

# THE BIBLICAL WORLD

CONTINUING

## *The Old and New Testament Student*

VOLUME I.

MAY, 1893

NUMBER 5

THE question, What books shall I buy to aid me in my study? is one which is constantly raised by the student of the Bible. This question is all the more important because in many cases the number of books that can be bought is limited. Even ministers—perhaps we should say ministers especially—to whom books are tools almost as indispensable as are hammer and saw to the carpenter, are often compelled to limit themselves to a very few of the books which they would be glad to have. Let us, in the first instance, suppose the case of a Bible student, somewhat fully trained, and ambitious to do thorough and substantial work, but compelled to be very limited in his purchase of books. What books shall he buy?

IN another part of this issue there is quoted the testimony of Bishop Westcott to the preëminent value of the lexicon and the grammar, and, still more, of the concordance in the study of the New Testament. What is the significance of this testimony? Certainly, Bishop Westcott is not thinking of the concordance merely as an index for finding a passage, the location of which has slipped the student's mind. He undoubtedly has in mind the employment of the concordance for the purpose of examining the whole list of passages containing a given word. In other words, he refers to the task of ascertaining the meaning of a word by a purely inductive process. It is certainly a significant

fact that a scholar who has all the wealth of immense libraries at his command, nevertheless declares that he has obtained his most valuable results by the use of two books, a concordance of the New Testament and a concordance of the Septuagint (the Greek texts to which these concordances refer are of course taken for granted), and testifies if the student will add to these but two others, a grammar and a lexicon, "he will find that he has at his command a fruitful field of investigation which yields to every effort fresh signs of the inexhaustible wealth of the 'Written Word.'" Is there not in the testimony of this most competent witness a suggestion to the Bible student who is perplexed to know how, with but little money to spend in books, he may make the best use of that little? Let him, having a Greek Testament or a Hebrew Bible, or both, provide himself with a concordance of the original text, and begin a faithful inductive study of some of the great words of the Bible. Let him take, for example, such terms as righteousness, holiness, sin, repentance, forgiveness; or such as heart, soul, flesh, spirit, or any one of a multitude more. Let him take each word by itself, and study with care every passage in which the word is contained, endeavoring by a faithful examination of the context to determine what the exact meaning of the word is. Let him note the result of this examination of each passage, and after comparison and revision and re-comparison, sum up the results of his work in a definition of the word; or, if it prove to have several meanings, in an analytical tabulation of the various meanings. The student who will patiently pursue this method with some of the great words of the Bible, will certainly find himself busy for a time, and if Bishop Westcott is right he will be most profitably employed.

---

BUT why is this kind of study of preëminent value? In the first place, because it is a study of the ultimate elements of biblical thought. The student does not undertake to grasp the whole of a book at once, still less a system of thought built on the Bible. Instead, he lays hold upon the separate elements of the biblical thought, and concentrating attention on these, one

by one, gains a firm hold upon them. Archbishop Trench has somewhere said that "the words of the New Testament are eminently the elements (*στοιχεῖα*) of Christian theology, and he who will not begin with a patient study of these, shall never make any considerable, least of all any secure advances in this; for here, as elsewhere, sure disappointment awaits him who thinks to possess the whole without first possessing the parts of which that whole is composed."

In the second place this method enables the student to work independently and at first hand. Here he can make real original investigation at first sources, and, free from all *a priori* presuppositions, can proceed in purely inductive fashion on the basis of the ultimate facts. Other advantages could be spoken of, but these are sufficient for the present.

This method of study is of course one which can be pursued to best advantage only by the student who has at least some knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. Subject to some limitation it may however be pursued fruitfully, in the case of the New Testament at least, by the use of a concordance of the Revised Version.

---

BUT there is another method of study which requires an even less expensive outfit than this which we have just referred to and which can be pursued to advantage without appeal to the Greek or Hebrew. The study of each book of the Bible as a whole is indispensable to any thorough study of the Bible and it is possible to the student who has only an English Bible. True as it is that the whole cannot be possessed without first possessing the parts, it is hardly less true in interpretation that the parts cannot be possessed without first possessing the whole. The book cannot indeed be understood till we know the meaning of the words. But it is also true that we shall often miss the meaning of the words—certainly of the sentence—unless we take in the thought of the book as a whole. To this broad study of a book as a whole a knowledge of the historical situation out of which the book arose is a great help, if it is not an indispensable aid. And for this a few books are needed. Yet it is often the

very book under consideration that is our chief source of information respecting this historical situation, and next to this in value are other books of the Bible. So that while at this point books are greatly desirable, yet even here much good work can be done with little other help than that which the Bible itself affords, and can be done moreover in a genuinely independent fashion.

---

THUS it appears that there are at least two ways of studying the Bible, both scholarly, and, if the student choose to make them so, thoroughly independent and inductive, for neither of which is an extensive library required. The Bible student who is possessed of a Hebrew Bible and a Greek New Testament and can read them, who has concordances of both, and an English Bible for rapid reading, has at his hand the tools for much of the very best and most scholarly work that can be done on the Bible by any one, however amply equipped. Other books are certainly desirable; it is difficult to restrain the pen from naming others that seem *almost indispensable*. But substantial and fruitful work can be done with these books. Such work will far surpass in value that which will be done by the student who, feeding on the multitude of digested and re-digested compends and popularizations, never himself reaches the foundations of biblical thought, never drinks at the fountain head.

---

THE student of the Bible after the fashion just indicated is also receiving in this study the very best training for the judicious buying of other helps to further work. He is not only cultivating the right method in investigation, he is also developing the sense for the best books in the line of fruitful investigation. The man who uses books which contain results, popular compends of achieved knowledge in the sphere which he proposes to examine, comes to require such books in every sphere of his study. He loses the power to use a thoroughly scientific book which is helpful largely because its use demands the student's best thought. It is not too much to say that the demand for the "manual," the "primer," the collections of "thoughts," "illustrations," etc.—a

great demand, to judge by the ever-increasing supply—is a sign of the decay of really scholarly habits among biblical students. It would be more deplorable were the other fact not equally patent that never before were so many thoroughly good books for biblical study produced and sold as at the present time. Be this as it may, the point to be emphasized is this, that the man who buys popular compends will find himself constrained to buy them in ever-increasing numbers or fall hopelessly in the rear, while the student of the Bible and its concordances finds himself intuitively feeling after those works which go to the root of the matter and guide him to the freshest and most fruitful results because they stimulate him to the closest study and subject him to the severest discipline. Ministers who want to know the most and the best in the biblical sphere do not need more books but better books, or rather they need to make the right use of the few books they possess as the most efficient means to guide them in the purchase of others.

## "THE STORY OF THE SPIES" ONCE MORE.

---

By PROF. WM. HENRY GREEN, D.D.,  
Princeton Theological Seminary.

---

The narrative of the spies in Num. xiii. and xiv. is discussed in the March number of *THE BIBLICAL WORLD*. The article contains a very clear statement of the analysis of these chapters proposed by the most recent divisive critics. And the respected author appears to think that the simple presentation of the analysis must carry conviction to every mind that the chapters are composite, and have been formed by the blending of two narratives which were originally distinct and independent. I must confess that I cannot see it in that light. There are some obvious difficulties in the way of the conclusion so confidently reached.

In the first place, the narrative has every appearance of unity, of being a consistent, well-ordered, properly-constructed narrative, which unfolds regularly, step by step, until it reaches its termination. It harmonizes throughout, and everything is in its proper place. There is nothing superfluous, nothing lacking. Every part contributes its share to the general design, and adds in its measure to the completeness which characterizes the whole. It may be fitly called a well-told tale. It is indeed said in the article above referred to, "A superficial reading of the story may not disturb one's impression of its homogeneity. Closer inspection reveals remarkable repetitions. Instead of advancing in an orderly way, the narrative again and again doubles on itself." But this can, I think, be shown to be a mistake. I hope in this paper to demonstrate the contrary. Now, the conviction in my mind is irresistible that such an appearance of unity could not exist unless the unity was real. A narrative compiled from two distinct accounts of the same transaction, independently conceived and written, cannot possess the unity attaching to the product of

a single mind. The difference is that between a material woven continuously throughout and one that is pieced together, however skillfully. The latter will inevitably be betrayed by the recurring seams, the interrupted threads, and the varied texture. A writer may draw his materials from various sources, and by elaborating them in his own mind give unity to the whole. But, if he simply compiles a narrative from preëxisting written sources, extracting a sentence or paragraph first from one, then from another, each being retained unaltered, so that they can be taken apart again and the original sources precisely reconstructed, it is impossible that it should have even a tolerable semblance of continuity. Yet this is what the divisive critical hypothesis assumes with regard to the Pentateuchal history as a whole, and each of its several portions.

A second difficulty, kindred to that already stated, is that the narratives into which the critics resolve the chapters before us, and from which they claim that these have been compounded, are inferior in symmetry and structural arrangement to the story as it lies in the existing text. On the critical hypothesis precisely the reverse should be the case. If the chapters are a conglomerate, in which heterogeneous materials have been compacted, the critical severance, which restores the component parts to their original connection, and exhibits each of the primary narratives in its pristine form, and purged of all interpolations and extraneous matter, must remove disfigurements, and reunite the broken links of connection designed by the early narrators. The intermingling of goods of different patterns has a confusing effect. It is only when they are separated, and each is viewed by itself, that its proper pattern can be traced and its real beauty discerned. But, when the separation spoils and mars the fabric, we must conclude that what has taken place is not the resolution of a compound into its primary constituents, but the violent rending asunder of what was really a unit, the breaking of a graceful statue into misshapen fragments. This is precisely what the critical analysis does. The results which it produces are confusion instead of order; discrepancies, incongruities, contrarieties, contradictions, in what before was harmonious, symmetrical and

complete, and which are created simply by the putting asunder of what properly belongs together. And it thereby writes its own condemnation. Harmony does not arise from combining the incongruous, but discord naturally follows upon the derangement of parts which, properly fitted into one another, are harmonious.

Bearing these considerations in mind, let us now study with some care the story of the spies as given in the book of Numbers, and in the double form yielded by critical processes. We shall confine ourselves strictly here to the analysis presented in the lucid article above mentioned; and this we shall follow step by step from the beginning to the end.

The first thing that strikes attention is that the first section of chap. xiii. viz. vss. 1-16, which narrates the selection of twelve men as spies, is incapable of division, and is assigned entire to P. The account of JE is without any beginning whatever, and one has to be supplied from Deuteronomy. The allegation (p. 178)\* that Deut. follows JE, and not P, is somewhat precarious, and is no very reliable basis for the assumption that everything in Deut. has been drawn from JE, and may be, in substance at least, credited to that document. We shall find in a very conspicuous example, before we finish these chapters, that Deut. sides with P where JE differs from it. Num. xxxii. 8 JE † is appealed to as confirming the identity of JE's account and that of Deut. But that passage says nothing of *twelve* spies having been sent, and it diverges from Deut. as really as P, in what is represented to be an "incongruity" or "contradiction." In Deut. (i.22) it is said that the spies were sent at the instance of the people, in P by direction of Jehovah; according to xxxii. 8, Moses sent them, and there is no mention of any suggestion from the people on the one hand, or from Jehovah on the other. If the reticence of this passage

\*This and similar references hereafter are to the March number of THE BIBLICAL WORLD.

†It is proper to remark here that xxxii. 8-13 is not, from the critics' point of view, a pure text of JE, but has been manipulated by R, so that any critical argument from it becomes precarious. The allusion to the census, "from twenty years old and upward," ver. 11, the mention of Joshua along with Caleb, vs. 12, and the sentence of "forty years" wandering in the wilderness, vs. 13, are, on their hypothesis, all from P.



is no bar, as, according to the article before us, it is not, to its harmonious agreement with Dt., neither is precisely the same reticence in xiii. 1, 2. The solicitation of the people is expressed in neither, but, if understood in one, can, with exactly the same propriety, be understood in the other. The people made the suggestion, it pleased Moses, and Jehovah directed him to act accordingly. Where is the difficulty?

It should further be distinctly observed that the mention in Dt. of the selection of spies in no way proves, and can by no possibility prove, that there ever was a duplicate account of such a selection distinct from xiii. 1-16, and connected with subsequent verses of this chapter so as to form a parallel narrative of this transaction. The critics indeed affirm it. They say that the Redactor in combining the two separate accounts thought it unnecessary to repeat from JE what had already been related with sufficient fullness from P, and so omitted the statement of JE upon this point. This is possible. Anything is possible, which does not positively contradict known facts. But we cannot accept every conjecture as true simply because it is possible. If we are expected to believe it, some reason must be given for our faith. And no reason can be given in the present instance, which does not first assume the very thing which is in question. *If* there were two complete and independent narratives of the mission of the spies, each must have been prefaced by a statement of their selection. But all depends upon this "if." The statement in Dt. is nothing to the purpose; for it is just as explicable on the assumption of a single narrative in these chapters as of two narratives. That a passage parallel to vss. 1-16 once existed as the introduction of an account by JE, but has been omitted by R (the Redactor), is purely an inference from the prior assumption of the truth of the divisive hypothesis. It cannot bolster up the hypothesis; it is only a deduction from it. The hypothesis must be independently proved, before it can be admitted.

The next paragraph, vss. 17-20, contains the sending of the spies and the directions given to them, both of which belong, of course, to any complete account of the transaction. But the critics divide them, and give the sending of the spies without

any directions, vs. 17a, to P, and the directions with no mention of the spies themselves or their being sent, or who sent them, vs. 17b-20, to JE. The portion assigned to JE begins abruptly "and he said to them," with nothing to intimate who is the speaker, who are spoken to, or on what occasion. All this, we are to suppose, was in a once-existing separate preface of JE's account, but was omitted by R as superfluous after what he had already drawn from P. Again we say, this is possible; but there is no proof of it. The text, as we possess it, contains but one statement on these points. And that there ever was another in this connection is simply an inference from the hypothesis itself, and may be admitted as a corollary from that hypothesis, after it has first been clearly proved, but not before. It brings no aid to its support.

The absence of directions in P is traced (p. 178) to the fact that "the spies are sent out in obedience to a direct command of the LORD," whereas directions are given in JE because "the idea of sending out the spies originated with the people." One would naturally expect a precisely opposite conclusion from the premises. If the LORD gave command to send the spies, it might be supposed that he would specify what he intended them to do; and if particular directions could be dispensed with, it would be when the proposal came from the people, who might then be presumed to know their own mind in the matter.

It is besides a most remarkable coincidence, and upon the critical hypothesis it is altogether accidental and undesigned, that these two imperfect and halting statements respectively made by P and by JE, quite independently of each other, with no collusion and no thought of mutual adaptation, yet when brought together precisely match, exactly complete each other, each supplying what the other lacks, and the combination of the two making just what is required in a full and satisfactory statement of the affair. In P, spies are sent, but no directions are given them; in JE directions are given, but nothing said about their being sent. Put these together, and you have just what the case calls for, and what we actually find in the existing text. Now is this complete and appropriate statement the result of a

lucky accident? Has it arisen from combining two partial accounts which were altogether unrelated? Or have these partial accounts been produced by the sundering of what was originally complete? Any sensible man may answer for himself.

The next paragraph, vss. 21-24, records the spies' fulfilment of their errand. They traversed the land to its utmost limit, noting particularly the Anakim at Hebron and the grapes of Eshcol, from which they cut a famous cluster. Here is a general statement, and particulars under it which were thought worthy of special mention. This is certainly appropriate and fitting, and all agrees well together. But the critics partition it, and thereby, in their own esteem, create a variance. The general statement, vs. 21, is given to P; the particulars, vss. 22-24, to JE. These specially noteworthy particulars are then set over against the general statement, and because the former do not cover the entire ground sketched in the latter, which no one should expect them to do, it is charged that there is a discrepancy; as though the particular mention of Hebron and Eshcol affirmed or in any way implied that the spies went to these places only and to no others.

But the critics tell us that one writer speaks of their going throughout the entire extent of the land; another only of their going to Hebron and Eshcol. These are represented to be two separate accounts, which must be kept distinct. Each must be interpreted independently and by itself. Neither of them is to be explained in connection with the other; least of all must any attempt be made to harmonize them. Nothing is to be more strictly avoided, according to the critics, than any approach to harmonistic methods, or any connivance at them.

Let it be distinctly observed here that the only semblance of variance arises from this absolute severance of what is entirely harmonious when viewed together. Observe further, that if the propriety of the critical analysis were conceded, the alleged variance would not follow from it. No honest lawyer would deal with witnesses, no reputable historian would interpret his sources after the example here set by the critics. They would be held to be in accord so long as their language fairly interpreted would

admit. Apply this obviously just principle to the present case, and the supposed variance instantly vanishes, whether the narrative be single or duplicate. Observe still further, that there is no ground whatever for the partition in the present instance, except that there are distinct clauses which are capable of being separated. But why all may not have proceeded from the same writer does not appear, unless indeed, as the critics claim, they represent incompatible conceptions; this, however, is clearly not the case.

In Deut. i. 24, Num. xxxii. 9, the valley of Eshcol alone is mentioned as visited by the spies, and nothing is said of Hebron. Are we then to infer that there is a variance between vss. 22 and 23 of the chapter before us, and that two different and discrepant narratives are combined in these verses? That according to one they went simply to Hebron and not to Eshcol, and according to the other they went simply to Eshcol and not to Hebron? Some critics, who are ready to splinter the text *ad infinitum* have gone to this length. But the respected author of the article which we are considering, is chargeable with no such extravagance. He claims (p. 178) that Deut. is in entire accord with JE, and that Num. xxxii. 8 (and of course vs. 9 also) is from JE. There is no discrepancy, then, in his opinion in the circumstance that Deut. and JE in one place mention Eshcol only, and that JE in another place speaks of both Eshcol and Hebron as in the route of the spies. If now Hebron may be omitted from the statement without the suspicion of variance, why not Eshcol also? And where is the propriety of alleging that vs. 21, in which the spies are said to have traversed the whole land without specifying particular localities, is at variance with vss. 22, 23, in which two localities, through which they passed, are named but nothing said as to the extent of their journey?

But again, the directions given to the spies and the report which they render, as these are found in the portion assigned to JE, are both inconsistent with the limitation of their journey to spots so near the southern border as Hebron and Eshcol. They were to go into the mountain district, vs. 17, which runs through Canaan with but slight interruption from south to north, and

investigate the character of the land and of the population, vs. 18, and the cities, vs. 19, and the products of the country, vs. 20. How could they do this in any adequate manner, if they went no further than Hebron? In their report they give an account of the land, vs. 27, which surely cannot be meant to apply only to a very limited district, but must be intended to characterize it in general; also of the people and the cities, vs. 28, not a single city merely; and they specify the various populations of its several regions, the South, the mountain tract, the region along the sea, and that beside the Jordan, vs. 29.\* All this implies an extensive tour through the country. So that the verses assigned by the critics to JE compel to the conclusion that the route of the spies could not have terminated at Hebron and Eshcol, but must have taken the full range indicated in vs. 21, which is assigned to P.

To sum up the case then in regard to this paragraph. There is no ground for partitioning it between P and JE, unless two different conceptions of the route of the spies are here expressed. The critics affirm that this is the case, and partition accordingly. The alternative then is this; either two accounts, which are really at variance, happen to have been so constructed without any reference to each other, that when united they appear to be in entire accord; or else an apparent variance has been created in an account, really harmonious, by rending it asunder and setting the severed parts in seeming opposition. I invoke the judgment of candid men; which is more likely to have occurred? Has harmony in this instance accidentally resulted from placing contradictory statements side by side? Is it not far easier to believe that apparent inconsistency has been created by isolating statements which were meant to be viewed in conjunction, and when so viewed are in entire agreement?

The incidental remark in vs. 22, fixing the age of Hebron by comparison with that of Zoan, is significant as showing that the Egyptian city was more familiar to the writer and his readers than Hebron in Palestine.

\*The statement (p. 180) that vs. 29 mentions "only the native tribes of southern Palestine" is shown to be a mistake by Josh. xi. 1-3; xii. 7, 8.

The next paragraph, vss. 25-33, records the return of the spies and their report. They come back bringing the fruit of the land, vss. 25, 26. Then follow, first, the report in which they all unite, describing the land as fertile and the inhabitants as strong, vss. 27-29; secondly, the diverse representations, the quieting assurances of Caleb, vs. 30, and the discouraging declarations of the others, vss. 31-33. This natural and well-arranged account is partitioned by assigning the return, vss. 25, 26a to P, and the whole of the report vss. 26b-33 to JE, except a trifling fragment vs. 32a, which is given to P. The consequence is that JE says nothing whatever of their return. Here, again, we are expected to believe that there was a separate statement of this fact, distinct from that in the text, which R has not thought it necessary to retain. The words "to Kadesh," vs. 26, are sundered from the clause to which they belong, and given to JE, though wholly unconnected, for the sake of creating a fresh divergence. As they stand in the text they are plainly epexegetical of the preceding; they came 'unto the wilderness of Paran,' that is to say, 'to Kadesh.' But we are told (p. 178) these "are not two names for the same locality," for "P locates Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin, Num. xxvii. 14, Deut. xxxii. 51;" so, too, Num. xx. 1, xxxiii. 36. It is hence inferred that P and JE do not agree in regard to the point from which the spies were despatched. But the difficulty is purely imaginary. Zin was the special name of a small section of the more comprehensive wilderness of Paran. So that Kadesh might, without impropriety, be said to be in either.<sup>2</sup>

Verse 26b is plainly the continuation of 26a, though the critics sunder them, giving the latter to P and the former to JE. The consequence is that there is nothing in JE to which 'them' can refer. 'Unto them and unto all the congregation,' 26b, is evidently identical with "to Moses and to Aaron and to all the congregation of the children of Israel," 26a. The reference to Aaron (involved in the plural pronoun) and the word "congre-

<sup>2</sup> The statement (p. 178) that "Israel's next move, according to P, is into the wilderness of Zin, Num. xx. 1," overlooks the interval of thirty-eight years that lay between.

gation" are reckoned among the most decisive tests of P, and the presence of either in any passage is uniformly held to prove that it belongs to P. But the manifest allusion to ver. 20, previously assigned to JE, makes it necessary for the sake of consistency to give 26b to JE likewise, in spite of the violation of their own criteria and the intimate connection of this clause with 26a, from which it is thus severed. In order to relieve the difficulty somewhat we are told (p. 181) that 'the occurrence of "him" in the very next verse, "and they told him," *i. e.* Moses, and not "them," Moses and Aaron, seems to show that the singular was used in the 26th verse also, but was changed to conform it to the first part of the verse.' But if a change was made for conformity in one verse, why not in the other also? The spies return to Moses and Aaron and all the people and bring back word to them and show them the fruit of the land, but they make their formal report to Moses, by whom they were commissioned. So it is uniformly in the history. Moses and Aaron appear in conjunction, but the responsible acts are those of Moses. Ex. viii. 25-31 (vs. 28, intreat ye), ix. 27-29, x. 3, 7 (this man), 8, 9, 16-18.

Verse 32a is assigned to P and connected directly with vss. 25, 26a, the effect of which is to make it the language of the entire body of the spies without exception. This is not P's meaning, as the critics themselves must confess. A limitation of the subject, as in vs. 31, and a counter report, as in vs. 30, are here indispensable. The report as given in P is said (p. 180) to be "the exact contrary of the report according to JE." "It is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof" is held to denote "an exceedingly undesirable land whose inhabitants are consumed by prevailing pestilences or by devastating wars." This may illustrate how completely the narrator is in the power of the critic. By shifting the lines of division between the documents he can change the contents of each at will; and by sundering clauses from their proper connection, he can attribute to them senses that they could not otherwise bear. There is no suggestion of "pestilence" in the figurative expression above cited, either here or Lev. xxvi. 38, but only of being destroyed by

powerful foes. It thus fits precisely into the connection in which it stands. This meaning is further determined in the present instance by the manifest allusion to it in the language of Joshua and Caleb xiv. 9, "for they (the people of the land) are bread for us;" a clause, which has been inadvertently, but most unfortunately omitted in the analysis (p. 172). Instead of our being eaten up by the people of the land, giants as they are, they shall be bread for us. This direct allusion further shows that xiii. 32 and xiv. 9 are from the same pen, and cannot belong to different documents, as the critics will have it.

On the whole, then, we meet the same phenomenon in this paragraph as in those before it. JE's portion is defective, containing no notice of the return. That of P is likewise defective, the evil report being attributed to all the spies, and no intimation given of a different account by any of them. And this evil report in P is "the exact contrary" of the evil report as given in JE. But when these two defective and mutually antagonistic accounts are put together, the result is a complete and harmonious narrative, exactly suited to the situation. Is this again a lucky accident? For observe that the skill of the Redactor is confined to his adroit piecing together; it cannot cover faults inherent in the original constitution of the documents. The result reached could never have been attained if they had not fortunately chanced to be capable of this perfect adjustment. Are we not once more compelled to conclude that the true original is the narrative in the text, and the so-called documents are only sundered portions of it?

The next paragraph, xiv. 1-10, relates in a graphic manner how the people rebelled, and how Joshua and Caleb vainly endeavored to correct their misapprehension and bring them to a sense of their duty. The critics sever vss. 3, 4 JE from vss. 1, 2 P, thus dividing in twain the language of the people, which is all of one piece, and evidently belongs together. Vss. 3, 4 in JE is introduced abruptly, with no mention of the speakers, and no statement of the despondent and murmuring attitude of the people. We are to suppose that there was a separate mention of this fact, which has not been preserved, the supposition being itself based upon the hypothesis, in support of which it is offered.



In like manner the language of Joshua and Caleb is cut in two by assigning vss. 5-7 to P and vss. 8-9 to JE, as though they were the words of Moses. It has already been shown that vs. 9 cannot be separated from xiii. 32. The assumption that Moses speaks what in the common text is attributed to Joshua and Caleb, implies, according to the critical hypothesis itself, an unwarranted imputation of either recklessness or bad faith to R, and finds no justification in Deut. i. 29, 30. Moreover, the meager address left to Joshua and Caleb, "The land, etc., is an exceeding good land," is nothing to the purpose. It does not touch the point about which the people were agitated, even according to P, as the critics apportion it. We are told (p. 180) "That the majority reported the land as impoverished and unfruitful, is also implied in the vehement protest of the minority, that it is 'an exceeding good land.'" But there is no such suggestion in the evil report in P any more than in JE. The one thing that alarmed the people alike in both is lest they fall a prey to the terrible occupants of the land. Vss. 8, 9 are, therefore, an essential part of their address, if there is any appropriateness in it at all.

There is no inconsistency between xiv. 6 and xiii. 30. The critics by referring the former to P and the latter to JE, and making them parallel but variant accounts of the same thing, confuse quite different transactions, distinct in time and occasion. Chap. xiii. 27-33 is exclusively occupied with the report of the spies, not with its effect upon the people. The part which Caleb took in that report is stated xiii. 30. On the following day the people broke out in loud discontent, and xiv. 6 sqq. relates how Joshua and Caleb strove to allay it.

It thus appears that in this paragraph again, there is completeness, harmony and fitness in the text, while the documents are fragmentary, dissonant and ill adapted to the situation. Can there be any doubt which is the true original?

In the succeeding paragraphs vss. 11-25 are given to JE and vss. 26-38 to P, and these two sections are regarded as variant accounts of the same thing, whereas they are quite distinct. The former details Moses' intercession on behalf of the people, and

the LORD's response. In the latter, sentence is pronounced and ordered to be communicated to the people. The LORD had already announced to Moses the exclusion of the rebels from the promised land. He now specifies with exactness who are to be thus excluded and how; all who were twenty years old and upward at the recent census except Caleb and Joshua shall perish in the wilderness during a wandering of forty years. Caleb is mentioned in the former section with special commendation and a special promise, because he had distinguished himself at the very outset on the occasion of the spies making their report. In the second section, which specifies who were to be exempted from the sentence of perishing in the wilderness, Caleb and Joshua are both named, Caleb before Joshua because of his greater promptness and fidelity.

The critical partition leads to the statement (p. 177) that P makes the term of wandering forty years, JE gives no definite time; (p. 180) in P two spies are faithful, in JE only one. In both respects Deut. agrees with P; 40 years Deut. i. 3, ii. 7, 14, viii. 2, 4, xxix. 5; Caleb and Joshua Deut. i. 36, 38.\*

Attention is called (p. 181) to "the apparent displacement of xiv. 31, which being an almost word for word repetition of JE in vs. 3, and entirely out of harmony with the rest of P, seems to belong to JE between verses 23 and 24 where it exactly fits in." It certainly is a very damaging fact to find this verse where it is. It is also very difficult to find any reason for such a displacement as is here supposed. Moreover Wellhausen has shown, for a reason that every Hebraist must acknowledge, that vs. 30 must go with vs. 31; its emphatic pronoun cannot otherwise be accounted for than by the contrast between 'ye' and 'your little ones.' If then vs. 31 is given to JE, so must vs. 30 be with its 'Caleb and Joshua.'

\* It is alleged (p. 180 note) that Joshua was permitted to go into the promised land not because of his "connection with the spies but his relation to Moses as his present colleague and future successor." But the affair of the spies gives shape to the whole passage Deut. i. 36-39, as is shown by the order 'Caleb,' 'Joshua,' 'your little ones,' cf. Num. xiv. 30, 31, as well as by the terms employed. The very natural reference to Moses' own exclusion leads to the reflection that Joshua was thus graciously preserved to be his successor.

The plain reference of vs. 39 to vs. 28 forbids the assignment of the former to JE; vss. 11-25 were not made known to the people, and yet on the critics' partition they are represented as acting as though they knew all about it.

Here again we have a consistent and appropriate narrative in the text, with incongruities resulting from the partition. Whilst the narrative 'advances in an orderly way,' the critics create confusion by their erroneous assumption that it 'doubles on itself' (p. 170), and their consequent attempt to treat two transactions, which are quite distinct, as though they were one and the same.

The result of the preceding investigation is, as it seems to me, to establish the intrinsic superiority throughout of the narrative in the text to the defective and limping documents which the critics have deduced from it, and to create a strong presumption of the unity and originality of the former as opposed to the derived and fractional character of the latter.

A further difficulty in the way of accepting the critical analysis is the facility with which it can be applied where it is obviously of no significance. It is assumed by the divisive critics and their followers, that the simple partition of the text of the Pentateuch or of any portion of it is a palpable and irrefragable demonstration of its composite character; whereas it demonstrates nothing but the ingenuity of the operator. Any other writing can be divided in a similar manner by the same methods. Any narrative containing a series of incidents can be cloven asunder as readily as the story of the spies. To illustrate this I have selected at random the parable of the prodigal son, Luke xv. 11-32, and have made a perfectly extemporaneous partition of it, which I herewith submit. No doubt, if it was worth the time and the trouble, I might with a little pains improve it. But such as it is, it is sufficient for my present purpose. And I venture to say that it has fewer infelicities than the analysis of the story of the spies, which has been wrought out by the combined labors of a succession of such eminent scholars as Vater (1802), Knobel (1861), Noeldeke (1869), Kayser (1874), Wellhausen (1876), Dillmann (1886), each of

whom has corrected defects in the work of his predecessors, and contributed something toward its present form.

## A.

11. A certain man had two sons:  
12. and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of thy substance that falleth to me. . . . 13. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, . . . and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. . . . 14<sup>b</sup> and he began to be in want.

16<sup>b</sup>. And no man gave unto him. . . . 20. And he arose, and came to his father; . . . and he ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. 21. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son. 22. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: . . . 24. for this my son was dead, and is alive again. . . . And they began to be merry. 25. Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, . . . 28. he was angry, and would not go in: and his father came out, and entreated him. 29. But he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine: and yet thou never

## B.

(A certain man had two sons:)

12<sup>b</sup>. and he divided unto them his living.

13<sup>b</sup>. And (one of them) took his journey into a far country. . . . 14. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country. . . . 15. And he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. 16. And he would fain have been filled with the husks that the swine did eat. . . . 17. But when he came to himself he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger! 18. I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: 19. I am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. . . . 20<sup>b</sup>. But while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion: . . . 23. and (said) Bring the fatted calf, and kill it, and let us eat, and make merry: . . . he was lost, and is found. . . . 25<sup>b</sup>. (And the other son) heard music and dancing. 26. And he called to him one of the servants, and inquired what these things might be. 27. And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe

gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: 30. but when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. 31. And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that is mine is thine. 32. But it was meet to make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again. and sound, . . . 32<sup>b</sup>. he was lost and is found.

There are here two complete narratives, agreeing in some points, and disagreeing in others, each having its special characteristics. The only deficiencies are enclosed in parentheses, and may be readily explained as omissions by the Redactor in effecting the combination. A clause must be supplied at the beginning of B, a subject is wanting in vs. 13<sup>b</sup> and vs. 25<sup>b</sup>, and the verb "said" is wanting in vs. 23.

A and B agree that there were two sons, one of whom received a portion of his father's property, and by his own fault was reduced to great destitution, in consequence of which he returned penitently to his father, and addressed him in language which is nearly identical in both accounts. The father received him with great tenderness and demonstrations of joy, which attracted the attention of the other son.

The differences are quite as striking as the points of agreement. A distinguishes the sons as elder and younger; B makes no mention of their relative ages. In A the younger obtained his portion by solicitation, and the father retained the remainder in his own possession; in B the father divided his property between both of his sons of his own motion. In A the prodigal remained in his father's neighborhood, and reduced himself to penury by riotous living; in B he went to a distant country and spent all his property, but there is no intimation that he indulged in unseemly excesses. It would rather appear that he was injudicious; and to crown his misfortunes there occurred a severe famine. His fault seems to have consisted in having gone so far away from his father and from the holy land, and in engaging in

the unclean occupation of tending swine. In A the destitution seems to have been chiefly want of clothing; in B want of food. Hence in A the father directed the best robe and ring and shoes to be brought for him; in B the fatted calf was killed. In B the son came from a distant land, and the father saw him afar off; in A he came from the neighborhood, and the father ran at once and fell on his neck and kissed him. In B he had been engaged in a menial occupation, and so bethought himself of his father's hired servants, and asked to be made a servant himself; in A he had been living luxuriously, and while confessing his unworthiness makes no request to be put on the footing of a servant. In A the father speaks of his son having been dead because of his profligate life; in B of his having been lost because of his absence in a distant land. In A, but not in B, the other son was displeased at the reception given to the prodigal. And here it would appear that R has slightly altered the text. The elder son must have said to his father in A 'When this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou didst put on him the best robe.' But thinking that this did not make a good contrast with the 'kid,' the Redactor substituted for it the B phrase 'thou killedst for him the fatted calf.'

An argument, that will prove everything, proves nothing. And a style of critical analysis, which can be made to prove everything composite, is not to be trusted.

The readiness, with which a simple narrative yields to critical methods, is here sufficiently shown. That didactic composition is not proof against it, is shown in a very clever and effective manner in *Romans Dissected*, by E. D. McRealsham, the pseudonym of Professor C. M. Mead, D.D., of Hartford Theological Seminary. The result of his ingenious and scholarly discussion is to demonstrate that as plausible an argument can be made from diction, style and doctrinal contents for the fourfold division of the Epistle to the Romans as for the composite character of the Pentateuch.

THE OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATION IN  
MATTHEW XXVII. 9, 10.

By HUGH ROSS HATCH,  
Newton Centre, Mass.

I. A preliminary discussion respecting the phrase, "by Jeremiah the prophet."

The evangelist prefaces his quotation with these words: "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying." But nowhere in the prophecy of Jeremiah can the words of the quotation be found, or anything resembling them. The scripture most like them is in the book of Zechariah (xi. 13). How this discrepancy arose has been and still is a mooted question. A number of theories to solve the difficulty have been set forth, some<sup>1</sup> of which have only to be read in order to be rejected. This discussion is concerned only with those that seem most plausible. It has been supposed:

1. That there was an apocryphal book of Jeremiah from which Matthew quotes.

Origen said<sup>2</sup>: "I suspect either that the Scriptures have an error, and that for Zechariah Jeremiah was placed, or that there is some secret writing of Jeremiah's in which it is written."

Jerome refers to such a book. Commenting on this passage he wrote: "This passage (*testimonium*) is not found in Jeremiah. But in Zechariah . . . something similar occurs. . . . I read recently in a certain Hebrew volume . . . an apocryphum of Jeremiah, in which I found this scripture, word for word. But still I am inclined to think that from Zechariah this passage is taken, in the usual manner of the evangelists and apostles, who, neglecting

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Morison, *Commentary on Matthew, in loc., et al.*

<sup>2</sup>Origen, in *Evan. Matt. Comment.* Vol. V., p. 28 f. Berolini, 1835, ed. Lommatzsch.

the order of the words, only give the general sense in citation from the Old Testament."<sup>1</sup>

Fragments of such an apocryphum are still extant.<sup>2</sup> Jerome evidently rejected the writing as not genuine. It seems an attempt on the part of the early Christians to solve the difficulty we are now discussing.

2. That the book bearing the name of Zechariah was not all written by Zechariah, son of Iddo, but that a part—including chapter xi—was composed by an earlier prophet.

This hypothesis has raised the question of the integrity of the book of Zechariah. Critics still differ widely as to results. But even were the question of the integrity of the book satisfactorily settled, the task would nevertheless remain of proving the earlier prophecy Jeremiah's—the only direct evidence being this passage in Matthew. The critics, indeed, who think that chapters ix–xiv belong to an earlier period than chapters i–viii, also confess the necessity of assigning them to a time prior even to Jeremiah's day.

Another form of this theory appears in the supposition that the words were actually Jeremiah's, but somehow have become incorporated into the text of Zechariah. This would make Matthew assume the rôle of a textual critic, for the words he quotes must have been in Zechariah in Matthew's day, as the LXX proves. To be sure there is much confusion in the text of Jeremiah. But to show that a part of Jeremiah has passed over into Zechariah is yet an insuperable difficulty.

3. That Matthew erred either in memory or in knowledge.

This theory would be the easiest way out of the difficulty, if

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. *in loc.* (vii. 288). Cf. Smith, *Dict. Bib.* art. *Zechariah*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Henderson, *Comm. on Minor Prophets*. Also, Meyer on Matt. *in loc.* Henderson gives the passage,—“Jeremiah spake again to Pashur, Ye and your fathers have resisted the truth, and your sons . . . will commit more grievous sins than ye. For they will give the price of him that is valued and do injury to him that maketh the sick whole. . . . And they will take thirty pieces of silver, the price which the children of Israel have given. They have given them for the potter's field, as the Lord commanded.”

The writer of 2 Macc. alludes to records in which are found certain commandments of Jeremiah to them “that were carried away”—records not in the book of Jeremiah. (2 Macc. ii. 1–8).



it did not involve in its acceptance other and more serious considerations. That Matthew was well acquainted with the Old Testament prophecy a close examination of his use of prophecy will clearly demonstrate. He wrote to those who also were versed in the Old Testament Scriptures and who could readily verify all his statements. If it was a slip of memory, it was carelessness, and is it not quite probable that such a mistake would have been discovered and corrected shortly after it had been made? If it was an error in knowledge, Matthew was culpable. But it will be shown in another part of this paper that Matthew's reference to prophecy in this case is highly creditable and evinces the close student of the relation between the gospel history and the prophetic utterances. It is very easy, however, to exaggerate the results of accepting this solution of the question.

4. That it is a scribal error.

This theory assumes two forms: (a) That an abbreviation, ζῆλον, was used for the prophet's name, which, under scribal manipulation, became Ιῆλον in the earliest MSS. The MSS., however, have the name in full. Wright<sup>1</sup>, following Turpie, remarks that "such contractions do not occur in the oldest MSS." (b) That Matthew did not write the name of the prophet, but simply, "by the prophet," and that for some reason a scribe inserted the name, and blundered. But it may be remarked that the MSS. evidence supporting the prophet's name is unimpeachable. Only a few MSS.<sup>2</sup> omit it. A few others<sup>3</sup> of minor importance have the name of Zechariah. Furthermore, it is easier to show good reasons why the few MSS. have omitted the prophet's name, or have inserted that of Zechariah, than to find good cause why Jeremiah appears in the most important MSS.

<sup>1</sup> *Zechariah and his Prophecies* (Bampt. Lect. 1878) p. 337 note. Also, Smith, *Dict. Bib.* art. *Zechariah*.

It must be that Wright cannot intend his remark to refer to contractions generally, but only to the two in question. For in the Vatican MS. the name Jesus, and also Christ, is contracted, the first and last letters being used according to the case.

<sup>2</sup> Syr. Psch. 33. 157. Lat. MSS. a. b.

<sup>3</sup> Syr. Hcl. mg. 22, an Arabic MS. quoted by Bengel. Cf. the various Greek Testaments, and also Henderson, *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*.

It may be of some weight in this connection to remember that Matthew, in quoting from Zechariah elsewhere in his gospel (see xxi. 5, also xxvi. 31, where he reports Christ as using words from Zechariah) does not mention the prophet by name. Indeed, this is invariably the case when he quotes from any of the minor prophets; to be accounted for, perhaps, by the fact that in the Hebrew Scriptures the minor prophets formed one book. -

From this somewhat extended discussion it may be seen how difficult it is to reach any satisfactory conclusion regarding the matter. With our present light some form of (3) or (4) must be decided upon. Although the major evidence seems to favor some form of (3), yet it is altogether possible that the mistake is due to scribal error.

II. Let us now turn our attention to Zech. xi. 13. It reads as follows:

"And Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter, the goodly price, that I was prised at of them. And I took the thirty *pieces* of silver and cast them unto the potter, in the house of Jehovah."

Any interpretation of verse 13 would be incomplete unless it took into account the section in which it occurs (vss. 1-13).

The language seems to be that of a prophetic narrative which has its foundation in past facts, *i. e.*, from the prophet's point of view. The prophet bases his discourse upon events in Israel's history, describing them in prophetic symbolism, through which he interprets to the people their own action.<sup>2</sup> It may be also that he prefigures the outgrowth of continuance in similar action. Whatever view, however, one may take of vss. 1-13, whether as a prediction to be fulfilled, or as a prophetic interpretation of Israel's history, the utterance is one full of woe to the people of the land.

The chapter begins with a statement of judgment upon the

<sup>2</sup>I have been led to this view by a sentence in Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (p. 328). "The view which appears to present the least difficulty, and which may claim at least the *presumptive* support of the narrative form of the prophecy is, that it is (until v. 15 f.) a symbolical description of events which had already taken place, the *significance* of which the prophet, by his allegory, points out, but respecting which the historical sources at our disposal are partially, perhaps even wholly, silent." Cf. Keil *in loc.* Also, Ewald, *Prophets of the Old Testament, in loc.*

Jewish nation. The wide-open doors of Lebanon, the fallen cedars, the howling of the oaks of Bashan, graphically describe the rush and onslaught of the destroyer as he swept through the land. The distress of nature is echoed back by the wailing of the shepherds because of their despoiled glory.

Through his representative, the shepherd, Jehovah fed his flock, the people of Israel. But they were insensible to Jehovah's loving kindness. They became alienated from him. They were a flock of slaughter, "because, under the tyranny of their foreign masters, they were given over to destruction."<sup>2</sup> The shepherd's official insignia were two staves: the one, Beauty or Graciousness, representing the favor of Jehovah in his covenant relations with his people; the other, Bands or Binders, the symbol of the unity between the two parts of Jehovah's people. Wearied at last with Israel's many transgressions and disinclination to requite Jehovah's love, the shepherd cut the staff Beauty asunder, and thus indicated that God had removed his favor from his people—the favor that protected Israel from the nations, and had preserved them in their possessions. Graciousness broken, Israel became the prey of hostile forces. The compact between Jehovah and his people ended, Jehovah, through his representative, called for his reward of service. He sought for some expression—if there were any at all—of his flock's appreciation of his mercies in their behalf. "If ye think good, give me my hire; and, if not, forbear. So they weighed for my hire thirty *pieces* of silver." Thirty silverlings! the price of a slave<sup>2</sup> gored by an ox—the very consummation of insult. A paltry sum indeed for all Jehovah's kindness—"the magnificent price" of the people's esteem of their God. Away with it! "cast it to the potter."

Some commentators regard *yôçêr* as an error for *'ôçar* (treasury), as rendered in the Syriac version, or for *'ôçêr* (treasurer), according to Targum Jonathan. On critical grounds, however, there is no need of changing the Hebrew text. The question to be considered in such a change is, would it throw any light on the passage: "Cast it to the treasury," or, same idea, "to the treasurer." Instead of adding light, this rendering rather creates

<sup>1</sup> Alexander, *Zechariah's Vision and Warning*, p. 213.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide Ex. xxi. 32.*

a new difficulty, viz., the reconciliation of the contempt expressed in the passage, and the offering of the mean sum of money to Jehovah by putting it into the treasury of the sanctuary. No dishonorable gains<sup>2</sup> were to be brought into the house of Jehovah, and shall we suppose that the wages granted<sup>1</sup> in contumely were to be placed there? Such disposition of the silver would have taken away the contempt altogether. Besides, the money had already been paid to Jehovah, and why should he order it to be paid over again to himself? For this he virtually would do in commanding it to be cast into the temple treasury.

Keil<sup>3</sup> suggests that "to the potter" may be a proverbial expression indicative of supreme contempt—like, *e. g.*, our own, "to the dogs"—even though, as Keil himself admits, it is impossible to trace the origin of it satisfactorily. Accepting this view, as perhaps on the whole the most suitable, we have a meaning in harmony with the irony of the passage. "The price," says Wright,<sup>3</sup> so insultingly offered to the shepherd, was to be flung to a potter, as one of the lowest of the laboring classes; to be cast to a poor worker in clay whose productions were of so little value that when marred by any accident they could easily be replaced at a trifling expenditure of cost or toil. The price offered by the people to the Lord was so mean and despicable that it could only be regarded as offered in mockery, and hence the worthless silver was not to be cast into the treasury, or used for pious purposes, but flung to one of the lowest of the people, thrown back to one of themselves, even as a dishonored carcass was flung upon the graves of the common people (Jer. xxvi. 23)."

Bishop Newcome's<sup>4</sup> suggestion, that there may have been some Levites in the temple to furnish the potters' vessels for the offerings of wine and oil, and that it was to one of these the thirty silverings were cast, has no well-grounded support. Hengstenberg<sup>5</sup> assumes that "to the potter" is the same as to an unclean place, and bases his argument upon the supposition

<sup>1</sup> See Deut. xxiii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Commentary on Minor Prophets, in loc.*

<sup>3</sup> Wright, *Zechariah and his Prophecies*, p. 329.

<sup>4</sup> Newcome, *Minor Prophets, in loc.*

<sup>5</sup> *Christology of O. T.*, Vol. IV. p. 45 (2d ed., Edinburgh, 1858).

that the temple potter worked in the valley of Hinnom. (He makes the prophecy of Zechariah in this place a renewal of Jer. xviii. 19). But this theory will hardly hold good, for it is not clear at all that any potter either dwelt in Hinnom or had his workshop there.

"And I took the thirty *pieces* of silver and cast them unto the potter in the house of Jehovah." If thus far we are correct, or partially correct, in our interpretation, what is the force of the phrase, "the house of Jehovah"? There can be no doubt, I think, that the potter, when the money is flung to him, is in the temple.<sup>1</sup> The connection seems to be this. The temple is the point of departure in Jewish activity. Here Israel assembled to worship; here Jehovah met his people. No other place would have been so fitting as this for the transaction mentioned in this scripture. "The house<sup>2</sup> of Jehovah came into consideration here . . . as the place where the people appeared in the presence of their God to receive or to solicit the blessing of the covenant from him."

The fact that the silver was cast into the temple indicates all the more Jehovah's displeasure and his utter abhorrence of the despicable price offered for his shepherding. Thus, too, the repudiation of Israel by their God could not be gainsaid.

We may not understand, however, that the event actually happened in the temple—that the money was really flung into the sanctuary by Jehovah's representative. It is not necessary to our interpretation to make the flinging literal. Accordingly we may regard the act as a symbolical presentation to the people of the consequences of their own actions towards their Lord and his appointed shepherd. Whatever else may have been the prophet's purpose, or however he may have comprehended his own prefiguration, we may be confident that primarily and chiefly vss. 1-14 constitute a sermon to the people, with a personal application for them, then and there. Perhaps it would not be asserting too much to say that the prophet uses vss. 1-14

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg supposes that the money is first flung into the temple, and then carried away to the potter.

<sup>2</sup> Keil, *Commentary on Minor Prophets, in loc.* Cf. Alexander, Dods *et al.*

as the starting-point for the prophetic warning declared in vss. 15-17.

In passing to the consideration of the New Testament scripture several noteworthy features of the Old Testament passage should be borne in mind.

1. *Jehovah representative.*
2. *His shameful treatment at the hands of the people.*
  - (a) *His rejection by the people.*
  - (b) *The price at which he is valued by them.*
3. *The temple as the scene of Jehovah's repudiation of his people.*

### III. The New Testament passage<sup>2</sup>.

First, the situation: Judas had agreed with the chief priests to deliver Christ into their hands, and in this agreement it should be noticed that the price of the treachery was left to the priests, the representatives of the Jewish people. Judas said to them:—"What are ye willing to give me and I will deliver him unto you? And they weighed unto him thirty pieces of silver." From that time Judas sought to betray Jesus. The opportunity soon came; and Judas accomplished the infamous deed for which the priests had paid him thirty pieces of silver. But when Judas realized that the Jews had carried their rancor to the point of condemning Jesus to death, he regretted what he had done. The clinking coin in his wallet no longer gave forth a joyful sound to his ear but became a lash to his conscience. His remorse drove him back to the priests and the elders, and to them he breaks forth into the lament, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood." His sorrow availed nothing, however. The priests and elders spurned him. "What is that to us? see thou to it." In despair Judas flung the silver into the sanctuary and went out and hanged himself. The money—the price of blood—lay at the feet of the priests. Their tender consciences, for-

<sup>2</sup> Regarding the LXX translation of Zech. xi. 13 but a word needs be said. At first sight the Greek appears to differ from the Hebrew. But it is a divergence that diminishes on examination. By a few slight changes of the Hebrew text, as suggested by Toy *et al.*, we should have the reading of the LXX. The peculiarities of the quotation in Matthew derive no support from the LXX. Accordingly, since the LXX affords no help for the interpretation of Zech. xi. 13, it is not discussed at length in this paper.

sooth, would not allow them to put blood money into the temple treasury. That would have been unlawful. Accordingly, after consulting together they decided to buy the potter's field to bury strangers in.

It is at this point in the record that the evangelist gives additional importance to the events by his reference to the prophet: "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was priced, whom *certain* of the children of Israel did price; and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me" (R. V.).

Secondly, Matthew's use of the quotation: In his entire narrative of the betrayal of Christ it seems as if Matthew had in mind the section of Zechariah's prophecy that we have been examining.<sup>1</sup>

To Matthew Jesus is God's representative to Israel. He receives only maltreatment and scorn from the Jews. They reject him officially and in mass. In the bargain between Judas and the priests, not only is Judas paid thirty pieces of silver for his dastardly act, but also a value is put upon him whom Judas betrayed. Then the silver is flung into the sanctuary. The objection that Judas does not represent the shepherd of the prophecy, and consequently that it was Judas rather than the shepherd who cast down the money in the temple, has little force and does not touch the underlying significance of the events. In both cases it is Jehovah's representative who is shamefully treated by Israel. Christ was valued at the same price as the shepherd's services. The money goes for the purchase of the potter's field. The incidents cluster about the temple. The whole story vividly recalls the prophecy of Zechariah referred to above.

Matthew, however, in setting forth the fulfilment of the prophecy seems to lay the stress upon the fact that the potter's field was purchased with the silver, whereas in Zechariah, as we

<sup>1</sup>It may be that he had Jer. chaps. xviii. and xix. also in mind, as some scholars have imagined, but the connection with Jeremiah is not at all evident, and it may well be doubted whether any such connection would have been discovered if the name of that prophet had not appeared in the gospel.

have already seen, the emphasis appears to be upon Jehovah's repudiation of his flock because of their contemptuous rejection of his favors.

Shall we say, then, that Matthew has misapplied the words he quotes? It does not necessarily follow that he has done so. It is evident that he gives the Old Testament scripture a new turn of meaning, but it is because of the historical situation in which he conceives the prophecy to be fulfilled. The quotation, as used by Matthew, seems to be a free adaptation of the Hebrew passage to the case in hand.<sup>2</sup>

If, on the one hand, we are disposed to think that Matthew in his use of the specific verse (Zech. xi. 13) has been governed somewhat by external coincidences, on the other hand, in his account of the betrayal of Christ by Judas, he has called to our attention the deep significance of the prophetic prefiguration in the larger section (Zech. xi. 1-13), and has, therefore, shown himself to be something more than a mere superficial reader of prophecy.

<sup>2</sup> Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah* (5th ed.) Vol. II. p. 576. Also Wright on *Zechariah*, p. 342.



PROFESSOR KAMPHAUSEN ON THE BOOK OF  
DANIEL.<sup>1</sup>

By PROF. JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE,  
University of the City of New York.

In a recent contribution to the apparently inexhaustible literature on the book of Daniel, Professor D. Adolf Kamphausen of Bonn discusses in the light of modern historical criticism this much disputed portion of Scripture. The first part of his paper is devoted to refuting at some length two opinions of the late Paul de Lagarde, viz: that Daniel is merely a combination of various sections, quite separate in origin, and that the fourth and last kingdom prophesied in the seventh chapter is the Roman Empire.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Kamphausen is quite right in regarding the book of Daniel as a connected whole. A comparison of the two recognized divisions of the work, the apocalyptic chapters and the narrative sections, shows plainly their interdependence. It is apparent, for example, that in several places identical prophecies are simply repeated in different forms, in which connection should be mentioned the coincidence of the visions regarding the four kingdoms in chaps. ii. and vii. Moreover, in all the prophecies a period of trial and tribulations is always followed by the triumph of the Lord and his saints. That the apocalyptic chapters themselves form a whole, few since Bertholdt, save Lagarde, have doubted.

The only germ of truth in the dismemberment theory lies in the fact that the Maccabæan author has probably embodied in

<sup>1</sup> *Das Buch Daniel und die neuere Geschichtsforschung. Ein Vortrag mit Anmerkungen*, von D. Adolf Kamphausen, Ord. Prof. der Theologie zu Bonn. Leipzig: Hinrichs 1893, pp. vi. and 46.

<sup>2</sup> See *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1891, pp. 497-520.

his work a number of originally independent parts, all of which have the same paranetic object in view.

Although probably correct in his idea, that the bilingual character of the book does not presuppose a separate origin for the Aramaic chapters, Kamphausen's explanation of the sudden change of language in chap. ii. 4 is very unsatisfactory. He says (p. 13) that, as both Aramaic and Hebrew were equally well understood at the time when the book was written, the author used whichever language he considered most appropriate to his subject. Thus Aramaic was used for the speech of the Chaldees in chap. ii. and was continued through the parts relating to Babylonian history. Kamphausen hints that the apocalyptic chap. vii. is in Aramaic, because of its close resemblance to the second chapter.

It should be remembered, however, that the second chapter, although containing the account of a similar vision to that in chap. vii., is still narrative in form, while chap. vii. is undoubtedly apocalyptic, and, according to Kamphausen's theory regarding the appropriateness of Hebrew to such literature, should have been in that language. The difficulty, therefore, with this view, which is practically that of Merx, is, that the apocalyptic seventh chapter, which is clearly a part of the prophetic division of the book, is in Aramaic, while, on the other hand, the narrative first chapter is in Hebrew.

The best explanation of the bilingual character of Daniel seems that suggested by Lenormant and adopted by A. A. Bevan (*The Book of Daniel*, 1892, pp. 27ff), that the work was written originally all in Hebrew, and for the convenience of the general reader was then translated into the Aramaic vernacular. It may be supposed that certain parts of the original Hebrew manuscript being lost, the missing sections were supplied from the current Aramaic translation. This theory at least explains the language of the second chapter, without compelling the supposition of an arbitrary change of idiom on the part of the author. It may be mentioned that the idea of an original Hebrew version of Daniel was somewhat sarcastically suggested by Bertholdt as a parallel to P. D. Huetius' view in his

*Demonstr. Evang.*, p. 472, that the entire work was written first in Aramaic and afterwards translated into Hebrew. (Bertholdt, *Comm. on Dan.*, p. 52.)

Kamphausen's statement that the author of Daniel undoubtedly regarded Aramaic as the language of the Chaldeans who ruled in Babylon, and that he could have known nothing of the real Assyro-Babylonian, seems by no means certain.

It is now regarded as possible that the Babylonian language may have been in use, even as a spoken idiom, until and during the first part of the Hellenic period. We have the inscription of Antiochus Soter (280-260 B. C.) in good Babylonian, and it is interesting to notice that a brick from Tello contains a proper name of distinctly Assyrian character engraved in both Aramaic and Greek letters. (See Gutbrod, *ZA.* vi., p. 27.) It does not seem an untenable supposition, therefore, that the Maccabæan author of Daniel, in his reference to the writing of the Chaldees in chap. i. 4, may really have meant the Babylonian cuneiform characters, of which he might have heard or even seen specimens. In this connection it should be mentioned that the comment is inexact which Dr. Kamphausen has made on my brief article about the interpretation of the mysterious sentence in Daniel, v. 25. (*J. H. U. Circulars*, No. 98, p. 94.) He asserts that I there advanced the opinion that the author of Daniel understood the Babylonian language and characters. I merely suggested, however, that the events recorded in Daniel v. may really have taken place at the Babylonian court at the time of the fall of the city, and advanced the hypothesis that the sentence was unintelligible to the wise men because it may have been written ideographically in the Babylonian language. The implication was that the account descended in tradition to the Maccabæan writer of Daniel.

Lagarde's error, that the fourth kingdom in Daniel is not the Greek, but the Roman Empire, Kamphausen has rightly refuted. Because Josephus has not anywhere mentioned chaps. vii., ix.-xi., Lagarde came to the conclusion that chap. vii. was not in existence in the canon at the time of Josephus and was consequently a later insertion referring to the Roman power; an *argumentum ex*

*silentio* of the boldest sort. To judge the prophecies of chap. vii. apart from the context of the rest of the book, and to apply them in a manner quite at variance with the general tone of the work is against the first principles of true exegesis. There can be little doubt that the allusions of all the other prophetic sections of Daniel refer to the Greek power as the last empire, and to deliberately extract chap. vii. from its context and thus to ignore its close resemblance to chap. ii. seems entirely unwarranted.

The latter part of Kamphausen's lecture is an able, condensed argument against the old idea that the book has its origin in the Achæmenian period. The author might have noted, in his treatment of the name "Darius" in Daniel, that the theory of the historical confusion of Darius Hystaspis, in the biblical allusion to a "Darius the Mede," dates from the eleventh century of our era. Marianus Scotus, the celebrated Benedictine, appears to have held this view.<sup>1</sup>

It might also be added here that the interpolation of a Median rule in Babylon directly after its fall may be due to a confusion in the biblical author's mind of the fall of Babylon at the hands of the Persians with the earlier capture and overthrow of Nineveh by the Medes.

Every unprejudiced reader will agree with Professor Kamphausen that, in spite of the unhistorical character of Daniel, the book was certainly not written in vain. If it be remembered that the biblical author really makes no pretense of writing a history, but rather a comforting assurance to his people, groaning under the Syrian tyranny, the book should lose none of its beauty and force.

Kamphausen's lecture may be characterized as a clear and concise exposition of the best modern views regarding the book of Daniel and it will certainly prove a valuable introduction to the critical study of that work.

<sup>1</sup> See Bertholdt, *Comm. on Daniel*, p. 844.

## THE NEW GREEK ENOCH FRAGMENTS.

By PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.,  
Capital University.

That the day of valuable literary finds is by no means passed is again shown by the discovery of the portions of the apocryphal gospel and the apocalypse of Peter, together with larger fragments of the Greek text of the book of Enoch, by all odds the most valuable of the pre-Christian Jewish apocalypses. Not since the discovery, just ten years ago, of the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles by Bishop Bryennios, has any new literary discovery aroused the general interest which the pseudo-Petrine writings have awakened. While the eagerness to see what the harvest will be in the case of the Enoch fragments is not so great, yet there can be no doubt that as their value becomes better known for text-critical, historical and other purposes, the interest in them will become deeper and wider. Even as matters now stand they have already done the service of having furnished excellent reasons for trusting the Ethiopic text as a whole, in which language only the book of Enoch has been preserved, notwithstanding that this version is a translation of a translation, the original having been Hebrew or Aramaic, and the Ethiopic having been done out of the Greek.

The manuscript which contained these literary treasures, was discovered in the winter of 1886-'87, in the Christian burial city of Akhmim, used from the fifth to the fifteenth century, in Upper Egypt, the old Panopolis, by excavators under the direction of the French archaeologist Grébaut, who at that time, as the head of the Egyptian Museums, had charge of this work. The editor, U. Bouriant, an Egyptologist of note, states that the publication at so late a date, namely the end of 1892, was owing to *fâcheux regards sur lesquels il est inutile de s'étendre*. In reality

*silentio* of the boldest sort. To judge the prophecies of chap. vii. apart from the context of the rest of the book, and to apply them in a manner quite at variance with the general tone of the work is against the first principles of true exegesis. There can be little doubt that the allusions of all the other prophetic sections of Daniel refer to the Greek power as the last empire, and to deliberately extract chap. vii. from its context and thus to ignore its close resemblance to chap. ii. seems entirely unwarranted.

The latter part of Kamphausen's lecture is an able, condensed argument against the old idea that the book has its origin in the Achæmenian period. The author might have noted, in his treatment of the name "Darius" in Daniel, that the theory of the historical confusion of Darius Hystaspis, in the biblical allusion to a "Darius the Mede," dates from the eleventh century of our era. Marianus Scotus, the celebrated Benedictine, appears to have held this view.<sup>2</sup>

It might also be added here that the interpolation of a Median rule in Babylon directly after its fall may be due to a confusion in the biblical author's mind of the fall of Babylon at the hands of the Persians with the earlier capture and overthrow of Nineveh by the Medes.

Every unprejudiced reader will agree with Professor Kamphausen that, in spite of the unhistorical character of Daniel, the book was certainly not written in vain. If it be remembered that the biblical author really makes no pretense of writing a history, but rather a comforting assurance to his people, groaning under the Syrian tyranny, the book should lose none of its beauty and force.

Kamphausen's lecture may be characterized as a clear and concise exposition of the best modern views regarding the book of Daniel and it will certainly prove a valuable introduction to the critical study of that work.

<sup>2</sup> See Bertholdt, *Comm. on Daniel*, p. 844.

## THE NEW GREEK ENOCH FRAGMENTS.

By PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.,  
Capital University.

That the day of valuable literary finds is by no means passed is again shown by the discovery of the portions of the apocryphal gospel and the apocalypse of Peter, together with larger fragments of the Greek text of the book of Enoch, by all odds the most valuable of the pre-Christian Jewish apocalypses. Not since the discovery, just ten years ago, of the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles by Bishop Bryennios, has any new literary discovery aroused the general interest which the pseudo-Petrine writings have awakened. While the eagerness to see what the harvest will be in the case of the Enoch fragments is not so great, yet there can be no doubt that as their value becomes better known for text-critical, historical and other purposes, the interest in them will become deeper and wider. Even as matters now stand they have already done the service of having furnished excellent reasons for trusting the Ethiopic text as a whole, in which language only the book of Enoch has been preserved, notwithstanding that this version is a translation of a translation, the original having been Hebrew or Aramaic, and the Ethiopic having been done out of the Greek.

The manuscript which contained these literary treasures, was discovered in the winter of 1886-'87, in the Christian burial city of Akhmim, used from the fifth to the fifteenth century, in Upper Egypt, the old Panopolis, by excavators under the direction of the French archæologist Grébaud, who at that time, as the head of the Egyptian Museums, had charge of this work. The editor, U. Bouriant, an Egyptologist of note, states that the publication at so late a date, namely the end of 1892, was owing to *fâcheux regards sur lesquels il est inutile de s'étendre*. In reality

two Greek manuscripts were found in one grave, one on papyrus, containing writings of a mathematical character, the other on parchment, containing the gospel and apocalypse of Peter; the Enoch fragments; a small segment taken from a canonical gospel (pasted on the inside of the book cover of the volume); and one leaf covered with uncial letters, of which Bouriant says, that it was pasted "*sur la garde intérieure*" of the cover. It is manifestly a fragment of the acts of a little-known martyr Julian. The whole is published in the *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire sous la direction de M. U. Bouriant*, (Tome ix<sup>me</sup> 1<sup>er</sup> fascicule Paris, Ernest Leroux 1892, ii. 147, lexicon size); a series of works containing original materials chiefly from the Orient, together with excellent discussions, which is unfortunately but too little known to American students. The mathematical codex also is published in this *fascicule* by J. Baillet, entitled "*La papyrus mathématique d'Akhmim*," and runs to page 89, including several pages in *fac-simile*. The editor of the second manuscript, Bouriant, has devoted nearly his whole attention to the Enoch fragments. Of the Peter apocalypse and gospel he gives only a translation; to the Enoch fragments he gives an introduction and partial commentary, and parts of these he prints twice, once in order to compare them with the Syncellus Greek fragments, and a second time in connection with the whole text as far as discovered. His estimate of the relative worth of the parts of the codex is seen both in his little "*Fragments du texte Grec du livre d'Enoch, et de quelques écrits attribués à Saint Pierre*," as also is the fact that he has promised a *fac-simile* reproduction of the Enoch fragments, but not of the other documents. Then, too, he has aided in the publication of the ambitious and really valuable discussion of these fragments just issued by the French docent Adolphe Lods, entitled "*Le Livre d'Hénoch, fragments Grecs. . . publiés avec les variants du texte Éthiopien, traduits et annotés*" (Paris, 1892, Leroux). The discussion of these finds has not followed the estimates of the original editor. The pseudo-gospel and apocalypse of Peter have crowded the Enoch fragments somewhat into the background for the present.



Bouriant describes the Gizeh manuscript, as it is now called from the fact that it is deposited in the museum of that city. It contains thirty-three sheets, which the editor has paged, making sixty-six pages in all. It is bound in covers somewhat black with age. The pages are fifteen centimeters high and twelve centimeters long. No date is mentioned anywhere, but the editor concludes from the orthography, type of writing, and other data, that the manuscript is no older than the eighth century and no younger than the twelfth. As both the pseudo-Petrine writings date from the second century, according to the judgment of both Harnack and Schürer and the book of Enoch, in all or nearly all its parts is pre-Christian, at least in the original language, the manuscript is considerably removed from the date of the composition of the writings. The Syncellus Greek fragments of Enoch date from the eighth century, although it is of course not known from what older source they were taken. It will thus be impossible to decide as to the relative age of these two Greek texts, and their relative value must be determined by internal criticism. So far as this has been done, the judgment must be pronounced in favor of the new text, which to all intents and purposes is a confirmation of the Ethiopic text. The Syncellus fragments differ materially from the latter text, and the fact that they were one step nearer to the original was regarded as an evidence in favor their correctness, although they contained not a few readings that condemn themselves. The new Greek text agrees in substance with the Ethiopic, and over against the Syncellus fragments presents the characteristics of one recension. It also has the advantage over the Syncellus text of being much longer. The former contains only vi. 1-x. 14 and xv. 8 to xvi. 1, *i. e.* only about  $3\frac{1}{4}$  pages in Dillmann's German translation. The new fragments contain virtually the entire first 32 chapters of the book *i. e.* 16 pages in Dillmann's translation. This is indeed only about one-fifth of the entire book but yet it is five times as much of the Greek text as we had before. The present Greek text still contains small *lacunæ*, which arose from the fact that the eye of the writer jumped from the beginning of the third to the beginning of the fifth chapter, which begin alike.

In this way the two small chapters, three and four, are lacking. On the other hand, the manuscript has another portion duplicated, namely, chaps. xx. 2-xxi. 9.

The editor has not followed the order of the documents in the original manuscript. He begins with Enoch, while the latter closes with these fragments. In the manuscript the first page contains only a large Coptic cross; pp. 2-10 bring the fragments of the gospel of Peter; pp. 11-19 contain the larger portion of the apocalypse of Peter; pp. 21-66 contain the Enoch fragments, but written by two different hands, namely, chaps. i.-xiv. by one, and xv.-xxxii. by another. For this reason Bouriant speaks of "two" fragments, although in the text itself the second continues the first without a break. He states, however, that the Petrine pieces are written *plus cursive que celle des fragments d'Enoch*.

The publication of these new fragments is a literary event of great importance for New Testament research. Not only do we have the Greek original in a better shape than before from which Jude 14 and 15, were taken—the only direct citation in the New Testament writings from an apocalypse;—but we have also reason to put greater confidence in the entire text of the book of Enoch, notwithstanding that the Gizeh fragments contain quite a number of unique readings that do not harmonize with the Ethiopic. The fragments of the more important parts of the book would indeed have been more welcome, *e. g.* of the "Similitudes," or the historical vision in lxxxv.-xc.; but what we here have is certainly most welcome. A closer study of the new finds will doubtless still more enhance their value.

## THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

---

In response to a request for some account of the formation and work of the British Institute of Sacred Literature, Professor J. T. Marshall, of Manchester, one of those most active in bringing about its organization and upon whom the main responsibility and labor of conducting it has rested, has sent the following statement. This is accompanied by a neat circular explaining the plan and purpose of the British Institute and describing the courses offered. While this work in Great Britain has no organic connection with the American Institute, it is clearly the direct outgrowth of it. The same methods have been adopted and the same text books and instruction sheets are employed as in America. Those who are interested in the work on this side the water cannot fail to be interested in Professor Marshall's account, and to rejoice in the success which is attending the effort to extend the study of the Scriptures in the original languages on the other side of the sea :

"The formation of the *British Institute of Sacred Literature* owes its inception to the visit of Professor Harper to this country in 1891. His last public appearance during that visit was on the platform of the Baptist Union, whose autumnal session was held in Manchester, during the early days of October. Professor Harper's reputation secured for him, as a visitor, a most enthusiastic reception, and his vivid description of the splendid service done by the American Institute in arousing a zeal for biblical studies throughout the States was received with equal enthusiasm. There were doubtless, among the hundreds of Baptist ministers assembled, grave compunctions of conscience over youthful resolutions unfulfilled; distasteful reminiscences of neglected Hebrew Bibles, followed by a reactionary spasm of pious resolve to equip themselves more fully as ministers of the Word. Only such emotions could explain the immense outburst of applause which shortly afterwards greeted Dr. Maclaren's statement, that he and I had been persuaded by Professor Harper, if there were satisfactory indications that such a thing was desired, to attempt in some way to bring English ministers into connection with Professor Harper's educational system. The Baptist ministers gave their answers very significantly, and though the number of recruits from among them has not thus far fulfilled the promise of the augury, yet it was their enthusiasm which was interpreted to mean that the ministry of England is conscious of its need of further education in the biblical languages. Shortly afterwards a

paper appeared in *The Freeman* on "the Education of Ministers," pointing out that there is a considerable percentage of our ministers who have never had a college training, and that many who have enjoyed this advantage, have sadly neglected the original Scriptures—especially the Hebrew; and suggesting that education by correspondence was the most likely way of supplying this early deficiency. Similar papers appeared in *many* of the religious journals, and the consequence was, that almost two hundred letters were received from men of all denominations, asking what was going to be done, or suggesting what should be done. In view of all this, Dr. Maclaren and myself felt encouraged to enter into negotiations with Professor Harper, to be supplied with question-sheets from Chicago, while the work of examination was to be done in this country. When these preliminaries were completed, before launching the matter fully, it was decided to lift the matter off denominational lines, by seeking the coöperation of scholars of other persuasions. Dr. Thomson, of the Lancaster Independent College, and Professor W. F. Slater, M.A., of the Wesleyan College, Didsbury, both readily consented to coöperation; and the prospectus of the British Institute of Sacred Literature was issued under their names. There are now 54 students attached to the Institute. Every religious denomination has its representative, and they are scattered as far as the limits of our islands will permit. They are classified as follows: Hebrew, First Course, 18; Second, 7; Third, 7; Fourth, 2. Greek, First Course, 11; Second, 9.

"We are exceedingly grateful for the interest taken in our movement by the Editor of *The Expository Times*. It is probable that through his kind intervention, we may be able to report an important step in advance, when we are next asked to give an account of ourselves."

## STUDIES IN THE WISDOM BOOKS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LESSONS.

By GEORGE S. GOODSPEED,  
The University of Chicago.

### II. THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

1. *Practical character of "Wisdom."* Hebrew "wisdom" was everywhere practical in its character and aims. The religious problems with which it dealt were not, in the first instance, speculative or theoretical; they were those which lay upon the hearts of living men, and prevented the free action of the religious life. The discussions respecting social and political affairs in general did not take the form of philosophical inquiries into origin and purpose. They were admonitions, "directions," as Schürer says, "based upon a thoughtful study of human things for so regulating our life as to ensure our being truly happy." The only sense in which one may speak of philosophy among the Hebrews is that of moral or practical philosophy; not metaphysical principles, but coördinated results of practical experience.

This being the case, the literary work which most truly represents the "wisdom" is not the book of Job, in which the "wise" man has turned prophet, and applied his wisdom to the exigencies of a particular situation in the history of Israel's religion. The book of Proverbs is a much better example of "wisdom" in its undiluted, simple elements, manifested in various forms and applications. Here wise men figure in their usual and natural character as guides of men and censors of social, political and private life.

2. *Divisions of the Book.* A superficial reading of the book of Proverbs makes it clear that no analysis of it can be made on the basis of the thought. The most convenient and natural division is made by the titles of various sections, some longer, some shorter, scattered through the book.

At chap. x. 1; xxiv. 23; xxv. 1; xxx. 1; xxxi. 1; are such titles. Similar divisions are implied at i. 7; xxii. 17; xxxi. 10. This analysis would give the following parts of the book:

- (1) i. 1-6. The Preface.
- (2) i. 7-ix. 18. The Praise of Wisdom.
- (3) x. 1-xxii. 16. The Proverbs of Solomon.
- (4) xxii. 17-xxiv. 22. Further Exhortations concerning Wisdom.
- (5) xxiv. 23-34. Other Sayings of the Wise.
- (6) xxv. 1-xxix. 27. Hezekian Collection of Solomon's Proverbs.

- (7) xxx. 1-33. The Words of Agur.  
 (8) xxxi. 1-9. The Words of King Lemuel.  
 (9) xxxi. 10-31. The Poem of the Virtuous Woman.

3. *The "Books" of Proverbs.* This cursory examination and analysis reveals the fact that we have not a homogeneous production written at one time by Solomon or any other writer, but a gathering together of collections of proverbs written by Solomon and others. The book of Proverbs is really the *books* of Proverbs, the library of Hebrew proverbial literature. These different books are also distinguished by variety of form and, in fact, of content. In the "proverbs of Solomon" and the "Hezekian collection," which constitute a large portion of the whole, each verse consists of two lines (sometimes three), in which, for the most part, two characters or two attitudes of mind are contrasted. These "proverbs" have, in many cases, no connection with one another, and their order and arrangement might be changed without doing violence to the thought. If, however, we turn to the last chapter, *vss.* 10-31, we find a poem, a unity of thought, and, as a reference to the original will reveal, an alphabetic structure, *i. e.*, its lines begin with the letters of the alphabet, each in order—a style of composition much more complicated than the simple maxims of the other sections. In the thirtieth chapter are examples of riddles and enigmas in *vss.* 21-23. The first section of the book is the most artistic and connected of all. It has one subject, the "Praise of Wisdom," illustrated and enforced in a variety of ways. It contains no detached maxims, but a series of pictures, sermons, exhortations, culminating, perhaps, in the lofty description of wisdom in the eighth chapter, as the master workman of Jehovah in creation.

4. *The Contents of the Books.* Some general observations may here be made respecting the contents of the "books." The "Solomonic book" contains a number of proverbs duplicated.<sup>2</sup> In the "Hezekian book" appears another peculiarity. A number of its proverbs are similar to those in the "Solomonic book."<sup>3</sup> This latter phenomenon would seem to indicate that the two "books" were made independently of one another.

It is interesting also to notice that the early verses (1-4) of the thirtieth chapter concern themselves, in part, with those problems of divine providence which appear in the books of Job and Ecclesiastes. The other proverbial "books" do not trouble themselves with such subjects, but deal with matters of practical wisdom. Professor Cheyne, in comparing these proverbial "books" with the little "book" (chaps. i.-ix.), on the praise of wisdom, says that the former speak solely from the basis of experience, while the latter commends wisdom for itself, its emphasis is on Divine Teaching. It is certainly true that many of the proverbs and maxims are not religious at all.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. xiv. 12 and xvi. 25; and, with slight changes of expression, x. 1 and xv. 20; x. 2 and xi. 4; xvi. 2 and xxi. 2; xix. 5 and 9.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. xxv. 24 and xxi. 9; xxvi. 13 and xxii. 13; xxvi. 15 and xix. 24.

Of the five grand divisions into which the contents of the Solomonic and Hezekian "books" may be divided, only one-half of one is purely religious—less than one hundred proverbs in all. It is significant that there is but one reference to immortality (xii. 28), while there are four to death or future punishment; four to sheol or the under-world; four to sacrifice; two to prayer; four to faith in God; one each to reconciliation with God and atonement. The name of God (Jehovah) occurs fifty-nine times.<sup>1</sup>

It is almost impossible to give an account of the contents of these "Books," certainly of those parts which are made up of disconnected maxims on a variety of subjects. Among the topics treated are *Social-political matters*, like the family life and relations, the King, the People, their relations, the rich and poor; *Legal matters*, such as the duties of judges, the laws of social life from usury to cruelty to animals and murder; *Economic subjects*, like wealth in its relations to righteousness, labor, commercial and agricultural industries; the *Question of Education*, the value and importance of right knowledge, the training of children; *Ethical and religious subjects*, like duties to one's self, self-denial, prudence, godliness, duties to one's fellow men, veracity, love, friendship, liberality, etc., the relations of God and man, the divine character and judgment, human sin and the fear of God.<sup>2</sup>

5. *Author and Date of the Book.* We must distinguish between the book and the "books," as to authorship and date. There were the special collections made at particular times, and there was the collection of these collections into the book of Proverbs which we possess. Taking up the latter question, first we ask, "When did the Book, as a whole, take its present form?" We can only determine this approximately. It must certainly have been after the time of Hezekiah when the Hezekian collection was made. If scholars are right in thinking that the writer of chap. xxx. was troubled with the same problems as those which met the author of Job, then we must put the book in the time of the Exile, or after. This is the best that can be done. *Who* made the final collection is, of course, not known.

In considering the separate collections, the first glance shows that some of them do not claim Solomon as their author. This is true of chaps. xxx., xxxi. and of xxii. 17–xxiv. 34. It has also been urged, that if chap. x. 1 has as its heading the "Proverbs of Solomon," then the one who put the preceding collection before it, chaps. i.–ix., did not regard this as written by Solomon. In that case the Solomonic portions are the two collections, x. 1–xxii. 16, and xxv.–xxix. The striking fact already noted, that the former collection, purporting to come from Solomon, contains repetitions of proverbs, suggests that Solomon himself did not have the collection and editing of it, and indeed

<sup>1</sup> These statements are made on the authority of an article entitled, "A Classification of the Solomonic Proverbs," by Dr. K. Yuasa, in *Old and New Testament Student*, Vol. XIII. p. 147 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For this classification I am indebted to Dr. Yuasa.

makes it probable that the collection itself consisted of smaller collections of sayings of different wise men. This conclusion is favored also by the different kinds of material, and the different forms of literary statement which this collection contains. Some proverbs are rough, some are polished and sharpened to the keenest point.

The Hezekian collection had proverbs like the Solomonic. Hence these two collections were independent. Professor Davidson has discovered, to his satisfaction at least, that this collection, by its form and contents, is to be put earlier than the other collection. There are not so many finely wrought aphorisms in it. Hence, according to him, the Hezekian collection is the nucleus of the book. It contains less religious matter than the other parts, and more details concerning common life and things. Thus, if the reasoning is correct, none of the collections come from Solomon's time, since the earliest one was made by Hezekiah's scribes.

6. *Solomon's Relation to the Proverbs.* What, then, is the connection of Solomon with this collection of "wisdom" books? In describing this one cannot do better than summarize the statements of Professor Davidson.<sup>2</sup>

There can be no doubt that he was a writer of proverbs. The tradition of his authorship in this kind of literature is too strong to be set aside. I Kings iv. 29-34 is proof of it. It is not necessary to doubt that he wrote some of the proverbs contained in our present collections, and that much of the material in those collections goes back to his time. In his day the condition of things in Israel was favorable to reflective thought. The nation was coming into form. Conditions were settled. Relations to foreign nations, and the beginnings of trade and commerce all united to afford a field for the discovery of general principles and a stimulus for their application. Solomon himself was in sympathy with this movement. He threw into it a keen, vigorous mind, with an eye for human nature, and a knowledge of the world, and a faculty of pointed speech. His proverbs, along with those of the men of like mind who occupied themselves with the moral education and social demeanor of the people, and those of their successors, have found their way into the collections which make up the book of Proverbs.

7. *The "Wise Men" and their Work.* The loss of the splendid figure of Solomon from the title page of the book of Proverbs is not without its compensations. The proof that he did not write much of what that book contains is not merely a negative result. It is rather positive and constructive, in that it sets before us, in a clear and truthful way, the real position and work of the less known, but, for this sphere, more important "Wise men" or "Sages."

Was this kind of thought and literary activity the especial province of

<sup>2</sup>Cf. *Ency. Brit.*, article, "Proverbs," a most lucid and informing presentation of the material relating to the Book.



a particular class of thinkers and writers? This is not necessarily to be expected, for the same man may think along many lines and express his thinking in many forms. Indeed, in the case of the writer of Job, a "wisdom" book, there was the prophetic fire and purpose, as well as the meditative, reflective and generalizing spirit of the philosopher. But we find good reason to hold that just as the prophetic and priestly ideas and literary activity were represented by special schools of prophets and priests, the same was true of the Hebrew "wisdom," which was fostered by a class of teachers and thinkers called the "Wise men" or the "Sages." It is self-evident from the private way in which they would carry on their work, and the indirect relation which they would take to the historical and religious development of the nation, that they do not figure largely in the annals of Hebrew history, or receive frequent mention in the pages of prophetic or priestly literature. Still there are some references to them, such as in Jer. xviii. 18 and Ezek. vii. 26, which indicate that they were marked off into a class, and exercised an influence which set them alongside the two great bodies of leaders and teachers in Israel, the priests and the prophets.

They work apart from priest and prophet, though not opposed to either. Proverbs iii. 9 shows their attitude toward priests; xxix. 18, toward the prophets. They pursue their own line, addressing the Israelite in his life as a man in his relations toward his family, his fellow men, his God. As has been said, this line was aside from the main current of the nation's life, though it was a no less influential one. Their work was devoted largely in private to a circle of followers or to men as individuals.

Thus, as Solomon steps into the background they come forward, a succession of teachers, century after century, developing the body of truths which it was their especial province to maintain and promulgate. Their monuments are in the "books" of Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and not a few of the Psalms.

8. *Their Teachings.* We may, perhaps, with Davidson, trace the progress of their thought from epoch to epoch, as it appears in the special book which is now under consideration. At first they may be regarded as seeking to prepare men for the duties of life by general moral maxims which condensed the experience of the past in comparisons and antitheses. The results of their familiar homely instruction, are found chiefly in the Hezekian collection. Later on they have continued to exercise their reflective and penetrative judgment in a less external way. They seek to analyze the mind and the springs of moral action, and find the sources of outward activity there. As the course of thought about God widens in Israel, He comes to be thought of more as universal in his activity. The idea of "wisdom" rises to a union of nature and experience and man, under the Divine government. Wisdom is the counterpart of the Divine mind, and human wisdom consists in entering into the knowledge and obedience of this universal "wisdom." This is the

teaching of the first "Book," the first nine chapters of Proverbs, where the thought is the broadest and highest.

9. *Relation to other Proverbial Literature.* The product of the educational and literary activity of these men is both similar to and different from the proverbial literature of other nations. In form all proverbs are more or less alike. Some of the proverbs of other nations express the thought they embody more sharply and clearly than do the corresponding sayings of the Hebrews. This comes largely from the fact that the Hebrew proverbs are not the outgrowths of popular life and experience, coming out from the ranks of the people, sharpened into form by passing for centuries from lip to lip. They are the production of teachers, they are not folk sayings, but the condensation of the thought of devout, shrewd and practised men. Hence they are not as rude, as homely, as popular proverbs. Yet it is the high moral and religious character of the book of Proverbs which distinguishes it from the proverbs of other nations. There are moral and religious proverbs among other peoples, but the body of such literature does not reach the high point, does not move with the same sure foot in the higher moral and religious regions as do the biblical proverbs.

10. *Religious Value of the Proverbs.* Here lies their religious value. They constitute that body of the Hebrew literature which is nearest the earth, most touched with earthly, common, everyday thoughts, ideas, actions, the external, the practical, the commonplace—out of which so much of our life is built. In this region, where it is so easy to err and mislead, the biblical proverbs are remarkable, because they reach so religious a standpoint; because they are permeated with the religious sentiment and pitched to the religious standard. At certain moments these wise men can rise to that symbolic picture of "wisdom" as the connecting link between heaven and earth, which later writers catch up and carry on until it blends with the reality of the Divine Saviour. But on lower stages their "wisdom" reveals—and *suggests* where it does not reveal—how the religious principle of life may have, must have, its moral application in all the spheres of our human activity—not only its meaning toward God but toward ourselves and our neighbor.

## Exploration and Discovery.

### THE DECIPHERMENT OF THE ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

By ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER.  
The University of Chicago.

#### II.

Passing over Löwenstern, de Saulcy, Longperier and others we come to the Irishman, Edward Hincks (died December 3, 1866, at Killeleagh, County Down, Ireland). In 1849 Hincks read a paper before the Irish Academy on the Khorsabad inscriptions in which he dealt chiefly with the ideograms of the Assyrio-Babylonian, and with the chronology of the Assyrians. In 1856 an appendix to the foregoing containing "Addenda and Corrigenda" was printed. In all probability this appendix was printed in 1850, but the complete volume of the Transactions of the Academy did not appear until 1855. The most important discovery in this Appendix is that the so-called Homophones (*i. e.* signs with the same value) for the single consonants were in reality different signs, some of which had a vowel before them and others a vowel after them; or, to be more explicit, in the case of the seven accepted signs for the consonant *b*, the values *ab*, *ib*, *ub*, *ba*, *bi*, *be*, and *bu* were to be sharply distinguished from each other. This was a great gain for the decipherment of the Assyrian. The list of signs was, on account of this discovery, quite different from the one proposed by de Saulcy and by Hincks himself in his earlier writings. The phonetic complement was discovered independently by both Hincks and Rawlinson. This so-called complement is a sign attached to an ideogram to indicate the reading of the ideogram, *e. g.* IS. KU = both *kakku* and *tukultu*. When the ideogram is to be read *tukultu*, we have, in almost every case, the phonetic complement, *tu*, *ti* or *tu* added to the IS. KU. to indicate this reading. The compound syllabic values were first noted by Hincks, viz: signs having values consisting of a consonant + a vowel + a consonant, as *dan* (= *da-an*), *bul* (= *bu-ul*), etc. The so-called "allophones" or "polyphones," *i. e.* characters that can be read in two or more different ways, *e. g.* *dan*, *kal*, *lab*, *rib*, all values of one sign, were first observed by Rawlinson. Cf. also *riu-u-kil*, to be read *u-sam-kit*.

With Hommel, the history of the investigations from 1851 on can be divided

into two periods, with Hincks and Oppert as the leaders of the first. During this period, all that had been done before was arranged philologically and new facts gathered from new inscriptions were added to those already known. In 1868, '70 and '72 appeared the first three volumes of Edwin Norris' *Assyrian Dictionary*. During this time volumes I-IV of *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* were published by Rawlinson, Norris and George Smith.

Schrader, the father of Assyriology in Germany, may be regarded as the connecting link between these two periods, belonging neither to the first nor to the second. His great service to the science has been from the standpoint of history and not of philology.

The second period begins with Friedrich Delitzsch and continues to the present time. The characteristic feature of this period is the close and strictly philological work done by Delitzsch and his school. When Delitzsch commenced the study of Assyrian, "Assyriology was in a state of slavish dependence on Arabic lexicography." He soon became convinced that Arabic was not so important to the study of Assyrian as the North Semitic languages, the Hebrew and the Aramaic dialects. He was the first to make any real attempt to explain the vocabulary of the Assyrians by means of the usage of words in the Assyrian texts. In other words, instead of slavishly following the lexicons of the Arabic, Hebrew, etc., and giving Arabic meanings to roots in Assyrian containing the same radicals, he studied the language from its own literature, calling the cognates to his assistance only when it was necessary. All the historical inscriptions have been retranslated and explained philologically. Much good work has been done in the mythical texts (Haupt, Jensen); the religious literature (Zimmern, Sayce, etc.); the contract tablets (Strassmaier, Talqvist, Peiser and others); syllabaries (Delitzsch); astronomical tablets (Oppert, Sayce, Epping and Strassmaier); letters (Smith, Delitzsch and others). There still remains a great deal to be done.

"The historical inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia have been, for the most part, carefully studied and translated. The more important texts hitherto published have been collated and fresh translations made by competent scholars during the last decade. No one can hope to add much to Semitic science historically, or linguistically, by continuing to work over the old material. There are not a few passages in these inscriptions in which there is still uncertainty, and others are wholly obscure. The obscurities are mainly etymological and lexical, and the aid necessary to their elucidation can be found only in new historical texts yet to be discovered, or, to a limited extent, in other branches of its copious literature, still imperfectly examined or wholly unknown. Assyriology in the future, more than in the past, must depend upon itself for its interpretation without, however, disdainful of valuable suggestions yet to be received from Hebrew and Aramaic, Arabic and Syriac, and even from some of the more remotely connected branches of this widespread family of languages. Assyrian possesses a vast deal of material for its exposition in the thousands of unpublished texts in the British Museum and in the

other collections in Europe and the United States. But the past lines of advance are not the future lines of progress. The time for the publication of "Miscellaneous Texts" is past. There is a call for students to devote themselves to special "series" dealing with particular subjects. Not even vocabularies and syllabaries can safely be taken at random and applied without discrimination to texts generally. Many of them were evidently intended for the explanation of special works. The meanings attached have application only within the bounds of the subject for which they were prepared. It is well known that even in modern languages words which are the same orthographically and genetically connote, by the special uses to which they have been applied, quite divergent and sometimes even antithetic ideas. This occurred much more frequently in ancient languages than in modern. Facility in the formation of special terms was not a characteristic of early languages. The main vocabulary was levied upon for the best it could offer to do duty in their stead, and these words were, so to speak, compelled to connote certain ideas in accordance with the character of the subject treated. This fact must not be lost sight of by Assyriologists, for, great as is the temptation to overlook it, the confusion consequent upon the oversight may be greater. This is not the place to discuss this subject. We call attention to it here in connection with the work under review. Not only must Assyriology depend more largely upon itself, but, further, each department of its literature must be studied exhaustively and, to a certain extent, independently. Astrological and astronomical works cannot be explained except in their own light. Mythological, ceremonial and religious texts derive little aid from contract tablets. Epistolary correspondence cannot be successfully made out by depending upon the historical vocabulary. Each class, if it is to be studied profoundly and scientifically, demands separate and exhaustive examination."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Craig, in his review of Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the K Collection*. *Hebraica*, vol. vii., Nos. 3 and 4.

## Synopses of Important Articles.

---

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF THE HEBREW MONARCHY. I., LAND. By Rev. Prof. W. H. BENNETT, M.A., in *The Thinker* for Feb. 1893.

The opportunity to use land is, in some ways, a more fundamental condition of a satisfactory life than even personal freedom. In the Old Testament, freeman and landowner are synonymous terms. Landlord and tenant were unknown characters in Israel of Old Testament times. Land tenure recognized no absolute ownership. The land was the property not of the individual but of the family. The partition of the land of Palestine among the tribes, in the book of Joshua, is said to have been "according to their families." All regulations for the sale of land tended to keep it in the family. The law providing that, in the Jubilee year, all land sold within the past fifty years should revert to its former owner, was in favor of the family tenure. At some points in Israel's history this law was trampled under foot. The kingdom of the ten tribes was drowned in a flood of injustice and violence, oppression and fraud, land-thieving and heritage-seizure. But in full force, the law deprived the land-holder the right of selling his landed estate. It was held as a sacred trust for posterity. His right was simply that of use for his own time and life.

---

PRICE.

THE FOLK-SONG OF ISRAEL IN THE MOUTH OF THE PROPHETS. By Professor KARL BUDDE, in the *New World* for March, 1893.

Professor Budde attempts in the present article to point out the prevalence of the use of Folk-poesy in the writings of the Old Testament prophets. The father of literature on this subject was Hamann, followed by the poet and writer Herder. Herder especially devoted his attention to the beauty of the poetry of the ancient Hebrews, and in his work on that subject presented matter in a very attractive and comprehensive form. Folk-song is a very common element of every-day life among Oriental peoples. It is especially prominent upon occasions of great joy or lamentation, at wedding feasts and at funerals. This is noted even today by residents and travellers in the East. But to turn to the Old Testament: we find illustrations of both kinds of Folk-song, joy and exultation in Ps. xlv., and in the Song of Solomon; mourning and lamentation in the Book of Lamentations. The Folk-song devoted to mourning and weeping was especially prevalent among classes of persons who made it their profession to mourn for the dead and for great disasters. The remnants of this literature or poesy display a peculiar make-up.

One of the best illustrations will be found in Lamentations ii. 1-3. While

in regular Hebrew poetry the lines are almost of equal length and either synonymous, synthetic or antithetic in their relations to each other, those of the dirge consist, each verse of two lines, the second of which is always shorter than the first, on an average in the ratio of two to three. This gives a kind of undulating or limping movement as characteristic of the lament, for example:

"Ah, how the Lord in his anger has smitten  
The daughter of Zion;  
And dashed from heaven to earth the beauty of Israel,  
And no way remembered his foot-stool."

Another interesting example is found in Isa. xiv. 4:

"Ah! how the tyrant is at rest;  
Ended is the oppression.  
Jehovah hath stolen the staff of the wicked,  
The sceptre of the rulers."

In Jer. ix. 17-21, the professional mourning women are called on and they give us in verse 22 a specimen of a dirge which they used on sorrowful occasions. The employment of this kind of metre in the Book of Lamentations called to the mind of everyone who heard it the presence of death. The overthrow of the sacred city was even as a death in the family, and impressed upon every hearer the thought of personal loss. Jeremiah in his prophecy uses the same special metre when he replies to Zedekiah (chap. xxxviii. 22) and foretells to him the certain overthrow of his city and of his people. Taking the prophets all through we find that there are probably fifty of these chants or dirges embodied in their writings. In fact there are only five, Joel, Jonah and the three post-exilic prophets who do not use it. A second stage of adaptation of the lament, is in its ironical use as shown in Jeremiah xlvi.-xlix. and often in Ezekiel. A third use is that of adapting it to hymnic verse in general as found especially in Isaiah xl. 9-11; xliv. 23-28. A fourth stage is that in which nothing but the empty form was left. This peculiar adaptation is found in the pilgrimage songs, Ps. cxx.-cxxxiv. In all of these four classes we find the same undulating, limping metre. The investigation of this class of poetry leads to some important results. The Book of Lamentations cannot be brought down many years after the fall of Jerusalem. It becomes a "sheer impossibility" to bring down Ps. cxxxvii. as done by Professor Cheyne, to the time of Simon Maccabæus. It must be left in the exile and near the beginning of it. Other writings which have been brought down to a late date are certainly earlier on the evidence of the Folk-song.

Professor Budde has given us a very interesting and instructive sketch of his topic. It reveals some attractive points concerning poetic literature of the people. Its bearing on textual criticism is noted but slightly. However, there is an inclination on his part, as seen in some of his other writings, to generalize on too narrow a basis. For example, he concludes because Isa. xl.-lxvi. uses the undulating metre for joyful expressions; that this was a late adaptation of the dirge, and that Micah vii. 7, where the same metre is used, therefore belongs to a date 100 years later than the supposed

author. Of course that is a hasty conclusion made on too narrow a premise. He also maintains that the presence of this metre gives a good basis for the emendation of the text and the discovery of omissions and the transference of words, but these can easily be carried too far. The article as a whole is very valuable in the study of Old Testament poetry, especially as found among the prophets. PRICE.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY. II. Paul's Religious History. By Rev. Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D., in *The Expositor*, for February, 1893.

A study of Paul's conception of Christianity fitly begins with an inquiry into his religious history, since his theology is the outgrowth of his experience, and because acquaintance with his spiritual history helps us to assume a sympathetic appreciative attitude toward his theology. The autobiographical hints in the controversial group of epistles are comparatively few, but valuable. They occur conspicuously in the first chapter of Galatians and the seventh of Romans. The former shows him, before he became a Christian, as a zealot in Judaism, whose ambition was to excel in establishing a legal righteousness. The latter shows his failure, arising from the discovery that the law forbade *coveting, i. e.*, that a mere feeling, a state of the heart not falling under the observation of others, is condemned as sin. The momentousness of this discovery for Paul himself it is impossible to exaggerate. From that moment his Judaism was doomed (Rom. vii. 9). Hope died because the zealot saw that there was a whole world of sin within of which he had not dreamed, with which it was hard to cope, and which made righteousness by conformity to the law appear unattainable. This was a great step from Judaism toward Christianity. It led up to the turning-point of his life, which, however marvellous, was not so sudden and unprepared as it seems. While the objective appearance of Christ to Paul at his conversion is by all means to be maintained, it is legitimate to assume that there was a subjective state answering to the objective phenomenon. Before Christ appeared to him on the way to Damascus He had been revealed *in* him (Gal. ii. 15), not yet as an object of faith, but as an object of earnest thought. That Paul had thought of Christ's claims, and of the significance of his life, death and resurrection, explains his fiercely hostile attitude to Christianity, which he regarded as a rival to Judaism. He hated it, yet was drawn toward it, and could not let it alone. Now when a spiritual crisis comes to a man of such heroic temper and resolute will, it possesses deep and inexhaustible significance. In the view of some writers the spiritual development of this remarkable man took place mainly after his conversion. It would be nearer the truth to say that on that day his spiritual development to a large extent lay behind him. For him to become a Christian meant everything. It meant becoming a *Paulinist* Christian in the sense which the famous controversial epistles enable us to set upon that expression. The preparation for the great change had been so thorough that the convert leaped at a bound into a large cosmopolitan idea of Christianity, its nature and destination. This view of Paul's conversion is



borne out by the autobiographical notices in the first chapter of Galatians. Four points deserve attention here. (1) He calls his old way of life Judaism, rather than Pharisaism or Rabbinism, obviously having present controversies in view. He knows all about Judaizing, and Judaism. It had been his life element. It was a miracle that he had ever been set free from its thrall. It was owing to the sovereign grace of God that he had completely and forever broken away from it. (2) He virtually asserts the identity of his gospel throughout the whole period during which he had been a Christian. The gospel which he received "by revelation" at his conversion was the same that he had preached to the Galatians, and was now obliged to defend against those who called it in question, and sought to frustrate it. The Galatians saw no inconsistency in beginning with faith in a crucified Jesus and ending with Jewish legalism; but for him these two things appeared utterly incompatible. "If righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for naught" (Gal. ii. 21). (3) Paul connects his conversion with his call to be an Apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. i. 15). What the circumstances required was that he should make it clear beyond dispute that he was an apostle to the Gentiles by immediate Divine authority and equipment. He could never have spoken of his call as he did if his heathen mission had been a tardy afterthought. (4) Paul's visit to Peter three years after his conversion was long enough for Peter to rehearse to him the Evangelic memorabilia, but hardly enough for a vital process of spiritual development. It was not there that he learned, or could possibly learn, his own gospel. That he had got by heart before he made his visit to Peter, when in thought and prayer he was alone with God in Arabia.

---

This article continues the series begun by Prof. Bruce in the January number of *The Expositor*. His exposition of that portion of Paul's religious experience which antedates his conversion, as given above, combines the view of Beyschlag, who emphasizes the fruitless struggle after a legal righteousness, with the view of Pfleiderer, who places the chief stress on Paul's acquaintance with Christian beliefs about Jesus and the effect of his reflection on those beliefs. P. A. N.

---

THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN THE PSALTER. *Die Messianische Hoffnung im Psalter*. By Bernh. Stade, Giessen, in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, II. 5, p. 369.

No more interesting results in Old Testament study than those presented under the above title by Professor Stade, of Giessen, in the last number of the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, have appeared in the German theological journals for many a month. This interest is but enhanced by the *positive* character of the results,—a feature, it must be confessed, too often lacking in the work of the German critic, and this positive contribution to the problem of the Psalter will be welcomed by all, in the present uncertain condition of the question.

In an historical introduction, Stade states that the Jewish view of the Messianic element in the Psalter in the time of Christ came to be the inheritance of the Christian Church, and has been largely retained to the present day. This view was abandoned by the Jews themselves in the Middle Ages. Like the Jews, and perhaps in the beginning somewhat influenced by them, Christian scholars have gradually thrown aside the old opinion, resulting in a wide diversity of interpretation, which was never greater than now. In his own words, "while some recognize that the interpretation of the same (the Psalms) found in the New Testament and the early Church presents a view which obtained by reason of the circumstances of the time, but is not binding upon us, and deduce and explain the interpretations of Jesus, like that concerning Ps. cx. (Mat. xxii. 41 f.), from his human development,—others, (but going from instance to instance and not without concessions,) seek to demonstrate the old view as properly subsisting." The resort of other conservatives is to a "typical Messianic significance."

This inharmonious condition of the discussion results, as Stade thinks, from an improper putting of the question, as will be seen.

The Messianic thought in the time of Christ was more than a merely abstract exegetical opinion. It belonged to the living tissue of their daily faith; they *expected* a coming judgment, marked features of which were the confusion and destruction of the wicked, the overthrow of the old order of things, and the establishment of a new and glorious kingdom (cf. the request of the sons of Zebedee). In their thought they stood before a "*Weltkatastrophe*." Now the Psalms are the songs for the service of the second temple, and express and embody the religious faith of the people. Do these songs show that the people stand before a great "world-catastrophe"? This is a more relevant question, for to them the judgment was a larger element in Messianic faith than the person of the Messianic King, which had not as yet assumed the proportions given it in the time of Christ. Whether a passage then, is Messianic or not, is not to be determined exclusively from its mention of the Messianic *King*, but rather primarily from reference to characteristics of the Messianic *time*.

Whether the Psalms be an expression of post-exilic piety (Reuss, Wellhausen, Smend, Cheyne), or the historic embodiment of the religious sense of Israel, from David down, the question is the same. Further, whether the individual speaks, or the congregation, the question is not altered, for all the songs came ultimately to be the expression of the people's feeling, and in this feeling the history of Messianic prophecy shows that the Messianic King does not, as in New Testament times, occupy the central point.

With the new question in view Stade now takes up the detailed treatment of a large number of Psalms: His first group consists of Ps. vii., xiii., xxii., xxxv., lvii., lix., lxxviii., lxxiv., lxxxiii., lxxxv., xc., xciv., cvi.—cix., cxv., cxxiii., cxxvi., cxxx., cxliv. The characteristic of this group is a cry of oppression and a demand for justice and judgment, for Jehovah to appear as a judge in the

world-judgment, which originates with the second Isaiah. Each Psalm closely inspected shows this same characteristic, the most interesting being the cxlivth, where for the first time there is reference to the Messianic King (vs. 10).

This leads to a second group, comprising Ps. xviii., lxxii., lxxxix., cxxxii., all mentioning the Messianic King or the restoration of David's line; this being the object of fervent supplication, as the judgment has before been. A further group expresses faith in the Messianic future, but not addressed directly to Jehovah to summon him to judgment. Observe that in Psalms of *lamentation* the Messianic hope appears as consolation tendered present misfortune; in Psalms of *praise* and *thanksgiving*, it furnishes the ground for praise of God. This group contains Ps. lx., lxix., lxxv., lxxvii., xcvi., cii., cxiii., cxxxv., cxxxviii., cxl., cxlix., of which cxlix. is unusual in presenting also the triumph of Israel.

From the study of these three groups of Psalms, it is evident that Israel contemplates her political situation and social condition in the light of the Messianic hope. The mitigation of her present evil state, release from degradation and oppression, are hourly expected. The true meaning of her cry of distress and prayer for help has always been missed, because they have always been considered as *general* in sense, whereas they are *specific*, and the help for which Israel cries and prays is the *help of Jehovah in the world-judgment*.

In demonstration of the Messianic character of the foregoing ideas three lines of proof are possible:

1. The occurrence elsewhere in the Psalms of the same expressions, where the reference to the Messianic hope is indisputable.
2. Such a reference probable from the further contents of the Psalm.
3. The occurrence of the same expressions in Messianic passages of the prophets.

A large number of phrases characteristic of the Psalms above treated are shown in detail to possess direct, verbal parallels in the Messianic oracles of the prophets. Such expressions as, "Arise, oh Jehovah," iii. 8, ix. 20, are compared with, "Now will I rise, saith Jehovah," Is. xxxiii. 10, and this comparison is carried out with a large number of similar phrases and developed with great exactness and care.

Stade now takes up those Psalms which assume a position directly in the midst of the Messianic time, where the poet sees the Messianic judgment and glories as in a vision. For a prophetic parallel see Amos ix. Psalms of this character fall into different classes as follows:

- a. Jahweh appearing in judgment, Ps. xxix.
- b. Jahweh as King, (a further development of the preceding,) Ps. xcvi. and related Ps. xcix.
- c. The judgment itself, Ps. lviii. and lxxxii., also xviii., which has been already used, and in which the poet varies from the judgment actually present, to the judgment hoped for.
- d. The time after the completed judgment, Ps. xlvi., less plainly Ps. xlvi.

As a type of the general class of Psalms projected into the midst of the Messianic time, Ps. xlvii. will serve, where Jahweh has but just entered upon his kingdom. The same, in liturgical form, is Ps. xciii.

The dawn of the Messianic kingdom and the entrance of Jahweh into his temple are the same. The recognition of this fact in the interpretation of Ps. xxiv. will establish the hitherto unperceived connection between vss. 1-6 and 7-10, which have been separated as incoherent by many commentators. With this Psalm compare Is. 63:1. It is a liturgical song of praise, and the connection of such representations of Jahweh coming in triumph from judgment, with the liturgical praise of God, is further shown by Ps. lxxvi.

The intimate relation between the hope for the coming of the Messianic time, and the description of the same, is shown by Ps. xcviii., but still more remarkably in Ps. ix-x, (which form one alphabetic song,) where the two thoughts interchange and alternate "*kaleidoscopartig*."

In conclusion Stade says: "While the Messianic references, when scrutinized after the plan 'prophecy and fulfillment,' threatened to disappear under the hands, on *our* fashion of questioning, the Psalter has shown itself to be completely filled with them."

The continuance of the Messianic idea through the centuries between the restoration and the beginning of the apocalyptic literature is of course clear from the later prophets, and it might possibly also be shown from them that this hope was not merely the learned, theoretic interest of a few pious individuals. But according to the view above presented the Messianic idea is shown to be the central light in the living hope and common faith of the people.

On three sides, the faith of Israel is higher than all others; first, they believed in one God, the final ground of all things; second, they believed in a moral law absolutely binding on men and revealed to Israel throughout her history; third, they believed in a coming Kingdom of God, ushered in by a judgment at which all wrong should be set right and resulting in absolute harmony between God and man. This was the greatest of the three, as it was the one absolutely unique. It brought to bear upon their daily living a force utterly unknown to the life of any other people and of incalculable effect in the moral progress of the nation.

---

It must be recollected by the reader, that what is here so hastily sketched, is presented with careful demonstration in an elaborate article of nearly fifty pages. To the writer the weak point in Stade's theory seems to be the prominence given the "world-judgment" and "world-catastrophe" in the minds of the post-exilic Jews as a necessary postulate of his theory, whereas it again appears as one of the largest results of the applied theory. But as a strikingly original and carefully developed hypothesis, its verification or rejection is of interest to every Old Testament student, and deserves the closest study, in view of the POSITIVE results which its establishment affords.

J. H. B.

## Notes and Opinions.

---

**Three Motives to Repentance.**—James Denney, in the March *Expositor*, treats of the three motives to repentance found in Luke xiii. 1-9.

1. The massacre of the Galileans in the Temple, by Pilaté, is a lesson for the nation. Their death is a picture and a prophecy of the doom which within a generation should overtake their race. The same cause that led to the death of the Galileans would bring about the destruction of the nation. So when we see moral forces operating in others and causing their moral ruin, this is a warning to us who find in ourselves the same tendencies active.

2. The falling of the tower of Siloam was an accident. Great accidents stir men's natures. They bring certain truths before the mind in a startling way, and thus furnish a true motive to repentance. To see men moved deeply, yet not permanently and to a change of life—this caused Christ to speak with startling vehemence.

3. The parable of the fig-tree in the vineyard was, perhaps, not spoken at the same time with the two previous exhortations. But it presents the same appeal, with the same importunity. "If it bear fruit thenceforth, *well*; but if not, thou shalt *cut it down*." We cannot understand this three-fold summons to repentance unless we remember the spiritual tension of Christ at that time. These three words are three flashes from the fire burning in his heart. They show his soul-travail for the conversion of men. T. H. R.

**About the Sixth Hour.**—A valuable article by W. M. Ramsay, in the *Expositor* of March, continues the discussion between Doctors Sanday and Dods, in previous numbers (1891), regarding the mode of reckoning time in the Roman world. Confusion has been caused by failure to distinguish properly between the civil and the natural days. The former consisted of twenty-four hours, beginning among the Greeks and Jews at sunset, and among the Romans at midnight. The natural day extended from sunrise to sunset, and varied in length according to the season, the hours at midsummer being seventy-five minutes and at midwinter forty-five minutes. It has been supposed by many commentators that there were two different methods of reckoning the hours, the Roman beginning at midnight and the Jewish beginning at sunrise. But this is a mistake. Hours were never reckoned by the civil day, but always by the natural. The night, in popular usage, was divided into watches, not hours. There is then only one meaning to the phrases, "the first hour," "the sixth hour." The first hour indicates the time when one-

twelfth of the natural day has passed; the sixth hour, midday at all seasons of the year. Only rarely do we find any attempt to indicate time more precisely than by the complete hour of the day. In the popular language little attempt was made to reckon any hours except the third, sixth and ninth. "To the oriental mind the question between the third hour and the sixth hour is not more important than the doubt between 12.5 and 12.10 is to us." At a point of time midway between the third and the sixth hours, it would be a question by which of these two hours to designate it. "Godet's remark, that the apostles had no watches, has been called flippant, but it touches the critical point. The apostles had no means of avoiding the difficulty as to whether it was the third or the sixth hour when the sun was near midheaven, and they cared very little about the point."

Polycarp's martyrdom at the eighth hour is the stock example to prove a second method of reckoning from midnight. But though executions usually took place in the forenoon, the evidence in this case shows that Polycarp was put to death in the afternoon—at the eighth hour from sunrise. T. H. R.

**The Synoptic Problem.**—The interest in this most important question of New Testament criticism gives no signs of abating. In 1793 the theological faculty of Göttingen announced it as the subject for competitive prize essays. In 1893 the offering of such a prize would apparently be a work of supererogation. *The Expository Times* for March devotes several editorial pages to it and publishes three articles upon it by contributors. In the first of these latter, Professor J. T. Marshall, M. A., of Manchester, gives an interesting account of the genesis and development of the theory which has been made familiar to New Testament students by his papers in *The Expositor* for 1890-1892, and presents an outline of the arguments for it. Professor Marshall's theory is, in brief, that many of the divergences between the gospels occurring in passages largely similar in substance are to be explained by the supposition that the several evangelists translated, for the most part independently, from a common Aramaic source. He does not claim that this theory solves the whole problem. Those passages which are peculiar to one gospel, as well as those in which two or even three evangelists show a close verbal agreement, are left untouched by it. He does not regard his theory as antagonistic to the two-document hypothesis, which Dr. Sanday has recently said holds the field, but claims that if this hypothesis establish itself, his investigations must be admitted to have shown that both documents existed primarily in Aramaic. It thus appears that Professor Marshall's view tends to the conclusion that there was a primitive Aramaic Mark as well as a primitive Aramaic Matthew. This Aramaic Mark, if such there was, contained "almost the whole of Mark's Gospel to the end of chap. xiii." but no account of the Lord's passion.

The second article is by Mr. Halcombe, and is the first of a series of articles expounding in outline the theory already advocated in his book, *The Historic Problem of the Gospels*, London, 1889. This theory is in brief that

the Gospel of John is the earliest of our four gospels, and that the other three were written in the order in which they stand in the New Testament. The remark of Dr. Dods respecting Mr. Badham's work, *The Formation of the Gospels*, may be applied slightly changed to Mr. Halcombe's theory. It "runs so counter to recent criticism . . . that perhaps he may find it difficult to gain a patient hearing." Mr. Halcombe continues the exposition of his theory in the April number of *The Expository Times*.

In the third article, Rev. Arthur Wright, author of *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, London, 1890, a book which defended a peculiar form of the oral gospel theory, replies to some criticisms offered by Professor Marshall in the February *Expository Times* on an article in the January number, in which Mr. Wright had defended his own theory and urged objections to that of Professor Marshall. Mr. Wright announces that he is about to publish some new and convincing evidence for the truth of this theory.

In *The Expositor* for February and March we have two valuable articles by Rev. Professor V. H. Stanton, D.D., of Cambridge, entitled *Some Points in the Synoptic Problem*. Professor Stanton announces himself as adhering in general to the documentary hypothesis, so far at least as to maintain that both the first evangelist and the third possessed and used our second gospel or a document substantially identical with it. He contends, however, that the apostolic unwritten gospel was a more important factor in the production of our synoptic gospels than has been recognized by the advocates of the various theories of the documentary dependence of one gospel on another. His first article is specially devoted to a criticism of the view presented in Dr. Paul Ewald's *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, Leipzig, 1890. Dr. Ewald proposed to explain the similarity of the first three gospels, and the difference between them all and the fourth, by supposing that the original apostolic tradition contained both the simpler elements which we now find chiefly in the synoptic gospels and the profounder elements which appear in the fourth gospel, but suffered in a particular region, under the influence of local and temporary causes, a one-sided shrinkage, by which the Johannine element largely disappeared. From this one-sided and shrunken tradition sprang the earliest gospel, nearly identical with our Mark. The employment of this document by the first and third evangelists was the primary cause of the one-sidedness of all three. The absence of Johannine elements from the other sources employed by the first and third evangelists, Dr. Ewald partly denies, partly explains by reference to the special purpose of the source or by the influence exerted on the evangelist by his chief source. Professor Stanton objects to this explanation of the one-sidedness of the synoptic narrative, contending that it is due rather to the fact that the work of the apostles required first of all a presentation of the work of Jesus in its simpler, more objective aspects—those aspects, indeed, which were most prominent in the ministry among the Galileans; that those to whom the apostles preached at first were not prepared for the more mysterious truths concerning the person of Christ and his

oneness with God which are recorded in the fourth gospel. Thus the special character of the synoptic gospels and their general resemblance to one another are due to the fact that they arose out of the earlier type of apostolic tradition. But this alone would not, in the opinion of Professor Stanton, account for the resemblance of these gospels in details and minutiae. This element of the problem, he holds, compels us to suppose a documentary relation between the several synoptic gospels. This discussion is especially interesting by reason of the distinction which is made between the general resemblance of the synoptic gospels in the type of teaching which they present, and their specific resemblance in selection of events, order of events, and verbal expression, and the reference of these two kinds of resemblance to different causes. In his second article Professor Stanton boldly attacks the two-document hypothesis itself. He shows in the first place that while Dr. Sanday is right in a sense in saying that this hypothesis holds the field at present, yet in fact this term, "two-document hypothesis" is applied to very diverse theories, some of which ought rather to be called three-document theories. Moreover the diversity of these theories is as important a fact as their harmony, and their mutual criticisms raise the question whether every form of the two-document theory is not in fact open to serious objection. Thus, the apparent unity of criticism at this point is rather apparent than real, and really conceals a radical diversity of opinion. In particular Professor Stanton attacks the theory that both the first and the third evangelists used the Logia of the apostle Matthew, urging against the theory the marked differences in the arrangement of material supposed to be obtained from the Logia as a common source as well as the verbal differences. This objection is strengthened by showing that these differences between Matthew and Luke in matter supposed to be derived from the Logia are much greater than the differences which we know—or which the advocates of the two-document hypothesis, as well as Mr. Stanton, maintain—to have come from the second gospel.

Both of Professor Stanton's articles are well worthy of attention. His partial defense of the oral gospel theory will, we believe, commend itself to the judgment of many. His criticism of the two-document theory is pertinent and forceful. Whether it is altogether convincing can be better judged when he has completed his argument. It is evident that unanimity on this important question has not yet been arrived at. It is scarcely less evident that biblical scholarship will not give over the investigation till more satisfactory results are reached than have yet been attained.

E. D. B.



## Work and Workers.

---

A NEW work by Professor C. C. Everett, on the Gospel of Paul, has just appeared. It embodies the results of long research.

TWO NEW appointments are announced in the biblical work of Theological Seminaries. The Rev. C. C. Camp, of Joliet, Ill., has been appointed to the chair of New Testament Exegesis in Seabury Divinity School, and the Rev. T. W. Kretschmann as instructor in Hebrew in Mt. Airy Seminary.

AT the late Michigan State Y. P. S. C. E. convention, the claims of a systematic Bible study for young people were presented by I. F. Wood, of the University of Chicago. Dr. C. F. Kent makes a tour of the State conventions of the Pacific Coast for the same purpose. These addresses are made under the direction of the American Institute of Sacred Literature.

AMONG the aids to New Testament study which have been needed by the student, is a vocabulary of New Testament Greek, so arranged that it could be used by the class or the private student for gaining familiarity with the more important words used. A small one has been printed, but not published, by Professor Horswell, of the North-Western University. Now we have the promise of another, designed for classes reading at sight, by Professor Jacobus, of Hartford Seminary.

IT now seems probable that the use of letters and signs to distinguish documents, a use familiar to all scholars of the Pentateuchal analysis, will pass into use in New Testament criticism. Johannes Weiss, the son of Professor Bernhard Weiss, in a late edition of Luke in the Meyer series, uses such letters. He distinguishes A, the original Mark; Q, the Logia; and L, the Lukian documents. According to his theory, Q and L had already been united before they came into use by the author of the third gospel.

TO MOST visitors, the most impressive sight in the famous Gizeh museum in Cairo is that of the royal mummies which were unrolled a few years ago. To look upon the face of a Pharaoh of the twentieth dynasty is an impressive experience, no matter how familiar with antiquities a person may be. The World's Fair promises facsimiles of these mummies, in the Egyptian collection. There will also be a large number of reproductions, including those of tombs and temples. The exhibit will be well worth the close attention, not only of those specially interested in Egyptian antiquities, but of all students of the Bible.

A NEW series of theological handbooks is announced from Bonn. The following are the volumes and authors, as arranged: *Theologische Encyclopadie*, Prof. Knoke; *Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*, Prof. Orelli; *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Prof. König; *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Prof. Meinhold; *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Prof. Paul Ewald; *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Prof. Kühl; *Leben Jesu und Geschichte des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, Prof. Steude; *Dogmatik*, Prof. Schmidt; *Ethik*, Prof. Lemme; *Kirchengeschichte*, Prof. Deutsch; *Dogmengeschichte*, Prof. Barth; *Symbolik*, Prof. Seiffert; *Religions- und Kirchenstatistik*, Pastor Koffnane; *Praktische Theologie*, Prof. Riggensbach; *Kirchenrecht*, Prof. v. Kirchenheim.

PRESIDENT DWIGHT, of Yale, remarked in a conference a few years ago, that, while Old Testament questions held the field almost exclusively at that time, he was sure that the New Testament would soon come into prominence again as the subject of critical interest. The New Testament questions are not yet settled, and, at the same time, they are so vital that they have but to be propounded to command their appropriate share of attention. It looks as though the time were drawing near when this prophecy would have its fulfilment. The synoptic question is commanding more attention in England and Germany than it has for a little time previously. The recent discoveries in New Testament apocryphal documents have roused anew questions of date and relationship of the gospels. The Bampton Lectures of Dr. Sanday contribute their share to the growing interest. We have another announcement of a book that will also bear on the questions. It is *Canonical and Uncanonical Scriptures*, by Rev. W. E. Barnes, Fellow of St. Peter's, Oxford. It will be of special interest, inasmuch as it will include a discussion of the newly-found Gospel of St. Peter.

THE following summary of Old and New Testament courses in the various German universities for the Summer Semester may prove of interest to others besides those who are looking forward to a visit to any of these centres of learning. The few courses where the name of the Professor does not appear are given by Licentiates or Docents.

*Berlin*: Professor Dillmann, History of Israel, Psalms, smaller exilic pieces in Isaiah, Old Testament seminar; Professor Strack, Old Testament Introduction, Genesis, Leviticus, selections from Jeremiah; Professor Weiss, Gospel of John, Pauline Epistles to Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, New Testament seminar; Professor Kaftan, Romans; Professor Pfeiderer, Synoptic Gospels; Professor Lommatzsch, New Testament Introduction; Professor v. d. Goltz, Biblical Theology of Ephesians; also courses in Biblical Theology of the New Testament, Life of Christ, History of Apostolic Times.

*Leipzig*: Professor Buhl, Genesis, Messianic Prophecy, Old Testament club; Professor Guthe, Psalms, History of Israel, Old Testament club;

other courses in Isaiah, History of Israelitish Worship, and an Exegetical seminar conducted by Professor Fricke; Professor Heinrici, New Testament Introduction, Revelation, James; Professor Schnedermann, New Testament Theology, Mark, Jewish people in New Testament Times, New Testament exercises; Professor Gregory, John, Exegetical club; Professor Luthardt, Romans; Professor Hofmann, Matthew; Professor Fricke, Galatians, Philipians, and Philemon, Exegetical seminar; Professor Hauck, Apostolic Times.

*Göttingen*: Professor Smend, Genesis, History of Israel until exile, Old Testament seminar; Professor Schultz, selected Psalms; Prof. Wellhausen, Daniel; also courses in Old Testament Introduction, and easy Prophetical Passages; Professor Joh. Weiss, Synoptics, Origin of four Gospels; Professor Wiesinger, Romans, New Testament seminar; Professor Lunemann, John; Professor Häring, Hebrews; Professor Bonwetsch, The Apostolic Age; also courses on General Epistles and Revelation.

*Halle*: Professor Rothstein, Isaiah, Job, selections from Proverbs, Old Testament exercises; Professor Kautzsch, Genesis, Postexilic Jewish History; also courses in Psalms and Old Testament Introduction; Professor Beyer-schlag, John, Galatians, Life of Christ, accounts of Passion and Resurrection; Professor Haupt, New Testament Introduction, Philipians, Colossians, and Ephesians, New Testament exercises; Professor Köhler, I Corinthians; also a course on the Parables.

*Breslau*: Professor Kittel, Isaiah, History of Israel, Old Testament seminar; Professor Löhr, Daniel, Minor Prophets, Old Testament Archaeology; also a course on Psalms; Professor Hahn, Romans, New Testament Theology, New Testament seminar; Professor Wrede, James, Synoptics, Elementary New Testament exercises; Professor Arnold, New Testament Times.

*Greifswald*: Professor Bæthgen, Old Testament Introduction, Genesis, Old Testament seminar; Professor Giesebrecht, Isaiah, proseminar; Professor Schlatter, New Testament Introduction, Romans, New Testament seminar; Professor Nathusius, Pastoral Epistles; also courses on Hebrews, Luke, and Johannine Doctrines.

*Königsberg*: Professor Cornill, Genesis, History of Israel, exegetical exercises; Professor Sommers, Job, Jewish Antiquities, Introduction to Old Testament Apocrypha, Old Testament seminar; Professor Grau, Synoptics, Life of Christ, New Testament seminar; Professor Link, New Testament Introduction, Corinthians, James; Professor Jacoby, Johannine Epistles.

*Marburg*: Professor v. Baudissin, Old Testament Introduction, Psalms, Old Testament seminar; Professor Jüllicher, Matthew, New Testament Seminar; Professor Kühl, New Testament Theology, Galatians, exegetical exercises; Professor Achelis, I Peter and I John; also courses in I Corinthians, and cursory reading of John.

*Tübingen*: Professor Grill, Isaiah, Old Testament Theology; also

course in History of Israel under first three Kings, and Old Testament conservatory; Professor Buder, Synoptic Discourses of Jesus; Professor Gottschick, John; Professor Kübel, Romans.

*Jena:* Professor Siegfried, Genesis, Old Testament seminar; Professor Schmiedel, New Testament Introduction, Corinthians, exercises; Professor Hilgenfeld, Synoptics, New Testament seminar; Professor Nippold, Life of Christ.

*Kiel:* Professor Klostermann, Isaiah xl.-lxvi., Religious Antiquities, Old Testament seminar; Professor Schürer, New Testament Introduction, Matthew with Parallels, New Testament seminar; Professor Kawerau, narratives of Passion.

*Erlangen:* Professor Köhler, Messianic Prophecies, Isaiah, Songs of the Pentateuch (seminar); Professor Zahn, I Corinthians, History of Jesus, Parts of Acts (seminar); Professor Seeberg, Matthew and Parallels; Professor Müller, Philippians, Philemon, Timothy, and Titus.

*Bonn:* Professor Kamphausen, Genesis, Old Testament seminar; Professor Meinhold, Job, Old Testament Theology; Professor Grafe, I Corinthians; Professor Sieffert, Hebrews; Professor Kraft, New Testament Times; also courses on Life of Christ, and accounts of Passion and Resurrection.

*Freiburg:* Professor König, Messianic Passages; Professor Hoberg, New Testament Introduction, Hebrews, Course on accounts of Passion and Glorification.

*Würzburg:* Professor Scholz, Jeremiah, Old Testament exegesis; Professor Grimm, I Corinthians.

L. B. JR.

## Book Reviews.

---

**The Epistle to the Hebrews.** The Greek Text with notes and essays by BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Durham. Second edition. London: Macmillan and Co. 1892. 8vo. pp. 84 + 504. \$4.00

This admirable commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews is already known to scholars through the first edition, which appeared in 1889. The new edition differs from the original only by a few minor corrections. The work is an example of the very best class of modern commentaries, presenting the results of thorough mastery of the historical situation, of careful and scholarly study of the words of the Epistle, and of faithful tracing of the author's course of thought. Bishop Westcott regards it as certain that Paul did not write the epistle, but that it cannot now be determined who its author was. He inclines to believe that it was written to the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. As respects date, he places it between A.D. 64 and 67, probably just before the commencement of the Jewish war.

One remark of the preface is well worth quoting for the benefit of those who wish to know how the best work in interpretation is done. Having mentioned various writers who have been helpful to him, he says, "But I have always seemed to learn most from Trommius and Bruder. If to these concordances — till the former is superseded by the promised Oxford concordance — the student adds Dr. Moulton's edition of Winer's Grammar, and Dr. Thayer's edition of Grimm's Lexicon, he will find that he has at his command a fruitful field of investigation, which yields to every effort fresh signs of the inexhaustible wealth of the Written Word." E. D. B.

---

**Har Moad, or The Mountain of the Assembly:** A series of archæological studies, chiefly from the standpoint of the cuneiform inscriptions. By the Rev. O. D. MILLER, D.D.; with plate illustrations. Published by S. M. Whipple, North Adams, Mass. Pp. xxi + 445.

The title of this book is taken from Isaiah xiv. 13. The author sets out to prove that it refers to Mt. Meru, in Central Asia. The volume in hand is made up of five books: Book I is a discussion, covering more than 100 pages, of Cushite archæology. The main sources of information used were the works of Lenormant, George Smith and Rawlinson. The methods employed are exceedingly ingenious. By the division of the readings of

cuneiform signs into their elements, and by choosing such significations of these elementary parts as suit his case, the author, through labyrinthian processes, arrives at his conclusions. His transformations from Pa-te-si to Cabiri on p. 65 *seq.* illustrate quite fairly his method. Book II deals with Mosaic and Babylonian cosmogony. By his own peculiar methods the author announces that he has proved that the race was cradled on Mt. Meru, and from that point radiated the different nations with their quota of religion and civilization. "On that summit, which penetrated the rotating center of the celestial sphere, the divine and human were first united in blissful fellowship." Book III is devoted to a discussion of the "celestial earth." All the great events of the race in its edenic period are found to have taken place at the summit of Mt. Meru. To determine the date of that mysterious epoch in human history the author discusses in Book IV the twelve stars of Phœnicia. He attempts to show that "they exhibit the order in which the Mosaic antediluvian genealogy was adjusted to the zodiac." Book V attacks the problem of zodiacal chronology, and discovers the characteristic features of the Eden of Genesis in that particular celestial region around and centering in the constellation Lyra. In his concluding remarks he seems to have settled all the problems touching the antiquity, the religion, the dispersion and the development of the race.

The work displays a prodigious amount of reading in the departments of mythology and the so-called occult sciences. It also shows what can be done by setting out to prove a particular proposition rather than to ascertain the truth. The author bends every point to establish his preconception of the location of the original central home of the race. His methods are multifarious, suspicious and even vicious. By them anything can be proved, anything that one desires can be established. Where he clings close to recognized leaders, he presents with force some truths, but his speculations therefrom have rarely more than a tangential relation to the original. The arrangement of the subject matter is exceedingly unfortunate. Altogether the work does not add to the equipment of the scholar, either in material or in the conception of truth.

PRICE.

---

**How to Read the Prophets.** With Explanations, Map and Glossary. By Rev BUCHANNAN BLAKE, B.D. Part III, Jeremiah. New York: imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1892. Pp. 287. Price, \$1.50.

Mr. Blake has already given us two small works arranged on the plan of this third part. The main features of the book are a new translation and arrangement of the prophecies of Jeremiah in the supposed chronological order. In this arrangement he embodies such passages of Kings and Chronicles as throw light upon the utterances of Jeremiah. 173 pages of the book are devoted to the presentation of this material. The second division of about

100 pages takes the same matter and weaves it into narrative form. The third division, of a few pages only, discusses the religious conceptions of Jeremiah, gives us a chronological table and a glossary of names and notes, followed by a subject index. Considerable care has been used in the presentation of the poetical form. This adds very greatly to the beauty of the prophecy and the vividness of the thought. It makes also a handsomer page for the reader. But he has not always carefully observed the divisions of the verses. For example: In chapter ix. 17-22 (pp. 47-48) the characteristic metre of the dirge, and that which makes it the more effective is unnoticed. Likewise in chapter li., we have a similar disregard of the metre. It is to be noted that he locates chapters vii.-ix, in the reign of Jehoiakim, as being a more elaborate presentation of the discourse mentioned in chapter xxvi. After chapters xxv. 38 he introduces the prophecies against foreign nations. But why should these not be brought in immediately after xxv. 13, as in the Septuagint, and allow the remaining verses of chapter xxv. to summarize what is said in these longer prophecies of xlvi.-xlix? There is apparently some confusion also in the arrangement of his matter. For example: On page 96 after he has nearly finished up the reign of Jehoiakim, he introduces the brief reign of Jehoahaz; also on pages 96a and 96b, he introduces, entirely out of chronological order, matter concerning the reign of Jehoiachin. Following that on page 97 we have the account of the death of Jehoiakim. It seems that the author had omitted two pages and afterward attempted to insert them between two closely connected in thought. This is a blemish which should be corrected before another edition of the book. Another conclusion for which no reason appears is that chapters ix. 23-x. 17 were uttered by Jeremiah in Egypt. Chapters l.-li., are later productions, added to the book by some later hand. Taking the book as a whole it will be useful in giving the reader a connected story of Jeremiah's work, but it would add very greatly to the satisfaction of the general reader for whom it was prepared to know why this or that order has been adopted. A few lines only of explanation would have sufficed. The most ordinary reader will not be satisfied nor be ready to accept his chronological divisions. But the life of Jeremiah and the condition of his times will be more vivid and of more real value to him after having once read the volume.

PRICE.

---

**Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament.** By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. London: Methuen & Co.

This is a volume of twelve sermons preached in Oxford and Cambridge, and published as a supplement to the author's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament." They are meant to illustrate Dr. Driver's contention that the adoption of critical conclusions "implies no change in respect to the Divine attributes of the Old Testament; no change in the lessons of human

duty to be derived from it; no change as to the general position (apart from the interpretation of particular passages) that the Old Testament points forward prophetically to Christ."

The last five sermons are simpler, and are published to show how "the specific lessons of the Old Testament" may be enforced and its "providential purpose" recognized, without interpreting its words in a sense alien to their original meaning, or context, or otherwise deviating from the strict application of critical and exegetical canons.

As an introduction, the paper read at the Church Congress at Folkestone, 1892, "On the Permanent Moral and Devotional Value of the Old Testament for the Christian Church," is prefixed. The Old Testament is of permanent value, he says, (1) on account of the clearness with which it insists on the primary *moral* duties obligatory on man as man; (2) on account of the examples of faith and conduct, character and principle it affords for our models; (3) on account of the great ideals of human life and society it holds before its readers. As to devotional uses, we have only to think of the Psalms, of the book of Job, and of the Second Isaiah. Its piety is manly and never descends to the effeminate pietism of modern days. We now come to the sermons. The first seven are essays rather than sermons. In the first, Dr. Driver shows that evolution is compatible with faith, because that doctrine applies only to the body, and does not reach the soul. In the second (Isa. vi. 3) he shows how the glory of God is reflected in the creation of the world and in fitting it for the abode of man. In the third, under the title of "The Ideals of the Prophets" (Gen. xii. 3), he speaks of the ideal destiny of Israel in its various aspects, a holy nation, a Messianic king, a people through whom all the world would be blessed. The fourth sermon treats of the growth of belief in a future state as seen in the Old Testament and the Jewish Targums. The fifth deals with the Hebrew prophets (Amos ii. 11, 12) and shows their work in the two spheres of politics and morals. They were the teachers of their own generation, the correctors of its political mistakes, its social abuses, its moral shortcomings.

"The Voice of God in the Old Testament" (Heb. i. 1) is the title of sermon VI, and deals with the variety of form and circumstance and occasion with which God revealed himself to the fathers. In sermon VII, on "Inspiration," he defines it as a unique and extraordinary *spiritual insight*, enabling those who received it, without superseding or suppressing the human faculties but rather using them as its instruments, to declare in different degrees and in accordance with the needs and circumstances of particular ages or particular occasions, the mind and purpose of God.

The other sermons are shorter and simpler. In a sermon on "The first chapter of Genesis" he shows that Science and Theology are complementary, not antagonistic. The purpose of the Bible is to teach religious truth, not scientific truth. In "The Warrior from Edom," (Isaiah lxiii. 1), he declares



the fundamental thought to be, the impotence of the nations to arrest God's purposes at a critical moment in the history of his people.

Sermon X is on "The Sixty-eighth Psalm." This psalm, he says, describes a past event, viz. the historical ascent of God into the "tent" prepared for him by David upon Zion. It is not a prediction of the ascension of our Lord. It has no reference to the future. Nevertheless the ascent of the Ark in which God was present into Zion, *prefigured* the ascent of Christ into heaven.

Sermon XI is called "The Lord our Righteousness" (Jeremiah xxiii. 6). This means the Lord *is* our righteousness, and is significant of the fact in a degenerate age that the nation's righteousness can only be secured by God.

In the sermon "Mercy and not Sacrifice," (Hosea vi. 6), he dilates on that *kindliness* of feeling which goes so far to make us love God with all our hearts and our neighbor as ourselves.

Dr. Driver is by no means an eloquent preacher, but his sermons are solid, scholarly, reverent and helpful.

THOMAS PRYDE.

---

**The Pauline Theology:** a Study of the Origin and Correlation of the doctrinal Teachings of the Apostle Paul. By GEORGÉ B. STEVENS, PH.D., D.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892. Pp. xi. + 383. \$2.00.

This able work on the doctrinal teachings of the great apostle is one of the most valuable contributions to exegetical theology made in recent years. In exegetical principles, method and structure, temper and style, it is worthy of highest praise. The author has clearly conceived the true nature of his task and has aimed faithfully to expound the thought of the apostle Paul from the apostle's own point of view. In accordance with this aim he has conscientiously surrendered himself to the leading of the apostle, reading what he says in the connection in which he says it, and with the emphasis which that connection gives it. It ought not perhaps to be exceptionally high praise to give a writer in exegetical theology, that he uniformly maintains his balance and poise and never betrays a polemical bias of his own; but whether exceptionally high or not, it is praise to which Professor Stevens is honestly entitled. He shows himself familiar with the ablest recent works on the apostle and his doctrines, yet is thoroughly independent in his own discussion.

The introductory chapters, on the conversion of Paul, his style and modes of thought, the shaping forces of his doctrine, and the sources of his doctrine, are deeply interesting and instructive in themselves and excellently prepare the way for the systematic presentation of the doctrines which the following chapters give. In the study of the man Saul, the historical and psychological elements of the problem are carefully investigated, yet with a full recognition of the divine element of the situation. The chapter on the apostle's style and modes of thought is noteworthy for its clear recognition of the obvi-

ous, but too commonly neglected, principle, that the sense of a passage is to be determined in view of its argumentative intent—the place it fills in the course of thought. The application of this principle to several passages in Romans which are sometimes misinterpreted through neglect of it is very refreshing.

When Professor Stevens comes to his main task, the exposition of the teachings of the apostle, it is difficult to find serious fault with him at any point. The book seems to show its author to be a man of very different type of mind, to be sure, from that of the apostle whose doctrines he is expounding, but possessed of that ability to assume the mental position of the apostle and to look at things along his angle of vision which is the mark of a true interpreter. What chiefly characterizes his work is not any novel definitions of the great terms of the apostle's vocabulary, but a clear perception of the relations in which these terms stand, or perhaps even more a clear apprehension of the limits of the apostle's statements. Yet the work is by no means characteristically negative. If many readers fail to find in this exposition of Paulinism certain things which they have been told were Pauline, they will also, we are sure, gain some most helpful enlargement of their previous conceptions of the apostle's thought. Especially enlightening is the exposition of the nature of faith, as "the entrance of the soul into right relation to God," "man's part in the constitution of a new and vital personal relation of the soul to Christ," "the very opposite of a meritorious claim upon God's mercy," yet constituting alike the ground of acceptance with God and the principle of the Christian life. Thus it gives unity and continuity to the Christian life and makes justification and sanctification not wholly disconnected facts, but facts vitally related through faith and grace which are the necessary conditions of both. To many the discussion of Rom. v. 12. will be of special interest, though they will possibly wish that the two following verses had been brought into connection with the view presented of this verse. But it is difficult to particularize since almost every chapter calls for special commendation as a whole or in detail.

The points at which one can conscientiously find fault are very few. The statement on page 179 that "it cannot be shown that Paul considers the law to have had the purpose or effect of adding to the inherent energy of the sinful principle which pervades human nature and is the root of sinful actions," seems to be contradicted by what we judge a truer statement of the case on page 189. The assertion (p. 357) that Paul couples the expression "from the dead" only with Christ's resurrection seems to overlook Phil. iii. 11. The discussion of Rom. ii. 12 alike on page 48 and on page 105, seems to imply that the statements of this verse and of both those that precede, and those that follow it refer merely to a hypothetical divine judgment. But surely this is not the language of mere hypothesis. Nor is this view required in order to make the apostle self-consistent. The doctrine of an actual final judgment on the basis of character is not merely not inconsistent with the

doctrine of justification by faith, but is really called for by that doctrine, when understood as Professor Stevens rightly interprets it. Of course Rom. ii. 12 must be understood not to refer to all humanity, but to one only of the two great classes mentioned in vs. 6-10.

But such small matters of dissent scarcely at all diminish our hearty appreciation of this most valuable book. Professor Stevens has put all students under obligations of gratitude to him not only for the valuable contents of his book but not less for the admirable example he has given of what Biblical Theology in its true sense is.

E. D. B.

**A Harmony of the Four Gospels in the Revised Version:** chronologically arranged in parallel columns. By S. D. WADDY, Q.C., M.P. 12mo., pp. 44+199. London: T. Woolmer, 1887.

**The Gospel History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,** in a connected narrative, in the words of the Revised Version. Arranged by C. C. JAMES, M.A. 12mo., pp. 26+188. London: Clay & Sons, 1890.

**A Harmony of the Gospels in the Words of the Revised Version.** Arranged by C. C. JAMES, M.A. London: Clay & Sons, 1892. 12 mo., pp. 30+274.

**A New Harmony of the Four Gospels in English According to the Common Version.** By GEORGE W. CLARK, D.D. Revised Edition. 12mo., pp. 302. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1892.

**Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien,** bearbeitet von A. HUCK. 8vo., pp. 16+175. Freiburg, i. B.: Mohr, 1892.

The first of the five volumes whose titles are here given, that of Mr. Waddy, is noteworthy as the first Harmony of the Gospels which makes use of the Revised Version of 1881, though a Diatessaron using this version had already appeared in this country some years in advance of it. It is further noteworthy as proceeding not from a theologian but from a barrister. The author holds that the most important use of a harmony is to bring into juxtaposition the accounts given by the different evangelists of each separate incident in the life of Jesus, and that the second use, the arrangements of the events in chronological order is subordinate, and indeed impossible of perfect realization. The book accomplishes fairly well the first of these two purposes, the passages which are properly parallel being arranged in parallel columns, and due attention being given to all the mechanical details which effect so much the practical usefulness of a harmony. As respects the second purpose, the author has, wisely it seems, abstained from embodying in his scheme of divisions any special theory of the chronology of the life of Jesus, either as respects the length of the ministry or the particular years in which it fell. But he could not avoid adopting some theory of the order of the events; and

he has followed the majority of recent harmonists in making Mark his chief authority among the Synoptists. In the details of order *non disputandum* is to be sure the reviewer's best rule, yet it seems difficult to justify some of the peculiarities of Mr. Waddy's order. For example, to detach Luke xi. 27, 28, and xi. 33-xiii. 21, for which there are no parallels, wholly from their connection in Luke for the sake of fulfilling the seeming requirement of Luke xiii. 18, though the most definite assertion of Luke xi. 27 is thereby disregarded, seems unwise. On the other hand there is much reason to think that the author is right in identifying the departure into Galilee, John chap. iv, with that recorded in Matthew iv. 12, and also in distinguishing the departure from Galilee of Luke ix. 51 from that of John vii. 10, though this combination of opinions is very unusual. The notes prefixed to the harmony are of little value, being chiefly instances of the kind of harmonizing that does not harmonize.

The *Gospel History* of Mr. James adds one more to the list of Diatessarons of the English gospels prepared under the impression that such a book had not previously been issued. If we mistake not there have been published in this country in the space of twenty years four different English Diatessarons, at least one of which, Cadman's *Christ in the Gospels*, employed the text of the Revised Version. Yet Mr. James says in his preface, "I have not been able to find such a book," a fact which indicates that though the man who reads an American book is perhaps not so rare as in Sydney Smith's day, he is still somewhat too rare in England. Mr. James divides the gospel history into one hundred and eighty-seven sections, the titles of which, with references to the corresponding passages of the gospels, are printed in a table at the beginning of the book. These references are also placed at the foot of the page under the text of the sections themselves in the body of the book. These sections are not grouped into parts or periods of the life except by the insertion of light lines in the table. These lines occur at points suggesting the usual divisions into Infancy and Youth, Public Ministry, Passion Week, Resurrection History. Rather strangely, however, the Public Ministry is divided into two parts by a line falling between the Confession of Peter and the Transfiguration. The author's method of constructing the composite sections he states as follows: "First, I arranged the parallel passages, side by side, as denoted by the best authorities. Then taking the fullest account of each event as the ground work, I have endeavored to weave into that the additional facts, traits, or illustrations which are found in the other narratives. Whatever I have not been able thus to weave in I have placed in the table of variations at the end of the volume." Mr. James accepts Luke's order as chronological, and differs from Mr. Waddy in order of events chiefly by reason of this fact. The work of composition seems to be well done; marginal references to illustrative passages and cross references to sections containing similar material add to the value of the work. There is but one harmonistic note, a good one on the Sermon on the Mount and its parallel in Luke. The

titles of the sections are brief and terse, contrasted in this respect with Mr. Waddy's, which are full and descriptive.

Mr. James's second book differs from his first chiefly in the fact that under each section it prints the several accounts, if there be more than one, in full and separately, instead of weaving them together into one narrative, as in his former work. At three points he has changed the order of events. Mark i. 14—ii. 22, with its parallels, is now placed after the unknown feast of John chap. v., instead of before it. Luke ix. 51—x. 42 is now placed before the feast of dedication, John x. 22, instead of after it. The raising of Lazarus, which, in the *Gospel History*, was placed just after the feast of dedication, and hence before Luke ix. 51, is now placed between Luke chap. xvi. and chap. xvii. This harmony has one notable peculiarity of mechanical arrangement. The different accounts of each section, or portion of a section, are all exhibited to the eye on one double page, but instead of being placed in parallel columns of varying width, they are printed the full width of the page, sometimes on opposite pages, sometimes one below the other on the same page. The effect is certainly much pleasanter to the eye, and, for many purposes of a harmony, quite as serviceable as the method more commonly adopted. The space which, by this method, would otherwise occasionally be left blank, has been used for printing what Mr. James calls quasi-parallels, that is, similar material, not, however, judged to belong to the occasion in question. This adds a valuable feature to the harmony, though one cannot but regret that it is introduced, not when there existed valuable quasi-parallels, but only when it chanced that there would otherwise be a blank page.

The division of the history into five parts, hinted at in the earlier work, is here explicitly stated, and briefly defended in a note at the beginning. The cross references of the earlier book are inserted in this also, a few additional notes are given, and useful tables and indexes are included.

Dr. Clark's book is a revised edition of a work which in its first edition had a very large sale, and which will undoubtedly be used by large numbers in its present edition. The gospel record is divided into eight parts, with definite chronological limits, and the parts into sections, the location and date of the events of which are in many cases given. The feast of John v. 1 is taken as a passover, and the ministry consequently made to extend to three years and a half. It is doubtful whether it is wise to combine with a harmony so much chronology which is of necessity extra-evangelic and problematical. Though assigning to Matthew less weight than to the other gospels in determining the order of events, Dr. Clark yet follows Matthew more closely than do most recent harmonists, particularly in reference to the events of Matt. chaps. viii. and ix. The departure to Galilee recorded by John, chap. iv, is identified with that given by the Synoptists, Matt. iv. 12, etc. The departure from Galilee recorded in Luke ix. 51, is identified with that of John vii. 10, and distinguished from that of Matthew xix. 1. The Sermon on the Mount is distinguished from the Sermon on the Plain, the former being

placed before, and the latter after the Choosing of the Twelve. Seventy-five pages of notes appended to the harmony discuss the chief problems of harmonization, for the most part with fairness and clearness. Occasionally a difficulty is too easily dismissed, as in the statement on p. 240, that "the two reasons for Jesus going into Galilee are harmonious and supplementary." An unconscious begging of the question seems to be the explanation of the third argument for making the feast of John v. 1 a passover. The date of John v. 1 can hardly be inferred from the fact that Luke vi. 1 was harvest time, since the chronological relation of John, chap. v. to Luke chap. vi. is itself determined only when the date of John v. 1 is fixed. The titles of the sections are descriptive rather than terse. There has been a little carelessness in spelling proper names. We find Stephens for Stevens, Cadmus for Cadman, and Mimpres for Mimpriss.

We can not but regret that in preparing a new edition the author did not take the opportunity to employ the text of the Revised Version. The insertion of many of its renderings as footnotes is but an imperfect substitute for the text itself. The mechanical execution is of that inferior sort with which the publishers have dishonored so many of the books issued by them.

In the fifth book in our list we have a very useful harmony, or rather synopsis, of the Greek text of the first three gospels. It is intended specially as a companion to the first volume of Prof. Holtzmann's *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, and its list of sections is transcribed almost unchanged from the second edition of that work. The text is that of Tischendorf as edited by von Gebhardt, but the margin shows the readings preferred by Holtzmann, as also those preferred by Weiss. The order of sections being that adopted by Holtzmann in his commentary, it naturally reflects his theory of the relation of the synoptic gospels, which takes Mark to be the oldest of our present gospels, makes Matthew to have used Mark, and Luke to have used both Mark and Matthew. Accordingly Mark's order is followed invariably for sections contained in Mark; Matthew's order is followed, with slight exceptions, for sections contained in Matthew, but not in Mark; while Luke suffers such dissection and transposition as is required by the application of the two preceding principles. Matter found only in Luke seems to be arranged chiefly in accordance with the editor's (*i. e.*, Holtzmann's) sense of the proper connection of thought. Some of the identifications seem forced and improbable. Such are the designation of the story of the ten lepers (Luke xvii. 11-19) as a variant form of the story of the leper (Luke v. 12-16). The dove-tailing together into one account of the mission of the Twelve and the mission of the Seventy fails to commend itself to the reviewer's judgment. Despite these defects, however, if defects they are, and quite apart from any question of the correctness of the theory of the relation of the gospels which underlies its arrangement, the book is a very useful and acceptable one. It is especially convenient for the study of the synoptic problem. For this purpose the absence of the Fourth Gospel is of course an advantage. A

simple mechanical feature greatly increases the value. The passages from each gospel are printed in a column of uniform width, one-third of the page, whether there is one account or two or three. Thus the reader sees by a glance at the page what gospel or gospels he has before him. By this means also the extent of the parallelism of two or more accounts is more easily perceived.

In one respect all these works fail, as, indeed, do almost all works of this character (that of Mr. James is in part an exception), in that while freely dissecting the gospels in order to bring parallel passages together, they yet fail of exhibiting all the instances of parallelism, especially in the sayings of Christ. The remedy lies not in further dissection, but in a system of cross references, by which the parallelism might be more fully exhibited, while even at the same time diminishing the amount of dissection and transposition required.

For continuous reading of the gospel narrative and for such study as does not particularly call for comparison of the gospels one with another, Mr. James's *Gospel History* is excellent, and the more so because of its use of the Revised Version. If one desire a harmony using the Revised Version, he will choose between Mr. Waddy's book and Mr. James's later book, and will probably be wise to give the preference to the latter. The absence of a definite chronological scheme is a feature common to both these books which will be esteemed by many a virtue rather than a defect. The student who wishes a harmony fitted to a definite chronological scheme with somewhat full harmonistic notes, and who is content to use the Common Version with notes of important variations of the Revised Version, will find Dr. Clark's book very useful. The student of the synoptic problem will find no book more convenient for his purpose than that of Pastor Huck. E. D. B.

## Current Literature.

By CLYDE W. VOTAW,  
The University of Chicago.

### OLD TESTAMENT.

#### Books and Pamphlets.

- Commentary on Genesis.* By Prof. Aug. Dillmann, D.D. Sixth edition. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1893. M. 7.50.
- Moses, the Servant of God.* By Rev. F. B. Meyer. Chicago: Revell Co., 1893. \$1.00.
- The First Book of Kings.* [Expositor's Bible Series.] By Archd. F. W. Farrar, D.D. New York: Armstrongs, 1893. \$1.50.
- The Tell Amarna Tablets.* Translated by Maj. C. R. Conder. New York: Macmillan, 1893. \$1.75.
- Pulpit Commentary: Ecclesiastes.* By Revs. W. J. Deane, T. Whitelaw, and others.
- Song of Solomon.* By Revs. R. A. Redford, B. C. Caffin, and others. London: Paul, 1893. 21s.
- Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.* [Hibbert Lectures, 1892.] By C. G. Montefiore. London: Williams & N., 1893. 10s. 6d.
- Geschichte der Juden und ihrer Literatur.* By Dr. M. Brann. 1. Theil. Von der babylonischen Gefangenschaft bis zum Abschluss des Talmuds. Breslau: Jacobsohn, 1893. M. 2.
- Biblischer Citatenschatz: eine vollständige, lexikalisch geordnete Sammlung von Citaten aus dem Alten und Neuen Testament.* By Fr. Fischer. Leipzig: Malende, 1892. M. 1.50.

- Les Apocalypses Juives. Essai de critique Littéraire et theologique.* By E. De Faye. Paris, 1892. 6 fr.
- Le Livre d'Henoch, fragments grecs découverts à Akhmim (Haute-Egypte) publiés avec les variantes du texte éthiopien traduits et annotés.* By A. Lods. Paris, Leroux, 1892.

#### Articles and Reviews.

- Moses, his Life and its Lessons.* By M. G. Pearse, D.D., in Preachers' Magazine, Feb. 1893.
- The Ministry of Elijah: A Theory.* By N. L. Walker, D.D., in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- The Warrior from Edom.* Editorial in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- Jeremiah viii. 1-11.* Editorial in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- Note on the Lamentations.* By Prof. A. Kuenen, abstract in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- The Structure of the Book of Daniel.* By Rev. J. E. H. Thomson, in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- The Book of Jonah.* By A. Crawford, in Prot. Episc. Review, Feb. 1893.
- The Spencerian Theory of the Religion of Israel.* By C. R. Blauvelt, in Christian Thought, Feb. 1893.
- The Standard of Veracity among the Jews.* Editorial in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.



- Medieval Anticipations of the Higher Criticism.* Editorial in *The Thinker*, Mar. 1893.
- The Higher Criticism.* By B. W. Johnson, in *New Christian Quarterly*, Jan. 1893.
- A Plea for Semitic Study.* By J. H. Blake, in *New Christian Quarterly*, Jan. 1893.
- The Inerrancy of the Original Autographs.* By Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D., in *N. Y. Independent*, Mar. 23, 1893.
- The Inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures.* By F. F. Adenweller, in *New Christian Quarterly*, Jan. 1893.
- The Inspiration of the Scriptures.* By J. M. Gibson, in *Preachers' Magazine*, Feb. 1893.
- The Book of Enoch, and New Test.* By Prof. G. H. Schodde, in *The Congregationalist*, Mar. 16, 1893.

## NEW TESTAMENT.

## Books and Pamphlets.

- Notable Sayings of the Great Teacher, and other Biblical Studies.* By H. Thorne. Sterling: Drummond, 1893. 2s. 6d.
- The Comments at the Cross.* Six Lenten Sermons. By Cameron Mann. New York: Whittaker, 1893. 60¢.
- Christ and Criticism.* By C. M. Mead, D.D. New York: Randolph, 1893. 75¢.
- Christ and Modern Unbelief.* By R. H. McKim. New York: Whittaker, 1893. \$1.25.
- Étude de la Doctrine Chrétienne.* By A. Matter. 2 vols. Paris, 1892. 8 fr.
- Die Gottheit Christi.* By C. Massow. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1893. M. 1.
- Through Christ to God. A study in Scientific Theology.* By J. A. Beet, D.D. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1893. \$1.50.
- Jezus' getuigenis omtrent God naar de vier Evangelien. Apgedragen an de theologische faculteit der Utrechtsche Rijks Universiteit in 1886.* By Az. W. Francken. Leiden: Brill, 1892.
- Nach Inhalt der vier Evangelien, kurz dargestellt von F. v. B. (in Die Ewige Wahrheit).* Berlin: Verlag für Sonnt., 1892. 80 pf.
- Simon Peter: His Life and Letters.* By W. T. P. Wolston. Edinburgh: Gospel Messenger Office, 1893. 2s. 6d.
- The Gospel of Paul.* By Prof. C. C. Everett, D.D. Boston: Houghton, M. & Co., 1893. \$1.50.
- Paul's Prayers, and Other Sermons.* By Alex. Maclaren, D.D. New York: Macmillan, 1893. \$1.50.
- Rechtvaardiging door het geloof bij Paulus. Eene bijdrage voor de nieuwtestamentische theologie.* By J. H. Gerretsen. Nijmegen: ten Hoet, 1892. 40 fl.
- The Gospel of Life. Thoughts introductory to the Study of Christian Doctrine.* By B. F. Westcott, D.D. New York: Macmillan, 1893. \$1.75.
- In Paradise; or, the State of the Faithful Dead. A study from Scripture on death and after death.* By Chas. H. Strong. New York: Whittaker, 1893. \$1.00.
- Chronologico-historica introductio in Novum Testamentum.* By T. Myszkowski. Lemberg: Gubrynowicz, 1892. M. 4.
- Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus. (Texte und Untersuchungen).* By Prof. Ad. Harnack. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893. M. 2.
- Evangelii Secundum Petrum et Petri Apocalypsoes quae supersunt ad fidem*

- codicis in Ægypto nuper inventi edidit cum latina versione et dissertatione critica.* By A. Lods. Paris: Leroux, 1892.
- Greek-English Word-List.* Arranged by Prof. Robt. Baird. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893. 35¢.
- Books and their Use.* By Prof. J. H. Thayer, D.D. Boston: Houghton, M. & Co., 1893. 75¢.
- Articles and Reviews.**
- The Moral Teaching of the Sermon on the Mount.* By Rev. F. H. Woods, in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- The Difficult Words of Christ. 2. Holy Violence.* By Jas. Stalker, D.D., in The Expositor, Mar. 1893.
- The Kingdom of God.* By Prof. E. Haupt, D.D., in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- Did Jesus Look upon Himself as the Messiah.* By Dr. J. A. Bruins, abstract in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- Three Motives to Repentance, Luke xiii. 1-9.* By Rev. Jas. Denney, in The Expositor, Mar. 1893.
- Christ and Nicodemus.* By Rev. Alex. Brown, in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- John vi. 37.* By Rev. E. Alty, in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- Thou-Me-Them, John xvii. 23-26.* By Rev. Alex. Warrack, M.A., in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- Wendt's Position on the Johannine Question.* By Dr. E. Haupt, abstract in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- About the Sixth Hour.* By Prof. W. M. Ramsay, M.A., in The Expositor, Mar. 1893.
- Gethsemane.* By Geo. Plattenburg, in New Christian Quarterly, Jan. 1893.
- Paul's Conception of Christianity. 2. The Epistle to the Galatians.* By Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D., in The Expositor, Mar. 1893.
- Jude's Doxology.* By A. T. Pierson, in The Treasury, Feb. 1893.
- The Wrath of the Lamb, Rev. vi. 16.* Editorial in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- Galilee.* By Prof. G. A. Smith, M.A., in The Expositor, Mar. 1893.
- The Supposed Relation of St. Matthew and St. Luke to the "Logia" as a Common Source.* By Prof. V. H. Stanton, D.D., in The Expositor, Mar. 1893.
- The Great Gospel Problem.* Editorial in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- The Aramaic Gospel.* By Rev. J. T. Marshall, M.A., in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- The Origin and Relation of the Four Gospels.* By Rev. J. J. Halcombe, M.A., in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- The Origin of the Gospels.* By Rev. A. Wright, M.A., in Expository Times, Mar. 1893.
- Harnack on the Newly-Discovered Gospel of St. Peter.* Editorial in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- The Christ of the Apocryphal Gospels.* By Rev. J. Bovon, abstract in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- Modern Judaism and Christianity.* Editorial in The Thinker, Mar. 1893.
- Professor Hort—Bibliography.* By Rev. J. O. F. Murray, in The Expositor, Mar. 1893.