THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

VOL. VI. DECEMBER, 1886. No. 4.

IF the question of the study of a given subject is made to turn on the importance of that subject, or on the number and magnitude of the difficulties which the study of that subject presents, or on the constantly increasing delight with which its study is attended, or on the fact that this subject, of all subjects, stands in need of honest, scientific investigation, or on the valuable practical results which will follow its investigation,—if we decide to take up or lay down the study of a given subject on these grounds, surely no biblical student, who has for a moment considered the claims put forth by the subject of *prophecy*, should hesitate to enter upon a close and exhaustive study of that topic.

BUT is it important? Is it not rather a subject which belongs to the past, one which is without relation, out of relation indeed, to the real issues of the day? Is it not a subject for "specialists" or "cranks" to consider? Is not time spent upon it practically thrown away? These questions receive an affirmative answer, if not in theory, at least in practice, from the great mass of intelligent students. The *un*importance of this department of study is quite generally conceded. They who concede it would seem to have overlooked the part played by Hebrew prophets in the advancement of the kingdom of God upon earth; the direct personal influence which the lives and words of these men have exerted upon nations and individuals of every age; the large proportion of Holy Writ which is either prophecy, or prophecy fulfilled; the absolute necessity of a knowledge of the laws and principles of prophecy for a correct understanding not only of the prophetic writings, but of any portion of the Bible; the fact "that no part of Scripture sheds such direct light on experience, none so follows the soul through all the windings of a God-forgetting, worldly, embittered, repentant, God-seeking life, none so meets and

appeals to the soul in every emergency, and has the right word to say to every variety of feeling." If the study of the Bible is important, then the study of its greatest mystery, prophecy, is important; and in so far as one neglects it, he narrows and perverts his conception of God, man and redemption.

THE difficulties which meet one in the study of prophecy are, it must be confessed, great; and to this fact may well be attributed the prevailing tendency to slight it. Prophecy is, for the most part, poetry; for the majority of men, poetry is distasteful. It is frequently a poetry characterized by obscurity, "full of rapid transitions, obscure allusions, highly imaginative representations;" to the majority of men that which requires close study is burdensome. We have only fragments, so to speak, of the original discourses or writings. We are occidental; the prophets were oriental. Historical data, needed for the understanding of many portions, are lacking. Of the prophets themselves our knowledge is scanty and unsatisfactory. Prophecy, like miracles, is a divine mystery, and was not intended to be fully understood. These, with other difficulties, constantly present themselves. But these difficulties are those which meet the student of any portion of Holy Scripture. And besides, they are difficulties which, in great measure, the student may overcome. The "obscure style" of the prophets, so frequently referred to, is a style which has characterized the greatest literary efforts of all ages. What a translation presents, in obscure form, is often entirely clear in the original. With a proper arrangement of the prophetic writings, with a proper method of study, with a proper idea of what prophecy is, and of what the prophets were, a large amount of what seems to be unintelligible will become clear. Difficulties will doubtless remain; but what man expects to possess himself of all wisdom? The very existence of difficulties should prove an additional incentive to the study. With nothing to overcome, study would be a farce, and life a burden.

WE cannot conceive a more interesting, or even fascinating, topic for study, than this same subject of *prophecy*. It has been urged against its study that they who take it up are carried away with it, and become, too frequently, fanatics. However this may be, it is true that once in possession of the leading facts of prophecy, and once imbued with the spirit of prophetic study, the student will find no other to surpass it, in the measure of satisfaction which it brings, or in the intense interest which it begets. And why should it be otherwise? Is any theme more instructive, more attractive than

that of human redemption? What were the prophets but religious teachers? What is prophecy but "religious instruction"? What is Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament but "the New Testament in the Old—the ever living and developing idea which inspired the faith, hope, love of the Old Testament saints, and gave their elementary redemption its sole efficacy and grace"?* To overcome the difficulties of prophetic study, as has been stated, it is necessary to have a proper method of study, and a proper idea of what prophecy is. The possession of these is also necessary, and, it may perhaps be said, *all* that is necessary to make the study one of peculiar interest, and of special delight. Did a man ever really *study* prophecy and find it uninteresting?

MOST of all, however, we must emphasize the fact that the subject of prophecy stands, to-day, in need of honest and scientific investigation; and that it is a duty resting upon Christian students to take up this investigation. Words too strong can scarcely be found to describe the methods of procedure employed by those who, at present, constitute a vast majority of the body of the students of prophecy. Prophecy and prediction, ideas entirely distinct, are confused. All prophecy is made predictive. What is not even prophecy, not to speak of prediction, is treated as such. Literalism is made supreme, and in its service, no inconsistencies of logic, no violation of grammatical rules, no disregard of historical data are deemed too flagrant, if, forsooth, numbers can be figured out satisfactorily. The great mistake,—and the magnitude of it will never be appreciated till the end has come,—is the failure to separate the substance of prophecy from its form. In other words, the method is superficial, unscientific. It works only on the surface, and is compelled to twist these surface-facts into consistency with each other. It deals only with the husks, never finding the kernel. It fails to discover the great principles lying underneath, and to employ them. The method has come down from the past century, but flourishes now even more vigorously than ever before. "The efforts to show the literal fulfillment of the predictions of Daniel, in the history of Israel from the exile to the advent, in its dreadful inconsistencies of interpretation have so disgraced the science of biblical interpretation, that it is a marvel that the book has survived such cruel manipulation. . . . Predictive prophecy has been made a burden to apologetics by the abuse that has been made of it by self-constituted defenders of the faith and presumptuous champions of orthodoxy.

* Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*. p. 63.

It is necessary that evangelical critics should rescue predictive prophecy from the hands of those who have made such sad mistakes."

These words of Professor Briggs are too true. The time has come when rational and logical methods in the interpretation of prophecy should be employed. Let our critical and scientific students take up the work.

THE question of practical results, of the practical use to be made of the results of prophetic study, presents itself. This differs from the question of importance; for we may often concede to be important, what does not have, at least directly, a practical issue. Putting aside minor points, which might well deserve a presentation, we may reduce the whole question to one of fact. Is it of practical importance to know the *truth?* If, as we confidently believe, the prevailing method is a false one, will not this error work bad results? If, as we are equally confident, there is a correct method, will not a familiarity with it, a knowledge of it, an employment of it, bring practical advantage? If the adoption of one or the other of two methods affects the meaning of three-fourths of the Sacred Scriptures, is it not a practical question as to which shall be employed? It is this very necessity of choice which leads so many to throw aside entirely the whole subject. But in view of what has been said, the honest, conscientious student cannot well afford to do this. The Word of God has been committed to our keeping, not to be laid upon the shelf, but to be studied. Surely, the Author of the Word must himself have made a serious mistake, if he has filled it with so large an amount of useless rubbish, material for which so many of us find no practical use. It is possible, on the other hand, that it may be *we* who, in failing to find, or perhaps even to search for, a practical use for this large portion of Sacred Writ, have made, or are making, the mistake.

THE LITERARY PROBLEM OF GEN. I.–III.

By Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph. D.,

Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

The question of the right of a literary analysis of the Pentateuch lies at the basis of all the Old Testament discussions of the last century. The key-note of these discussions was struck by the Roman Catholic physician in France, Astruc, when, in 1753, he published his *Memoires*, in which he defended the position that Moses, in writing the Book of Genesis, had drawn chiefly from two sources,—one with the name Elohim, the other with the name Jehovah for God,—and, to a limited extent, had used ten other documents. This idea met, at first, with more opposition than favor. But when later introduced into German critical circles, chiefly through the advocacy, though in modified form, of the influential Eichhorn, it readily and speedily secured the adherence of nearly every Old Testament specialist. And to-day a doubt as to the fact of an analysis is rarely expressed by a German scholar. That the Pentateuch is a literary composition drawn from various sources, and that the stratifications in its structure are readily discernible to the critical eye, is, among Germans, almost an axiom; it is certainly a fixed tradition of critical investigation. The question is no longer whether these books can be analyzed, but *how* this is to be done. It is significant that, in Wellhausen's elaborate analysis of the Hexateuch, he does not, with a single sentence, defend the right of this process, but proceeds immediately to dissect the various chapters. Undoubtedly much of the fruitlessness of the Pentateuchal controversy, of late, has been owing to the fact that this state of affairs is but imperfectly understood and appreciated by those who would defend the old traditional views. In the American phase of the controversy especially, little attention has been paid to this side of the question. As matters actually stand, the discussion between the conservative and the more liberal scholars starts from different premises; the latter arguing from the stand-point of the analysis as a "sure" result of modern investigation; the former treating the matter, often ignorantly and superficially, as something of little moment and of less foundation. Now, as a matter of fact, we do not have that critical process as an historical background which Germany has; and if the results of this process are to be refuted, it will be necessary to examine the sources whence they are drawn. In other words, the composite character and the literary analysis, especially of the Pentateuch, must receive the attention which its fundamental position among Old Testament problems deserves. What we propose is to submit, for information and study, a concise statement of the controversy so far as it relates to Gen. I.–III. This is done, not in order to discuss the pros and cons of the question, but rather to show *what* these are, and thus to aid the student in settling the matter for himself.

The thesis of the analyst is briefly this: These chapters did not originally belong to one and the same literary work, but were drawn from two different sources by the writer and editor of the Pentateuch, or rather Hexateuch. The portion drawn from the first source is chap. I. 1—II. 4a; that drawn from the second is II. 4b to the end of III. and further. The arguments adduced for this claim are not always the same by all writers, but the leading propositions are these:

The use made of the names for God shows the composite character of these chapters. It will be noticed that up to chap. II. 4a only the name Elohim is employed for this purpose, while after that, with one exception, only the double name *Jehovah Elohim* is found. There can be no doubt as to the facts in the case; the only question is as to the meaning of these facts. The analyst claims that these facts indicate that one of the literary sources employed the name *Elohim* exclusively for God; it is, therefore, generally called the *Elohistic* document; the other work used exclusively the word *Jehovah* (or Yahweh) for this purpose, and is accordingly called the *Yahvistic* document, the name *Elohim* in Gen. II. 4 seq. being added later by the editor or redactor of the whole work. This conclusion is drawn, however, not only from these chapters, but from the whole Book of Genesis and the first six chapters of Exodus. It will be seen, by an examination of these portions, that often whole chapters use exclusively the name Jehovah, and others exclusively the name Elohim for the divinity. This is done by the latter document down to Exod. VI., where verse 2 seq. are interpreted to mean that according to the Elohistic writer, of whose document this chapter forms a part, the name of Jehovah had not been revealed to the fathers, but that God had been known to them only by the name *El Shaddai*, which is accepted as the equivalent of Elohim. This word the Elohistic writer from these premises uses for God down to Exod. VI., but after that he uses Jehovah and Elohim promiscuously. The Yahvistic writer is represented as not having acted from this historical standpoint, and has been guilty of the anachronism of using "Jehovah" also in the days preceding the exodus.

This certainly remarkable use of the names of God down to the sixth chapter of Exodus is accompanied by other facts that are used to prove that the Elohistic and Jehovistic sections should be separated. It is noticed that each of these sections shows certain peculiarities of style and diction not found in the other. In regard to Gen. I.–III. alone, Dillmann, in his edition of Knobel's Commentary, draws attention to the following: The Yahvistic writer, i. e., the author of chap. II. 4b seq., uses the verb "to make" or "to form," while the Elohist uses "to create;" the animals are called "beasts of the field," and not "beasts of the earth;" he speaks of "the shrub of the field" and not "the herb of the field." Certain expressions* peculiar to Gen. II. and III. are never found, or only rarely, in the sections where Elohim is used.

This argument is rounded by the claim that the various Elohistic and Yahvistic sections differ in their manner of representing and describing events. In regard to the chapters before us, Dillmann says that over against the simple manner of chap. I., in which the leading facts are emphasized, chap. II. 4b seqq. shows a decided preference for the description of side-issues and cause and effect, as also for picture sceneries, for views growing out of a closer reflection and more thoughtful study. The manner of speaking of God is more familiar than that of the Elohist, e. g., God *forms* the animals and man; he *breathes* into his nostrils the breath of life; he *plants* the garden of Eden; he takes a rib out of Adam and *makes* it into a woman, and *closes* the opening; he *brings* the animals to man; he *walks* in the cool of the evening; he speaks as though *jealous* of man. Out of these facts and facts of a like nature found in connection with sections employing the word Elohim for God, the critics have drawn what they regard as a correct descrip-

* These are הפעם, בעבור, לבלתי, מה זאת, יעצבון, שמע לקול, etc.

tion of the character of the Elohistic and Yahvistic writings. It must be clearly understood that the full force of this argument can not be seen from Gen. I.–III. alone, but an examination must be made of the greater portion of the Pentateuch in order to test the justice or injustice, the weakness or the strength, of this claim.

The conservative scholars, while of course not denying the facts in the case, furnish an entirely different explanation of them. The position is taken that these names have different meanings and that their use is regulated by the sense and the connection; that Elohim is the general term for God and is employed when reference is made chiefly to his omnipotence, and that Jehovah is the name of God when considered as the one who revealed himself to Israel as the gracious God of promise and of the covenant grace. Keil, in his "Introduction" to the Old Testament, § 25, starting from this view, states that Exod. VI. 2, forming an epoch in the history of the relations between Jehovah and Israel, also causes a change in the more or less frequent use of the names for God. Before this epoch God had revealed himself as Jehovah only in promises, and as El Shaddai possessing the power to fulfill his promises. For this reason the name Jehovah is found in the first half of Genesis only where there is reference to the revelation of deliverance commenced actually with the call to Abraham, while Elohim remains the general name for God in relation to the world and the creatures; whereas in the other half of Genesis the same facts continue, but that after God has concluded the covenant and made promises to him as El Shaddai, the latter name is also used as a name for the God of the covenant by the side of Jehovah; and as El Shaddai is then used rather more for poetic diction, the name Elohim is used in its room even to express the special covenant relation; and so in the latter portion of Genesis the name Jehovah occurs but seldom. This difference in the ideas of Jehovah and Elohim holds good throughout the Pentateuch, and the words are never used promiscuously, and a correct interpretation of Exod. VI. 2 seq. will comfirm this.* The other matters mentioned in corroboration of this principal argument, the difference in style and manner of presentation, are regarded as being the natural results of the difference in the subject-matter treated, in so far as they are regarded as true conclusions from the text of the book.

The second argument has more exclusive reference to the chapters before us, and consists in the claim that the two writings do not harmonize in their description of the same event, and in reality give different and contradictory accounts of creation. The cautious Bleek, in his *Einleitung*, § 37, voices this view in these words:

"According to chap. I., the creation of the animals takes place before the creation of the human race, both male and female; according to chap. II., this takes place between the creation of the man and the woman. Then in chap. I., the creation of the herbs of the earth is the immediate result of God's creative word, while in chap. II. this is represented as dependent upon rain and the work of man. Further, a certain difference between the statements in regard to the original relation existing between God and man cannot be denied, namely, that according to chap. I. man was from the beginning created in the image of God, while in chaps. II. and III. it seems that man only gradually had reached this stage through his distinguishing between right and wrong."

While the later writers in the ranks of the analysts have given up the standpoint that we have two rival accounts of creation in these chapters, and teach also

* Cf. Keil, Commentary on the Pentateuch, *in loco*.

that the statements in the opening verses of chap. II. 4b seq. are but introductory, to the end of chap. II. and of chap. III., and that the object of the whole section is to narrate the fall of man; yet the position is adhered to, that between the statements of the two chapters in reference to the creation of man and of the animals and plants there is a marked difference; and this seems to be not without a foundation in fact, as a careful perusal of these verses will show.

The argument is met by the conservative side with an exegesis of these verses that excludes the possibility of contradictory accounts. The position is taken that these verses are a direct continuation of the previous sections and do not purpose to give a second account of the act of creation at all, but only of the planting and preparation of Eden as the place in which the first stages in the development of man shall take place. The security or insecurity of this position rests to a great extent upon the meaning assigned to a number of leading words in these verses, notably to "the earth" in verse 4 and "was" in verse 5, the former of which is restricted to the garden of Eden and the latter, as a parallel to "sprung up" in the same verse receives the meaning of "growing" or "becoming." Very properly objection is also raised to the translation proposed of II. 4b–7, which makes verses 5 and 6 parenthetical expressions, and verse 7 the continuation of verse 4b. The full facts in the case and the bearings on this question can best be learned by a comparison of the exegesis offered by the representatives of the two schools. Keil is probably the best for the conservative side, and Dillmann as good as any for the side of the analysts. The former is accessible in English, but not the latter.

In this connection we add a few remarks:

1) The problem as such is merely a literary and critical one, and not dogmatical. Only the facts in the case and not any theory concerning the origin and character of the books of the Bible can settle this question. It refers solely to the human side of the origin of the Bible, to the question whether in composing Gen. I.–III. the writer made use of two literary documents and united them in his account, or did not. The great question is, What are the exact facts and what do they imply? The fact that analysts have abused this problem for destructive purposes should not close our eyes to the real character of the question.

2) In itself there can be no objection to a documentary theory. Writing existed at a very early stage, and the facts of revelation were early known at least to some of mankind. Already in Seth's day (Gen. IV. 26) people began to call upon the name of the Lord, and Adam's acts and words in Gen. III. 9 seq. show that he had been made acquainted with God as the creator and the just judge. Nothing is more natural than that these truths revealed so early to mankind should have been put down in a written form by either inspired or uninspired pens, and that the writer of Genesis, in compiling his account of the creation and the fall of man, should have made use of one or more of these records for his purpose. We know from the direct statements of Old Testament history that the inspired writers made it a rule to consult the official records, and we know also that the Pentateuch itself elsewhere quotes from other books. And so considered in itself, the acceptance of a literary analysis of these chapters, or of the whole Book of Genesis, or of the whole Pentateuch, or of any other book, does not conflict with any correct view of the origin of the divine books.

3) Nor does such an acceptance of an analysis, at least of these chapters, in itself involve the rejection of the Mosaic authorship. It must be said, however,

that nearly all of those who accept such an analysis reject the old view that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch, and understand that he wrote a greater or smaller portion of it. Originally such was not the case, and nothing was further from Astruc's mind than the denial of the Mosaic authorship. The very title of his work reads, "Memoirs which Moses seems to have employed in the composition of Genesis." Of course, the acceptance of the theory in other books than Genesis and the early chapters of Exodus, cannot but involve this denial to a greater or less extent.

4) The leading arguments pro and con are directly connected with the use of the names Jehovah and Elohim, and both methods of explaining the most remarkable use of these words down to Exod. VI., meet with serious difficulties. The acceptance of a difference in the meaning of these terms is justified by facts, but while the application of this view to the earlier chapters of Genesis is quite successful, it is very strained in the last ten or twelve chapters. On the other hand, the analysts have been compelled to accept two documents using the term Elohim, one of which had already been incorporated into the Yahvistic document before this was united with the other Elohist to form our Genesis. We doubt whether an explanation of this phenomenon fully satisfactory and one that can cover all the actual cases, has yet been furnished. The names used for God in Genesis are still the riddle of the Pentateuchal sphinx.

5) The willingness on the part of many analysts to accept "contradictions" in the records of Genesis and elsewhere, strikes us as a violation of the premises from which they proceed. They all accept a redactor who united the alleged documents into one book; yet he seems to have permitted so many opposing statements to remain, that some of the chapters seem little less than a bundle of contradictions. The effort, manifestly, often is not to see if two accounts can be made to harmonize, but whether they can be compelled to militate against each other. Even if we should accept the composite character of the Book of Genesis, the natural supposition is that, as the editor or writer understood these accounts, they were not contradictory. It is absurd to believe that, in a carefully edited book like our Pentateuch, even aside from all divine influence or inspiration, there should have been left hundreds of errors and contradictions. Manifestly the purpose should be to attempt not to make two verses or chapters disagree, but to make them agree, as they evidently were understood to do by their author or editor. Approaching the literary problem of Gen. I.–III. in this spirit, there seems no valid reason for seeing any contradictory statements in them. It is possible, without any violation of the laws of language or of thought, to see in these chapters a harmonious account of the creation and fall of man. It is, of course, also possible to understand these chapters as giving different accounts of the same thing; but the question remains, Which of these two possibilities is the one to accept? All other things being equal, the former is the more natural and rational, and fair literary criticism, here as elsewhere, will accept this stand-point. Of course, if the chapters do harmonize, this in itself does not decide the question of composite character. The latter is still a possibility; but if such contradictions existed, the analysis would almost be a necessity.

6) We repeat that the object of this article has been merely to state candidly, calmly and fairly, the question in regard to the literary problem of Gen. I.–III., and not to advocate either side. Which is right? This every conscientious student of God's Word must decide for himself.

RELIGION AS AN ELEMENT IN CIVILIZATION.

By Justin A. Smith, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

There were in ancient times two small countries which, simply as such, have had more to do in originating the influences that have been most conspicuous in the history of civilization than perhaps any of the great empires of either ancient or modern times. Of one of these Dr. Edersheim has said that "it is impossible to think of it without a wonder and admiration which are only deepened the more we endeavor to trace in every direction the obligations under which we lie to it. The land was small, only covering—apart from its colonies—an area equal to one-third of that of England and Wales. Its population was insignificant in point of numbers, the free citizens of its several states not amounting to the population of Scotland at the present day; while Athens,"—for of course this little country is ancient Greece—"while Athens, the centre of its most powerful and lasting influence, possessed, with the exception of its slaves, not more than 21,000 citizens above the age of twenty. What a land, and what a city, to have effected what they have done."

Of the other country alluded to above, one of our authorities speaks thus: "The Holy Land is not in size, or physical characteristics proportioned to its moral and historical position, as the theatre of the most momentous events in the world's history. It is but a strip of country about the size of Wales, less than one hundred and forty miles in length, and barely forty miles in average breadth, on the very frontier of the East, hemmed in between the Mediterranean Sea on the one hand, and the enormous trench of the Jordan Valley on the other, by which it is cut off from the main land of Asia behind it." Neither in commerce, in war, in the arts, in schools of philosophy, in politics, does this small country compare in history with the countries adjoining on the south, the north, or the east; yet who will say that in point of positive and decisive influence upon the course and growth of the world's civilization, all of these combined can contest the palm with this narrow spot of ground alone?

Doubtless, in the history of human civilization there are other great names besides these: Egypt, Assyria, Italy, Northern Africa at the time when Carthage was in its glory, and those modern nations in which has appeared what Mommsen calls "a new cycle of culture, connected in several stages of its development with the perishing or perished civilization of the Mediterranean states, as this was connected with the primitive civilization of the Indo-Germanic stock, but destined, like the earlier cycle, to traverse an orbit of its own." Yet the question here is not as to the great part any empire or city may have played upon the historical stage, nor as to its achievements "in arts and arms." Human civilization, properly seen, is not sporadic and occasional, nor is it to be estimated by what any one nation, or group of nations, may have attained to, or the splendor of that height of glory and power from which, one after the other, they have fallen. It is rather that result of human improvement upon the whole which is found at the

end of centuries and cycles of centuries, and in which all the good of the past is found treasured in the institutions, the resources, the moral and intellectual condition, and the general well-being of the present. It may be seen beforehand to be possible that those influences and causes which have been most powerful in producing this result, may have existed independently of extent of territory, of military supremacy, and even of that "wealth of nations" which after all is "wealth" only in a very narrow and inadequate sense. The "poor wise man" who "by his wisdom delivered the city," yet whom "no man remembered," may stand for us as the type of that which has been the real and permanent element of beneficent growth, in that developing civilization whose progress and whose vicissitudes are the real theme of history.

The true and correct way to classify the world's civilizations, taking all the periods of history together, is to view them as (1) pagan, (2) Christian. To classify civilizations as Egyptian, Assyrian, Grecian, Roman, German, Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Aztec, Peruvian, or by any other method which has respect to such limited and possibly temporary distinctions as nationality, achievement in one or a few special lines of human improvement, or upon any other principle than that which respects the universal and the permanent, may answer the ends of some special inquiry, but is necessarily imperfect and partial. There have been really only two civilizations—pagan and Christian; and with these all history, in its two great divisions of Ancient and Modern, is concerned. Ancient history exhibits the great yet disastrous career of the one. Modern history records the immensely larger and more auspicious growth, and prophesies the sure and glorious destiny, of the other.

The central and decisive element in civilization is religion. That alone which deals with the higher nature of man can so enter into even the life of nations as to result in the kind of growth in which civilization consists. This proposition might be claimed as well-nigh axiomatic; so almost self-evident is it that what constitutes real improvement in the individual is that which alone can improve and elevate the nation or the race. The individual man is never made wise, or moral, or happy by wealth alone, or by material prosperity or advantage of any kind whatsoever; neither, for that very reason, is the race as a whole, or any section of it. To say this is to state a truism. And still it involves a principle which underlies all history; a principle, however, which in the practical life of the world is scarcely remembered at all. And this higher nature in man is a part of him that is unreached, as to what is most essential in human improvement, even by intellectual culture alone. Strange, indeed, that it should be necessary to so often reiterate the truth that it is only as the moral and the spiritual nature in man is distinctively and effectively made to be at its best, that the man himself is at his best; that only as the race itself has undergone a like transformation will the process of the world's civilization have come to any decisive and permanent result!

Now the pagan civilization has been in certain periods and aspects of it a very admirable thing. The little country described at the beginning of this paper stands worthily as its representative. One may associate with it its mighty suc-

cessor, the Roman state and people, in which appear those sterner and more stalwart elements which are essential in government and in national unity and force. Preceding the Grecian were other forms of civilization, whose monuments along the Nile and the Euphrates have as yet not wholly disappeared, and whose pre-historic achievements are still the puzzle and the wonder of the world. But while these last have ceased to be felt in the march of human progress, and while even Roman law and military art are seldom thought of either as an example or as a lesson, the world feels to this day the effect of Athenian culture, and recognizes it as one of the permanent forces in the growth of civilization. And even before the time of Athenian supremacy Grecian soil had given birth to influences which are more felt, perhaps, to-day than at any period since. There has never been a time when the Homeric age of human history was so profoundly studied as now; and the more it is thus studied the more is it seen how much of the life of that heroic time lived again in what was best in the later history of Greece, and indeed lasts on to the present hour. Will there ever come a time when the philosophy of that later time will cease to instruct the world, its poetry to inspire, its art to kindle?

But always in a pagan civilization, even this of Greece in its best days, one perceives a deficiency that proves in the end to be fatal. Even one who should fail to identify this fatal defect could not fail to be conscious of its existence, even when such civilization is in the glory of its best period. The instructed mind, looking upon it thus in its prime, and even while filled with admiration, is compelled to exclaim, "It is splendid,—but can it last?" One feels, in contemplating it, that after all it must be evanescent. There is a lack of foundation for the stately and gilded fabric. We look for a pure and salutary home-life among the people, and nowhere find it. We look for the people itself, in that sense of the word which, to modern ideas, is the only true one, and we look in vain. A throng of slaves, a body of rude and ignorant artisans in the cities, and peasants in the country, an unwashed crowd in the agora or the forum, swayed hither and thither by the orators, who think for them, and who lead them by inflaming their passions—what are these as the foundation for a state? The temples are glorious as works of art; but the worship there appeals only to superstition, and often to still worse passions. As we look back across the centuries upon the fabric of pagan civilization, we see it shining in a bright eastern sky, with domes and towers glorious in the light of the world's earlier time. But as we draw near, we see that what is beneath, and upon which the whole structure rests, is false, deceptive and decaying. We find that philosophy, poetry and art, even wise laws and great political leaders, do not make a civilization. The temple of Athene, crowning the acropolis at Athens, represents at once the glory and the shame, the triumph and the ruin, of the ancient world. It is glorious as a work of art, and the image of the goddess within is an achievement to which only the genius of Phidias could be equal. Yet as a time would come when processions and victims would cease to visit the Parthenon, so must the time come when a civilization whose only religion was a superstition should have wholly perished from the earth.

Perhaps at no point does the civilization of the modern world so contrast with that of the ancient world, as in that which is at its base and constitutes its foundation. If one were to name that which above every thing else characterizes modern history as a story of human progress, he would surely be right in saying

that it is the birth and growth of *a people*. A government cannot make a civilization; however strong in itself, however splendid in achievement. An aristocracy cannot make a civilization, no matter how ancient or how richly endowed. Neither can schools, nor literatures, nor discoveries in science or philosophy, nor inventions in the useful or the decorative arts. There can be no civilization where there is no people; and the measure and value of the civilization will always be the intelligence, the morality, the social elevation, the general welfare and the happiness of the people. The steady progress of human improvement during the whole period of modern history has been in that direction,—a progress marked by immense vicissitude, with long pauses, with intervals of apparent decline, with explosions of furious elements that seemed at times to threaten universal ruin; yet with progress upon the whole, which, as we look upon it in its result, now seems almost amazing. Exactly at this point the ancient and the modern world are most of all in contrast. To what is it due?

To many causes, undoubtedly. Yet can any person of ordinary intelligence and reflection believe that all would be as we now see it, if the world were to-day filled, as once it was, with heathen temples? What has most of all made this *people* of the nineteenth century, if not their religion? Do you find a people anywhere in the world, save where Christianity is the reigning force? And is not the perfection of this result of generative and formative influence always in proportion as the Christianity which produces it is most truly Christian?

There can therefore be no reason why, in any interest of Christianity, we should undervalue the attainments, in various elements of human progress, made by the pagan nations of antiquity. What man is capable of in one age of the world, other things being equal, he is capable of in any other age. But this qualifying clause *other things being equal* makes a wonderful difference as we come to that which is the real root of the matter. We may claim, therefore, the history of civilization as one of those testimonies for Christianity in which history in general is such a faithful and true witness. Should anyone say that Christian civilization itself has features as bad as any which pagan civilization ever had, or that, in some things, it is worse than paganism ever was, the answer is this: These are no part of any Christian element in the existing condition of the nominal Christian world. They are survivals of that which, where paganism reigns, has full opportunity, and prevails without hindrance. It is so much of the old barbarism still remaining; as in the cultivated field, wild growths, survivals of the old wilderness condition, from time to time re-appear and embarrass the work of the husbandman. The remedy lies, in the one case as in the other, not in criticising or crippling the work of renewal, or in trying to prove that the old wilderness state was after all the best, but in plying with steady industry all the agencies of regeneration.

HEBREW PROPHETS AND PROPHECY.

By Prof. R. V. Foster, D. D.,
Theological School, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

I.

A prophet is also a prophecy—just as in some sense the life of the Christian is his best sermon. All prophecies may be thrown into one of two general classes:

1. Verbal Prophecies.
2. Historical Prophecies.

This classification makes the discussion of Old Testament prophecy a discussion of the whole contents of the Old Testament; and so indeed it may properly be—a synonym of Old Testament Theology. In these brief papers, however, we shall use the term prophecy in a more restricted sense.

A verbal prophecy is the oral utterance, whether recorded afterward or not, of Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, or any other person whom Jehovah may choose to make the medium, or vehicle, of his revelation.

An historical prophecy is one expressed in an event, or series of events, rather than in words. In this sense the whole of the Israelitish history is a prophecy in the twofold respect, 1) that it is a course of instruction, 2) that it looks to the future. In this sense the general fact recorded concerning Jonah is a prophecy, though in the other sense the Book of Jonah is not a prophecy. While, however, the history, or life, of Jonah as a whole is a prophecy, it would be straining a point to regard as such every detail of his life. In the second of the above two senses the Jewish classification of the historical books of Joshua, Judges, the Samuels, and Kings, as Prophetae Priores may be justified, though the term derives its chief Jewish significance rather from the place which these books occupy in the canon. But it is noticeable in this connection that the Jews regarded all the Old Testament books, except "the Law," as books of "the prophets."

The prophetical books proper of the Old Testament, including some which are not, strictly speaking, prophetical books, are commonly catalogued under the two classes of

1. The Major Prophets.
2. The Minor Prophets.

The first includes Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. The second includes Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. It is easy to see that this classification has nothing to recommend it, but its popularity. It is Jewish, however, and very ancient. The Talmud omits Daniel from the list of "greater prophets," and the Hebrew canon places his book among the K'thubim, or Writings. Augustine several times in "The City of God" recognizes this classification as one well known in his day. An obviously better one, it would seem, is the chronological, whether the subject of study be the contents or the language of the prophecies. The following arrangement is substantially the one proposed by Van Til, a Dutch writer and professor at Leyden in the early part of the eighteenth century:

1. The prophets of Judah and Israel to the time of the overthrow of the latter, B. C. 721. This list includes Jonah, Amos, Joel and Hosea.

2. The prophets of Judah from the overthrow of Israel to the final overthrow of Judah and Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 586. This list includes Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk and Zephaniah.

3. The prophets of the captivity, B. C. 586 to B. C. 516. Ezekiel and Daniel.

4. The prophets of the restoration. Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.

Of course, the line of separation between these periods must not be too rigidly drawn, as in each case one period more or less overlaps another. Isaiah's ministry, for example, probably began in the first period, and Jeremiah's ended in the third. The prophetical books of each of these groups should be studied, of course, in connection with the history of the periods to which they respectively belong. No one of them can be studied well, either in respect to its subject-matter or its diction, if it be studied independently of its chronology and historical surroundings—though it is also true that the study of the diction exclusively, or the subject-matter exclusively, may help to determine the chronology.

The sixteen prophets above mentioned cover a period of four hundred years, beginning about five hundred and fifty years after the settlement in Canaan, and extending to about B. C. 400. This would seem to be a small ministry for so long a period of time and for so "stiff-necked" a people. It was a small ministry, and an unsuccessful one,—counting success after the manner of men. It was a small number, even after making due allowance for those who wrote nothing, as Elijah and Elisha, and for the still larger number whose names are not even mentioned. Many of these were unworthy to be called prophets, because they were "false," and many of the remainder were doubtless inefficient. The Prophetical Colleges in those days could make neither heart nor brains. And as for supernatural endowments, God was much more likely to inspire a man who had a basis of natural gifts with which to begin. Not every young Hebrew who attended the Prophetical Schools, and had the diploma, and wore the uniform of the order, was capable of being inspired. Not every prophet in Israel was an inspired prophet. Many were prophets only in the sense that they belonged to the order; some in a little higher sense; others in a lower. The Elijahs, Isaiahs and Jeremiahs, if distributed evenly along the course of prophetic history, would scarcely furnish two for each century. But these were enough. Not many generals are needed. John Huss, Savonarola and Luther were few among many. Samuel stood alone in his day.

But how did there happen to be a prophetical order? for it can scarcely be doubted that there was one. It was not distinctly provided for, or contemplated, in the original Mosaic economy, any more than was the monarchical form of government.

To the sacerdotal order was originally entrusted the function of teacher and governor of the people in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical. Doubtless they also were originally the physicians and teachers of the secular schools, in so far as there were any. Did they not adequately fulfill the task assigned them? Not long. A few score years, at most, was as long as they did their work *adequately*. With neglect of duty and corrupt practices the priesthood was soon reduced to a low condition. Then Samuel was raised up, but whether he was himself a Levite remains a disputed point. It is probable that he was. He was a prophet, and established the Prophetical Order. He founded the first Prophetical School, and these were similar in constitution and purpose to our Theological Schools. They studied music, and poetry, and the Law. They became the teachers of the people,

the politicians, the annalists and historians, the physicians, the conservators of patriotism, morals, and spiritual religion. They wore a kind of uniform, and could be identified as prophets at sight. They had nothing to do with the functions of the priests, but were even more influential than the priests. Kings both respected and feared them. They were a numerous class. Obadiah concealed one hundred at a time from the wrath of Jezebel, an unknown number having already been cut off by her. Ahab king of Israel gathered together four hundred prophets of the Lord, and there was doubtless a larger number in both Israel and Judah in quieter times. But not all who belonged to the prophetic order had the prophetic gift. The majority of them doubtless were without it. Nor was there always agreement among them. So far, indeed, did some differ from others in their views and teachings as justly to entitle them to be called "false" prophets. The condition of the government and of the people was generally such as to call forth much difference of opinion as to matters both of public policy and private morals. But however honest in their views the false ones may have been, they were guilty. They had influence enough to lead the nation to ruin. Their predictions were merely forecastings. Though all claimed to be "seers," comparatively few of the prophetic order were inspired. Some priests, and others who did not belong to this order, were inspired. The whole number making up the inspired list from the close of Solomon's reign to the time of Malachi is about twenty-seven, and extends over a period of about five hundred and fifty years. Besides those mentioned above, their names are Shemaiah, Ahijah, Azariah, Hanani, Jehaziel, Jehu, Eliezer, Micaiah, Zechariah (?) (2 Chron. XXIV. 20), Zechariah (2 Chron. XXVI. 5), Oded (?). It is not expressly stated, however, that the first Zechariah and Oded were inspired. None of the other seers, or prophets, or "teachers in Israel," were in any respect superior in endowments or acquirements to our modern clergy. It is probable that even these twenty-seven were not permanently endowed with the spirit of inspiration. "The word of the Lord" came to them at such times as he saw it was wise and needful thus to communicate with them.

But it was not the duty of the prophetic class, whether inspired or uninspired, merely to teach and preach. It was a part of their duty, and a very important part, to make a record of the Divine utterances, and thus provide for their permanent existence; and in doing this they were guarded by the Holy Spirit from error. It is probable that not only the prophetical books strictly so called, but also the historical books, were written by men who belonged to the prophetic order; so that these historical books may well be called books of the prophets, as they actually are called in the Hebrew Bibles. The written prophecies, in the narrower sense of the term, are records, whether made by the men who originally spoke them, or not, of the revelations of Jehovah to the men selected by him to make known his will to his chosen people. And these prophecies were not merely of local and temporary value. The will of God is the same, under the same circumstances, in all ages and nations; and besides this, the Jew as well as the Christian, of all subsequent times, may see in the fulfillment of the predictions which occur in prophecy a proof that the Bible is in all respects what it pretends to be.

The darkest period of the Hebrew political history was the most brilliant period of Hebrew prophecy. The national sins, and confusions, and defeats, and exiles became the best occasion of its rise and development. Had there been no clouds there had been no rainbows. Prophecy brought to the people a larger hope

of the resurrection both in the national and in the individual, or personal, sense of the term; and the root of this hope lay in the gloom of the present. It is only night that can make us think of morning. Prophecy also brought a larger anticipation of judgment after death. While it did not displace Mosaism, it became its consummation and fulfillment, and, by placing the greater emphasis on the spiritual nature of God's requirements, prepared the way for the ultimate abolition of ritual and symbol. While the prophets never for a moment lose sight of the national identity, and are ever jealous of it, they do ere long mount the partition wall between Israel and the Gentiles, and proclaim a kingdom of God, which, having its center at Jerusalem shall embrace even the Gentile nations, and permeate them with its benign influence. This, however, leads us into Messianic prophecy, the chief glory of Israel's most brilliant prophetic age; and it was the failure on the part of the Jews to rightly apprehend it that so largely influenced their treatment of Jesus, and consequently the whole contents of the New Testament.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

By Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.,
Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

THE BOOKS OF GENESIS AND EXODUS.

The Lessons for the first half of the year 1887 are from these books. It is safe to say that a somewhat thoughtful and scholarly study of the books will be made, during that half year, by many more persons than ever previously made a similar study in any six months of the earth's history.

In actual work with ordinary Sunday-school classes, it would be a mistake for teachers to call much attention to the disputed critical questions concerning these books. Sunday-school work should be distinctively religious, and mere critical discussions are very dry husks for the feeding of the religious life. From the point of view of even the worst possible theory of the origin of these books, their more salient and important religious teachings are unassailed and unassailable. One need not settle the critical questions, in order to establish his right to rest upon the spiritual truths. In what they teach their scholars, most Sunday-school workers will do well to confine themselves pretty closely to these truths. But in making our preparations for teaching, it is well for us, if we can, to study the critical questions. We should need this, were there no other reason, to save ourselves from repeating the thousand traditional mistakes that are currently repeated along with the truths in these books, as if they were a part of the truths themselves. We need it too, in order to be prepared to answer questions and meet difficulties. It is known, not to a few merely, but to the million, that very many scholars of unimpeachable eminence hold that the Pentateuch was written, not by Moses, but many centuries after his death; and that many such scholars also hold that these books are not credible as history. A Sunday-school teacher is liable, at any time, to have questions of this sort sprung upon him; it will increase his usefulness, if he is prepared to meet them.

The first five books of the Old Testament have commonly been spoken of as the Books of Moses; they are so spoken of in the New Testament. This has gen-

erally been understood to mean that Moses was, in some fair sense of the term, the author of them. It is perfectly fair, however, to raise the question whether tradition has not been misled in this matter. It is entirely supposable that the books may originally have been called the Books of Moses because they brought up the history of the world to the time of Moses, and because he is the most prominent character in the books, without any intention of indicating thereby that he was their author; and that, in fact, they may have been written at some later period. If any one could maintain this hypothesis by arguments that did not impeach the truthfulness of the Scriptures, no believer in the doctrine of inspiration need find fault with him. As a matter of fact, however, the best known attempts to prove the late origin of the Pentateuch are made by men who disbelieve in the historicity of the records. It is this especially that gives importance to the matter; the question whether God's revelation to men has been made through the medium of actual history, rather than through the medium of a series of religious legends, is a question of no mean importance.

The critics who attack the received view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch start from such facts as the following: Evidently, the Book of Genesis gives us at least two accounts of the creation. Further, this book, and that of Exodus, give duplicate accounts of a good many of the events which they mention. Between these various pairs of accounts there are differences of vocabulary, of syntax, of mode of conception in regard to the facts narrated. Notably, for example, the first account in Genesis uniformly calls the Supreme Being *Elohim;* the second calls him *Jehovah Elohim*, with some variations. From this difference, the first account is called Elohistic, and the second Jehovistic, though some other differences between them are regarded as even more important than this. These differences seem to indicate that we have here what were originally separate pieces of composition, which have been united in the making of the records we now have.

To this extent, it seems to me that critics are evidently in the right. Large portions of the Old Testament have been composed, in part, from previously existing compositions. Those who defend the views commonly received make a mistake when they deny or ignore the marks which indicate that any particular passage is composite.

Formerly it was held that the Elohistic parts of Genesis and Exodus were earlier than the Jehovistic parts; at present the reverse is confidently affirmed. An average view of the matter is that Genesis and the first thirty-four chapters of Exodus were made by putting together sections of three different previous works, two of them Elohistic and one Jehovistic, each of which was substantially a history of the whole period. Each of these works, it is claimed, had been rewritten one or more times; the first two were combined by one editor, and this composite work afterward joined to the third by another editor, both editors mak ing changes and additions. The attempt to prove such a theory as this, from such phenomena as are found in these books, seems to me like the attempt to make two straight lines inclose a surface. To do this is very different from showing that our present books were partly drawn from previous written sources of some sort. But it is no easier to disprove some parts of these theories than to prove them; either for proof or for disproof, the evidence is, in the nature of things, indecisive.

Supposably, however, one might hold to this analysis of the two books without denying that they originated in the times of Moses, and under his influence

and without at all impeaching the divine character of the books. But men like Kuenen and Wellhausen do not hold to it in any such way. As an average view of the matter, they hold that the oldest of the three documents is mainly a collection of legends connected with the sanctuaries of northern Israel, with some other traditions, and including the civil code found in Exod. XXI.—XXIII.; and that this was written a generation or two before the times of Amos and Hosea. They hold that the second document was another similar collection, made in the times of those prophets, or a little later; this second document included the Ten Commandments. The third document, they say, was written in Babylonia, in Ezra's time, the whole being put together at some later date. It seems to me that these allegations are not merely unproved by the facts in the case, but disproved. Yet he who would be prepared to meet difficulties as they arise should have at least a general knowledge of the opinions of this sort that are more or less current.

JAN. 2, 1887. THE BEGINNING. Gen. I. 26–31 and II. 1–3.

The critics just mentioned regard Gen. I. and II. 1–3 as part of the later of the two Elohistic works just mentioned—the work written in Ezra's time. They admit that Ezra proclaimed this work as ancient; that its Hebrew differs from the known Hebrew of the times of Ezra; that the Books of Chronicles, and occasionally the Books of Kings, presuppose its existence far back in the history; that it is quoted or referred to in the Psalms ascribed to David, in the writings of the pre-exilic prophets, and in the earlier documents of the Hexateuch (notably, for example, in Exod. XX. 11), and a long list of other similar facts. They harmonize these facts with their opinion by the hypotheses that what Ezra proclaimed was a legal fiction; that for this reason it was written in archaic style; that the author of Chronicles was mistaken; that the Books of Kings, the prophetic writings, and the Ten Commandments have been subjected to interpolations; that the Davidic Psalms were written several centuries later than David; and the like. Surely one may be pardoned if he fails of being convinced by such reasoning.

Three or four words, or special uses of words, in this first account of the creation, call for attention. In the case of words that have so extensive a use as have *bara* and *raqi'a*, the meaning should be ascertained by the usage, and not by speculation or by etymological conjecture. *Bara* in the Qal and Niphal is uniformly used of divine origination, as distinguished from origination by second causes. In the lexicons a few exceptions are taken to this statement; but an examination of the passages will show that they are mistaken. The origination may sometimes be from pre-existing materials; the man and woman are both said to have been created (Gen. I. 27), though one was made from dust, and the other from the side of the man. The origination may be the product of a series of second causes, as undoubtedly was the case with the Ammonite, Ezek. XXI. 30 (35). But in such cases the origination is conceived of, not as wrought by second causes, but simply as a divine act. Probably this idea of a characteristic divine origination does not differ essentially from the scholastic idea of creation from nothing, when the latter is correctly defined; but perhaps theology would lose nothing if it should substitute the biblical form of the idea for the scholastic. In any case, nothing depends on the conjectural etymologies of *bara*, whether the root-idea be that of carving, as the lexicons make it, or be something different.

Raqi'a, the lexicons say, is derived from the idea of beating, and hence of expanding metals into thin plates by beating, and therefore denotes a sort of sheet-iron sky, or something of that kind. This is mostly an importation into Hebrew of the ideas of some other language. The *raqi'a*, as defined in Genesis I. 7, 8, is the whole open space bounded by the earth-surface below and the apparent sky-surface above; it is not the mere sky-surface itself, conceived of as solid. The expansion by beating which the lexicons connect with this root is purely conjectural; the words of this stem are applied to the earth as well as to the sky; the Hebrew poets think of the outspread sky-surface as textile, rather than as metallic, "as a tent to dwell in" for example. See Isa. XL. 22; XLII. 5; XLIV. 24, etc.

It is currently alleged that the Hebrew has no plural of majesty, and therefore that the use of the plural *Elohim* for God, and the use of the plural verb and pronouns "we will make man in our image," etc., in Gen. I. 26, are traces of polytheism in the religion of Israel. To these instances should be added that of the plural *Adhonay*, the usual substitute for the name Jehovah. These same facts are used by an entirely different class of persons as legitimate proofs of the doctrine of the trinity. The fact that *Elohim* usually and *Adhonay* always have their verbs and adjectives in the singular is discouraging to those who seek here a polytheistic meaning, and rather encouraging to those who seek the doctrine of one God in three persons. But as a matter of fact, the nouns *adhon* and *ba'al* are currently used in Hebrew in the plural, when they denote only one person, in the case of human masters as well as in the case of divine names. In 2 Chron. XXV. 16, we are told that Amaziah said to the prophet, "Have we given thee for counselor to the king? For thy part, desist; why should they smite thee?" Here the king speaks of himself as "we." In view of the existence of these instances, there is a good deal of risk in regarding *Elohim* and *Adhonay* as any thing more than plurals of excellence. And doubtless every one will reach the same conclusion in regard to the plurals in Gen. I. 26 that he reaches in regard to these proper names.

This first account of the Creation consists of a few selected facts concerning the divine origination of the universe, in the mnemonic form of a sketch of a week's work of God, written mainly for the purpose of impressing two great religious truths, namely, the supremacy of the divine creator, and the sanctity of the Sabbath. The selection of the facts, the classification of them, and the order of statement are those required by the mnemonic form and the religious purpose of the account. That it is a statement of facts and not a myth is evident, even if there were no other proof, from the many agreements between the account and the best authenticated results reached by science. But as this author has not undertaken to state all the facts in the case, nor to state them in scientific order, or with scientific classification, he cannot, for any failures of this kind, be charged with contradicting science. The six days belong to the mnemonic form of the narrative, and do not necessarily give us any information as to the time actually employed in the several creative processes described. From what we know of the facts in the case, we know that the order of the days is essentially that in which the successive processes occurred, though, in some instances, one of the processes described as a creative day must have overlapped one or more of the others. In fine, a man who believes this account to be inspired should feel himself to be beyond the necessity of asking how it may be reconciled with science,

and should rather be asking science to help him fill up the outlines of the sketch, and thus interpret it.

Among the commentaries on Genesis and Exodus with which I happen to be familiar, the *Pulpit Commentary* is the best, on the whole, for average American Sunday-school teachers. In the Introductions to this work, and in other parts of it, may be found pretty good popular accounts, written from an orthodox point of view, of the various critical controversies. A more full and complete account of the history and literature of these controversies is to be found in the article of Dr. Charles A. Briggs in the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1883, and in the series of articles that preceded and followed it. The best presentation, in English, of the views of the dominant school of destructive criticism is probably the translation of Kuenen's *Hexateuch*, published in 1886. The Old Testament articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* are of the same school. On the other side, Dr. E. C. Bissell's *Pentateuch* is perhaps the most complete refutation that has been published in English. The little book of Dr. Rufus P. Stebbins is more readable than most such books. Works of value on the Pentateuch have been published by Dr. Wm. H. Green and Dr. Charles Elliott. There is a full treatment of the subject in Dr. Henry M. Harman's *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*. Add to these, review articles and articles in commentaries and books of reference, almost without number. The literature of the subject is pretty exhaustively treated in the article of Dr. Briggs, mentioned above, and the book of Dr. Bissell has a very full literary list.

The best work I have met on the biblical account of the creation is *The Week of Creation*, by George Warington, published in London by Macmillan & Co., in 1870. Principal Dawson's *Origin of the World* combines the geological record with the biblical. Dr. S. M. Campbell's *Story of Creation* is good. On this subject, I know of few passages better worth reading than the fourth chapter of Dr. Newman Smyth's *Old Faiths in New Lights*, especially pages 142–153. Other works on the subject are numerous, and some of them able.

BOOK-STUDY: GENESIS (PART I.).

By the Editor.

I. GENERAL REMARKS.

1. "Genesis" has been chosen for our next "Book-Study," because it is soon to form the basis of work in the International Sunday-school Lessons; and also, because repeated requests have been received from Bible-students that this book be taken up in this manner.

2. No book in the canon makes such demands of the interpreter as does the Book of Genesis. The subjects of which it treats cover the whole domain of knowledge. Of every department of learning, the "beginnings" are contained in this book. No book, therefore, is more deserving of thorough study; and certainly, if nothing more can be done, its contents may be learned.

3. Our aim in this work is a definite one: viz., to lead the student to investigate for himself some of the problems here presented. We cannot take up every thing that belongs legitimately to the book. We may, however, suggest an outline the carrying out of which will lead to some practical results.

4. For use in this work the following books are recommended:—

a. *Dod's* Book of Genesis, with Introduction and Notes;* brief and to the point, giving the results of the latest investigation, accepting the composite authorship of the book.

b. Pulpit Commentary: Genesis.† Expositions and Homiletics by Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M. A.; presenting clearly the most important views with the arguments pro and con.

c. *Geikie's* Hours with the Bible, vol. I.‡

d. *Lenormant's* The Beginnings of History, according to the Bible and the Traditions of Oriental Peoples.§ This is fresh and interesting, but not always trustworthy.

e. The articles on the various topics in *Smith's* Bible Dictionary.‖

f. Much help can also be obtained from such standard works as *Lange's* Genesis,§ *Kalisch's* Genesis,¶ *Kurtz*, History of the Old Covenant.§

5. References are given only to those books which are supposed to be in the hands of nearly every Bible-student. The articles and passages referred to themselves contain other references which those who so desire may study.

6. The book will be treated in two "Studies," the first covering Genesis I.–XI., the second Genesis XII.–L.

7. The General Remarks of previous "Studies" are applicable, as well, to this "Study."

II. DIRECTIONS.

1. Master the *contents* of Genesis I.–XI., according to the following plan:—

a. *Read carefully* each chapter, noting its main thought, and its connection with the preceding and following chapters.

b. *Write out* on a slip of paper the topic, or topics, of which each chapter treats; study these topics, until each at once suggests to the mind the details included under it, and until the *number* of the chapter suggests both the topic and the details.

c. *Analyze*** this division: Select say five or six important topics, under which and in connection with which you can arrange all the material.

d. *Index* this division: Make a list of important persons, places, events or objects; e. g., Adam, Cain, Noah, Terah, Eden, Creation, Deluge; and connect with each name, in the order narrated, the statements relating to it.

e. *Read again* the chapters of the division, (1) correcting and verifying the work done thus far; (2) seeking, especially, to fasten in mind the logical connection of the various chapters.

2. Study the *chronology* of Genesis I.–XI.:

a. Get clearly fixed in mind the so-called accepted chronology as commonly given; this will serve as a starting-point.

---

* In Series of Hand-Books for Bible-Classes. *T. & T. Clark*, Edinburgh.

† *A. D. F. Randolph & Son*, New York.

‡ *James Pott & Co.*, New York.

§ *Chas. Scribner's Sons*, New York.

‖ *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, Boston.

¶ This may be picked up in second-hand book-stores; or it may be imported.

** Pay no attention to the analyses given in commentaries; make your own. Avoid particularly those analyses which are made upon the basis of the introductory formula "These are the generations," etc.

b. Compare the varying chronologies* given by the Hebrew text, the Septuagint version, the Samaritan Pentateuch and Josephus, and explain, if possible, these variations.

3. Consider some of the more important *general topics* brought up in this division:†

a. *The relation of the account of creation, given in the opening chapters, to the account given by science:*‡ (1) What was the object of the writer of Gen. I., what was he trying to show? (2) In what respects does the order of creation here given differ from that taught by science? (3) Is there anything to favor the view that the author was really regardless of scientific accuracy? (4) Is there anything to favor the view that this first chapter is a *poem*, and to be interpreted as *poetry*? § (5) What light is thrown on the question by other cosmogonies? ‖ (6) What, in particular, is the connection of the Babylonian account of creation? (7) Did the people for whom the account was first written, understand the "day" to be one of twenty-four hours? (8) What is the view prevailing among Christian scientists? ¶

b. *The two accounts of Creation:* (1) What is the fact concerning the use of the divine names in the first and second chapters?** (2) Concerning the differences of style and language between I.–II. 4 and II. 5–25? (3) Concerning the alleged discrepancies between the two accounts? (4) The explanation of these facts, so far as they exist, on the supposition that there is but *one* account? (5) The view which makes *two* accounts? ††

c. *The Garden of Eden:*‡‡ (1) The biblical statements? (2) The various problems? (3) The allegorical interpretation? (4) The mythical interpretation? (5) The historical interpretation? (6) The more important of the theories which have been held? (7) The view of Friedrich Delitzsch?

---

* See Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Chronology;* and various commentaries on ch. v.

† The first eleven chapters of Genesis cover more ground, and present more difficult questions than all that remains of the entire Old Testament. For the *satisfactory* study of the great problems here presented omniscience would be required. It is nevertheless our duty to study them and to find, so far as it is possible to find, a solution of these difficulties. Much will remain doubtful; much, nevertheless, may be ascertained. Only directions of the most general character can here be given.

‡ See *Dod*, Genesis. Introduction, pp. xiv-xxii; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, vol. I., ch. IV.

§ See OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. III., No. 8.

‖ See *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, vol. I., ch. III.; *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. I.

¶ These are a few of the questions for which the general student should seek an answer. Scores of books, most of them worthless, have been written on this subject. A most satisfactory statement will be found in *Guyot's* Creation, or the Biblical Cosmogony in the light of Modern Science. *Chas. Scribner's Sons*, New York. See also what Prof. Beecher says on p. 113 of this number.

** The question of the composite authorship of Genesis, or any other book, is one chiefly of *fact*. Assertions are made as to the existence of certain facts. Now the thing to do is not to argue that these facts cannot, for certain reasons, be supposed to exist; but to show that they *actually do not exist*. On the supposition, however, that the facts do exist, the inferences which destructive critics draw from them may be rejected. We may, each one, interpret the facts according to our own ideas. But why should we discuss the interpretation of them, before we have examined into the case and made up our minds as to their existence or non-existence?

†† See Prof. Schodde's article in this number; as well as the commentaries *in loco*.

‡‡ See *Delitzsch*, Wo lag das Paradies; also the article by Prof. Francis Brown in OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. IV., No. 1; Brit. Encyc., article on *Adam;* Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Eden;* *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, vol. I., ch. VIII.; Commentaries on Gen. ii.

*d. The first sin:** (1) The biblical statement? (2) The allegorical, mythical and historical interpretations? (3) The view which makes it a "combination of history and sacred symbolism, a figurative presentation of an actual event"? (4) The serpent, a symbol of sin? (5) The various traditions of this "sin" handed down among other nations? (6) The relative value of these traditions, as compared with the biblical account? (7) The origin of these traditions and the bearing of this on the biblical account?

e. The Cherubim and the flaming sword:† (1) The biblical passages in which reference is made to cherubim? (2) The form which the biblical writers supposed them to have? (3) The cherub (kirubu) among the Assyrians? (4) Parallels in other mythologies? (5) What did the cherubim symbolize? (6) The flaming sword?

f. Cain and his family:‡ (1) The significance of the story of Abel's murder? (2) Similar stories among ancient nations? (3) The punishment of Cain? (4) The names of Cain's descendants compared with those of Seth? (5) Lamech's family? (6) This account of the origin of arts as compared with that of other ancient nations? (7) The interpretation of Lamech's song? (8) The two important items contained in verses 25, 26 (ch. IV.)?

g. The Descendants of Adam through Seth:§ (1) Make out a tabular list of the names; (2) write in parallel columns the descendants of Adam through Cain, placing Cain opposite Cainan; (3) note the similarities in the names, the differences, also the differences in the meaning of the names, the interchange of Enoch, that in both cases the last name branches into three (Jabal, Jubal, Tubal, and Shem, Ham, Japheth), the part played by the numbers three, seven, ten; (4) compare the parallel usage of ancient nations in speaking of ten primitive kings, heroes, or demi-gods; (5) explanations offered for these facts; (6) variations between the ancient versions in the numbers of this chapter; (7) the purpose of these genealogies; (8) the general impression they convey.

h. The longevity of the antediluvians:‖ (1) Traditions among ancient nations in reference to longevity? (2) The opinions of scientists as to the probability or possibility of this? (3) Various interpretations to evade the difficulty? (4) Considerations to be urged in favor of accepting the statements as literally true?

i. The Sons of God and the daughters of men:¶ (1) Various interpretations of these terms? (2) Arguments for and against the view that intercourse of "angels" and women is referred to? (3) Arguments for and against the view that "sons of God"=the Sethites, the pious race? (4) Parallels in ancient mythologies? (5) Giants in Scripture? (6) The meaning of the

---

* See, besides previous references, *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. II.; Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Serpent;* Commentaries *in loco.*

† *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. III.; Encyc. Brit.; Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Cherubim;* Commentaries *in loco.*

‡ Commentaries *in loco;* *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. IV.; Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Cain* and *Abel.*

§ Commentaries *in loco;* *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. V.; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, vol. I., ch. XII.

‖ Pulpit Commentary, on Gen. v. 5; *Lange's* Genesis; *Kalisch's* Genesis, pp. 158–161; Smith's Bible Dictionary, under *Patriarch;* *Kurtz*, Hist. of O. C., Vol. I., pp. 93, 94.

¶ Commentaries *in loco;* Smith's Bible Dictionary, under *Noah*, pp. 2175–2177; *Kurtz*, Hist. of O. C. Vol. I., pp. 96–109. *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. VII.

expression "My spirit shall not strive with man forever"? (7) Meaning of "their days shall be a hundred and twenty years"? (8) The "repenting" of God? (9) The destruction of animals with man? (10) The view that would make this entire narrative a myth?

j. *The Deluge:** (1) The ark (a) the word, (b) material, (c) plan, (d) size, (e) shape, (f) purpose of construction, (g) the possibility of its containing all that was intended to go in it? (2) The universality of the deluge, (a) authorities for and against, (b) arguments for and against? (3) Duration of the Deluge? (4) The exact meaning of the language employed in the description? (5) Allusions to the Deluge in later biblical literature? (6) The Babylonian account of the Deluge? (7) Traditions among other nations? (8) The events immediately following the flood? (9) The precise object of the flood?

k. *Noah's Curse:*† (1) The immediate occasion of the utterance of these words? (2) Is it a prayer or a prophecy? (3) The words concerning Canaan? (4) Why was Canaan cursed instead of Ham? (5) The words concerning Shem? (6) Concerning Japheth? (7) The various interpretations of the line "and let him dwell in the tents of Shem"? (8) The Messianic element in this passage? (9) Its fulfillment?

l. *The Table of Nations:*‡ (1) For what reason is this list of nations of special value? (2) Are the names given those of individuals or of nations? (3) Are the nations presented according to their racial affinities, or according to the geographical location of their territories? (4) The identification, as far as it is possible, of those mentioned as "sons of Japheth"? (5) Of the "sons of Ham"? (6) What is to be understood from the narrative concerning "Nimrod"? (7) Identification of the "sons of Mizraim"? (8) Of the "sons of Canaan"? (9) Of the "sons of Shem"? (10) Of the "sons of Joktan"? (11) Make out a map showing the facts of this table. (12) What were the occasions, the manners and the order of the great human migrations? (13) What are the scientific tests of racial affinity?

m. *The tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues:*§ (1) Identification of this tower with the temple of Birs-Nimroud at Borsippa? (2) The rebuilding of this temple by Nebuchadnezzar? (3) The relation between the narrative of the "confusion of tongues" and the "table of nations"? (4) Origin of differences of language according to philology? (5) To what extent does philology favor the view that one language was once spoken by all men? (6) Does this narrative teach that the differences existing between languages are due to a miraculous interposition on the part of Jehovah? (7) What was the sin of the tower-builders? (8) What traditions concerning the confusion of tongues exist among other ancient nations? (9) Advantages and disadvantages attending the existing variety of languages? (10) The im-

---

* Commentaries *in loco;* Smith's Bible Dictionary, under *Noah*, pp. 2177-2187; *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. VIII., with appendix V.; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible I., chaps. XIII., XIV.; Encyc. Brit., article *Deluge*, by T. K. Cheyne.

† Commentaries *in loco.*

‡ Commentaries on Gen. X.; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, I., chaps. XV., XVI.; Smith's Bible Dictionary on the various names which occur; and on *Shemitic Languages: G. Rawlinson*, Origin of Nations (Chas. Scribner's Sons).

§ Commentaries *in loco;* Smith's Bible Dictionary, under *Tongues, Confusion of*, and *Tower of Babel; Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, I., chap. XVII.; *Kurtz*, Hist. of O. C. Vol. I., pp. 108-122.

portance of this event in the history of the divine plan of redemption?

n. *The descendants of Shem:** (1) The numbers three and ten? (2) The variations between the figures of the Hebrew text and those of the Septuagint? (3) The family of Terah? (4) Ur of the Chaldees? (5) The reasons for Abram's migrations?

o. *The double account of the deluge:*† (1) Study comparatively the following arrangement of the chapters and verses describing the deluge, and, if possible, the accompanying references to the cuneiform tablets containing the Babylonian account:

Ch. VI. 11, 12	VI. 5-8	I. 11-16
13, 14	VII. 1	17-23
15, 16	——	24-27
——	——	28-35
17, 18	4	36-38
19-21	2, 3	39-44
——	——	45-52
22	5	II. 2-24
VII. 6; 11-16	7-9	25-34
——	16b	35-39
18-20	10; 12, 17	40-50
21, 22	23	III. 1- 4
——	——	5-18
24	——	19, 20
VIII. 1; 2a; 3b	VIII. 2b; 3a	21-23
——	——	24-31
4	——	32-36
5; 13a, 14	6-12	37-44
15-17	——	——
18, 19	13b	45a
——	20	45b-50
IX. 1-11	——	——
12-16	——	51, 52
17	——	——
——	——	53
——	——	IV. 1-11
——	21, 22	12-20
——	——	21, 22
——	——	23-30

(2) Note any differences which may seem to exist between the two biblical accounts in reference to (*a*) the use of the divine names; (*β*) the beasts which Noah is commanded to take with him into the ark; (*γ*) the time during which the waters prevailed.

(3) Note the details omitted in each of the biblical accounts, and supplied by the other, as well as the additional details in the Babylonian account.

(4) Is there any perceptible difference in the style and language of the two biblical accounts?

(5) What evidence does the Babylonian account furnish for or against the existence of a double biblical account?

(6) What explanation of these apparent repetitions, and differences and discrepancies, may be offered which will render the hypothesis of a double account unnecessary?‡

Remark.—Other important topics must be omitted for lack of space. The second division of Genesis will be taken up in the next number of THE STUDENT.

---

* Commentaries *in loco.*

† This arrangement is taken from *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, chap. VIII. In this book, pp. 1-45, will be found Gen. i.-xi. translated, and printed in such a manner as to show the alleged different accounts. Foot-notes also are given indicating the difficult points in the analysis. The Babylonian account is given in full in Appendix V. The latter will also be found in *George Smith's* Chaldæan account of Genesis, chap. XVI. (Chas. Scribner's Sons).

‡ This topic has been given because the writer is firmly of the opinion that it is the duty of the Bible-student to acquaint himself with the *facts in the case.* The question for each one to settle is: Do these alleged facts exist? And it can only be settled by a personal investigation.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

In the November "Notes and Notices," the name of the Instructor in Hebrew in Cambridge (Mass.) Episcopal Divinity School was given as M. Lindsay Kellum. It should have been M. Lindsay Kellner.

At the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, the faculty has been requested by quite a large number of students to make provision for instruction in Hebrew. It is difficult to see how this request can reasonably be refused. This great University of the West furnishes instruction in almost every subject which may be mentioned. Why should Hebrew be omitted? This question is especially pertinent, in view of the demand which has been made by her students, and in view of the fact that other institutions, East and West, are establishing Semitic chairs.

The Young Men's Hebrew Association, of Philadelphia, offers a prize of fifty dollars for the best essay on the following topic: "The principles of Ethics in the sayings in the Book of Proverbs, with an inquiry into the social conditions which they reflect." The choice of the subject appears to be a particularly happy one; and it is only to be hoped that the rather formidable title will deter no one from competing. Of course, the more knowledge the better; but the subject is by no means one that requires special erudition to be well handled. The Association, we understand, does not expect learned treatises (though, of course, it will be happy to receive such); but a popular treatment of the subject. A careful study of the Proverbs themselves, with the aid of the most important works bearing on the subject, is all the preparation a person of intelligence and good education requires in order to write something which, even if it does not gain the prize, will reflect credit upon the writer.

Notice has already been given of the special course in Assyriology, to be given at Baltimore, during January, by Professor Paul Haupt, Ph. D. The regular Semitic courses will be interrupted for this period, and all the time devoted to Assyriology. Professor Haupt will teach daily from 3 to 4 o'clock P. M., giving a series of introductory lectures on Assyrian Grammar and interpreting selected cuneiform texts, principally those bearing upon the Old Testament. Besides the classes of Professor Haupt, individual instruction will be given three or four hours daily by the Fellows of Semitic Languages. Students are recommended to familiarize themselves with the elements of the cuneiform syllabary. No tuition-fee will be charged. Professors and students of other institutions, as well as clergymen, are invited to attend. Accommodations may be secured for five or six dollars a week. Surely this is an opportunity of which everyone for whom it is possible should avail himself.

The *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* is at hand. To the Secretary, Professor H. G. Mitchell, of Boston University, much credit is due for the neat and accurate form in which it is published. Old Testament students will be interested in the papers on "Worship of the Tabernacle compared with that of the Second Temple," by Dr. S. J. Andrews; on "Rain-fall in Palestine,"

by Dr. E. W. Rice; on "The Asaph-Psalms," by Dr. C. H. Toy, and on "Jacob's Blessing," by Dr. Jno. P. Peters. One of the most valuable items in the *Journal*, is the note of Dr. E. C. Bissell, on the passage Zech. VI. 1–7. The work of the Society grows with each year. Its winter meeting is held in New York City, during the holidays.

During the month of January, 1887, the work of the students in the Baptist Union Theological Seminary, of Morgan Park, Ill., will be almost exclusively in the line of the Old Testament. Five Courses of lectures will be delivered by Professor Harper. *One*, on Hebrew Syntax, in which selected texts will be studied with reference to the syntactical principles which they illustrate; a *second*, on Isaiah XL.–LXVI., in which, besides the translation of the Hebrew text, there will be taken up the interpretation of the most important passages, and the study of the division as a whole, in the manner outlined by Professor Ballantine in the October STUDENT; a *third*, on Messianic Prophecies and Prophecy; a *fourth*, on the Post-Exilic Prophets; and a *fifth*, on the Books of Genesis, Exodus and Deuteronomy, in which these books will be studied as distinct books. Each Course will include twenty lectures.

The quickened interest in Old Testament study is particularly noticeable in certain Southern States and in Canada. There are data for the statement that the renewal of interest in Old Testament work among the ministers of these sections is becoming quite general. It is sincerely to be hoped that this growing interest may continue, until the last shelf-deposited, dust-covered, neglected Hebrew Bible shall have been put into vigorous use.

In the great International Oriental Congress held recently, in Vienna, Austria, the various departments met in separate sections.

"In the Semitic section there were only three papers that had special interest for students of the Bible. The Rev. C. J. Ball, of London, read a paper upon 'Hebrew Poetry,' advocating a theory which is essentially the same as that of Professor Bickell—namely, that lines of Hebrew poetry are measured by definite numbers of syllables. He was stoutly supported by Professor Bickell, but found no other support. What direction the discussion might have taken was difficult to determine. It was strangely interrupted by one of the Vienna Orientalists, who interjected remarks upon the Hebrew tenses which had nothing whatever to do with the subject. He was allowed to complete his talk, and the discussion came to an end. The Semitic section was also favored with the presence of a Hungarian crank, who had a word to say upon every subject, but the president was able to keep him in order. The most interesting item in the Semitic section was a statement of Dr. Ginsburg that he had discovered a fragment of the Jerusalem Targum on Isaiah. He presented the Congress with specimens of it, and excited great attention. It seems that this Targum on the Prophets was known in the Middle Ages, but it was lost sight of, and then its existence was doubted. The discovery of this Targum makes its existence a certainty. Dr. Ginsburg found it among some loose leaves that he himself discovered in an ancient tomb.

"The Rev. W. H. Heckler, Chaplain of the Church of England in Vienna, presented a chart giving a comparative chronological table of the biblical, Assyrian and Babylonian history, and exhibited some bricks that had been recently

brought from Babylonia. He wishes to make the recent discoveries useful to ordinary students of the Bible."—*Correspondent of the Independent.*

Under the title of the *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, a monthly journal devoted to Assyriology and cognate studies has been started. It is issued under the direction of an editorial committee comprising Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie, Mr. W. C. Capper, and Mr. T. G. Pinches, of the British Museum; and the collaboration of the following scholars has been secured: Prof. A. H. Sayce, the Rev. H. G. Tomkins, M. G. Bertin, Profs. Fritz Hommel, C. de Harlez, Carl Bezold, Pleyte, M. E. Naville, and Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie. A special feature of the *Record* will be the publication, with facsimiles, of inedited texts from the British Museum. The first number appeared November 1, and contained "Akkadian and Sumerian in Comparative Philology," by Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie; "The Plague Legends of Chaldea," with two plates; "Singašid's Gift to the Temple Ê-ana," by Mr. T. G. Pinches. 250 subscribers are required to ensure the continued issue of the *Record*; the support of all students of Assyriology and biblical archaeology is earnestly solicited.

Almost every day new light is being thrown upon the Bible by the investigations which are being conducted in the great fields of Assyrian and Egyptian research. One of the most noteworthy articles of modern times is that of M. Clermont Ganneau, of Paris, in the *Journal Asiatique* (July–August, 1886), on those mysterious words written upon the wall of Belshazzar's palace, *Mene*, *Mene*, *Tekel*, *Upharsin*. A translation of this article will appear in January *Hebraica*.

The University of Pennsylvania has taken another step forward in the encouragement of Semitic work by appointing Dr. Morris Jastrow, Jr., to the chair of Arabic and Assyrian. With Dr. Peters and Dr. Jastrow thus associated, the cause of Semitic study may be expected to prosper in Philadelphia.

It is interesting to note the fact that in the Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass., Prof. Brown has a class of three in Assyrian; and that Dr. Manly has a class of five in the same subject, in the Louisville Baptist Theological Seminary. With classes of like size at Harvard, Boston University, Union Seminary, Yale, and Johns Hopkins, America will soon be in a position to take her stand in this department side by side with England and Germany. The help afforded the Assyrian movement in this country by the publication of Prof. Lyons' *Manual* can hardly be estimated.

In New York City an Egyptologist died recently who has had a somewhat remarkable record. We refer to Dr. Gustav Seyffarth, who was over eighty years of age. He was a German by birth, and up to 1850 was extraordinary professor of Archæology in the University of Leipzig. His specialty was the study of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and to the end of his days he disputed with Champollion the honor of having discovered the true key to the sacred writings of the monuments of Egypt. In 1850 he came to America and for three years occupied a chair in the theological seminary of the Lutheran church in St. Louis. From 1853 he lived in New York City, devoted to the pursuit of his favorite branch of study. He was a prolific writer in German, English and Latin, and on many points was regarded as an authority.

BOOK NOTICES.

BRIGGS' MESSIANIC PROPHECY.*

The author of this volume is well known to the theological public. On at least two questions he has taken what may fairly be called an advanced position, and in this position he has given and received many blows. His revision of "criticism" and his criticism of the "revision" have made him prominent in the department of Old Testament study.

A third line of work is now presented. What are its characteristics? What are its excellencies? What are its defects?

Prophecy is taken in its wide sense as "religious instruction," Messianic Prophecy is taken in its wide sense as "the prediction of the completion of redemption through the Messiah." He does not limit himself, therefore, to those prophecies which refer to a personal Messiah. Hebrew prophecy has much in common with the prophecy of other nations, but, at the same time, has certain distinctive features which raise it far above all other prophecy. The operation of the Holy Spirit upon the prophet is to be explained by the similar operation of the Spirit in "giving the Christian assurance of salvation." The contents of the influence differ, and there may be a difference in extent and degree of this influence; but the operation is practically the same.

Prediction is sharply distinguished from prophecy. All prediction is prophecy; but much prophecy is not prediction. Prediction is "an extraordinary feature" of prophecy. It is "the smallest section of the range of prophetic instruction." It is not peculiar to Hebrew Prophecy, but is found in the prophecy of all nations. The importance of prediction lies in the fact that Messianic prophecy is prediction.

That theory of prophecy which seeks above all to find the literal fulfillment of individual prophecies, a fulfillment of the word and of the details, is believed to be false. "Prophecies are predictions only as to the essential and the ideal elements. The purely formal elements belong to the point of view and coloring of the individual prophets. We are not to find exact and literal fulfillment in detail or in general; but the fulfillment is limited, as the prediction is limited, to the essential ideal contents of the prophecy.... Looking forth into the future, prophetic prediction clothes and represents that which is to come in the scenery and language familiar to it in the present and in the past." There is a clearly marked development in the growth of prophecy, from lower forms to higher; from general prediction to specific. "Messianic prophecy is an advancing organism expressing in ever richer and fuller representations the ideal of complete redemption through the Messiah. History advances with prophecy toward the same goal, but prediction points the way." Hebrew prediction has no double sense, and indeed, no successive fulfillment. What interpreters commonly understand to be "successive fulfillment," is but the realization of some phases of the messianic ideal before the ideal itself is attained.

* MESSIANIC PROPHECY, the prediction of the fulfillment of redemption through the Messiah; a critical study of the Messianic passages of the Old Testament in the order of their development. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. 8vo, pp. xx, 579. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1886. Price, $2.50.

Partly in his language, and partly in our interpretation of his language, we have given the leading principles in accordance with which the subject is worked out. This presentation is necessarily brief and fragmentary.

Now, as to the application of these principles. In thirteen chapters there are discussed, 1) Primitive Messianic Ideas, 2) Messianic Prophecy in the Mosaic Age, 3) The Messianic Idea of the Davidic Period, 4) of the Earlier Prophets, 5) of Isaiah and his contemporaries, 6) of Jeremiah and his contemporaries, 7) of Ezekiel, 8) of the Exile, 9) The Prophecy of the Servant of Jehovah, 10) The Prophecy of the Restoration of Zion, 11) of Daniel, 12) The Messianic Idea of the Times of the Restoration, 13) The Messianic Ideal. Under these several heads are grouped the various individual prophecies. In this classification and presentation the author avails himself of the opportunity to carry out his ideas in reference to "criticism" and "revision." If the Messianic Idea is a development, it is necessary that each prophecy find its proper place in the series of prophecies. It is interesting to note the position assigned to Isa. XL.–LXVI., Zech. IX.–XIV., and other contested pieces. The author does not present the translation of the RV., but his own. And in this he has presented, more fully than ever before, his ideas concerning Hebrew poetry, which have not been generally accepted, and indeed cannot be until they are given in systematic form. Here, too, he has shown a peculiar fondness for reconstructing the text. The emendations proposed on nearly every page, are worthy of careful study; we feel, however, that the reading of the Septuagint has too often been accepted instead of that of the Hebrew, without sufficient reason.

To sum up, the characteristic features of this book are (1) the historical theory of prophecy upon which it is constructed; (2) the emphasis laid upon the subordinate importance of prediction, as related to prophecy in general; (3) the application of the idea of developmeut to the individual Messianic prophecies; (4) the application of the principles of higher criticism in locating the several prophecies; (5) the application of the principles of lower criticism in reconstructing the text; (6) the carrying out of the author's peculiar ideas as to Hebrew Poetry; (7) the boldness and vigor with which the whole work has been performed.

In conclusion, the spirit of the writer, while at times severe, is generally excellent. One cannot but feel that he is searching for the truth. The style, as an Englsh critic has put it, is, although ungraceful, very clear. There are passages in which it is truly eloquent. We believe the author to be, in the main, correct in regard to the principles of prophecy which he lays down. And that the adoption of these principles will bring us back to the Old Testament; for the fact is, Christian students have strayed away from the book. There are many interpretations, many details, some of them quite important, in which he seems to have gone far away from a correct view. Perhaps nothing is more unsatisfactory than his interpretation of the Immanuel prophecy. One cannot regard as satisfactory the treatment of Isaiah LIII. That he has been unduly influenced by those views in reference to which he had previously declared himself so positively, is apparent. It remains, however, to be said, that this work is the first critical treatment of the subject that has ever been written in English; it is the only presentation of the subject from the correct stand-point, worthy of notice; it is a volume for which Bible-students,—*those, at least, of them, who desire to know the truth*, will be profoundly grateful to the author.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

Daniel, an Exposition. By Very Rev. R. P. Smith. London. 8vo.....6s.

Abraham, his Life and Times. By Rev. W. J. Deane. London.....2s. 6d.

Graduated Lessons on the Pentateuch. By W. Taylor. London. 8vo.....3s.

Melanges de critique biblique: le Texte primitif du premier réeit de la création: le Deutéronom; le nom et le caractère du Dieu d'Israel Jahveh. Paris: Lib. Hachette et Cie. 1886. Pp. iii, 406. 8vo.

Die Qohelet-Literatur. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese des Alten Testaments. Mannheim, 1886.

Judenthum und Christenthum. By A. Hilgenfeld. Leipzig: Fues.....M.2.40

"How readest thou?" Luke x. 26, or, the first two chapters of Genesis considered in regard to the direct text. By E. Dingle. London: S. W. Partridge & Co. 1886. Pp. iv, 79.

Revision et reconstitution de la chronologie biblique et profane des premiers âges du monde d'apres les découvertes de la science moderne et la savant système de M. l'abbé Chevalier: epoque antediluvienne, étude historique etc. By V. Dumax. Paris: Lib. Haton. 1886. Pp. 234.

Ancient Cities. By Rev. Wm. Burnet Wright. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.....$1.25

The Messianic Prophecy. By Charles Augustus Briggs. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 8vo.....$2.50

Abraham: the Typical Life of Faith. By Rev. David R. Breed, D. D. Chicago: F. H. Revell. 12mo, pp. 160.....$1.00

Revision of the Old Testament. Opinions of eminent German Hebraists on the revision of the Massoretic Text. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 62.

Die Stellung der Sklaven bei den Juden in rechtlicher und gesellschaftlicher Beziehung. Nach talmudischen Quellen. Breslau: Preuss & Jünger. Pp. 66.....M.1.20

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel. Herausggeb. von Lic. Dr. C. H. Cornill. (T. K. Cheyne) in Academy, Oct. 9, '86.

L'etude de la religion egyptienne. Son état actuel et ses conditions. By E. Lefébure, in Revue de l'hist. des religions, juillet—août, '86.

La religion chaldeo-assyrienne. By E. de Pressensé, in Revue de l'hist. des religions, juillet—août, '86.

Die Anfaenge der juedischen Schriftgelehrsamkeit. Eine akademische Vorlesung. By V. Ryssel. Theologische Studien u. Kritiken, 1887, I.

Hittites and Amorites. By T. K. Cheyne. (A. Neubauer) in Academy, Oct. 30, '86.

Messianic Prophecy. By Prof. C. A. Briggs. (T. K. Cheyne) ib.

Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Elfte Lieferung. Die Genesis v." Dr. August Dillmann. Fünfte Aufl. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886. (Francis Brown) in Pres. Rev., Oct., '86.

The Jews in Rome, from Ancient Times to the Present. Their Exodus from the Ghetto. By Madame Sofia Bompiani in N.Y. Observer, Oct. 28, '86.

The Book of Zechariah. 7. National Revival. By Rev. Marcus Dods in Expositor, Nov., '86.

The Life and Works of Heinrich Ewald. 2. His Weakness and his Strength, as a Critic and as a Man. By Prof. T. K. Cheyne, ib.

St. Paul from a Jewish point of View. By Dr. S. M. Schiller-szinessy, ib.

The Amorites and the Teraphim. By A. H. Sayce in Academy, Nov. 6, '86.

Outlines of Jewish History, from B. C. 586 to C. E. 1885. By Lady Magnus. (P. A. Barnett), ib.

Moses und sein Volk. By Dr. H. Weiss. (Himpel) in Theol. Quartalschrift, III., '86.

Geschichte der juedischen Literatur. By Gustav Karpeles. Lief. 5. Saturday Review, Oct. 16, '86.

Twenty-one Years Work in the Holy Land. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. London: Richard Bentley & Son. Ib.

On the Asaph-Psalms. By Prof. C. H. Toy in Journ. of the Soc. of Bib. Lit. and Exegesis, June, '86.

The Worship of the Tabernacle, compared with that of the Second Temple. By Rev. S. J. Andrews, Ib.

Rainfall in Palestine. By Rev. E. W. Rice, ib.

On Zechariah VI. 1-7. By Prof. E. C. Bissell, ib.

The Divine Names in Job. By Prof. H. M. Harman, ib.

Jacob's Blessing. By Prof. J. P. Peters, ib.

The Ten Words. By Prof. J. P. Peters, Ib.

Archæological Notes. By Prof. J. P. Taylor in Andover Review, Nov., '86.

The Resurrection of Buried Languages. By Francis Brown in New Princeton Review, Nov., '86.

Cabbalah of the Old Testament. By J. R. Skinner in Path, Aug., '86.

Arts of the Hittites. Revue des deux Mondes, July 15, '86.

L'archeologie et prehistorique et l'antiquite de l'homme. By Hamard in La Controverse et le Contemporain, VII. août, '86.

Quelques eclaireissements sur la chronologie biblique. By J. Brueker, ib., VIII. sept., '86.

Die assyrische Chronologie. Exeurs zu Abschn. II. des Aufsatzes "Zur Assyriologie." By B. Trew in Mitthelign. u. Nachr. f. d. evang. Kirche in Russland. June, '86.

The Prophecy of Jacob. By Prof. M. S. Terry in Methodist Review, Nov., '86.

Hebrew at Oxford and Cambridge. Jewish World, Oct. 29, '86.

Ueber die Hypothese Steinthal's, dass Simson ein Sonnenheros war. By Flöckner in Theol. Quartalsch., '86, III.

The Rose of Sharon. By Prof. J. G. Lansing, D. D., in Christian at Work, Nov. 4, '86.

Biblical Research. By Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D., in Independent, Nov. 4, '86.

Recent American Literature on the Old Testament. Prof. S. Ives Curtiss in Expositor, Nov., '86.

Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament. By Wilhelm Vatke. Nach Vorlesungen hrsg. v. Dr. H. G. S. Preiss, in Athenæum, Oct. 9, '86.

Babylonian Antiquities in the British Museum. Episcopal Recorder, Oct. 28, '86.