the same reason. The prophet bases his exhortation on whatever men then knew, or looked forward to, of the Messianic covenant made with Abraham, Israel and David. The Christian teacher bases his exhortation on whatever men now know or look forward to, of the same covenant; for we all claim, with Paul, that ours is a new covenant only in the sense of being a larger unfolding of the old covenant.

JAN. 3, 1886. JOSIAH AND THE BOOK OF THE LAW. 2 Kgs. XXII., 1-13.

Hezekiah, king of Judah, was succeeded by Manasseh. During his long reign, Sennacherib, Esar-Haddon, and Assur-bani-pal (the Sardanapalus of the Greek historians) were kings in Assyria. Their records are known quite in full, and abound in matters indirectly throwing light upon the Bible history; but we must resist the temptation to cite them. The Sardanapalus of the Assyrian records is

as unlike as possible to the Sardanapalus of the Greek historians; being an energetic prince and a great conqueror, instead of an effeminate person. After a long reign, Manasseh was succeeded by Aman, and he, after two years, by Josiah, the king in whose reign the incidents of the lesson took place. At some time during the reign of Josiah, the long series of conquests which the Assyrian kings claim to have made over Babylon culminated in the complete supremacy of Babylon, and the final overthrow of Assyria. The Mesopotamian records of this event are meagre, the Greek records hardly trustworthy, and the Hebrew records mainly confined to the fact that Zephaniah, who says that he prophesied in the days of Josiah, was prophesying against Nineveh.

We turn from further notice of the historical setting of the lesson. In the current critical discussions, two questions concerning the lesson are of very marked importance: First, what was the book that Hilkiah found? and secondly, how did he happen to find it?

It seems to me unaccountable that the men who have answered the first of these questions have paid so little attention to the fact that, both in Kings and Chronicles, the records carefully distinguish, verbally, between the book that was found, and the book which was read, entire, before the people. Nearly every author assumes that these two were identical, and argues his opinions from this assumption. But the book that was found is called "the book of the Law;" in one instance, "the book of the law of Jehovah by the hand of Moses," 2 Chron. xxxiv., 14, 15; 2 Kgs. xxii., 8, 11. It is said in Kings that Shaphan read it, that Shaphan read it before the king, that the king read it (verses 8, 10, 16). The parallel statements in Chronicles are that Shaphan read in it before the king, and that the book (or perhaps the curses written in the book) was read before the king, verses 18, 24. In none of these private readings is there a syllable to indicate whether the reading occupied one sitting or many, or whether the whole book was read, or only a part of it. Later, the king read publicly "all the words of the book of the covenant, which was found in the house of the Lord," 2 Kgs. xxiii., 2; 2 Chron. xxxiv., 30. From the words "which was found in the house of the Lord" it is probably fair to infer that this book of the covenant was identical, either wholly or in part, with the book of the law found there. From its being called by a different name, and from the fact that the statements made concerning it are different, it is fair to infer that the identity may have been only partial, or, in other words, that the book of the covenant, the whole of which was read to the people, was some defined section of the book of the law. We cannot absolutely prove this, indeed; but it is likely to be true, and no one can disprove it.

The traditional opinion seems to be that the book of the law found in the temple was the Pentateuch; and there is certainly nothing inconsistent with this in the account. We have just seen that there is no force in the objection that the Pentateuch is too long to be read at a sitting, for the account does not intimate that the book of the law, as distinguished from the book of the covenant, was thus read, either publicly or privately. On the other hand, however, it is evident from verses 11-20, that the king read the law in Deuteronomy, and there is no trace in the narrative of his having read any other part of the Pentateuch. So far as any testimony positively given in the narrative is concerned, his book of the law might have been merely this section of the Mosaic writings. But still again, the term "the book of the law," or even the term "the book of the law by the

hand of Moses," is not necessarily limited to the Pentateuchal writings. The term "the book of the law" would appropriately include any other writings authoritatively given through prophets, as well as those given through Moses. In the New Testament, the law sometimes means the Pentateuch, and sometimes the whole Old Testament. It is both unproveable and improbable that there was ever a period in Israelitish literature, when a similar variation of usage was inadmissible. In Ezra, the phrase "the book of Moses" is so used, apparently, as to include certain sections of the Book of Chronicles—a book which then probably existed only in sections.* Joshua, as well as Moses, wrote in the book of the law. There is historical testimony to the fact that prophetic writings were not only produced, but were gathered into collections, in the days of Samuel and David, and again in the days of Isaiah. We are informed that Josiah actually possessed and used authoritative sacred writings of David and Solomon, and perhaps others, 2 Chron. xxxv., 4, 15, 18. 2 Kgs. xxiii., 15, 17, 18. If the book found in the temple was larger than the people's code in Deuteronomy, it seems more probable that it contained all the prophetic Torah-writings which had been collected and recognized, up to the time of "the men of Hezekiah king of Judah" (see Prov. xxv., 1), than that it consisted of Mosaic writings only.

Whether this book was the Pentateuch, or only a part of the Pentateuch, or included other writings as well as those of Moses, there is no intimation that this was the only copy then existing. The idea that there was no other copy anywhere, and that the pious young king had never till then accurately known the contents of the law, is so picturesque, so gratifying to our love of the wonderful, that no one should be surprised at its having come to be a part of the common interpretation of the narrative. But the records nowhere either assert or imply that this was the only copy; and the probabilities are certainly all the other way. The authors both of Kings and of Chronicles held that the book of the law had been in use from the beginning of the times of which they treat, that is from the reign of David; and that during all this time, Israel was a literary people. They both give us to understand that Josiah was already prosecuting the reforms called for by the book of the law, before Hilkiah found the book in the temple. No reader doubts that the authors intended to convey the impression that the copy found in the temple was a special copy of some sort; supposably the original copy, or supposably the official royal copy, or something of the sort. The fact of its being a special and remarkable copy will account for all the interest taken in it, and thus for all the renewed zeal occasioned by it, even if common copies of the same book were then plentiful in Jerusalem and elsewhere. The assertion that the copy found was the only copy in existence is, therefore, one that must not be taken for granted. It needs proving, and no proof of it can be found.

The traditional opinion as to how the book happened to be found in the temple is, of course, that it had been hidden away during the persecutions of Manasseh, and the knowledge of its hiding place lost. The contrary opinion held by many is that the book had just been written in Josiah's time, and that the finding of it in the temple was part of a plan arranged for calling the attention of the king to it. Few of the intelligent supporters of this theory would claim that it

* In Ezra vi., 8, we are told that the setting of the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses is written in the book of Moses. But these matters are not mentioned at all in the Pentateuch, and are treated in detail, with the use of the same technical terms used in this statement in Ezra, in 1 Chron. xxlii. and xxlii.

agrees with the account given, either in Kings or in Chronicles; they would only claim that this must be the underlying fact, which the authors of the historical books which the authors have somewhat inaccurately transmitted. Their reasons for this claim are drawn partly from the narratives themselves, and partly from external sources. The reasons from external sources, we cannot now examine. They do not seem to me to justify the conclusions just mentioned. Their reasons from the narratives themselves are really very largely based, not on the narratives, but on the traditional interpretation which we have considered above. The men who hold to the traditional interpretation of course deny these conclusions drawn from it. But it seems to me in this, as in many other instances, that to correct the misapprehensions that have been incorporated into the traditional view is to remove the fulcrum from under the lever of the men who are working to overthrow that view.

STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

XII.

THE IDEA OF EVIL, AS TO ITS NATURE.

It is but stating a very obvious truth to say that evil presents itself to men, always and necessarily, under two aspects,—either as that which we term physical, or that which we term moral. The former, of course, will include all that in nature which indicates disorder, or that affects unfavorably the welfare of sentient beings, and the latter, that which, in a higher sphere of things, is evil because it is wrong. That the relations of these two should, in apprehension and in speculation, be confused, is noways surprising, especially in those cases where men confront such great problems of the universe with no help from revelation. We perhaps ought rather to be surprised that, in a world where the physical aspects of evil so much force themselves on the attention of men, its moral aspects should retain a hold so firm and so enduring. The fact may testify to the undying nature of that principle which God has given to the human soul as a higher law in man's own being, and a witness to the being and nature of God himself.

INSTINCT AND SPECULATION.

It is more in the way men have dealt with this principle, than in the presence or absence of the principle, that differences in races and in ages of mankind are seen. Traces of it—rather we may say distinct manifestations of it—appear even in savage races. Take the case of the Basoutos, among whom, according to Casalis, cited by Pressensé “the idea of moral evil is conveyed by such expressions as ugliness, debt, deficiency, powerlessness;” by whom “theft, adultery, and lying, are unsparingly denounced;” and in many of whose proverbs a moral insight appears which one would not expect to find in a savage race. “Human blood,” they say, “is heavy, and will not let him flee on whose hands it is.” “If a man be secretly killed, the straw of the field will tell it.” “The thief catcheth himself.” “Cunning devours its master.” Undoubtedly, the idea of moral evil, among such races, never gets beyond what is elementary to it, or perhaps we may

say instinctive, although in some things they may put to shame the so-called civilized races themselves. "Two Irishmen one day," says Quatrefages, in treating of this point, "quarreled with some Australians; they were without arms. Instead of profiting by this advantage, the savages gave them arms, that they might defend themselves." "In our war at Tahiti," says the same writer, "Admiral Bruet, commander of the French forces, took a bath one day in a river in the interior of the isle, while a well-armed chief, belonging to the enemy, was concealed near by. When peace was gained, the chief came to see the admiral, and easily showed him that, for nearly two hours, his life had been in his power. 'Why did you not draw?' said the admiral. 'I should have been dishonored in the eyes of my people,' replied the native, 'if I had killed, by surprise, a chief such as thou.'"

To speculative and mystical philosophy the beclouding of these distinctions as respects the nature of evil is perhaps more due than to any other one cause. Plato's treatment of the subject is well-known. So far as virtue is wisdom and sin is folly, Plato's teaching might almost be said to exhaust the subject. Yet, who, in these days, needs to be told that such teaching does not even approach the root of the matter? Seneca, although far from being as good a man as Plato, came nearer to the truth on this subject than Plato ever did, in saying: "The human mind is by nature perverse, and strives for what is forbidden. Our fault is not external to us; it is within us, and cleaves to our souls." How oriental mysticism viewed the matter will appear further on.

THE PRIMITIVE IDEA—ACCADIAN.

Primitive ideas as to the nature of evil, so far as they can as yet be ascertained, are very significant in this connection. In what is thus far accessible of primitive Accadian and Aryan literature, there is little or no trace of that confusion of physical with moral evil which we find in the sacred books and the priestly systems of later centuries. As the translators of those Accadian psalms of penitence, so ancient and so primitive, say, the tone of them is often almost scriptural, and sometimes we might seem to hear David himself lamenting and confessing his sins. "O Lord," this penitent cries out, "O Lord, thy servant thou dost not restore. In the waters of the raging flood seize his hand. The sin that he has sinned to blessedness bring back. The transgressions he has committed let the wind carry away." "My Lord in the wrath of his heart has punished me. God in the strength of his heart has overpowered me." The petitioner is much confused in his ideas of deity. Now he uses a word which, perhaps, almost answers to the Hebrew Jehovah; then he prays to his god and to his goddess, to the sun and to the moon. He is wandering into thick darkness, as to the personality of God; but he has not yet lost that view of sin as sin, which Old Testament history assures us was impressed on primitive man in the story of the fall in Eden, and confirmed by the history and fate of the whole antediluvian world.

One might dwell upon this at almost any length. Prof. Lenormant, while accepting as true the corrected translation of what Mr. George Smith supposed to be a legendary account of the fall itself, maintains, to use his own words, that there are "convincing proofs of the existence of myths relating to the terrestrial paradise, in the sacred traditions of the lower basin of the Euphrates and Tigris." And he makes emphatic reference to that picture, Chaldean in origin, with which our Bible dictionaries have made us familiar, and now to be seen in the British

Museum, carved upon a cylinder of hardened stone, which presents a man and a woman, seated, one on each side of a tree, whose fruit they are in the act of plucking, while behind the woman a serpent stands erect. These traditions of the fall had evidently made a profound impression upon that people who planted along the lower Euphrates the first human abode after the deluge, and out of whose country came Abraham, the friend of God.

THE PRIMITIVE IDEA—ARYAN.

But let us notice, in a like way, another of these primitive peoples. In his preface to the "Sacred Books of the East," Prof. Max Müller speaks of those who have asserted that "the religious notion of sin" is not found in the hymns of the Rig-Veda, the oldest sacred literature of the ancient Aryan race. This, he says, is a mistake. In another of his works he says that "the consciousness of sin is a prominent feature in the religion of the Vedas," a statement which other writers think over-strong. He translates, in still another book of his, from a hymn to Varuna, which has a very marked Old Testament cast. "Let me not yet, O Varuna," pleads the petitioner, "enter into the house of clay"—that is, the grave; "have mercy, almighty, have mercy. If I go trembling, like a cloud driven by the wind; have mercy, almighty, have mercy. Through want of strength, thou strong and bright god, have I gone wrong; have mercy, almighty, have mercy. Thirst came upon the worshiper, though he stood in the midst of waters; have mercy, almighty, have mercy. Whenever we men, Varuna, commit an offense before the heavenly host, whenever we break the law through thoughtlessness; have mercy, almighty, have mercy." Other writers quote from other hymns such expressions as these: "Deliver us this day, O God, from heinous sin." "May our sin be repented of." "Absolve us from the sin of our fathers, and from those which we have committed with our own bodies." "Varuna is merciful even to him who has committed sin." For the most part, indeed, as we had occasion to notice in a former paper, the prayers in these hymns are for quite other things; for victory over enemies, for the preservation and increase of the flocks, for long life and for worldly good in general. Yet this other feature is certainly a marked one. What we have to say of it all is that in this literature, out of which grew alike the religion of the Brahman and Buddhist, and the religion of Zoroaster, as many think, the idea of evil is singularly free from those absurd accretions which characterize Brahmanism especially; illustrating again the fact that the prehistoric religions of paganism, so far as we become acquainted with them, are more pure and just in their conceptions of the nature of evil than the historic ones. If I may, without dwelling here too long, I would like to quote in addition, one of these old hymns, a hymn to Indra, partly as an additional illustration of my point, and partly because of its suggestiveness otherwise. It is a kind of dialogue between Indra and the worshiper. Indra speaks first:

"I come with might before thee, stepping first,
And behind me move all the heavenly powers."

The worshiper then responds,

"If thou, O Indra, wilt my lot bestow,
A hero's part dost thou perform with me.
"To thee the holy drink I offer first;
Thy portion here is laid, thy soma brewed.
"Be while I righteous am, to me a friend,
So shall we slay of foemen many a one."

“Ye who desire blessings, bring your hymn
 To Indra: for the true is always true.
 ‘There is no Indra,’ many say; ‘who ever
 Has seen him? Why should we his praise proclaim?’”

Then, in his own response, in turn, Indra says:

“As on heaven’s height I sat alone,
 To me thy offering and thy prayer rose up.
 Then spake my soul this word within itself:
 ‘My votaries and their children call on me.’”

There are several things here upon which we might comment. Assuming the translation to be a correct one, as in the main it probably is, it is an example of what I have had occasion to speak of before, a monotheistic strain, even in one of the hymns of a people whose worship was paid to nature-gods. Indra “sits on heaven’s height alone;” and as he comes to meet his worshiper, “all the heavenly powers” are simply his attendants. Then, among this Aryan people, as also of those amongst whom Job lived, there were those who demanded, “Who is the Almighty that we should serve him? And what profit shall we have if we pray unto him?” There were fools, then, who said in their hearts, “there is no God.” But it suits our present purpose to notice this line especially in the hymn,

“Be, while I righteous am, to me a friend;”

And also these two,

“Ye who desire blessings, bring your hymn
 To Indra; for the true is always true.”

Righteousness in the deity worshiped, righteousness in the worshiper. It is but a word, but a gleam; yet does it not teach us something? Religion had not yet become pantheistic; nor had it yet confused itself with speculations as to the soul’s emancipation from the soul of the universe, or its corruption through some contact with matter and a body rank with sinful desire. These Vedic worshipers are not yet either Brahman or Buddhist. They hold this simple faith: that a wicked man must not pray in his wickedness to the righteous deity; but he whose hands are clean may come to the True One who is “always true,” and may expect to hear him say, “My votaries and their children call on me.”

The writer, Mr. Keary, of the British Museum, in whose book upon “*Outlines of Primitive Belief*” I find this hymn, holds the strange theory that the hymn was made and sung by a people whose ancestors had been fetish-worshipers; that their earliest object of adoration had been the fire-drill, shaped like a cross, with which, in their savage condition, they had been accustomed to kindle the flame in the wood to cook their rude banquets. When, in history, one may ask, has a savage race, worshiping the crude utensils of their household life, risen up, entirely of themselves, with no help from any quarter, to such a conception of deity and of man’s duty to him as this hymn discloses? If it were not so much beneath the dignity of evolutionist wisdom to believe in the Bible, might it not give a far more rational account of the origin of the Aryan faith?

The truth seems clearly to be that both Brahmanism and Buddhism, while basing themselves on this Ancient Vedic religion, were not improvements upon it, but much the contrary. Hence it was that when Rammohun Roy, and Chunder Sen, within the present century, wished to reform the Hindu faith, they went clear back to the Vedas themselves; claiming that the religion there disclosed, although in form and seeming polytheistic, was in truth a religion recognizing one

God, though under many names because under many forms of manifestation; and claiming, also, that as compared with either of its offshoots, it was pure, both in teaching and in tendency.

THE LATER IDEA—BUDDHISM.

Buddhism, certainly, much as it has been praised of late years, was a great falling away from the robust religion of those ancient conquerors of India. Buddhism, as taught in the sacred books of that religion, is not the faith of one who faces the facts of his condition, or the facts of his environment in this world, honestly and bravely, but of one who runs away from them, like a coward, or tries to, and hides himself.

The key to the Buddhistic conception of evil is found in what is told of Buddha himself, more especially the circumstances under which he was led to devote himself to the founding of a new religion, or at least the reforming of an old one. The story has been many times written, of late years, and I need give it only the briefest attention. The son of a king, by name Prince Siddartha, he left his heirship to a throne to become an ascetic and a teacher. He is represented in the narrative as having been, during all his early years, jealously kept by his father, with a view to defeat some prognostic of calamity to the royal race through him, secluded from all contact with the world outside the palace, and all the suffering and sorrow there endured. Life was made to him, until he had reached early maturity, one holiday, with every conceivable luxury and every form of pleasure jealously provided for him. This is his idea of life; allowed finally to ride forth from the palace into the city, in spite of all precaution taken he chances to see, on the first of these excursions, a diseased person, on the second one decrepit, wrinkled and shrunken with age, on the third, a dead body borne to its burial. He had never known before that such things as these had even an existence. From his third excursion, especially, he returns home smitten to the soul with a sense of human misery, and thenceforth has no rest, until, as he imagines, he has found a sure means of relief. With the three great evils already encountered by him he associates another—that of the repeated births, which, according to the Brahmanism in which he had been educated, are the lot of man, and which entail upon him a liability to successive existences in which he may traverse the whole circuit of unhappy being, from the highest to the lowest. The prince may in his second birth be a beggar, the common man may be reborn a brute; upon that whole future of the soul in its transmigrations, rest the most dismal possibilities, from which a sensitive spirit like this of Buddha might well shrink. Hence, we find, all through the life and teaching of Buddha, the changes rung upon these four great evils as afflicting the race, birth, old age, disease, and death. The ideal remedy provided is what the Buddhists call Nirvana; a state reached, in the present life, in which every manner of desire, affection, aspiration, hope shall be by processes of self-mortification so completely subdued, as that the evil and the good in existence shall be made one and the same; and a resultant state in the next life which is, as nearly as possible, annihilation of the very consciousness of being.

I find in the Buddhistic books that the idea of evil as sin, is not, indeed, wholly absent; yet it is there, not as implying any sense of guilt, but simply as causing pain. Such a prayer as one finds in a hymn of the Rig-Veda, or an Accadian penitential psalm, would be an impossible thing on Buddhistic lips. Of whom

is such a one as he to ask forgiveness? To whom is he to confess sin? Whether as pantheist or atheist, he knows of no such thing as moral accountability, for there is no being to whom to be accountable. There is no law save that kind of inexorable naturalistic fatality, under which certain effects follow certain causes. Sin, for him, save so far as some vague sense of distinction of right and wrong survives, is simply the act of a fool, who puts his foot into an open trap, or drags down a leaning wall upon his own head.

There are, indeed, admirable precepts of a certain kind in the Buddhistic books, and of these I shall speak hereafter, and of the real ethical value there may be in them. For the rest, I do not know of a more fatuous thing, even in nineteenth-century fatuity, than that glorification of Buddha and Buddhism in which Mr. Edwin Arnold—chiefly, let us hope, in a literary interest—led the way, and in which a few silly people in Europe and America are trying to follow him.

Buddhism may represent to us the mystical and ascetic view of evil as to its nature—how widely prevalent, no student of the history of religions needs to be told. The more distinctly speculative view though still defective, is a higher one. It is well stated by ex-President Woolsey, in his introduction to the "Gorgias" of Plato, where he says that "in the view of Socrates, and in that of Plato at first, all virtue must be resolved into science," or knowledge, "all vice into ignorance." Plato's later view, according to the same writer was, that virtue consists in truth: "that the faculties of the soul respectively perform their part, and are all obedient to the reason;"—a doctrine as to the foundation of morals which quite pervades the modern rationalism. It certainly is not an adequate idea, either of evil or its remedy, since it takes no account of that which *prevents* men, *all* men, from acting "obedient" even "to the reason."

CONCLUSIONS.

1. There is already ground for saying that in its idea of evil pagan religion is upon the whole, more pure in tone and more consistent with the teachings of enlightened reason, even, as we ascend into prehistoric times. As we approach the primitive periods in the annals of any historic pagan religion we find the conception of evil more and more that of our own sacred books. The prehistoric literature of these religions, so far as yet accessible, deals with evil almost wholly in its aspect as moral evil, while the pagan rituals of that early period are pervaded, as those of later times never are, with a penitent utterance that at times is almost in the phraseology of the Hebrew ritual itself.

2. When this primitive purity in the conception of evil began to change to its later and corrupt form, the first step of change was, as the evidence appears to show, that of the old dualistic religions, in which the origin of evil was found in the malignant interposition of an evil being, powerful enough to contest the supremacy of the universe, while the creation of evil by this being was his method of making war upon the author of all good. In this, so much of the original revelation on this subject was retained as concerns the fall of man and the introduction of evil on earth through the instrumentality of Satan, the tempter.

3. In process of further change those speculative notions began to prevail, in which ideas of physical and moral evil were confused; the conception of evil as sin grew dim and feeble, and while pagan religions became more pantheistic or idolatrous, the sense of accountability, of personal guilt, was obscured if not wholly lost. In a word, pagan religions, in their history, are shown to have

undergone processes of steady deterioration, in respect to the idea of evil, just as also in their idea of God.

4. If these inferences from what is known at present of the history of religions shall be justified by the results of further inquiry, as there is every reason to believe they will be, that theory of the origin of religion which is held by the extreme evolutionist school, will, it should seem, have to be given up. This theory supposes that religion began in a sentiment of wonder, as man in his earliest rise above the conditions of a brute became more intelligent; that the next step of evolution was the worship of the fetish, in the form of any object that appealed to this sentiment of wonder, or the sentiment of reverence, or of fear; that next came the worship of nature-gods; then mythology and the deities of such pantheons as those of Egypt, of Greece, and of Rome; polytheism becoming at last monotheism. This necessarily presupposes that all religious ideas were in the beginning crude and almost brutal, and that as we ascend into prehistoric times, they become more crude, and less in harmony with the reason and conscience of enlightened man. It is enough to say, at present, that the evidence thus far warrants us in holding that the facts are in direct conflict with this theory; and these facts, as time goes on and investigation proceeds, will in all probability make it at last impossible to consistently hold any other theory of the origin of religion than that which finds it in that *revelation* of which the Christian Bible is the record and the repository.

→GENERAL NOTES.←

“Lay thy hand under my thigh” (Gen. XXIV., 2).—I do not propose to determine whether the usage alluded to in this passage points to a phallic-worship or to a special sanctity of the organ of generation, resulting from the rite of circumcision, or whether this usage merely symbolizes an invocation to posterity, to guard the oath that has been offered, and to avenge it if violated. But I wish to point out that in Ur-Mughair, the place from which Abraham took his departure, as well as in other ruined towns of Chaldaea, *phalli* made of clay have been discovered with inscriptions of Uruk, of Nur-Rammân, and of Ismî-Dagan, etc. It should be observed that the inscription is always placed on the portion of the conical stone which extends as far as the *glans*, while the exposed *glans* on the other hand never exhibits an inscription. Also on the large conical stones, which were set up as frontier and boundary marks, the portion corresponding to the *glans* never bears an inscription. We have here merely religious and symbolic figured representations.—*Schrader in The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament.*

The Serpent in the Cuneiform Inscriptions.—We meet with the serpent in figured representations repeatedly, especially upon cylinders, and it assumes such a form that we can see that it has some religious and symbolic significance. But hitherto it has not been possible to say with any certainty what this significance more precisely is. It has not yet been proved whether, in the well-known representation on a cylinder (see Geo. Smith, *Chaldaeian Genesis*, Germ. ed. p. 87), the snake, that is coiling upwards behind the woman who is seated, is the serpent that tempts man to sin, or whether this entire representation has any reference to the Fall (so Delitzsch *Parad.*, p. 90). Just as in this case we have two human beings (man and woman) seated and in like manner stretching forth their hands to the fruit—clusters of dates—hanging down on every side, so we find in a similar representation on the pages of Ménant, catalogue, etc., pl. III., No. 14, two persons standing one on either side of a palm quite naturally portrayed and each holding with one hand the stalk of a cluster of dates. In the latter case, however, there is no reason to suppose that there is any allusion to the story of the Fall; nor upon the cylinder above mentioned is there the slightest indicated reference to what constitutes the specific feature of that narrative—the presentation of the fruit by the woman to the man. We certainly have no right to assert that the Babylonians had no story of a Fall, although no written accounts bearing upon it have hitherto come to hand. We merely contend that it is not presupposed in the above figured representation.—*Schrader in The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament.*

The Principle of Development and the Work of the Pre-Exilian Prophets.—Those who are seeking to make everything clear on the principle of natural development have not only the anomaly of reforming kings without a standard of re-

form and the furnished temple of the Psalter without priesthood or ritual to explain, but also the attitude and work of the pre-exilian prophets. They, it is claimed, were the real sources of Israelitish history and religion. Who and what were their sources? Moses was too great, too developed a character to have arisen in the period of the exodus! What a soil, then, the period of the judges for such a growth as that of Samuel! Whence came Elijah the Tishbite? and Obadiah and Joel, Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah? Unlike in natural gifts and training, they were yet impelled by one spirit; uttered really but one message. Prophets of two fiercely rival kingdoms, they never waver in their loyalty to one invariable standard and to one King. It was Amos of Judah who, while tending his flocks in Tekoa, heard the call of God, and hurried to confront the haughty king of Israel and his false priests at Bethel. It was Elijah of Israel who won from the people of Judah such love and reverence that, to this day, in certain ceremonies, their descendants still set for him a chair as an invisible guest.

What gave to these men this unity of spirit, this fiery zeal, this mysterious power over kings and people? What was it that took away all sense of fear in the discharge of duty? Whence that idea of solemn, imperative duty? It was the Mosaic law given amidst the awful sanctions of Mount Sinai, that was at once their bond and inspiration; that ruled them and heartened them. They severally make direct and unmistakable allusions to it, or its essential historic setting. All their utterances are based on such a presupposition. They recognize a covenant made with God through Mosaic mediation. That covenant had not been kept. Their whole activity proclaims a perverse trend of thought and conduct against which they relentlessly fight, one and all. Founders of a religion they were not, and could not be, men like these, without a sign of collusion; but mighty reformers they were, who set their faces like a flint against a prevailing degeneracy and lapse of the people whom God had chosen for his own.

Caroline Fox, in her *Memories*, tells of a Quaker of literary turn who would not undertake a translation of the *Iliad* lest he should catch the martial spirit of its heroes. Our critics, so far from catching the spirit of the Hebrew prophets, have not seemed able even to understand their teaching in its distinguishing features. To overlook the higher truth in their burning metaphors and startling paradoxes, and charge them with hostility to the idea of sacrifice because they denounce an unworthy dependence on altar gifts as an *opus operatum*, and properly brand the sacrifices of the wicked as an abomination, is not only to bring them into conflict with themselves, but also with the whole current of biblical teaching, from the lesson of those first offerings of Cain and Abel to the words of Him who made love to be more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices (Mark XII., 33).

—E. C. Bissell, in *The Pentateuch: its Origin and Structure*.

The Character of Prophecy.—The Prophet, as preacher, views the present in the light of the future; as foreteller, the future in the light of the present. He points out present sin, duty, danger, or need, but all under the strong light of the Divine future. He speaks of the present in the name of God, and by His direct commission; of a present, however, which, in the Divine view, is evolving into a future, as the blossom is opening into the fruit. And when he foretells the future, he sees it in the light of the present; the present lends its colors, scenery, the very historic basis for the picture.

This, as we have seen, will help to explain alike the substance and the form of the prophetic message. To the prophetic vision the present is ever enlarging, widening, extending. These hills are growing, the valley is spreading, the light is gilding the mountain tops. And presently the hills are clothed with green, the valleys peopled with voices; the present is merging into the future, although exhibited in the form of the present. The prophet is speaking of Moab, Ammon, Tyre, Assyria; and these are gradually growing into the shapes of future foes, or future similar relations. And in the midst of such references here and there appears what applies exclusively to that Messianic Kingdom which is the goal and final meaning of all, and of all prophecy. It is an entire misunderstanding to regard such prophecies as not applying to the Messianic future, because they occur in the midst of references to contemporary events. As the rapt prophet gazes upon those hills and valleys around him, they seem to grow into gigantic mountains and wide tracts, watered by many a river and peopled with many and strange forms, while here and there the golden light lies on some special height, whence its rays slope down into valleys and glens; or else, the brightness shines out in contrasted glory against dark forest, or shadowy outline in the background. And the Prophet could not have spoken otherwise than in the forms of the present. For, had he spoken in language, and introduced scenery entirely of the future, not only would his own individuality have been entirely effaced, but he would have been wholly unintelligible to his contemporaries, or, to use the language of St. Paul, he would have been like those who spoke always in an unknown tongue.

To make ourselves more clear on these points, let us try to transport ourselves into the times and circumstances of the prophets. Assume that the problem were to announce and describe the Messianic Kingdom to the men of that generation, in a manner applicable and intelligible to them, and also progressively applicable to all succeeding generations, up to the fulfillment in the time of Christ, and beyond it, to all ages and to the furthest development of civilization. The prophet must speak prophetically yet intelligibly to his own contemporaries. But, on the other hand, he must also speak intelligibly, yet prophetically to the men of every future generation—even to us. We can readily understand how in such case many traits and details cannot have been fully understood by the prophets themselves. But we are prepared to affirm that all these conditions are best fulfilled in the prophecies of the Old Testament, and that, if the problem be to announce the Messianic Kingdom in a manner consistent with the dogmatic standpoint then reached, the then cycle of ideas and historical actualities and possibilities, and yet suitable also to all generations, it could not have been better or equally well done in any other manner than that actually before us in the Old Testament. As a matter of fact, the present generation, and, as a matter of history, all past generations—admittedly the whole Jewish Church and the whole Christian Church—have read in these prophecies the Messianic future, and yet every successive generation has understood them, more or less clearly, and in a sense newly. If I might venture on an illustration: the reading of prophecy seems like gazing through a telescope, which is successively drawn out in such manner as to adapt the focus to the varying vision.—*Edersheim in Prophecy and History.*

»EDITORIAL NOTES.«

New Professors of Hebrew.—We welcome to the fraternity of Hebrew professors Rev. David A. McClenahan, who has just been elected to the chair of Old Testament Literature in the United Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Allegheny City, Pa.; and Rev. Wallace W. Lovejoy, who has been elected to the same chair in the Reformed Episcopal Divinity School, just established in Philadelphia.

These men were busy city pastors, none busier. Yet with all their pastoral cares, they found time during their work, and (without injury to their health) *during their vacations* to prosecute their Bible studies. The time which many ministers waste was employed by these men in a work, the great advantages of which they are now just beginning to enjoy.

If these gentlemen never succeed in doing anything more, they have demonstrated the fact that, whatever may be said to the contrary, ministers have time, if they will but use it, for the exhaustive and scientific study of the Divine Word.

The Institutions, to which these men have been called, are to be congratulated upon the fact that they are to have in their faculties men who have prepared themselves for their work in the midst of, and in spite of, the arduous labors of a ministerial life.

The Amherst Hebrew Club.—Our readers may be interested to learn that a Hebrew Club is in successful operation at Amherst, Mass. The Club comprises Rev. J. F. Genung, Professor of Rhetoric, Mr. L. H. Elwell, Instructor in Greek and Sanskrit, and Rev. J. W. Haley; author of "Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible" and editor of the Lowell Hebrew Club's "Translation of Esther." Latterly Dr. T. P. Field, Professor of Biblical Interpretation and of Hebrew, has contributed to the interest of the Club by his presence and co-operation.

The Club are engaged upon the Book of Ecclesiastes. They are making a new and carefully literal translation from the Hebrew, which is to be accompanied with copious notes illustrating the text.

The translation will not be ready for publication for some little time, since the Club will spare no pains to make the forthcoming Commentary thorough and exhaustive. They find great pleasure and profit in their work. Meetings of the Club are held weekly, and the members engage in their work *con amore*. The word of God, like a rich mine, abundantly repays those who delve therein.

It is one of the cheering "signs of the times" that numerous Hebrew Clubs are coming into existence in our country, and that such thoughtful, laborious and reverent study is bestowed upon various books of the Bible.

The Vividness of Old Testament Representations.—How many ministers have ever studied the prophecy of Hosea, so as to grasp the great truth of the book? How many Bible students have comprehended the depth of divine love there portrayed? No representation in the New Testament except that of John III., 16, 17 and those based upon the same thought surpass it. The fulness of the reconciliation between God and the people has never been more beautifully, more com-

pletely and more tenderly set forth than in the matchless words of the conclusion of the first parable of the unfaithful wife, "I will betroth thee unto me forever." The word betroth is used, the word suggestive of pure maidenhood, the word which indicates that no past sinful infidelity is to be remembered; all that is forgiven, forgotten, never to be called to mind. "Yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment and in loving-kindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness; and thou shalt know the Lord." (Hos. II., 19, 20.) The parable of the prodigal son even does not equal this as a picture of divine love, treating the adulterous wife, who wrongs her husband, far more than any prodigal does his father,—treating her as though of virgin purity, one who had never sinned.

Thus do we find in the Old Testament things old and new; and this is done by no fanciful allegorical interpretation, but by the most rigid historical and grammatical exegesis. And herein lies the great force of Old Testament truth, viz., in its manner of presentation. What models it furnishes to those who in our day are called to proclaim the same truth, under the same circumstances!

The Outcome of the Higher Criticism.—There are three views as to what the result of the Higher Criticism will be:

1. One class of students, those who denounce it in every shape and form, are very confident that if such work continues, the Bible will be lost to us. The adoption of such views even as those held by moderate critics will so modify the estimation in which the Sacred Books are now held, that these Books, as thus considered, will no longer be *the Bible*, but rather a collection of ancient records. The acceptance of these views in any form means the rejection of the inspiration of the Bible; means, in other words, the placing of the Bible on a level with other literature. The Higher Criticism is of the devil, and so are all who teach it.

2. A second class, those who advocate it in its more destructive forms, insolently and irreverently assert that the Bible, as we have it, is but a mass of tradition, but that this rubbish, when sifted by the critical process, and arranged according to the law of that great principle, development, will be found to contain all that is needed as a basis for our religious beliefs. Higher Criticism, according to the view of this class, therefore, is to revolutionize completely the commonly entertained opinion in reference to Sacred Scripture.

These two classes are therefore in substantial agreement. The first class say, if the critical process be continued, it will destroy the Bible; the second class say, the critical process is to continue and the Bible of to-day, the Bible as men, to-day, accept it, will pass out of existence. A large proportion of the first class are so pessimistic as practically to concede that the Bible is already fast losing its hold, and that each successive age its influence is diminished. Many, however, believe that by frowning down upon this great evil, by denouncing those who propagate it, the time will come, in the providence of God, when men will think as of old, and just as their fathers have thought.

3. But there is a third class, some of whom favor the views of the higher critics, some of whom *do not*. It is the opinion of this class of students that the "higher criticism," at least in its more moderate application, contains much that is good, and that even the evil which characterizes it will be overruled by the all-wise God and made subservient to good. This class believes that, however antagonistic the attitude of the critics may be, however destructive their conclusions may

seem to be, however great may be the amount of new truth which they may discover—it is all as God meant it should be, it is all a part of the divine plan in reference to the reception and acceptance of his Word, it is all for good.

No student of the Bible can fail to see how in many ways the good effects of this work, whether the work itself is intended for good or for evil, have already appeared. It has been the main instrument in stirring up an interest in the Old Testament, which is greater, it would seem, than in any previous period of the Christian Church. It has led many devout men to consecrate their lives to the special study of the Word, in order to use the same weapons in behalf of that Word, which so many ungodly critics have used against it. It is leading to the better understanding of the separate Books of the Bible, and this was the great thing needed in our day.

Shall we not, therefore, encourage all reverent study and handling of this Word, which may lead us to a clearer and a deeper knowledge of its great truths; and on the other hand, while doing everything in our power to battle error, using its own weapons against it, shall we not have faith to believe that what we, in our weakness, fail to overcome, God will overrule for good, and that what we, in our blindness, accept as truth, although being false, God will render incapable of injuring others.

The Hebrew Professors in America.—A general surprise has been manifested in reference to the large number of Hebrew professors in the United States and Canada, a list of whom was published in October *HEBRAICA*. One would scarcely have believed that the number of men in this department would reach one hundred and fifty-seven. It is true, of course, that not all the names here given are of men who teach only in the Semitic and Old Testament department. Many in connection with their work in this department, do work also in other departments.

It is a cheering indication, however, that the number of institutions is increasing in which the Professor of Old Testament instruction confines himself exclusively to that department. The fact is, the department is in itself a double department, and in every well-equipped seminary there should be two men in it. To ask a man to teach Hebrew seven to nine hours a week, and, in addition, to carry on the work that should be done in Old Testament History, Geography, Archæology, Old Testament Introduction (a great department by itself), Old Testament Hermeneutics and Exegesis, Old Testament Theology, and still further to give instruction in Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic and Assyrian,—to ask all this of one man is too much. Yet all this, and more, must be done if the department is properly cared for.

We have thought what a radical change could be effected as to the estimation in which Hebrew study is held, if every man of these one hundred and sixty professors were a *live* man in his department.

It must be evident to the man who thinks, that something was wrong, or, with so many teachers, the study of Hebrew would not have become an object of ridicule, disgust, and even hatred. Nor is this last word too strong a term to describe the feeling entertained for it by many. A hundred letters could be shown, from men prominent in the ministry, the burden of which is, "I had come to hate Hebrew." Times are changing; they have already changed considerably. Yet there is room for further change.

→BOOK NOTICES←

[Any publication noticed in these pages may be obtained of the AMERICAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF HEEREW, Morgan Park, Ill.]

WHY WE BELIEVE THE BIBLE.*

This is the title of a small volume by J. P. T. Ingraham, S. T. D., which purports to be "An hour's reading for busy people." It consists of a series of questions and answers which bring out not only the leading arguments for the truthfulness and divine origin of the Scriptures, but also a considerable amount of information not so closely connected with the subject set forth in the title. It treats briefly of the history of the books of the Bible, the language of the two Testaments, the various versions, the canon, the manuscripts, and other topics pertaining to introduction and criticism. The aim of the author seems to be to provide a hand-book adapted to the use, not of scholars, but of the common people who have neither the inclination nor the ability to study the more elaborate treatises on these subjects. While "busy people" engaged in literary and professional pursuits cannot be expected to have a profound knowledge of these questions, it is important that they should know something of them that they may be able to answer intelligently the shallow objections to the Bible which they hear on the street and in the shops. The information here afforded will, no doubt, strengthen the faith of many a humble believer, and fortify him against the prevalent skepticism of the day. For his effort to make such subjects popular, the author is worthy of high commendation, and he should have the sympathy of all lovers of the Book.

The general plan of the work is this:—the chief facts of biblical history are stated in chronological order, the various questions of doctrine, introduction and criticism being briefly discussed in connection with the facts, and the proofs given in the form of numerous references to the Scripture. The organic unity of the two Testaments is firmly maintained, and the principle of unity is rightly found in the Messiah who is promised in the earlier revelation and presented in the later as the fulfillment of that promise. It is questionable, however, whether this idea is not carried too far, and whether the expectation of the Messiah is not made to explain some Old Testament facts with which it has no connection whatever.

The author is evidently a man of firm convictions, and he does not hesitate to make positive statements about many questions concerning which the best scholars are not by any means agreed. By failing to distinguish between the probable and the certain he runs the risk of weakening the reader's confidence in his general accuracy. Too dogmatic assertion on controverted points certainly detracts somewhat from the value of his book.

* WHY WE BELIEVE THE BIBLE. By J. P. S. Ingraham, S. T. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 16mo, pp. 155. 70 cents.

PHILISTINISM.*

A series of sermons preached last winter which evoked no little criticism at the time is here given to the reading public. The aim cannot be better expressed than in the words of the preface: "They were called forth by the repetition in our city, during the winter, of certain onslaughts upon Christianity which are notorious for their telling expression of the crude and coarse scepticism which many circumstances combine to make popular at present. My aim in this course. . . . was to go over the grounds along which the more sweeping attacks are being made against religion; in order to indicate, to those who might follow me, the actual situation, and to aid my hearers in discriminating between the indefensible positions which a reverent reason may call upon us to abandon, and the true strategic lines which are not even uncovered by the forces of a raw rationalism."

The author's line of argument is that the attacks of this crude scepticism are directed not upon the Bible and Christianity, but upon false conceptions of the teachings of the Bible and of the fundamental truths of Christianity which have grown up in the popular religious mind. The real offence consists in this, that the sceptic, having demolished these misinterpretations of the Bible, thinks he has demolished the Bible itself, and that, as he has shown the absurdity of the misconceptions of Christian truth in the minds of many Christians, he supposes he has left nothing at all of Christianity.

The author's counter-charge sweeps away boldly and unceremoniously many common conceptions of fundamental Christian doctrines, and then proceeds to show that the doctrines themselves have not even been touched by the attack, and that they are incontestable facts witnessed to by the human mind in all ages, whether they can be explained by man or not.

Many, if not most, Christian readers will refuse to follow him into all his positions, but it cannot be denied that the argument is exceedingly suggestive and stimulating.

EDERSHEIM'S PROPHECY AND HISTORY.†

This is a timely book. It handles questions now occupying the foreground of theological discussion. Whether there is in the Old Testament any true prophecy, and what is its nature; whether any Messianic hope from the beginning, and whether Jesus fulfilled this hope; whether there were any Mosaic institutions at all; whether we are to speak of the Law and the Prophets, or the Prophets and the Law; whether, of Moses and the Prophets, or the Prophets and the Priests—These, together with the Messianic hope of the period from the closing of the Old Testament Canon to the advent of Christ, are the topics of these lectures.

Dr. Edersheim's position as an evangelical and conservative scholar of unusual learning, especially in Jewish literature, is so well attested by his *Life and*

* PHILISTINISM, Plain Words Concerning Certain Forms of Modern Scepticism. By R. Heber Newton, Rector of All Souls' Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 5x7. Pp. ix, 332. \$1.00.

† PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE MESSIAH. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-84, with two Appendices on the Arrangement, Analysis and Recent Criticism of the Pentateuch, by Alfred Edersheim, M. A., Oxon., D. D., Ph. D., author of the *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Pp. xxiv, 391. Size, 8¼x6½. \$2.50.

Times of Jesus the Messiah, that his utterances on these questions cannot fail to be of interest and authority. He holds to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, and gives many keen thrusts at the theory of Wellhausen. The difficulties of that theory are presented; the complete unlikelihood of such a literary mosaic as Wellhausen regards the Pentateuch; the absurdity of the final redactor leaving so many contradictions, if these really existed; why also was the Priest-code introduced as the law of Moses, if differing so from legislation already received as Mosaic? or if introduced, why was the older, antiquated code retained? why called Mosaic? why inserted in the Pentateuch? The laws and arrangements of the Pentateuch relative to trade, property and the administration of justice and attendance upon the feasts, are shown also to be foreign to the circumstances of Israel at any other time than that of their entrance into Canaan. But of special value are Dr. Edersheim's views on prophecy and the relation of the Old Testament to the New, and his emphasis of the idea of the kingdom of God. "The whole Old Testament is prophetic. Special predictions form only a part, although an organic part of the prophetic Scriptures." (P. 24.) The prophet is not a mere foreteller of future events; prophecy is not identical with prediction. Nor on the other hand is the prophet a mere teacher, one who admonishes and warns. Nor is there yet a combination of these two elements, the predictive and paranetic, but a welding of them into one. The prophet occupies the divine standpoint, where there is neither past, present, nor future. (P. 126.) All prophecy has also the moral and spiritual elements as its basis and essential quality. Prophets foretold not only what came to pass, but in order that it might not come to pass. (Pp. 140, 152.) Dr. Edersheim is thus seen to be no narrow literalist in his interpretation of prophecy. He belongs to that school which find in the Old Testament ideas which have repeated and successive fulfillments in the unfolding of God's purpose and plan. "The fundamental idea does not change, but it unfolds and applies itself under ever-changing and enlarging circumstances, developing from particularism into universalism; from the more realistic preparatory presentation to the spiritual which underlay it and to which it pointed; from Hebrewism to the world-kingdom of God." (P. 185.)

We regret that these views on prophecy were not presented in a more scientific form with copious illustrations from Scripture. Had this been done, this work would have become a standard of permanent value. Now, since the lectures are given as delivered over a period of four years, it is marred by diffuseness and repetition and a lack of unity. Indeed it is partially a treatise on the Pentateuchal question and partially on Messianic prophecy. No full outlines of the lectures are given, and there is no index. These are serious deficiencies.

THE HEBREW FEASTS.*

Biblical criticism of solid value depends upon a fair, honest and thorough examination of the subject studied. Absolute freedom from bias may be an impossibility, but when a theory like that of Wellhausen is under consideration, treating, as it does, with the make-up of the entire Old Testament, not the tendency of the theory, but the facts of the theory must be candidly sifted and

* THE NEWTON LECTURES for 1885. THE HEBREW FEASTS in their relation to recent hypotheses concerning the Pentateuch. By William H. Green, Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. \$1.50.

weighed. Moreover, such a theory, covering so much ground, and dependent upon so many minute elements, cannot be examined carefully as a whole. It demands the application of the lens part by part. cursory examinations of the whole field resulting in broad generalization, may have a general value, giving a general idea of the theory, its weakness and its strength, but monographs are far more satisfactory. And if such monographs attempt to remove some one of the strongest arguments of the theory, the work done is the more highly to be commended. Pecking away at the arch may destroy it in time, but destroy the keystone and the rest will fall of itself.

Such is the purpose of Professor Green in these lectures. He was invited by the faculty of Newton, through the liberality of the Hon. Warren Merrill, A. M., to give the students the benefit of his knowledge of the so-called Pentateuchal question. Instead of surveying the whole field, he selected the Hebrew Feasts, one of the most important and at the same time one of the most difficult of the points of attack. In his own language, "Two reasons led to the selection of this point for more particular discussion. First, the Feasts are alleged to be one of its main props, and to afford the clearest proof that the various Pentateuchal laws belong to different eras and represent distinct stages in the religious life of the people. And secondly, while the critical views respecting the Sanctuary, the Sacrifice, and the Priesthood have been vigorously and successfully assailed, proportionate prominence has not been given by the opponents of the hypothesis to the matter of the Feasts."

We welcome these lectures as a valuable contribution to burning questions. As yet there have been few monographs in reply to the Newer Criticism. Bredenkamp's "Gesetz und Propheten," König's "Religious History of Israel," A. P. Bissell's "The Law of Asylum in Israel," are excellent in their sphere, but they treat of the less urgent difficulties. Professor Green puts his shoulder against one of the strong pillars in the new structure. So long ago as 1835, Leopold George, in his "Die Aelteren Jüdischen Feste," etc., made the Feasts the *point d'appui* in the controversy, and so far as we are informed, he has never been answered with much thoroughness. This needed work has now been performed, and conservative students of the Old Testament will be benefited by the result.

Professor Green's style is clear and compact, and his thought necessarily dense: too compact for easy listening, too dense for easy thinking. But if the student, Bible in hand, will follow him and verify him, he will feel that he is following one who has traversed the ground many times and knows the way he takes. All of his difficulties may not be removed, certainly not such difficulties as are not germane to the topic in hand, but he will find himself helped, and be taught the true method in biblical criticism. Lectures II., III. and IV. are admirable specimens of how to do it.

The lectures may be a little too plethoric with the opinions of various critics; a discussion of the theme from the standpoint of some one eminent advocate of the theory antagonized might avoid some confusion in the mind of the reader, but the school of critics here considered differ so much among themselves, they must be slain, if at all, one by one. This, however, is a minor criticism. The lectures are worthy of the man and his subject.

THE BLOOD COVENANT.*

Of authors who have never perpetrated a new idea there is no lack, but those who give the world a new thought are like angels' visits. The task of the book-reviewer is often dreary in the extreme, as he encounters day after day the same old commonplaces thinly disguised with fresh powder and paint, and new jackets. They wander up and down in the earth, like the immortal Jew, seeking rest and finding none. How few are the books that yield a new idea, an idea that sticks, that becomes a dominant factor in one's thought. He who begets, or discloses, such an idea becomes in the best sense of the word an author. Such is the writer of this book. It is hardly possible for any man, acquainted with theological thought, to read this book without being profoundly impressed by it. There are writers who have "a bee in the bonnet," who, becoming possessed by an idea, magnify it out of all proportion, and perforce bend everything favorable or unfavorable to its support. We distrust them. Facts which bear legitimately upon an argument suffer because they are in bad company. It is therefore refreshing to open a book that is not vitiated by special pleading in favor of a preconceived theory; in which there is not even a theory propounded, scarcely anything beyond a clear, systematic marshalling of facts from which the reader is compelled to see for himself the conclusion which the facts disclose.

Dr. Trumbull is popularly known as the able editor of *The Sunday School Times*, and from his pen have been published several most valuable Bible helps. What Bible student has not heard of that extraordinary volume on *Kadesh-Barnea*?—a book that has won the enthusiastic admiration of the foremost Semitic scholars of this country and of Europe, as one of the most remarkable of modern contributions to the elucidation of Scriptural history. This new volume, aside from the appendix, consists of three lectures delivered before the Summer School of Hebrew in Philadelphia, June 16-18, 1885. While the form of the lectures has been retained, the text has been considerably expanded by the presentation of additional facts. The subject-matter of these lectures grew out of a clew which opened a mine of remarkable richness. Any attentive student of the Scriptures cannot fail to be struck by the persistent reference to blood, and the apparently profound significance attached to it. It meets us everywhere, from Genesis to Revelation, not only in the primitive worship of the antediluvian and patriarchal ages, but in the consummation of the Gospel scheme of redemption. Read, for example, the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, and see how utterly inadequate is the prevalent superficial theory in accounting for the extraordinary language there used. Nor have the rejectors of the doctrine of blood-atonement been slow to perceive this remarkable peculiarity of the inspired writings, and to sneer at Christianity as a religion that savors of the slaughter-house, and that represents God as a monster who delights in blood. This must of course be regarded as a slander; but in the absence of a thoroughly satisfactory reason for this pre-eminent emphasis on blood, we have for the most part been disposed to accept the fact, while remitting the explanation to the unsolved mysteries of providence. This volume on the "blood-covenant" throws a surprising light on

* THE BLOOD COVENANT. A Primitive Rite and its Bearing on Scripture. By H. Clay Trumbull, D. D., author of *Kadesh-Barnea*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885. Pp. viii, 350. Price, \$2.00.

the problem itself. This covenant as practised from the most ancient times, and among savage and half civilized peoples to-day, is "a form of mutual covenanting by which two persons enter into the closest, the most enduring, and the most sacred of compacts, as friends and brothers, or as more than brothers, through the intercommingling of their blood, by means of its mutual tasting, or of its intertransfusion." The three lectures deal respectively with "The Primitive Rite Itself;" "Suggestions and Perversions of the Rite," and "Indications of the Rite in the Bible." They aim to exhibit and demonstrate the existence of these "universally dominating primitive convictions: that the blood is the life; that the heart, as the blood-fountain, is the very soul of every personality; that blood-transfer is soul-transfer; that blood-sharing, human, or divine-human, secures inter-union of natures; and that a union of the human nature with the divine is the highest ultimate attainment reached out after by the most primitive, as well as by the most enlightened mind of humanity."

In its final application the blood-covenant deals, then, with the profoundest problems of soteriology; it co-ordinates the Old Testament and the New, and shows how the one is the necessary and legitimate outcome of the other; it focuses a multitude of scattered rays upon the mystery of the Atonement, on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and on the believer's personal union with Christ; it reveals an astonishing harmony between the fundamental truths of revelation, and the primary, universal convictions of the race, and shows that the latter unmistakably spring from the same divine mind as the former; it is the scarlet thread upon which the saving doctrines of Judaism and Christianity crystallize in exquisite beauty and symmetry.

The volume is a marvel of research, considering that the field it covers is hitherto unexplored. The author seems to have ransacked all literature ancient and modern, archæology, medical science, travels, poetry, and folk-lore; Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek and Roman antiquities, Chinese and Indian lore, Scandinavian sagas, and patristic literature have yielded their contributions of illustrative facts. This material is handled with consummate scientific skill. There is no flight of imagination, no tumid rhetoric. Everything is subordinated to a presentation of facts, and such inductions as may be derived from them by no undue pressure. We do not see, therefore, how the main principle of the book can be successfully controverted. The facts are indisputable, and they tell their own story. Nor can we refrain from commending the volume as a most striking and valuable contribution to the religious thought of the world. It is emphatically one of the few books that no religious thinker can afford to be without. We doubt if any man can rise from its perusal without feeling that his grasp of saving truth is stronger, clearer, and more comprehensive than ever before.

◀ SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY. ▶

AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS.

- CLISSOLD, H. R. International Sunday School Lessons for 1886. The Scriptures only, Golden Texts and Memory Verses, with the principal changes of the Anglo-American Revision indicated in foot-notes. Chicago: *American Publication Society of Hebrew*. Cloth, limp, 32mo, pp. 76.....10c.
- Expository Sermons and Outlines on the Old Testament. New York: *A. C. Armstrong & Son*.....\$1.50
- Half Hours with the Lessons of 1886. Chapters on the Bible texts chosen for Sabbath-school study during 1886, in connection with the International lesson series. Philadelphia: *Presbyterian Board of Publication*. 12mo, pp. 464. Cloth, \$1.25; paper covers.....85c.
- HERNDON, E. W. Explanatory Notes on the International Sunday School Lessons for 1886. Columbia, Mo.: *Missouri Statesman*. Pp. 300.....70c.
- MONSER, J. W. An Eclectic Commentary on the International Lessons for 1886. St. Louis: *John Burns Publishing Company*. 12mo, pp. 436. Cloth, \$1; half morocco.....\$1.50
- STEBBINS, RUFUS P. A Common-sense View of the Books of the Old Testament. Boston: *American Unitarian Association*. Pp. 328.....\$1.50
- THOMSON, WILLIAM M. The Land and the Book. Vol. III. Lebanon, Damascus, and Beyond Jordan. Completing "The Land and the Book." New York: *Harper & Brothers*. Illustrated. Pp. xxxiv, 712....\$6., 7., 8.50., 10.
- WHITON, JAMES MORRIS. The Evolution of Revelation. New York: *G. P. Putnam's Sons*.... 25c.

FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- BALFOUR, J. H. The Plants of the Bible. New and enlarged edition. London: *Nelson*. Crown 8vo, pp. 256.....5s.
- BRADLEY, GEORGE GRANVILLE. Lectures on Ecclesiastes delivered in Westminster Abbey. London: *Henry Frowde, Clarendon Press Warehouse*. Crown 8vo, cloth.....4s. 6d.
- BUDGE, E. A. WALLIS. The Dwellers on the Nile. Life, literature, history and customs of Ancient Egypt. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Crown 8vo, cloth.....3s.
- CAMERON, H. P. History of the English Bible. London: *A. Gardner*. 12mo, pp. 192.....2s. 6d.
- CONDER, CLAUD REGNIER. Heth and Moab. A new and cheaper ed. London: *Richard Bentley & Sons*. 1 vol., crown 8vo.....6s.
- CROSS, JOHN A. Bible Readings selected from the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. London: *Macmillan & Co*. Globe 8vo.....2s. 6d.
- DELITZSCH, FRANZ. Der Messias als Versöhner. Eine biblische Untersuchung. Leipzig: *Dörffling & Franke*. 32 S. gr. 8.....M.0.40

- FAUSSET, A. R. An Expository Commentary on the Book of Judges. London: *James Nisbet & Co.* Demy 8vo.....10s. 6d.
- GILLESPIE, C. G. K. Revision Reasons. Vol. 1: Pentateuch. London: *Heywood.* 8vo, pp. 136.....2s. 6d.
- GRANT, CHARLES M. Bible Heathens; or, Church and World in Scripture Times. London: *James Nisbet & Co.* Crown 8vo.....2s. 6d.
- GRASHOFF, W. Alttestamentliche Bibelstunden zur Einführung der Gemeinde in das Verständniß der Heilsgeschichte. Bremen: *Mueller.* 3. Bd. 8..M.2.40 bound.....M.3.20
- GUTHE, H. Das Zukunftsbild d. Jesaja. Leipzig: *Breitkopf & Härtel.*...M.1.20
- MITCHELL, J. MURRAY. Hinduism, Past and Present. With an account of recent Hindu Reformers and a brief comparison between Hinduism and Christianity. London: *The Religious Tract Society.* Pp. 299.....4s.
- NEWTON, R. II. The Right and Wrong Uses of the Bible. Crown 8vo, cl..3s. 6d.
- PETRIE, W. M. FLINDERS. Tanis. The Egypt Exploration Fund. Second Memoir. London: *Truebner & Co.* 4to, pp. 27, with 19 plates and plans..25s.
- RIEHM, E. Die messianische Weissagung. Ihre Entstehung, ihr zeitgeschichtlicher Charakter und ihr Verhältnis zu der neutestamentlichen Erfüllung. 2. Aufl. Gotha: *F. A. Perthes.* vi, 233 S. gr. 8.....M.4
- RITTER, IMMAN. HEINR. Zum Verständniß des Judenthums. 2 Vorträge über seinen Charakter und seine Priesterlehre. Berlin: *Speyer & Peters.* Gr. 8, 20 S.....M.1
- ROSENZWEIG, A. Das Jahrhundert nach dem babylonischen Exile, mit besond. Rücksicht auf die religiöse Entwicklung des Judenthums. Berlin: *Duenmiller.*.....M.4
- SAYCE, A. II. Assyria: its Princes, Priests and People. London: *Religious Tract Society.* Cloth.....3s.
- The Scripture Atlas. From original drawings. Containing sixteen 4to maps; with Index. London: *W. & A. K. Johnston.* Imperial 4to, 1 and 2 vols., cloth and half calf.....15s.; £1.10; £2.2.
- VOLCK, W. Zur Lehre von der heiligen Schrift. Beleuchtung der offenen Erklärung der Glieder der Oesel'schen Synode zu ihrem Synodal-Proteste vom Jahre 1884 betr. die Lehre v. d. heil. Schrift. Dorpat: *Karow.* Gr. 8..M.0.80
- WEISS, H. Moses und sein Volk. Eine historisch-exegetische Studie. Freiburg i. B.: *Herder.*.....M.2.50
- WELLSHAUSEN, J. Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. 2. Heft. Die Composition des Hexateuchs. Berlin: *Reimer.*.....M.6

RECENT ARTICLES.

- HUTCHISON, J. German Translations of the Bible before Luther. *Academy,* Oct. 17, '85.
- Progressive Orthodoxy. The Scriptures. *Andover Review,* Nov., '85.
- JACOBS, JOSEPH. An Anglo-Teutonic-Israelite Document. *Athenæum,* Oct. 17, '85.
- ELMSLIE, W. GRAY. The Revised Old Testament. *British Quarterly Review,* July, '85.
- BARTLETT, S. C. The Book of Jonah. *Congregationalist,* Nov. 12, '85.
- BRANDT. Die alttestamentliche Hypothese Wellhausens. *Deutsch-ev. Blätter,* X., 10, '85.

- MEINHOLD. Die Bibelrevision. *Ev. Kirchen-Ztg.*, 40, '85.
- RATHMANN. Zu den neuesten Verhandlungen über die Probebibel. *Ibid.*, 41, 42, '85.
- DRIVER, S. R. The Revised Version of the Old Testament. 4. The Books of Deuteronomy and Joshua. *Expositor*, Oct., '85.
- JENNINGS, A. C., and LOWE, W. H. The Revised Version of the Old Testament. A Critical Estimate; III. *Ibid.*
- SOCIN, A. The Survey of Western Palestine. A Critical Estimate of the Work of the Palestine Exploration Fund. *Ibid.*
- Biblical Research. *Independent*, Nov. 19, '85.
- TANNER, A. Die Päpste und die Juden. I.: Die Juden in Portugal. II.: Die Juden im Kirchenstaate. *Kath. Schweizer-Blätter*, 6, 7, '85.
- Jewish Jottings. *The Messenger*, Oct. 21, '85.
- HUNNIUS, F. Die 3 letzten Capitel des Buchs der Richter u. Sauls Königthum. *Mith. u. Nachr. f. d. ev. Kirche in Russland*, Sept., '85.
- TREU, B. Zur Assyriology. *Ibid.*, April and Sept., '85.
- BARMBY, J. The Song of Solomon. *Monthly Interpreter*, vol. II., pp. 408-421, '85.
- WHITELOW, TH. The Patriarchal Times. IV.: The Story of the Fall. *Ibid.*, pp. 439-455, '85.
- BICKELL. Exegetisch-kritische Nachlese zu den alttestamentlichen Dichtungen. I.: Historische Lieder. *Ztschr. f. kath. Theol.*, IX., 4, '85.
- FLUNK, M. Die moderne Pentateuch-Kritik auf ihren wissenschaftlichen Gehalt geprüft mit besonderer Beziehung auf den Schöpfungs- und den Sintflutbericht. *Ibid.*
- SCHMID, F. Die neuesten Controversen über die Inspiration. *Ibid.*
- PORTER, J. L. Solomon's Ascent to the Temple. *Pulpit Treasury*, Nov., '85.
- PETERS, JOHN P. The Times of Isaiah, illustrated from the Monuments. *Sunday School Times*, Nov. 21, '85.

REVIEWS.

- PEARSON, WILLIAM L. The Prophecy of Joel. (John P. Peters.) *Andover Review*, Nov., '85.
- FERRIERE, E. Paganisme des Hébreux jusqu' à la captivité de Babylone. *La Cultura*, vol. VI., 9, '85.
- EWALD, GEORGE H. A. Revelation; its Nature and Record. (A. Spaeth.) *Lutheran Church Review*, Oct., '85.
- CUMMINGS, E. C. Nature in Scripture. *New Englander*, Nov., '85.
- LADD, GEO. T. The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. (Sewall, A. C.) *Ibid.*
- FRANTZ, A. Die Inspiration. (E. Luthardt.) *Theol. Litbl.*, 40, '85.
- GUNNING. De Godspraken van Amos. (E. König.) *Theol. Litbl.*, 32, '85. (J. P. Valetton, Jr.) *Theol. Studien*, 4 en 5, '85.
- HEIDENHEIM, M. Bibliotheca Samaritana I. Die samaritanische Pentateuch-Version. (E. Kautzsch.) *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Oct. 3, '85.
- PEARSON, WILLIAM L. The Prophecy of Joel. (Rudolph Smend.) *Ibid.*, Oct. 17, '85.