

◀THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.▶

VOL. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1883.

No. 1.

TRACES OF THE VERNACULAR TONGUE IN THE GOSPELS.

BY PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH,
Leipzig, Germany.

III.*

In the language of the Mishna the baker is called **נַחְתָּם**; in Targumic and Syriac with the postpositive article, **נַחְתּוּמָא**, **נַחְתּוּמָא**. Prof. J. Levy in both his Dictionaries derives this word from the Aramaic verb **נַחַת** *to descend*, Aphel **אַחַת**, *to bring down*, which in one passage of the Pesikta occurs of the baker who brings down the bread baked from the oven.

But this derivation is very unlikely. This Aphel **אַחַת** can be said of every one bringing down something; it denotes nothing in any way characteristic of the baker. And indeed it is possible that **נַחְתּוּמָא** is formed from **נַחַת** with postfixed *om* like **פְּרִים** *λεῖτρον*; but with the same right the final letter can be considered as a radical. The form can be the same as **נִפְתּוּלִי** *struggles*, Gen. xxx., 8, and **נַחְשׁוּל** *tempest*, a frequent word in the literature of the Talmudic age.

The name of the baker **נַחְתּוּמָא** was so common in Palestine that in the Palestinian Talmud *Baba bathra* II., 3 a noun **נַחְתּוּמָר** is formed, which signifies a baker's shop. The termination might seem to be Persian, but I am persuaded that it is Roman as *armamentarium*, *colymbarium*, and such like. Just as instead of *colymbarium* also a shorter form *columbar* was in use, *uachthouar* instead of *nachthomarium* (a mixed word, half Hebrew, half Latin) the work-shop or sale-shop of a baker.

Now I direct the attention of the reader to a remarkable passage of St. John's Gospel, VI., 27: Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endures unto everlasting life, which the Son

* Number I. of this series appeared in Vol. II., No. 3; Number II. in Vol. II., No. 4.

livelihood by discharging prophetic functions. To this Amos answered, "I was no prophet neither was I a prophet's son, but I was a herdsman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: and the Lord took me from behind the flock and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophecy to my people Israel." Obviously there is here no reference to the degree or the kind of the prophet's culture. The point of the statement is that Amos was neither by profession nor by descent a prophet, but a man of secular pursuits from which he was diverted only by the immediate call of Jehovah. He was therefore in no sense dependent upon the prophetic office for his support, and the suggestion of Amaziah had no bearing in his case. This is all that is meant by Amos's mention of his original occupation. And that that occupation did not interfere with a certain intellectual culture is shown by the parallel case of David. He was taken from following the flocks of his father when called to the service of Saul, nor are we told of any educational opportunities which he enjoyed. Yet he became the sweet singer of Israel and in early life put together such immortal poems as "O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name etc.," "The LORD is my shepherd etc." What David's literary advantages may have been it is not easy to say, but one may fairly infer that the same, whatever they were, were open to the herdsman of Tekoah, who therefore could not have been an uneducated man.

And this view is confirmed by the entire character of his utterances. None of them indicate the crudeness or infelicity of an unlettered man. On the contrary there is much which shows that the author was concerned not only about his thought, but about the precise and forcible expression of it. A signal instance is found in the opening chapters which display a rhetoric as careful and finished as is to be found anywhere else in the Old Testament. First, the prophet announces the source and the object of his inspiration, the former coming from the seat of the Theocracy, Jerusalem, and the latter being the Northern kingdom, represented by its bold headland, Carmel. Jehovah has a message of wrath against Israel. But mark the deliberate way in which this utterance is approached. At first view, Amos seems to go far away from his aim; but it is only in appearance. He takes up in turn seven of the surrounding peoples, Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab and Judah, and in a series of predictions, all constructed after the same pattern, sets forth their sins and their doom. Each has been guilty of three transgressions and of four, i. e., an indefinite number, and in the case of each fire is to fall upon its wall and devour its palaces. But this is only to introduce the case of Israel. In nature we see the lightning's flash and then hear the roar in the skies, but

here we have the reverberation of the thunder before the bolt falls. It tells us that sin is everywhere the object of God's wrath, but especially when it is found among his own people. And the solemn rhythmical prelude respecting the judgment upon the heathen and Judah gives a fearful impressiveness to the lengthened denunciation against Israel. It was not an unskilled writer that conceived this highly wrought picture.

So the three successive chapters that follow this weighty introduction, each beginning with a "Hear this word," are careful enlargements of a single portion of the one great theme, and show the hand of a man who knew just what he wanted to say and chose the most fitting form to say it. See, for example, the succession of striking metaphors in chap. iii. by which the authority of the prophet is exhibited; and the list of divine judgments in chap. iv., each one in turn followed by the solemn refrain, "Yet ye have not returned unto me, said the Lord," and the whole wound up with the lofty description of Jehovah, God of hosts, as he that formeth the mountains and createth the wind and declareth unto man what is his thought. Surely if untaught herdsmen of Judah could talk and write after this fashion, they were different from all other herdsmen of whom we have knowledge.

The same features appear in the series of brief symbolic visions mentioned in the last three chapters. First, is the representation of Israel's overthrow under the form of an invasion of grasshoppers cutting off the entire second crop of the grass and therefore leaving no hope of revival, but at the prophet's intercession the destruction is averted. Secondly, devouring fire seizes all the sea and a part of the land, but once more Amos intercedes and the decree is revoked. Thirdly, Jehovah is seen standing upon a wall with a plumb-line in his hand, not however to complete the building but to see that it is systematically and thoroughly destroyed. The intercession is not repeated, but the priest of Bethel seeks to frighten the prophet away. The only result of this interposition is a denunciation of the priest's own doom, and a new symbol of the people's ruin, viz., a basket of summer fruit, the Hebrew word for which has also the sense of *end*, and the obvious meaning of the vision is that there is an end once for all to Israel. The sun is to go down at noon, feasts are turned into mourning and songs into lamentations, and the worshippers of idols shall fall never again to rise. To complete the picture of this final remediless overthrow, a concluding vision is set forth in the opening of the ninth chapter. The prophet sees the Lord standing upon the altar, not to welcome the worshippers, but here in the holy place itself to give the signal of destruction and send the whole edifice crashing upon the heads of the

people. So complete is the ruin that none escape. Neither heaven above nor Sheol beneath, neither the top of Carmel nor the bottom of the sea, shall prove a refuge for the fugitive. The land itself is submerged like Egypt, and Israel perishes just as if they were uncircumcised heathen.

But the prophecy closes with a bright vision of hope. A day will come when the fallen tabernacle shall be restored and all its breaches repaired. The blessing shall take in not only the covenant people, but all the heathen upon whom God's name is called. The kingdom which is to fall to pieces like a dismantled hut, will be re-established as in the splendid days of David's reign, but will far surpass even his extended boundaries since it will take possession of all the nations. Then all nature shall smile. The plowing lasts unto the harvest and the vintage to the sowing time. The mountains drop new wine and the hills melt into streams of milk. And upon the whole is placed the stamp of perpetuity: "they shall no more be plucked up out of their land which I have given them."

It is undoubtedly true that Amos's language and imagery indicate a country life on his part but not in the sense of rudeness for, as Ewald justly says, his rustic images are stamped with originality and vividness. The country seat and the vineyard, the cart full of sheaves, the plowing among rocks, the devastation of the locust, the sadness of a drought, were suggestions from his own personal observation. The same may be said of his references to wild animals, the roar of the lion, the rescue of a mere fragment of his victims, the biting of a serpent, the snaring of birds and the encounter of a bear, all reminiscences of what he had seen or felt. Still more evident is this in his descriptions of the mighty workings of God. Here he dwells by preference upon celestial phenomena, since the contemplation of the starry heavens belongs characteristically to a shepherd living in the open air. Jehovah represents himself to him as the former of the mountains and the creator of the wind, the maker of the Seven Stars and Orion, the Being who turns the shadow of death into morning, or on the other hand causes the sun to go down at noon and darkens the earth in clear day. Every where nature appears as the creature of God, absolutely subject to his will, and subservient to his purposes. If the Ephraimites explained their worship of the golden calf as terminating not in the mere image but in the reproductive power of nature as thus symbolized, he exalted the Jehovah as the God of hosts, who controls heaven above and Sheol beneath as well as all that lies between them, who touches the earth and it melts, who gives or withholds the rain, who sends and recalls the destructive flood, and who

therefore admits of no rivalry either with graven images or that which they symbolize. If Amos therefore moved only in the simple circle of country life, he did it to purpose, and made most effective use of all natural phenomena, common or uncommon, small or great.

In conclusion, Dr. Pusey justly suggests the wondrous rigor of the sudden summons (iv., 12): "Because I will do *this* unto thee [the silence as to what *this* is, is more thrilling than words], prepare to meet thy God, O Israel!" Or the extreme pathos with which the picture of the luxurious rich is closed (vi., 6) when having said how they heaped luxuries one upon another, he ends with what they did *not* do: "they are not grieved for the afflictions of Joseph."

THE BATTLE ADDRESS OF ABIJAH.

2 Chronicles XIII., 4—12.

BY REV. JAMES L. BIGGER, M. A., B. D.,

Lisburn, Ireland.

Is this speech of Abijah an historical fiction? Are the references to Levitical ordinances as gross anachronisms as Shakspeare's "shipman's card" or "cannon" in the time of Macbeth? Is it as impossible that the Jewish king could have spoken as is represented, as it is that the words of the play could have been uttered in the days of the Scottish monarch?

These questions are suggested by the following note in Dr. Robertson Smith's "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," p. 421. "The speeches in Chronicles are not literal reports. They are freely composed without strict reference to the exact historical situation" . . . "Thus in Abijah's speech on the field of battle (2 Chron. XIII., 4 sq.) the king is made to say that Jeroboam's [rebellion took place when Rehoboam was a mere lad and tender-hearted, and had not courage to withstand the rebels. The mere lad (נער) according to 1 Kings XIV., 21 was forty-one years old. Abijah then proceeds to boast of the regular temple service conducted according to Levitical law. But the service described is that of the Second Temple, for the king speaks of the golden candlestick as one of its elements. In Solomon's Temple there stood not one golden candlestick in the holy place in front of the *adyton* (רביץ, oracle, i. e., Holy of Holies) but ten (1 Kings VII., 49). Again the morning and evening burnt-offerings are mentioned. But there is a great concurrence of evidence that the evening offering was purely cereal in the First Temple, or indeed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (1 Kings XVIII., 36, *Hebrew*; 2 Kings XVI., 15; Ezra IX., 4, *Hebrew*). Compare Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*, chap. 14, note 1. This speech is one of the clearest proofs that the Chronicler's descriptions of ordinances are taken from the usages of his own time."

Three arguments are here expressed or implied: 1. The word נער signifies "a mere lad," and could not under any circumstances be applied to a man forty-one years of age. 2. The golden candlestick, as distinguished from ten golden candlesticks, was not an element of the Temple till the Second Temple was built. 3. No

stated burnt-offering (עֹלָה) was presented evening by evening in the time of the First Temple, nor indeed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, but only a meat-offering (מִנְחָה), which is to be interpreted as an exclusively cereal offering. The conclusion to be drawn is that there is here "one of the clearest proofs" that the Chronicler ascribes to earlier ages the usages and ordinances of his own time. An examination of these arguments cannot be uninteresting or unprofitable.

1. The exact signification of the word נַעַר and its limitations can be ascertained only by an accurate examination of the passages where it is employed. It is applied to Moses when an infant of three months¹, to the weaned child Samuel², to a boy of about fifteen³, to Joseph, when he was seventeen years of age⁴, and to a young man of marriageable age⁵. If the usage of the word were confined to such instances, it might be interpreted, "a mere lad." But Benjamin is repeatedly called a נַעַר⁶, when Joseph was thirty-nine years of age, and twenty-two years in Egypt, consequently when Benjamin was at least twenty-three, Professor Delitzsch⁷ says, "at least twenty-four." Eli's sons are spoken of under this name in 1 Sam. ii., 17. Assuming the Levitical legislation to have been in force, they cannot have been less than twenty-five years old at the time⁸. It is difficult in any case, in the light of the history, to believe that they had not reached this age. Certainly they were not "mere lads." Solomon, again, not only is called a נַעַר by his father in the Book of Chronicles⁹, where Wellhausen and his followers would say it was untrustworthy, but also, as is recorded in the Book of Kings, calls himself by the name, and even adds to it the epithet "little."¹⁰ At this time Solonon had been married to the mother of Rehoboam at least two years¹¹. Equally evident is it that the word in dispute is applied to another son of David, long after he had passed the age of boyhood. Absalom had his own house and was assuredly not "a mere lad," when Tamar confided to him the story of her wrong. He waited afterwards "two full years"¹² before he avenged his sister at his sheephearing. While the "young men" (נַעֲרִים), the king's sons, fled, Absalom betook himself to Geshur "and was there three years."¹³ On his return he dwelt "two full years"¹⁴ in Jerusalem. Then after maturing his rebellion for "four years,"¹⁵ if the reading of the Syriac and Vulgate be adopted, he was at last slain in the battle of the wood of Ephraim. Thus eleven full years elapsed between Amnon's sin and Absalom's death. It is impossible to conceive of Absalom, the father of four children¹⁶, as less than thirty years of age at the time of his death. Yet he is called at that time "a young man" (נַעַר)¹⁷. Some indeed are of opinion, on the ground of the existing text of 2 Sam. xv., 7, that he lived forty years. Others understand the number "forty" to refer to the years of David's reign, in which case Absalom would have been at his decease between thirty-three and forty years of age.¹⁸ The application of the term נַעַר to Joshua¹⁹ will be a last example. There is a fairly general concurrence of opinion that Joshua ruled, after the death of Moses, twenty-five or twenty-seven years. Josephus²⁰ witnesses to the former number, and Ewald and Fuerst are prepared to accept it. Clemens of Alexandria²¹ supports the latter. Africanus in his

¹ Ex. ii., 6. ² 1 Sam. i., 24. ³ Gen. xxi., 17 ff. ⁴ Gen. xxxvii., 2. ⁵ Gen. xxxiv., 19. ⁶ Gen. xlv., 30 ff. ⁷ On Gen. xxxv., 16-20. ⁸ Cf. Num. viii., 24 and iv., 3. ⁹ 1 Chron. xxix., 1. ¹⁰ 1 Kgs. iii., 7. ¹¹ Cf. 1 Kgs. xi., 42 and xiv., 21. ¹² 2 Sam. xiii., 23. ¹³ Verse 38. ¹⁴ 2 Sam. xiv., 28. ¹⁵ 2 Sam. xv., 7. ¹⁶ 2 Sam. xiv., 27. ¹⁷ 2 Sam. xviii., 5, 32. ¹⁸ Cf. 2 Sam. iii., 3 and 1 Kgs. ii., 11. ¹⁹ Ex. xxxiii., 11. ²⁰ Ant. V. i., 39. ²¹ Strom. I., p. 384. Ed. Potter.

Chronica gives both numbers²². Joshua "died being one hundred years old."²³ It follows that at the beginning of the forty years wandering in the wilderness he was forty-three or forty-five years of age. And the fact that Caleb was thirty-eight years old at the Exodus²⁴ gives a general corroboration to these figures. To complete the argument, it is only necessary to remind the reader that, after the Exodus, this Joshua is called a נער²⁵.

Where, now, is there room for the critic's cavil against the words of Abijah? If Solomon, the king of Israel, if Absalom, the almost successful rebel, if Joshua, the victorious general against the Amalekites, could each of them be called a נער why might not Abijah, whose interest it was to make as little as possible of his father's defeat, designate by the same name the rash and puerile Rehoboam, who was, as a matter of fact, "tender-hearted and had not courage to withstand the rebels"?

2. The book of Kings gives the historical fact that Solomon had made ten candlesticks of gold.²⁶ Abijah, it is assumed, comes into collision with this when he speaks of "the candlestick of gold." Now the contradiction, if there be a contradiction, is equally against the statements of the Chronicler himself. In two passages, 1 Chronicles xxviii., 15, and 2 Chronicles iv., 7, he narrates how "candlesticks" were made for the Temple. It must, therefore, be supposed that two inconsistent methods were adopted by the writer. In one passage he describes the service of the Second Temple, and speaks of a single candlestick; in other passages he accepts the true account given in Kings and mentions candlesticks.

The fallacy of this reasoning may be seen best from a parallel example. The Chronicler records that Abijah boasts in this same speech²⁷ of the shewbread table, not of tables. This harmonizes with his subsequent allusion to a single shewbread table in the time of Hezekiah²⁸. It agrees, too, with the account given of Solomon's work in the book of Kings. "He made the table of gold whereupon the shewbread was."²⁹ It is perfectly certain that one table was assigned to the shewbread in the time of Solomon. But the same Chronicler narrates, in these different passages, that there were "tables" for the shewbread in Solomon's Temple.³⁰ How is it to be accounted for, that he who is charged with adapting his narrative to the ordinances of the Second Temple, here departs from these ordinances in so marked a manner? It cannot be said that the record of tables is untrue. For if it be not true, whence did the Chronicler assume the fact? Not from the usage of the Second Temple for it is not its usage. Not from the book of Kings, for that book mentions only a single table. He must have written of several tables because, in truth, Solomon had made ten.

Now, if Abijah could speak correctly of the table of shewbread, though Solomon had made ten, might he not perhaps speak with equal right of one candlestick, though there were ten in the temple of Solomon? Must there not have been some reason for the special designation of one table and of one candlestick of the ten, as the table and the candlestick? What is that reason? The critic who has relegated the Levitical legislation to post-exilic times cannot reply. But he who still holds the traditional view of its Mosaic origin is at no loss for an answer. With unerring finger he can point to the twenty-fourth chapter of Leviticus.

²² See Routh, *Rel. Sac.* Vol. II., pp. 274, 288, 431-2. ²³ Josh. xxiv., 29. ²⁴ Cf. Josh. xiv., 10. ²⁵ Ex. xxxiii., 11. ²⁶ 1 Kgs. vii., 49. ²⁷ 2 Chron. xlii., 11. ²⁸ 2 Chron. xxix., 18. ²⁹ 1 Kgs. vii., 48. ³⁰ See 1 Chron. xxviii., 16; 2 Chron. iv., 8, 19.

There one candlestick was appointed, which through all time, even though ten were made, would still hold its pre-eminence. There, and there positively alone in the Bible, could Abijah have heard of a "pure table."³¹ Refuse to accept the pre-existence of the Mosaic legislation, and it is impossible to account for the manufacture by Solomon of "a table" as is related in Kings, and yet of "tables" as Chronicles describes. Assume the pre-existence, and it is equally easy to see how one table could be singled out for special prominence, and to believe that Abijah might speak of "the candlestick of the ten."

3. The priests of Baal prophesied after noon till "the offering up of the offering" (מִנְחָה).³² "At the time of the offering up of the offering" (מִנְחָה),³³ Elijah stepped forward and vindicated his God. King Ahaz commanded Urijah to offer upon the great altar "the evening offering" (מִנְחָה).³⁴ Ezra in his humiliation rose "at the evening offering" (מִנְחָה).³⁵ It is indubitable that a stated offering (מִנְחָה) was presented in the evening. Professor Smith asserts that there was no other stated evening sacrifice, especially no burnt-offering (עֹלָה). It is, he maintains, altogether inaccurate to ascribe to Abijah his boast of "burnt-offerings," evening by evening. The argument is not directed against the morning burnt-offering, but it holds equally well, or equally ill, if so applied. Add 2 Kings 11., 20 to the verses cited above, and this becomes evident. There it is said that water came from the way of Edom "in the morning at the time of the offering up of the offering" (מִנְחָה). It is an exact parallel to the passage 1 Kgs. xviii., 36. If from the latter it is argued that the evening sacrifice was only a meat-offering (מִנְחָה), from the former the same must be argued of the morning sacrifice. It is impossible to escape this conclusion. If the reasoning be good in one instance, it is good in the other, and if bad, bad. Now it is evident from the charge of Ahaz to Urijah,³⁶ already referred to, that it is thoroughly bad in reference to the morning offering. The king commanded the priest to burn on the great altar, the "morning burnt-offering" (עֹלָה). There is a morning burnt-offering as well as a morning meat-offering. Here are passages, taken be it observed, from the Second Book of Kings, not from the so-called anachronous record of the Chronicler, in which these two are mentioned. It would be uncritical to ignore the sixteenth chapter, and to argue from the third chapter that a "meat-offering" alone was presented in the morning. The meat-offering (מִנְחָה) and the burnt-offering (עֹלָה) were at that hour offered side by side. May this not have been the case in the evening? If the argument here advanced against the morning burnt-offering, does not prove its non-existence, why should a train of reasoning, similar in every particular, prove the non-existence of the evening burnt-offering. Is it an impossible supposition that the evening meat-offering (מִנְחָה) and the evening burnt-offering (עֹלָה) were both offered to Jehovah? It is not, however, a mere supposition. In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the critic confidently declares, no stated burnt-offering had been introduced. And yet in the time of Zerubbabel, seventy-eight years before Ezra reached Palestine, ninety-one years before the arrival of Nehemiah they offered, it is distinctly affirmed,³⁷ burnt-offerings morning and evening. Professor Smith says there was no evening burnt-offering

³¹ The peculiar phrase, הַשֻּׁלְחָן הַטָּהוֹר, occurs only in Lev. xxiv., 6 and 2 Chron. xlii., 11. ³² 1 Kgs. xvii., 29. ³³ Verse 36. ³⁴ 2 Kgs. xvi., 15. ³⁵ Ezra ix., 4, 5. ³⁶ 2 Kgs. xvi., 15. ³⁷ Ezra iii., 3.

(עֹלָה); the record tells clearly that there was. A more deliberate contradiction cannot be imagined. It is manifest that the evening meat-offering (מִנְחָה) and the evening burnt-offering (עֹלָה) existed together.

The book of Kings assigns a morning burnt-offering (עֹלָה) and a morning meat-offering (מִנְחָה) to the regal period in exactest agreement with the requirements of the law.³⁸ In Ezra the same two offerings in the evening are equally in accord with Mosaic legislation.³⁹ Do not these facts meet and confute Professor Smith and the school of critics to which he belongs? They feel themselves compelled to date the Levitical ordinances in post-exilic times, because the history ignores or contradicts them. Are they not now bound, on the same principles, to accept an early date for the authorship of those portions of the Priest's Book which treats of the sacrifices in question? They, at least, are part of the ritual with which the historian is familiar.

Accept the earlier composition of these parts of the Pentateuch, and it becomes easy to explain the allusions. In the Law the continual burnt-offering and the continual meat-offering are alike emphasized.⁴⁰ Is it not perfectly natural that the whole stated service is called now by one emphatic part of it, now by the other? One speaks of it as the meat-offering (מִנְחָה), all the more readily since this word had not altogether lost its early signification of an offering in general.⁴¹ It was not confined, (though Professor Smith implies that it was), exclusively to cereal offerings, but was also applied to offerings of flesh.⁴² Another characterizes, as Abijah does, the whole by the most important part of it, and speaks of the burnt-offering (עֹלָה). In this there is the most perfect harmony if the Levitical legislation be assumed to exist. If its existence be denied, there is, no doubt confusion thrice confounded.

Professor Smith must assuredly be a Scotchman of a peculiar type. Painsstaking investigation and excessive caution are proverbially associated with Scotland. In him they are conspicuous only by their absence. He is rash in the extreme and most positive when he is most illogical. To him the statement that Solomon offered burnt-offerings⁴³ "can hardly bear any other sense than that the king officiated at the altar *in person!*"⁴⁴ When it is said that the people had not dwelt in booths at the feast of tabernacles "since the days of Joshua the son of Nun,"⁴⁵ he interprets it to mean, in spite of Ezra 111., 4, that "the feast of tabernacles had never been observed according to the Law, from the time that the Israelites occupied Canaan under Joshua,—that is of course never at all!"⁴⁶ He asserts that the prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the pillars, and sea, and vases⁴⁷ is "not only false but palpably absurd," because forsooth they "could not have been transported *entire!*"⁴⁸ Where is it said that they would remain unbroken? Of reckless assertion and hasty generalization the note on Abijah's battle address is not the least notable example.

³⁸ Ex. xxix., 39, 40; Num. xxviii., 45. ³⁹ Ex. xxix., 39, 41; Num. xxviii., 4, 8. ⁴⁰ Num. iv., 16; Ex. xxix., 42; Num. xxix., 11. ⁴¹ Abel's sacrifice of a lamb is called a מִנְחָה, Gen. iv., 4. ⁴² See 1 Sam. ii., 17. ⁴³ 1 Kgs. ix., 25. ⁴⁴ "O. T. in the Jewish Church," p. 248. Cf. Professor Green's "Moses and the Prophets," p. 106. ⁴⁵ Neh. viii., 17. ⁴⁶ Page 56. ⁴⁷ Jer. xxvii., 19-22. ⁴⁸ Page 116.

ISAIAH AND THE NEW CRITICISM.

BY REV. C. N. PATTERSON,

St. Paul, Minn.

When modern iconoclasm directed its shafts against the Bible, the book of Isaiah by no means escaped. These attacks began about 100 years ago, with the German critics; and every new assailant seems bent on surpassing his predecessor in destructiveness.

The main question at issue is regarding the last 27 chapters of this prophecy. There are some who dissect the entire book, and find as many as ten different authors and periods, but the majority of critics satisfy themselves with denying that Isaiah wrote chapters 40-66 of the prophecy commonly assigned to him. The second part of the book is supposed to come from another author at a later date. This second prophet has been styled the "Deutero-Isaiah," or the "Babylonian Isaiah," assuming that he lived and wrote during the exile. Ewald has introduced him as the "The Great unnamed," and Prof. Robertson Smith calls his work "The chief example of an anonymous prophecy."

The first suggestion of a duality or plurality of authors came from Koppe, who has been followed by the greater number of German critics, including, among others, DeWette, Gesenius, Hitzig, Umbreit, Ewald, and, of the latest writers, Kuenen and Wellhausen. In fact, there remain but few German scholars of eminence, who have not been more or less influenced by this tendency, consciously or unconsciously. One or two examples, from the conservative school will serve to illustrate this fact.

Dr. Naeglesbach, in the Lange series, devotes considerable space to arguments in favor of the authenticity and integrity of the book of Isaiah; yet his arguments lose much of their force when we find him saying with reference to certain passages in the disputed portion, "I have distinctly declared these to be interpolations; I confess, however, that I hold these to be only the ones most plainly recognizable as such."

Dr. Franz Delitzsch is so conservative an exegete that his commentaries have been spoken of with contempt by rationalistic critics like Ewald. Speaking of the New Criticism Delitzsch says, "This criticism denies miracle; denies prophecy, denies revelation, * * * and the results are, in the main points, ready before all investigation." Notwithstanding this, we find him quoting from the "Babylonian Isaiah."

These two instances show something of the extent to which the influence of this criticism is reaching.

The most extreme and rapidly growing school may be represented by Julius Wellhausen, who with Kuenen, has carried out the principles of criticism adopted by so many of the German writers in discussing the Pentateuch. His attitude towards the Scriptures is explained by Dr. Howard Osgood in these words, "The Old Testament is to him a corpse, the corpse of a criminal laid on his dissecting-table for the skill of his hand with knife and pincers, and the joy he derives from it is in discovering a new ganglion of contradictions." We cannot expect that such an one would have tolerance for the last 27 chapters of Isaiah. He says, "Ezekiel covers iniquity with a moral cloak. The author of Isaiah 40-66 much

more deserves to be called a prophet, but he will not be; his plainly intended anonymousness leaves us in no doubt about this fact. He is really rather a theologian."

Of English writers, Rev. T. K. Cheyne has announced himself as holding to the idea of more than one author. In the same trend of thought comes Robertson Smith. In his "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," he is not ready to venture an opinion as to whether the disputed chapters are the work of Isaiah, or whether they come from a later prophet. He approaches the subject, makes an insinuation, and then, like a school boy who has found another too large for him to whip, turns away allowing himself the benefit of the doubt. However, before writing his "Prophets of Israel," he seems to have gathered sufficient courage from the writings of Wellhausen to reassure him, and in this volume he is ready to accept the views of the new school, acknowledging his special indebtedness to his friend Prof. Wellhausen. He also highly commends the work of Mr. Cheyne.

The array of talent here presented on the side of the attack, is imposing enough to occasion considerable alarm, till we examine more carefully the basis and the results of their reasoning. On examination, we discover the truth of the words already quoted, viz.: "The results of this criticism are, in the main points, ready before all investigation." In other words, the majority of these critics start out with the assumption that there is no such thing as predictive prophecy, and therefore, as the so-called Isaiah speaks of the delivery under Cyrus, he must have lived at that date himself.

When we understand that the spirit which underlies this kind of criticism is a disbelief in the doctrine of Inspiration, we do not give much weight to the logical deductions from such a premise. We may perhaps be surprised that Wellhausen, of whom Dr. Cunningham Geikie says "he makes the Bible a mere trinkle of history through a meadow of fable," should have been chosen to write the article on "Israel," in the new edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, but we are not surprised that critics in Great Britain and the continent should reject portions of Isaiah and other books. We have an Ingersoll in this country who rejects the whole Bible, and the Idea of God, besides.

As to the argument that whereas Isaiah lived more than 100 years before the exile, the author of chapters 40-66 must have lived during the exile, we do not see why it is not as reasonable and logical to go farther, and to say, Chapters 40-66 contain predictions of the character, sufferings, death and glorification of Christ. Therefore, the writers of these chapters must have been at the cross, and have witnessed the ushering in of the new dispensation. Or, let us suppose that the author of the last 27 chapters was a contemporary of Cyrus. If the events narrated had already occurred, or were then present, how ridiculous and blasphemous for him to speak of them as a divine revelation about to occur!

A student of the New Testament would refer the objector to the case of the Eunuch who believed when Philip explained to him a passage from Isaiah 53, beginning, "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter." The example of Christ affords still greater authority, or else, carrying out the spirit of adverse criticism, he made a great mistake in the Synagogue at Nazareth when he preached from Is. LXI., 1-2. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me," and declared, furthermore, that these words had reference to himself.

In justice to the more conservative critics it should be said that they do not maintain that the question of authorship affects the authenticity of the latter part

of Isaiah, but, by the majority, the argument from the New Testament is disposed of as it is by Kuenen, in his "Prophets and Prophecy in Israel." He says, "We must either cast aside as worthless our dearly bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament, in the domain of the exegesis of the Old; without hesitation we choose the latter alternative."

When the question thus comes to be dependent on a choice between the New Testament and scientific methods, the Christian world asks no better evidence of an untenable hypothesis. Any theory that would explain prophecy in direct opposition to the teaching of Christ, must be regarded as one that will not stand in the judgment.

Thus far the line of argument, while sufficiently conclusive to the Christian world, has no particular weight with the anti-Christian, or with the purely scientific mind.

There is another argument independent of doctrinal assumption, which seems to indicate clearly that the 66 books in question belong to a single age, and a single author. It has been asserted that the last part differs from the first in religious views, peculiar style, and *usus loquendi*.

Just here a sentence quoted in Smith's Bible Dictionary from the accomplished critic Ewald, is pertinent. He says, speaking of the genuine Isaiah, "He is not the especially lyrical prophet, or the especially elegiacal prophet, or the especially oratorical and hortatory prophet, as we should describe a Joel, a Hosea, a Micah, with whom there is a greater prevalence of some particular color; but just as the subject requires he has readily at command every several kind of style, and every several change of delineation; and it is precisely this, that, in point of language, establishes his greatness, as well as, in general, forms one of his most towering points of excellence."

The special pertinence of these words from one of the critics, is readily seen from the fact that a careful reader will find no great trouble in discovering evidences of the same versatile genius in the second part of Isaiah that Ewald finds in the first.

As Keil has so ably shown, there are no differences which are inconsistent with unity of authorship. Especially is this seen when we consider the fact that in the later portion of his work the prophet was writing, in retirement, and not simply recording spoken discourses; and furthermore, that his prophecies extended over a period of at least 50 years.

The argument from style, in favor of unity of authorship, is greatly augmented by a comparison of the vocabulary of Isaiah A with that of Isaiah B. However, the results of this work were so recently shown by Rev. W. H. Cobb, in the columns of THE HEBREW STUDENT, that it is needless to repeat them here, though the argument is incomplete without at least a reference to this kind of evidence.

The words of Prof. D. S. Talcott form a fitting conclusion for this phase of the discussion. He says, "Probably there is not one of all the languages of the globe, whether living or dead, possessing any considerable literature, which does not exhibit instances of greater change in the style of an author, writing at different periods of his life, than appears upon a comparison of the later prophecies of Isaiah with the earlier."

The arguments here considered, by no means cover the whole field of the controversy; yet it seems as if other objections must stand or fall with what has already been presented.

It is of comparatively recent date that American scholarship has been called out

on this question, but in view of the fact that the hypotheses from which these adverse conclusions come must be built on the ruins of Inspiration, of a supernatural revelation, of even the teachings of Christ himself, and when we consider that the New Testament must be exchanged for scientific methods, the ministry, at least, should not be in doubt concerning which side it belongs to in the so-called New Criticism.

THE OLD HEBREW THEOLOGY.*

BY REV. NATHANIEL WEST,

Morristown, N. J.

There is something very tender in the fact that the volume, whose title is given below, is, on the part of Dr. Delitzsch and his assistant, a work of love, in memory of a faithful servant of God, gone to his rest, and whose interest in Israel, and Israel's relation to the Great Salvation, and the world's Final Glory, led him to devote the literary part of his life to the study of the Hebrew faith. The dying request of the gifted author, committing his labor to the hands of Dr. Delitzsch, has been religiously regarded. The volume bears the imprimatur of the great Hebraist, and his assistant, who assure us that all the quotations have been "verified," and express their sense of its high scientific value, and commend it as the best extant work, in all the centuries, on the Old Palestinian Theology.

The bitter conflict of the Roman church with Judaism, and the severe persecutions of the Jews by Christian nations, called forth many defenses of the Jewish faith on the part of the Hebrews, with corresponding assaults on the Christian religion. The list of works written, and catalogued by Fuerst, Graetz, Jost, and Etheridge, is amazing,—among them the defenses by Saadias, Judah Halevi, Albo, and Maimon. Of all, however, none exercised a greater influence than the elegantly printed volume, ספר חזק אמונה, *Book of the Rampart of the Faith*, by Rabbi Isaac ben Abraham, published at Amsterdam, 1705, intended as a demonstration of Judaism against Christianity, and, if we are to believe Voltaire, the chief armory of the Freethinkers of the eighteenth century, in their attacks upon the Roman church and Christianity in general. In reply, from the Christian side, came a host of productions, replete with high scholarship, yet no less replete with the necessary polemic spirit of the times. The titles of some of them indicate at just what point the thermometer stood,—"*Pugio Fidei*" by Martini, "*Systema Controversiarum*" by Helvicus, "*Tela Ignea Satanae*" by Wagenseil, "*Flagellum Judaeorum*" by Fini, besides the not less learned, though less polemic works of Eisenmenger and Pfeiffer. Two of these we have studied carefully, Eisenmenger and Martini, and the rest looked into, and, for a while, have felt somewhat as the ardent Luther did, when he said that the Jew is so "*stock-stein-teufel-hart*," there is no use in translating πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται in any other

* System der altsynagogalischen palaestnischen Theologie, aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud dargestellt von Dr. Ferdinand Weber, Pfarrer in Pölsingen. Nach des Verfassers Tode herausgegeben von Franz Delitzsch und Georg Schnedermann. Leipzig: Doerffling & Franke, 1880.—System of the Old Synagogue Palestinian Theology exhibited from the Targum, Midrash and Talmud, by Dr. Ferdinand Weber, Pastor in Pölsingen. Edited, after the author's death, by Franz Delitzsch and George Schnedermann. Leipzig: Doerffling & Franke, 1880.

sense than of the final salvation of the elect, especially the Gentiles!—a view, however, of which the great Mountain subsequently repented, when apologizing for the little avalanche he shook from his locks, in a moment of anger. Bodenschatz's "Modern Judaism," about the middle of the 18th century, was irenic in its tone. Wonderful has been the activity of scholars in the Jewish field. Not to dwell upon the works of Buxtorf, Cappelus, Selden, Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Bertholdt, Gfroerer, and Hilgenfeld, the press of later date continues to pour upon the market a flood of literature concerning the Hebrew faith, hope, and customs, and their relation to Christianity, surpassing in volume all before it. Never was research more assiduous. The work of Castelli, "*Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*" (1874), of Siegfried, "*Analecta Rabbinica to the New Testament, and Church Fathers*" (1875), Wuensche's "*New Contributions to the Explanation of the four Gospels*" (1876), the work of Solowyczyg on "*The Bible, Talmud, and Gospels*" (1877), Schneider's "*Principles of Judaism compared with those of Christianity*" (1877), Drummond's "*Jewish Messiah*" (1877), Duschak on the "*Morality of the Gospels and the Talmud*" (1879), Hamburger's "*Encyclopaedia for the Talmud and the Bible*" (1880), besides the multiplied translations of the most important Jewish works into the different European languages, reveal a condition of things intensely significant. The labors of men like Delitzsch and Fuerst are all well known. The decrease of a bitter polemic spirit between Jews and Christians is a marked feature of our age, notwithstanding the Semitic question in politics, as is illustrated in the kind personal relations which such men as Philippson, Jacobson, and Adler, sustain to Christian scholars equally accomplished, and seems to augur something of deep importance for the future. Involuntarily we think of the budding of Israel again, and Ezekiel's Valley of Vision.

Dr. Weber's Book, entirely independent of all previous ones, except to correct their errors, draws directly from the original sources, the Targum, Midrash, and Talmud, disregarding the later Sohar and Cabbala, and pours a stream of Old Palestinian Theology upon the mind of the student, such as is believed to have come down from the men of the Great Synagogue,—the traditional faith of God's ancient people, from Ezra's time. It purports to be the sum of what descended from the old Soferim, the official expounders of the Torah, to Maccabean times, was gathered up by the great schools of Hillel and Shammai, and finally developed in the Talmud. It is not designed as a formal *Glaubenslehre*, or *Dogmatik*, but as a faithful representation, in systematic arrangement, of the Jewish doctrine, free, to a great extent, from the frivolities and fancies with which the Jews themselves have encumbered it. Not that the reader will not meet with many curious things, but that here he will find the very crown of Hebrew wisdom set with many a pearl and gem of Hebrew genius, and most of all a body of doctrine and faith, the knowledge of which makes the reading of the Scriptures shine with a new light. It is no ordinary privilege to be thus brought in direct contact with the men and writings of the old Legal church, and be able not merely to see, but *feel*, the eternal difference there is between *Grace and Law*, as also realize how grand was the preparation for the Gospel of Christ, and how supremely superior is Christ to Moses.

The book is divided into two chief parts, viz., I. The Principles; II. The Particular Doctrines; each part subdivided into General Divisions, six chapters in the first, and four in the second. In the First Division, First Part, we have "*The*

Material Principle, Nomism, or Legalism. Under this in Chapter I. "The Historic Implanting of the Nomoeracy in the New Jewish Commonwealth." And here, § 1, is the Activity of Ezra for the new community; § 2, the Growth of Jewish Legalism over against Hellenism; § 3, the Definite Victory of the Nomoeracy, i. e., the outcome of the Maccabean struggle. The rubric of Chap. II. is, "The Torah the Revelation of God," and under this, § 4, "The eternal existence of the Torah, before God, as the image of His Essence;" § 5, "The Torah the only saving revelation of God;" § 6, "The Torah the Source of all Salvation, and of the Highest Good." The rubric of Chap. III. is, "Legality the Essence of Religion." Under this, we have § 7, "Piety is Love for the Torah;" § 8, "The Proof of Love for the Torah;" § 9, "Legality the sole form of Religion for all times;" § 10, "The relation of the Religious Consciousness to the Sacrificial Service;" § 11, "The esoteric character of the Jewish Religiosity,"—an eye-opener on the Pharisaic "Stand aside for I am holier than thou!" The rubric of Chap. IV. is, "Jehovah's fellowship with Israel conditioned alone by the Torah," and the sections here are, § 12, "Jehovah's Presence in Israel is connected with the study and practice of the Torah;" § 13, "God's Conduct toward men is conditioned alone by their relation to the Torah." The rubric of Chap. V. is the grand one, "Israel the People of the Torah among the Nations," and here, § 14, "Israel the People of the Torah is God's People;" § 15, "The People of God in Contrast with the Heathen World;" § 16, "Israel in Exile,"—banished of God. The rubric of Chap. VI. is, "The Religious Character and the Destiny of the Heathen World;" § 17, "The Heathen World outside the Kingdom of God;" § 18, "The Worthlessness of the Heathen World before God and Israel;" § 19, "The Continuance of the Heathen World and its Power over Israel,"—Why? And so ends the First Division of Part First.

Of special interest to the student is this part of Dr. Weber's work, chiefly in its relations to Pentateuchal criticism. It confirms the position taken by conservative, and impossible to be refuted by radical, scholarship, viz., that, by the term "*Torah*" in the mouth of the Jew, was meant not alone the precept part of the Pentateuch, or formal legality, nor alone some special code, nor merely a solitary prescription, but *the whole body and fulness of Pentateuchal instruction of whatever kind*; in other words, the "*Five Books of Moses*,"—a position triumphantly proved by Bredekamp, lately, in his *Gesetz und Propheten*, as against Wellhausen's school, and in harmony with Professor Strack's own statement, in Zöckler's recent *Handbuch*, viz., that the five-fold division remounts beyond the time of the Septuagint translation, dating even from Ezra's day. The inner reason of this division, of the Mosaic Books, is illustrated by a variety of striking analogies, and some remarkable and beautiful Jewish conceits.

The Second Division of the First Part, gives, as the governing rubric, "*The Formal Principle of Legalism.*" And here we come to Chap. VII. whose title is, "The Written Word;" under which, § 20, is, "The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures;" § 21, "The Attributes of the Holy Scriptures,"—sacred, authoritative, pleromatic; § 22, "The Holy Scriptures and the Church,"—demanding an official and well trained ministry. Chap. VIII., "The Oral Tradition," under which § 23, is "The Authentic Exposition of the Scriptures,"—Halacah and Haggada; § 24, "The Relation of Tradition to Scripture;" § 25, "Scripture and Tradition in Practice,"—the triumph of Rabbinism, or of the Doctors, over the Word of God; theological dogmatism; the Scriptures are salt, the Mishna pepper, the Gemara wine; orthodox is church dogmatics. Chap. IX., "The Scripture Proof," under which,

§ 26, are "The Thirteen Rules," or *Middoth*, all hermeneutical; § 27, "The Proof through Intimation," found in the signs, letters, particles, position of words, and context. Chap. x., "The Rabbinical Authority," under which we have § 28, "The Order of *Wise Men*;"—the Sanhedrin, Synagogue, Rabbis and Elders, clothed with divine honor and dignity, as the officially constituted expounders of the Torah; § 29, "The Threefold Power of the Wise Men,"—a power legislative, judicial, instructive, imposed by ordination, all congregations, colleges, academies, and schools of prophets, under the direct control of one Supreme Court, the Sanhedrin. And thus ends the Second Division of Part First,—the one division setting forth the *Material Principle*, the other the *Formal Principle*, of Judaism; the one *Legality*, the other the *Torah*.

In the *Second Part, First Division*, we have the general title, "*The Circle of Theological Doctrine*." Under this comes Chap. xi., "The Jewish Conception of God," § 30, "The Result of Legalism for the Comprehension of the Idea of God;" § 31, "The Unity and Sublimity of God;" § 32, "The Judaizing of the Idea of God." Chap. xii., "The Heavenly World;" § 33, "The Habitation of God and His Glory;" § 34, "The Heavenly Spirit-World;" § 35, "The Relation of the Spirit-World to God." Chap. xiii. treats of "Mediatorial Hypostases;" § 36, "Preliminary Remark and Sketch;" § 37, "The Metatrôn;" § 38, "The Memra of Jehovah;" § 39, "The Shekinah of God;" § 40, "The Holy Ghost and Bath Kôl."

This brings us to the *Second Division of Part Second*, whose general rubric is, "*The Circle of Cosmological and Anthropological Doctrine*," in which, Chap. xiv., with its title, "The Creation and Preservation of the World," gives us, § 41, "Preliminary Remark;" § 42, "The Divine Purpose of Creation;" § 43, "The Creation of the World;" § 44, "The Relation of Heaven to Earth;" § 45, "The Preservation of the World." Chap. xv., "The Creation and Fall of Man," gives us, § 46, "The Creation and Primitive Condition of Man;" § 47, "The Moral Condition of Man;" § 48, "The Fall of Man into Sin;"—through Free-Will. Then comes, in logical order, Chap. xvi., "The Condition of Sinful Man;" § 49, "The Origin and Nature of Sinful Man;" § 50, "The Freedom of Choice, and Universal Sinfulness;" § 51, "Sin and Guilt." To this stands closely related Chap. xvii., "The Penal Consequences of Sin," under which we have, § 52, "Sin and Evil;" § 53, "Sin and Death;" § 54, "Sin and Dæmons."

Then comes the *Third Division*, here with its general title "*The Circle of Soteriological Doctrine*," under which we have first, Chap. xviii., "The Revelation and the History of Salvation," giving § 55, "God's Plan of Salvation"; § 56, "The History Prior to the Sinaitic Revelation"; § 57, "The Giving of the Law on Sinai"; § 58, "Israel's Apostasy and its Consequences." Chap. xix., "The Righteousness before God, and Merit." Here we come into the very adytum of Jewish Soteriology; § 59, "The Conception of Righteousness"; § 60, "The Righteousness by the Fulfilling of the Law"; § 61, "The Righteousness by Good Works"; § 62, "The Different Relations of Individual Men to God"; § 63, "The Representative Righteousness of the Fathers,"—their vast merit made available for their posterity, in times of self-examination, prayer, death, and judgment. "We have Abraham!"; § 64, "The Merit of the Saints"; § 65, "The Reward of Works"; § 66, "Merit as a historical Motive of Salvation." Chap. xx., "The Atonement", gives us, § 67, "The Conception of the Atonement;"—it is not only a covering of sin from God's eyes, but a restoration of the sinner to the legal and ceremonial standing he had before the transgression, making the sin as though it

never had existed, cancelling its guilt and removing its consequences. § 68, "Repentance and the Day of Atonement"; § 69, "Suffering and Death as a Means of Atonement"; § 70, "The Representative Sufferings of the Righteous",—they bear the guilt of others, and, for their sakes, since Israel is an Organism, the punishment due is often restrained; § 71, "Atonement through Good Works"; § 72, "Results of the Doctrine of Justification and Atonement."

The *Fourth Division*, here, presents its general title as "*The Circle of Eschatological Doctrine*," under which we have, Chap. XXI., "The Consummation of the Individual;" § 73, "Death and the Condition of Death;" § 74, "The Abode of Souls in Gehinnom;" § 75, "The Lot of the Blessed in Gan-Eden," i. e., Paradise. It is of prime importance to note that, under Jewish *Eschatology*, comes the Doctrine of *Messiah*, our whole New Testament time being one organic eschatological period, called the "Last Days." Hence, in the Midrash-Talmud doctrine of the Last Things, we find, Chap. XXII., "The Redemption of Israel through the Messiah;" § 76, "The Messiah;" § 77, "Elias, the Forerunner of Messiah;" § 78, "The Entrance of Messiah into the World;" § 79, "The Hidden Growing and Activity of Messiah;" § 80, "The Messiah, Son of Joseph;" § 81, "The Redemption of Israel and the First Resurrection." Then comes Chap. XXIII., concerning "The Kingdom of Messiah;" giving us § 82, "The Messianic Age;" § 83, "The Building of Jerusalem and the Sanctuary;" § 84, "The Temple-Service and the Law, in the Messianic Age,"—the Jewish doctrine not recognizing that Messiah's Sufferings would put an end to all "*Legality*," nor recognizing any, save *one Advent of Messiah*, and His coming to "abide;" § 85, "The Righteousness and Blessed Condition of the Community;" § 86, "The Sovereignty of Messiah over the Nations;" § 87, "Gog and Magog, and the End of the Messianic Age." The closing Chapter in this Circle of Eschatological ideas, and last in the book, is Chap. XXIV., whose title is "The Final Consummation," under which we have, § 88, "The (last) Resurrection and Judgment of the World;" § 89, "The New Heaven, the New Earth, and the New Humanity;" § 90, "The *Olam Habba*," or "Coming World,"⁵—first, in Messianic Glory on Earth (there being but *one Advent*), second, in Eternal Blessedness and Glory, in a world without end. In all, 24 chapters, 90 sections, and, with table of contents and minute index, 399 pages, 8vo. A marvelous work,—a work of twenty years' constant labor,—reminding one of Cudworth's "Intellectual System of the Universe."

No one can rise from the reading of Dr. Weber's book without feelings of the profoundest gratitude to God, through Christ, for redemption, not only from Sin and Death, but from "*Legality*." It shines with sunlight clearness, that the *whole* difference between the Christian and Jewish Soteriology is that between Grace and Law. And, in the sphere of Anthropology, how deep Israel's apostasy has been, and how hopeless the condition of fallen man, in spite of all his works, no uninspired pages prove more eloquently than do these. As to Theology proper, if, on the one hand, a strict Monotheism ran into a Monism which precluded any possibility of trine activity within the divine essence, on the other hand, the Sublimity of God was held so firmly as to be a barrier to His loss of Personality, and to any pantheistic mixture with His works. As to the Torah in its perceptive part while it was regarded as no less than God's objective Self, the fatal Judaistic error deemed it as the sole, the last, and absolute revelation of God, to be fulfilled by man, precisely in the form it wears. And yet, what grand conceptions of its purity, divinity, authority, eternity! only lost by deep apostasy. As

to the circle of Eschatology, no reader of the book will fail to see how much there is in common with the prophets, as to Messiah's Kingdom, Power, and Glory, on the Earth; Israel's Redemption, the Resurrection of the just, the Golden Age, the Final Resurrection and the Judgment of the World, followed by the endless state. If later Judaism corrupted these by carnal fancies, yet the main outlines of the Jewish doctrine are precisely those of the prophets; and, abating the corruptions, as also making allowance for the fact that only one Advent of Messiah seemed to be predicted, and only Jewish-Gentiles share the final glory, their outlook is just what we see in John's Apocalypse. It is impossible not to realize the fact that the Eschatology of the Jewish Church passed, in its purest form, through Christ and His Apostles, into the Christian Church of early times, and was then corrupted, as was all other truth, and that the New Testament prophetic outlook cannot be interpreted aright, apart from the recognition of those great leading lines, and that order of events, common to the prophets and the ancient Jewish faith. If the Christians are not always right, the Jews are not always wrong. The Church has much to learn from the Synagogue, as well as the Synagogue much to learn from the Church. Dr. Weber's investigations on Sheôl seem to justify our New Testament translation of "Hades" by "Hell," in the authorized version, and prove that in the purer Jewish faith, the souls of the righteous passed immediately to the Throne of God; beholding, there, His glory. His discussion of "*Olam Habba*," the Coming Age, *αἰων ὁ μέλλων*, "the World to Come," makes the Epistles to the Hebrews glow with light, as Wuen-sche's on the "*End*" clears up the darkness in the Olivet-Discourse. One cannot but wish that day were near, when Jew and Gentile might see eye to eye in the Kingdom of God. To quote from Dr. Weber, in a brief review, was impossible. The rubrics are enough to show the greatness and the value of the work.

◁GENERAL NOTES.▷

A Kid in its Mother's Milk.—The passage "*Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk*," is thrice repeated in the Mosaic law. The Jews here explain the expression גֵּרִי בַחֲלֵב אִמּוֹ to mean a sucking kid, but when asked what is the meaning of the passage, they explain it as a prohibition of cooking a kid, or any other "butcher's meat" in "semen," i. e. the melted and clarified butter with which Orientals mostly do their cooking.

I will give you instead the interpretation of my servant, who is an Egyptian "Fellah," quite innocent of reading and writing in either Hebrew or Arabic, and who, I am quite sure, has never heard the passage read or explained. Of a certain act of cruelty he said—"That would be as bad as cooking a kid in his mother's milk." (Gidi be-leben imu). He thus used the exact Hebrew expression with the simple substitution of "leben" for חֲלֵב. (The Syrians call sweet milk "halub," and sour milk "leben." The Egyptians call sweet milk "leben," and sometimes add the other word, and call it "leben halub.") I asked him what he meant by "Gidi be-leben imu," to which he answered, "A sucking kid." This shows what was among the Hebrews is still here the proverb for cruelty to animals, and any one who has heard the almost frantic bleating, and piteous moaning of a goat deprived of her

suckling, will understand the naturalness of the proverb. The spirit of the precept is therefore that of the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and with this naturally fall in the passages which we find in Ex. XXII., 29; Lev. XXII., 27, 28, and Deut. XXII., 6, 7.

G. LANSING.

The Study of Palestinian Life.—Well has it been said, "Immutability is the most striking law of Eastern life." This unchangeableness gives immense weight to all researches into the present condition of Palestine. We have had of late much very important work done by the Palestine Exploration Fund. The *land* has been surveyed throughout by able men with most valuable and interesting results. But far more valuable and interesting discoveries are to be made in an exploration of its *life*. Not only are many questions of topography of comparatively minor value to the Biblical student, even when perfectly clear, but such is the state of emptiness, ignorance, wasting and general decay into which the country has fallen for upwards of a thousand years that a perfect identification of most Scriptural sites is scarcely possible. But in the case of the manners, customs, productions, great natural features, and a large part of the language of the people, these through ages of convulsion have survived unaltered, and may be seen and heard to-day in Emmanuel's Land the same in all essentials as they were seen and heard by David three thousand years ago. Ruin has been able to make but little havoc in these living, divinely-preserved commentaries on the Written Word. And more than this, the simple, everyday features of Palestine life, when once recognised, throw, in very many instances, a broad flood of light across the pages of the Bible. The identification of the site of a city may serve to explain one or two important narratives, but the discovery of an ancient custom, a regular atmospherical phenomenon, or a technical expression still on the lips of the people, may give a new force—ay, perhaps a new meaning—to a hundred passages.—*Jas. Neil, in Palestine Explored.*

Camp-fires in the Holy Land.—The lighting of camp-fires is a constant and very noticeable feature of journeys in the Holy Land. Fuel for this purpose is afforded by the low, woody, herbaceous growth, partaking largely of a thorny nature, which abounds in the deserts, and is to be met with by the wayside in most parts of the country. The "fire of thorns" is often alluded to in the Old Testament, and every resident in Palestine has reason to know what a familiar sight it is.¹ Easterners, who have a great dread of darkness and a passionate fondness for light, seem to rejoice to seize every opportunity of making these bonfires, and continuing them far into the night. They particularly delight in the crackling and the bright flames which thorn bushes specially throw out. They kindle these fires, however, as much for protection as for pleasure. The lurid light thus given serves to scare away the wild beasts which come out at night in many lonely places, and also to show to those on the watch the approach of thieves and robbers. When traveling under the escort of *Bedaween* Arabs in certain dangerous parts of the desert, travelers have observed that their wild escort keep up watch-

¹ Psalm cxviii., 12; Isaiah xxxiii., 12. Sometimes the mention of fire in connection with thorns refers to large conflagrations kindled in autumn. These extensive fires are lighted to clear the stubble lands of their wild growth, amongst which thorny plants of many kinds are very numerous (Exodus xxii., 6; 2 Samuel xxiii., 6, 7; Nahum i., 10). The context generally shows which kind of fire is meant.

fires round the camp all night, while the "keepers," or guards, shout out at intervals to render the protection more complete. On one occasion, while traveling through the waterless desert leading to Palmyra, when within a short distance of its ruins, I had to pass a large camp of the 'Anazeh tribe of *Bedaween*. I was traveling all night, accompanied by a friend and a government escort of soldiers. For an hour before we drew near to them, we saw large bright fires encircling the encampment, and we had to ride far out of our way in order to avoid them. The flames of these fires were kept up till daybreak.

There would seem to be a plain allusion to this practice in the promise of Jehovah's safeguard over Jerusalem in millennial times. "Jerusalem shall abide as the country parts, for the multitude of men and cattle therein. And I, saith Jehovah, will be unto her a wall of fire round about."¹ All Eastern cities to this day are surrounded with high massive walls and stout iron-plated and iron-barred gates. The security, wealth, and safety of Israel during the fulness of Messiah's kingdom is shown in this representation by its walls being thrown down, its boundaries immensely enlarged, and its being inhabited like a vast camp over which the Lord Himself continually watches.

Still clearer is the reference to these camp-fires kindled for protection, in a passage in Isaiah. The prophet, after administering comfort to the faithful in Israel, proceeds to warn the faithless and self-righteous of the utter futility of their carnal efforts to seek salvation. To all who fear Jehovah he says—

"Let him that walketh in darkness,
and hath no light,
Trust in the name of Jehovah,
And stay himself upon his God."²

But to the unbelievers he cries, in the next verse,

"Behold, all ye that kindle a fire,
That gird you about with flames!
Walk in the light of your fire,
And in the flames ye have lighted:
This shall ye have from my hand;
Ye shall lie down in sorrow."

Here the girding about with flames, evidently as a means of protection in the darkness, is connected with lying down to sleep. Yet their rest shall be broken by trouble and sorrow, notwithstanding all the flames of the watch-fires with which they are surrounded.—*Jas. Neil, in Palestine Explored.*

Influence of the Jews in the History of Mankind.—Never at any time, except it be quite lately, have the Jews numbered more than six or seven millions; throughout their whole history, they have been a people despised and hated of all nations, and yet there is no doubt that, notwithstanding all this, they have exerted, and in one way and another, are still exerting, a transforming and determining influence upon human life, beyond that of any nation that has ever lived upon the earth. This is the more remarkable that whereas, in the case of other nations, as, for example, Greece and Rome, their day of greatest influence was the day of their greatest national prosperity, and that influence waned with their declining fortune, with Israel, the reverse has been the case. With the accession of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, the Jewish state began a course of steady decay, but throughout this period, from soon after its beginning for several hundred years, were pro-

¹ Zechariah II., 4, 5. ² Isaiah I., 10.

duced one after another, those wonderful writings of the Jewish prophets, which to this day so move the heart and so influence the life of Christendom. And then as the consummating fact of all, we cannot forget that after all the prophets had come and gone, and Judea had sunk to be an insignificant province of the Roman empire, out of this same people arose the Jesus of Nazareth, whose short life of no more than three and thirty years, has undeniably proved, however any may explain it, to have been the turning point in human history, the most decisive and far-reaching crisis hitherto in the history of mankind. There is not a single people of any note for active and widespread influence in the world to-day, which does not signify its appreciation of this fact by reckoning all its history with reference to the year in which that Jewish carpenter was born.

As to the nature and extent of the influence of the Jewish nation, much more might be said and will be in the sequel. For the present let it suffice to note a single point. All the monotheism in the world to-day, Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan, has its source in the Jewish nation. So far as we can see, then, except for them, the world would have been to-day without a faith—at least in any organized form as a religion—in the being of one personal God, the Creator and Governor of the world. Whatever, therefore, of influence the belief in the existence and government of such a Being has had on the history and destiny of man, it is strictly correct to say that is the measure of the influence of the Jewish nation. And so, again, it is plain that as regards influence upon the practical life and speculative thought of men, as in other respects noted, Israel holds a position, as compared with other nations, absolutely solitary, unapproached by any of the greatest and mightiest races of mankind!

This fact, in itself so remarkable, is the more so, that it was not to have been anticipated from anything in the Israelitish stock itself or in its early history. It cannot be ascribed to superior intellectual power; for, while we fully recognize the naturally high endowments of the Jewish race in this respect, there is no reason to believe in this regard they were or are superior to other races that might be named. It can hardly be attributed to a deeper spirituality, as a characteristic of the race, leading them more than others to seek after God. In this respect, again, it may be more than doubted whether they have been on the whole naturally superior to other races, such as the Hindoos, for example, or the ancient Persians. Without joining at all with many "anti-Semites" in Europe and elsewhere, in indiscriminate abuse of the Jews, as if all alike were usurers and extortioners, we shall not be held uncharitable in saying that the Jews certainly never have been nor are now noted for an unworldly spirit. It would probably be hard to find a race more eager in the pursuit of worldly wealth and all that wealth can give, than are the Jews. Neither can we, with Renan, attribute this conquering Jewish monotheism to a "monotheistic genius" in the race. Their early history, as we learn it both from their own records and from other ancient testimonies, goes to prove the exact opposite of this theory. It has been clearly demonstrated, that the early Semites, so far from being distinguished for their opposition to the idolatry and polytheism which already, with the first dawn of monumental history, we find prevailing in the Euphrates valley, were distinguished rather in this, that they, as compared with other neighboring races, more swiftly descended to a more cruel and revolting idolatry than any other race or people of whom history has left a record. Prof. Ebrard, of Erlangen, has fitly described the state of the case in the following words: "Those Euphrates-Semites must have been given over to a

spirit of confusion out of the abyss, as they declared everything which the conscience forbids and condemns as infamous and horrible, to be precisely that which belonged to the service of the Godhead." And again, "It was no gradual declension from a purer knowledge of God to a knowledge less clear, as with the Persians, Indians, Greeks and Egyptians. The rise of *this* religion—the primitive Semitic heathenism—presupposes a wilful repetition of the original fall, a fall out of a state of simple sinfulness into a diabolical and demoniac hardness of heart, an accursed revolt against both God and the conscience." To the same effect Prof. Zoekler tells us, "History teaches us with the utmost plainness that the Semitic peoples—Israel not excepted—were rather distinguished by a natural inclination to a gross, sensual, idolatrous superstition, and a strong tendency to polytheism, instead of the monotheistic instinct which is claimed for them."

In full accord with all this, is the testimony of the books of the Old Testament. They uniformly represent the nation as, quite until the captivity, despite all the faithful instructions and warnings of the prophets who from time to time arose among them, again and again returning to the revolting cruelties of the worship of Moloch and the unnatural obscenities of the cult of Astarte, the "queen of heaven." And this, according to their own historians, was their character as a nation during the whole thirteen hundred years from the call of Abraham to the Babylonian captivity. Herein, assuredly, was no clear evidence of a "monotheistic genius." Not so can we account for the undoubted fact that the existing monotheistic religions all have their origin in Israel. On the contrary, that from a nation with such historical antecedents, such almost ineradicable tendencies to the grossest forms of idolatry and moral debasement, should have come all the monotheistic faith that there is in the world to-day, is a phenomenon so extraordinary that it may well command the attention of every thoughtful man.—*Samuel Kellogg, in The Jews; or, Prediction and Fulfilment.*

Shapira's MSS.—One of the best departments of *The Independent*, is that of *Biblical Research*. Every number of the paper contains from one to two columns of matter of the most interesting nature. In the issue of August 30th, there appeared the version of the Decalogue as given in Mr. Shapira's parchments. For the benefit of our readers we give the version as there printed, together with the translation, and the remarks which accompanied it:

אֱנֹכְךָ . אֱלֹהִים . אֱלֹהֶיךָ . אֲשֶׁר . הִחַרְתָּךְ . מֵאַרְצֶיךָ . מִצִּירֶיךָ . מִבַּת . עֲבָדֶיךָ .
 לֹא יִהְיֶה . לְכֶם . אֱלֹהִים . אֲחֵרִים . לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה . לְכֶם . פֶּסֶל . וְכֹל . תְּמוּנָה .
 אֲשֶׁר . בְּשֵׁמֶם . מִמַּעַל . וְאֲשֶׁר . בָּאָרֶץ . מִתַּחַת . וְאֲשֶׁר . בַּמַּיִם . מִתַּחַת .
 לָאָרֶץ . לֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה . לָהֶם . וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם . אֱנֹכְךָ . אֱלֹהִים . אֱלֹהֶיךָ .
 קִדְשֵׁךָ שֶׁתִּי . יָמֶם . עֵשִׂתִּי . אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם . וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ . וְכֹל .
 אֲשֶׁר . בָּם . וּשְׁבַתִּי . בַּיּוֹם . הַשְּׁבִיעִי . עַל . כֵּן . תִּשְׁבֹּת . גַּם . אֶתֶּךָ . וּבְהַמְתָּךְ .
 וְכֹל . אֲשֶׁר . לְךָ . אֱנֹכְךָ . אֱלֹהִים . אֱלֹהֶיךָ .
 כִּבְדֹךָ . אֶת אֲבֹתֶיךָ . וְאֶת אֲמִךָ . לְמַעַן . יֵאָרְכֶךָ . יָמֶיךָ . אֱנֹכְךָ . אֱלֹהִים . אֱלֹהֶיךָ .
 לֹא תִרְצַח . אֶת נַפְשִׁי . אֲחִיךָ . אֱנֹכְךָ . אֱלֹהִים . אֱלֹהֶיךָ .
 לֹא תִנְאֹף . אֶת אִשְׁתִּי . רַעַךְ . אֱנֹכְךָ . אֱלֹהִים . אֱלֹהֶיךָ .
 לֹא תִגְנוֹב . אֶת הֶן . אֲחִיךָ . אֱנֹכְךָ . אֱלֹהִים . אֱלֹהֶיךָ .

לא תשבע . בשמי . לשקר . כי . אנך אקנא . את עון . אבת . על . שלשם .
 ועל . רבעם . לנשא שמי . לשקר . אנך . אלהם . אלהך .
 לא תענו . באחך . עדת . שקר . אנך . אלהם . אלהך .
 לא תחמד . אשת . . . עברו . ואמתו . וכל . אשר . לו . אנך . אלהם .
 אלהך .
 לא תשנא . את אחך . בלנבכך . אנך . אלהם . אלהך .
 את עשרת הדברים האלה דבר אלהם

I am God, thy God, who made thee a freeman out of the land of Egypt, from the house of servants.

1. Ye shall have no other gods. Thou shalt not make for yourselves [a possible Hebrew construction, in which the nation is considered both collectively and distributively] an image, or any likeness of anything that is in the heavens above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, and thou shalt not serve them. I am God, thy God.

2. Sanctify . . . six days I made the heavens and the earth and all which is in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore thou also shalt rest; thou and thy cattle, and all which is thine. I am God, thy God.

3. Honor thy father and thy mother, in order that thy days may be long. I am God, thy God.

4. Thou shalt not kill the lives of thy brother [a strange construction and a strange order of the Hebrew words]. I am God, thy God.

5. Thou shalt not commit adultery with the wife of thy neighbor. I am God, thy God.

6. Thou shalt not steal the property of thy brother. I am God, thy God.

7. Thou shalt not swear by my name to a falsehood; for I will be jealous of the sin of the fathers unto the third and fourth generation, to him who taketh my name to a falsehood. I am God, thy God.

8. Thou shalt not bear false testimony against thy brother. I am God, thy God.

9. Thou shalt not covet the wife of . . . his man-servant, or his maid-servant, or anything which is his. I am God, thy God.

10. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart. I am God, thy God.

These ten words God spake.

It seems that there are two or three copies of the Decalogue in Shapira's parchments which slightly differ. Among the noticeable peculiarities we will mention the suppression of "plene" forms except in **ים**; the point after each word in the Decalogue portion (not elsewhere, the preface being regarded as part of the Decalogue), as in the Moabite inscription, except **לא** and **את**; the curious order of the commandments, the first and second being united, as in the Catholic style, the third being put before the ninth, and so altered as to be scarce more than another form of the ninth, and the number being filled out by adding the command "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart"; the addition of the formula "I am God, thy God," to each commandment; the awkward transfer of the sentence about God's visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the sons from the second to the third commandment (Shapira's seventh); the weak dilation of the sixth, seventh and eighth commandments; the mixing of "thou" and "ye" at the beginning of the commandments and the use of some peculiar forms, as the verb **החרתך** (to be free) for **הוצאתך** in the introduction, of **שת** for **ישת**, apparently the use of the old final **ו** for **ה** in **תענו**, the use of **קנא** (to be jealous) for **פקד** (visit). Dr. Ginsburg says that the words "that thy days may be long" are omitted in one duplicate, that the copies show traces of two different scribes, that one

copy has the regular plural אָנָם for אָנָת (fathers), so that the expression "God, thy God," does not appear in the Old Testament. The form of the letters being closely copied from the Moabite inscription, it is probably difficult to use them to prove the forgery, and a *facsimile* has not reached us. Internal evidence has to be relied on. Apart from general considerations, some of the minuter points which strike one may be mentioned. One is the use of the expression "made thee a freeman," which is incongruous with "land of Egypt." The expression "I am God, thy God," is extremely unlikely, and would be tautological. "Jehovah, thy God," or "Chemosh, thy God," would have a meaning; but this is meaningless. The use of the Hebrew word meaning "testimony" instead of that meaning a *witness*, in Shapira's eighth, implies a false idea of the verb. The use of "neighbor" in the fifth for the usual *brother* is dictated by something else than Oriental delicacy. The last commandment is quite too subjective to be genuine.

↳ EDITORIAL NOTES. ◀

A New Volume.—The name OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT has been substituted for *Hebrew Student* because the latter term seemed to convey to the minds of many a wrong idea of the aim and contents of the Journal. As is known to those who are acquainted with it, the Journal is not intended solely for students of the Hebrew language. Hebrew is studied for the sake of the additional light upon Old Testament subjects which a knowledge of it gives to the student. While, therefore, it would be extremely desirable for all students of the Old Testament to be students also of Hebrew, such a thing is clearly impossible. The great mass of those who ought to be Old Testament students are so situated as not to be able to become students of Hebrew. This fact makes it all the more important that they should avail themselves of such aids as it is possible for them to obtain. Our Journal, from the beginning, has been adapted to the wants of this class of readers. It is a time when laymen as well as clergymen desire to study, when Old Testament subjects demand the attention of all Christian men and women. THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT will aim to furnish its readers with fresh and reliable discussions of those Old Testament topics, which, to-day, engross the attention of scholars and thinkers. It will give the latest information touching the work of Old Testament specialists, and investigators. It will endeavor to keep its readers informed as to the literature of this department of study. It will, in short, aim to present in the smallest possible space, just what every student of the Old Testament desires to know,—just what he *ought* to know, in order that he may keep abreast of the times; for in no other field of investigation are the results more numerous, more interesting, or more important.

While, however, the needs of *Old Testament* students are specially kept in view, the Journal, it is hoped, will be found of equal interest and profit to those who are able to prosecute their studies in the original languages. No effort will be spared to improve the general character of the various departments. As heretofore, the Journal will receive the support of the best talent. Plans are already in process of consummation, by which it will be made more valuable and attractive. Feeling that success in this undertaking is dependent, largely, upon the assistance obtained from those who are interested in it, we venture at this time, to remind our

readers of the valuable aid, which, with even a slight effort on their part, they might render this work.

New Hebrew Professors.—During the summer months, many vacancies in our theological seminaries have been filled. Among others it is our privilege to notice the appointment of Rev. H. G. T. Mitchell, to the Professorship of Hebrew in the Theological Department of Boston University (Meth.), of Rev. Charles R. Brown, to the Associate Professorship of Hebrew in Newton Theological Institution (Bapt.), and of Rev. W. W. Moore, to the same position in Hampden Sidney College (Pres.), Va. These professors are all young men. They enter upon their work this month, after a long and careful preparation for it under able teachers in this country and in Germany. It is unnecessary to say that they have undertaken the work of that chair, which is, in many respects, the most difficult in the theological seminary. It is certainly more difficult to interest students in this department than in any other; the work of the first year, and, indeed, of the whole course is, for the most part, drudgery. What ought to have been learned in college, must now be learned under circumstances the most disadvantageous. There is a large amount of truth in what an Eastern Professor has said: "Among the noble army of martyrs, the glory and crown of the Christian Church, surely none will more richly deserve the eternal rewards promised to that patience which is proper to saints, than the Professors of Hebrew in our Theological Seminaries." But this is not the only difficulty attending the work of a professor of Hebrew. His position is an extremely delicate one. His opinions as to the questions of the hour are sought after alike by friend and foe. He cannot dogmatize if he is a true investigator, for he knows, if others do not, that however positive the traditionalist may be, however confident the higher critic may be, there are but few questions which, as yet, are settled absolutely. Yet he must assert an opinion; otherwise, either his scholarship or his orthodoxy will be doubted. It is safe to affirm that the young Hebrew professor occupies to-day a position at once trying and delicate. He, of all others, stands in need of forbearance, and of the moral support of his students and his colleagues. He must not be pressed for dogmatic assertions upon this or that subject. He who makes such assertions, unless indeed, he has for decades been engaged in investigation, may be set down as "full of conceit," and unsafe to follow.

July Hebrew Study.—At the School of Hebrew, held at Morgan Park, July 1-29, there were in attendance six instructors, seven lecturers, and eighty-five students. The numerous notices of the School, which have appeared in the various religious papers, have been seen by our readers. But it will be proper here to note one or two of the characteristic features of the School. Most striking of all was the sturdy determination to learn the language, exhibited by every student. The average age was about thirty-eight. Men of this age would certainly not leave home and church, give up recreation and rest, spend time and money to prosecute a study unless, in their very soul, they believed the prosecution of that study to be a duty, and unless, as a consequence of this belief, they were resolved to do all that was possible to be done in the given time. And so, hour after hour, day after day, and week after week, they bent themselves to the self-allotted task, inspired by their determination, and incited by the example of others. Is it at all surprising that such men, with such surroundings, should do a large amount of work, in a comparatively short time?

Another feature, worthy of mention, was the large number of denominations and widely-scattered localities represented. Members of eleven different Christian bodies, and residents of twenty-one different states and countries were present. Men of so varied religious beliefs, and of so different local interests could not mingle with each other in class-room, at table, and in social intercourse, without great profit. For the time being, all else was laid aside; a common motive prompted their work; a common end bound them together; and the good influence of this Christian fellowship was not the least valuable result of the School.

But what does it all mean? Will these men go to their homes, put aside their Hebrew books, forget what they may have learned, and be no better off than before they determined to undertake the study? This, no doubt, is an opinion entertained by many. That it is erroneous, every man who participated in the work will testify. An impetus, not merely to the study of Hebrew, but to all study, was received, the force of which will long be felt. No discipline, however excellent, is equal to that of the class-room. Nor will these men now throw aside the study of the Hebrew. Some of them carry it on in the theological seminary. Others join together, and by helping each other, help themselves. The majority continue their study in accordance with a regular systematic plan, by which sure and steady progress will be made, even amidst the cares and interruptions of a pastoral life. Not a man among them stops. Is this not a matter worthy of consideration? Is it not a straw indicating, in its small way, a tendency of the times? Is it true, as many assert, that there *is to be* more interest in these studies than there *has been*?

➤ BOOK NOTICES. ◀

[All publications received, which relate directly or indirectly to the Old Testament, will be promptly noticed under this head. Attention will not be confined to new books; but notices will be given, so far as possible, of such old books, in this department of study, as may be of general interest to pastors and students.]

THE BOOK OF JOB.*

Rosenmueller (1824) enumerates in his *Elenchus Interpretum* one hundred and twenty commentaries on the Book of Job. This volume, however, aims only to be a literal and easily accessible translation of the Massoretic text. The translator seeks to bring out as vividly as possible the idea of the original. No notes or comments are appended. We commend most highly one feature of the translation, viz., the retention of such Hebrew words as *El, Elohim, Eloah, Shaddai Adhonai, Goel, Sheol, Abaddon*, for which the English language has no exact correlatives. The translator believes that there is no satisfactory ground for the opinions that the Book of Job belongs to the patriarchal age, but although he is not inclined to dogmatize upon the subject, is inclined to assign it to a period between Solomon's reign and the Exile. He understands the great lesson of the Book to be "that God is omniscient, omnipotent and inscrutable; and that as 'He gives to no man an account of His matters', man must acquiesce where he cannot

* *The Book of Job*. Translated from the Hebrew by J. M. RODWELL, M. A., of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge; Rector of St. Ethelburga, London. Third Edition. London: F. Norgate, 7, King Street, Covent Garden. U. S.: *Old Testament Book Exchange*, Morgan Park, Ill. 12mo. Pp. 80. Price, 85 cents.

understand, and walk by faith, not by sight." The translator has accomplished well his immediate object, to bring out as vividly as possible the vigor and strength of the original. A common fault of translation is the endeavor to supply everything which the fancy of the translator sees in the text. We have not space to criticize his translations of special texts. The verses given below (III., 3-10) will give the reader a general idea of the style and character of the work attempted.

Perish *the* day in which I was born,
 And the night that said, "A man-child is conceived!"
 That day! let it be darkness!
 Eloah regard it not from above!
 Nor let light shine upon it!
 Let darkness and death-shade reclaim it!
 Let cloud abide upon it!
 Let obscurations of *the* day affright it!
 That night! deep darkness take it away!
 Let it not be united with *the* days of *the* year!
 Let it not come among the number of *the* months!
 Lo, that night! be it barren!
 May no cry of joy enter it!
 Let those who curse days, lay their ban upon it,
 Those who are of skill to rouse up Leviathan!
 Darkened be *the* stars of its twilight!
 Let it wait for light and there be none!
 Norlet it behold *the* eyelashes of *the* dawn!
 For it shut not up *the* doors of my *mother's* belly,
 Nor hid trouble from mine eyes.

THE PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH.*

This translation, by the same author as that mentioned above, is similar in plan, and equally good in execution. Nowhere have we seen so clear a statement of the difficulties of translating correctly the prophetic portions of Scripture, as is contained in the preface to this volume. Not all students of prophecy will adopt the canon of interpretation here laid down. It is, however, the regulating principle of most commentators, and being such, is worthy of close study. This statement is as follows:

A translation will naturally take much of its color from the views which the translator himself may happen to hold of prophecy in general, and of the extent to which he regards the writings of any particular prophet, as penetrated by the Messianic idea. But not only will a translator be liable to translate according to some preconceived theory or bias, and often to stamp his theology on the very front of his version, but the translator of a prophet like Isaiah, whose utterances have a distinct and vivid reference to events taking place when they were spoken, and at the same time look forward to and comprise a distant future, finds himself burdened with the difficulty of doing justice to this twofold aspect of the author whom he endeavors to represent, and in danger of bringing either the present or the future into undue prominence by his choice of words and renderings.

A translator, for instance, may see in the Prophecies of Isaiah nothing more than the utterances of a pure patriotism, vague but lofty hopes of a brighter future, interspersed with dark pictures of the sufferings to which the faithful servants of God, whether as individuals, or as a prophetic order, or as a faithful remnant among the people, might be subjected. He might see in them merely a

* *The Prophecies of Isaiah*. Translated from the Hebrew, by J. M. RODWELL, M. A. London: F. Norgate, 7, King Street, Covent Garden. U. S.: *Old Testament Book Exchange*, Morgan Park, Ill.. 12mo. Pp. 171. Price, \$1.25.

reflection of the stormy times which ushered in and caused the decadence of the Jewish nation, and the rejection of an unwelcome message, which drew down upon the prophet the bitterest persecution. To such a translator, Isaiah would be little more than the patriot statesman, or the stern moralist filled with a boldness which enabled him to rebuke the sinful, whether princes or people, to strengthen the vacillating and encourage the faint-hearted. He will see in him one of those who stood against their age and the spirit of the world—never despairing of better times—a devout adorer of the God of his Fathers, and full of faith in that divine superintendence which looked throughout all the clouds that obscured the present to a bright but unknown future. Such a translator would of course translate in accordance with his literalistic views.

But though these views are true enough as far as they go, they do not satisfy the requirements of the problem to be solved, and are wholly irreconcilable with the idea of a progressive revelation culminating in Christianity. We are rather to suppose that while the prophecies, down to the minutest particular, have immediate reference to *passing* events, they also contain implied references and a capability of application to *coming* events in the history of the Jewish people and humanity at large—that whatever was spoken by Isaiah of Jerusalem, of the *righteousness* or righteous and faithful dealings of God with Israel, of their *salvation* or deliverance from Babylon, of *Cyrus* as its instrument, or of the *servant*, or servants of God, as its prophetic announcers, not only admit of a facile application to the Church and to the world, to the Messiah and his kingdom, but were so intended in the scheme of an over-ruling Providence. For the Prophet Isaiah does not stand alone. He is one of a long series of prophets, each of whom has a message pointing more or less distinctly to the central hope of man's salvation, and stands in connection with that long series of types and ordinances as well as typical characters, which all point in the same direction, and furnish the true and only key to the latent meaning of the prophetic word. To say the least, there is an extraordinary correspondence between the words of prophecy and the facts of the life of the founder of Christianity. But it is this which increases a translator's difficulty, that words which to Isaiah himself were probably little more than a dim intuition, only when taken in connection with their harmony with Gospel History, assume the proportions of divine enlightenment.

THE HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT.*

A debt of gratitude is due Professor Franz Delitzsch for the conscientious and painstaking labor, the result of which is seen in his Hebrew New Testament. The pamphlet before us, written in English, is intended (1) "to afford a glimpse into the work, of which the Hebrew New Testament is the fruit, and (2) to show what instructive results have proceeded therefrom for Hebrew grammar, especially syntax." The beginning of the work was made in 1838, when he translated 1 Cor. XIII. This was followed in 1870, by the translation of the Epistle to the Romans. In 1877, by the assistance of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the whole New Testament was issued. In this, the first edition, the text adopted was that of the Sinaitic Codex, the chief variations of the Textus Receptus being placed in brackets. The second edition appeared in 1878, based upon the Receptus. The third edition was issued in 1880. This edition was soon exhausted, and in October of the same year, with the assistance of Rev. Palmer Davies, the fourth, electrotyped, edition was published. And finally, after a careful revision of the text, a fifth edition has been published. It is exceedingly interesting to note some of the

* *The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society.* A contribution to Hebrew Philology by Prof. FRANZ DELITZSCH. Leipzig: *Dörffling and Franke*; U. S.: *Old Testament Book Exchange*, Morgan Park, Ill. 12mo. Pp. 38. Price, 50 cents.

changes, with the reasons therefor, which the translator, after the most exhaustive study, deemed it wise to make, e. g.

Matt. ix., 21 כִּי אָמְרָהּ בְּקִרְבָּהּ for *she said within herself* is changed to כִּי אָמְרָהּ בְּלִבָּהּ, because אָמַר בְּקִרְבֵּי has no support in biblical Hebrew. 2 Cor. viii., 22 פְּעָמִים רַבּוֹת is changed to פְּעָמִים רְבוּת

1 Pet. i., 13 וְקִוּוּ קִוּוּ and *hope perfectly* is changed to וְקִוּוּ קִוּוּ, because as he affirms, the intensive Inf. when combined with an Impv., always follows it.

Aside from the correction of typographical errors, the author notes fifty-six such changes as those given above. Every instance involves an important principle as to the usage of a word or construction.

Among other points, the author calls attention to the difficulty found in translating the Greek expressions of *doubting*, and to the canon of translation, "that when the context and meaning are similar" the same Greek word ought to be rendered by the same Hebrew word. It was found necessary, however, to introduce some variations; e. g.: *χάρις* is rendered חֶסֶד (John i., 17), חֵן (Luke i., 30), תּוֹרַת (Rom. vi., 17). *λειτουργία* is rendered עֲבֹדָה (Luke i., 23), but שְׁרוּת in Heb. viii. Professor Delitzsch accepts frequently, though not always, the criticisms of S. R. Driver. We commend the pamphlet to every student of Hebrew. It is full of rich suggestions, the fruit of a long and laborious life devoted to the study of the subject, and, in this connection, we would remind the student of the New Testament, that much assistance may be obtained from a study of the New Testament in the Hebrew dress.

→ REVIEW NOTICES. ←

Recent numbers of the various religious journals have not been rich in articles dealing with subjects relating to the Old Testament. *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (July, 1883) it is true, devotes two of its seven articles to discussions of the early Hebrew traditions. Prof. Dillmann (pp. 433-449) endeavors "to refute the proposition that the whole primitive history of the Hebrew books was borrowed from Babylonia," as the advanced school of criticism now assert. He suggests, first, that *a priori* the hypothesis is untenable, because the Jews would be slow to adopt the religious traditions of their oppressors, that in fact they appropriated indifferent things as names of months only very reluctantly and after a long period, that the polytheistic forms of Babylonian traditions could not have been reconstructed into an account of such monotheistic simplicity and beauty by the degenerate Jews of that day. But the larger part of his discussion is occupied with an examination of the actual facts, a comparison of the traditions, to discover the points of identity and dissimilarity. Four leading characteristics of the Hebrew tradition come in for examination, (1) A primeval chaos, (2) Paradise, (3) Primitive genealogies, (4) The flood. Comparing the Babylonian and Hebrew accounts in each one of these particulars, he discovers among some coincidences a greater number of divergencies. The conclusion arrived at is that "all wherein the Hebrew primitive history has points of contact with the Babylonian is also common property of other nations. The utmost imaginable would be that the late Jewish composers

might have, with reference to what they had heard in Babylonia, altered or interpolated the accounts of their native books; but this conjecture is not necessary, and is unsupported by farther literary facts."

To be read in close connection with the preceding article, in the same journal, is a *Symposium on the Antediluvian Narratives*, prepared by Prof. Curtiss, in which Prof. Dillmann again appears along with Lenormant, Delitzsch (Fdr.), and Haupt, in a discussion of this same general subject. It is, indeed, merely a synopsis of various works of these authors, Lenormant's "Beginnings of History," recently noted in this Journal, Friedrich Delitzsch's "Wo Lag das Paradies?," Haupt's lecture on "The Babylonian Account of the Deluge," and Dillmann's lecture reproduced in the same number in English, being summarized by the writer. Prof. Curtiss concludes with Dillmann that "this derivation of the Jehovistic as well as the Elohist narratives from Babylon during the Exile is one of the most startling vagaries of modern research, and is a complete *reductio ad absurdum*."

In the *Modern Review*, (July, 1883) the series of articles from the standpoint of the Advanced School, is represented by an examination of the Book of Judges from the pen of Prof. J. Estlin Carpenter. The hypothesis being taken for granted that it was written late in the Jewish history, the principle on which it was compiled is as follows: "The Prophet who beheld his people frequenting the licentious orgies of the Baals had no hesitation in announcing that disaster was at hand; and the historian had simply to invert the order, and from the record of defeat to infer the antecedent sin. From the conquest to the fall of Jerusalem the editors gathered the national traditions and reversed the national annals under the focus of this central idea. . . . No book shows plainer evidence of having undergone this prophetic reconstruction than the Book of Judges." The component parts of the Book are, chap. I., Introduction; a short fragment II., 1-5; the real Judges-Book, II., 6-XVI., 31; two episodes appended, (1) XVII., XVIII., (2) XIX.-XXI. In the examination of the Book, the writer finds (1) Great modifications of the traditions in the light of later ideas; (2) Unreal character of the conquest given in the Book of Joshua. In that Book, it is represented as "the triumphant action of an entire nation, marching in united hosts from city to city, and leaving behind them nothing but blazing homes and slaughtered people. The war was a war of extermination. No one was left to tempt or seduce them. The Sanctuary was set up in the centre of the land. In full possession of the Law, they were undisturbed in the discharge of its injunctions. Their apostacy was willful." Closer investigation reveals the unreal character of this representation. The first chapter of Judges, together with other scattered hints of popular tradition and of later fact, enables us to correct the Book of Joshua. The attack was made not by a single people, but by detachments. No cities fell by trumpet blast. The defence was stubborn. The Canaanites were not exterminated nor were they ejected. The settlement of the tribes may have been effected by peaceable extension. But by this dispersion, the unity of Israel was broken up. To blend the new elements with it, and evolve a higher unity was the work of centuries. The Book of Judges contains the record of tentative efforts in this direction. It tells (a) of the necessity of numerous places of worship and their establishment all over the land; (b) of the adoption, as was natural in the absence of any external unity, of the Canaanitish religion; (c) of the reaction against Baalism of the old Yahveh ideas in the revolt of Deborah and Barak. The conclusion is that the time of the Judges was a time of transition. The rude tribes of the desert are settling down

into an agricultural life. Conflicting impulses struggle for the mastery. Its crimes outrage our ideas of propriety and civilization. But new forces are being stored. They result in the next age in the Monarchy and the Prophetic order.

➤SEMITIC➤AND➤OLD➤TESTAMENT➤BIBLIOGRAPHY.◀

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- CRAFTS, REV. W. F., Must the Old Testament Go? or; The Relation of the Old Testament to the Christian Life of to-day. New York: *J. H. Earle*, pp. 119.....\$.40
- SPENCE, REV. H. D. M. and EXELL, REV. J. S., The Pulpit Commentary: Joshua. Am. Ed. New York: *A. D. F. Randolph & Co.*.....\$2.00
- EVERETT, REV. C. C., D. D., Religions before Christianity: manual for S. S. Boston: *Unitarian S. S. Soc.*, pp. 62.\$.25

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- BOEHL, E., Zum Gesetz u. zum Zeugniß. Eine Abwehr wider die neukrit. Schriftforschg. im Alten Testament. Wien: *Baumüller*, '83. (v., 231 S. gr. 8.).....\$1.25
- BERTHEAU, E., Die Sprüche Salomos erklart. In 2. Aufl. hrsg. v. *W. Nowack*. Der Prediger Salomos. Erklart v. *F. Hitzig*. In 2. Aufl. hrsg. v. *W. Nowack*. (Kurzegefasstes exeget. Handbuch zum A. T.) Leipzig: *Hirzel*, 1883. \$1.50
- THOMAS, D., The Book of Psalms, exegetically and practically considered. Vol. 2. London: *Dickinson*.....\$3.00
- DELITZSCH, PROF. FRANZ, The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society. A contribution to Hebrew philology. Leipzig: *Doerffling and Franke*, 1883. (37 S. gr. 8.).....\$.50

RECENT ARTICLES.

- BIXBY, REV. J. T., The Religious Genius of the Races. *Unitarian Rev.*, July and August, '83, pp. 70-78, 97-114.
- EACHES, REV. O. P., Comparative Religion. *Bapt. Quar. Rev.*, July, '83, pp. 267-278.
- DILLMANN, A., D. D., On the Origin of the Primitive Historical Traditions of the Hebrews. *Bibl. Sacra*, July, '83, pp. 433-449.
- CURTISS, PROF. S. I., D. D., A Symposium on the Antediluvian Narratives.—Lenormant, Delitzsch, Haupt, Dillmann. *Bibl. Sacra*, July, '83, pp. 501-533.
- CARPENTER, PROF. J. E., The Book of Judges. *Modern Rev.*, July, '83, pp. 441-463.
- FROTHINGHAM, REV. F., The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. *Unitarian Rev.*, July, '83, pp. 62-69.
- KELLOGG, PROF. S. H., D. D., The Doctrines of the Buddha and the Doctrines of Christ. *Pres. Rev.*, July, '83, pp. 503-547.
- PAINE, PROF. J. A., The True Mount Lebanon—Scriptural Testimony to the Place. *Journal of Christ. Phil.*, July, '83, pp. 487-520.
- PARK, REV. C. W., The Brahma Samaj, I. *Bibl. Sacra*, July, '83, pp. 401-432.
- ARNOLD, MATTHEW, Isaiah of Jerusalem, II. *Nineteenth Century*, May, '83, pp. 779-794. *Eng. Ed.*
- LAUTH, Zur Geschichte der Aegyptologie. I. *Lit. Rundschau*, '83, 13, Pp. 385-390.