

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. IV.

MARCH, 1885.

No. 7.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDY FOR HOMILETIC USE.

BY R. S. MACARTHUR, D. D.,

New York City.

The Old Testament is often in danger of neglect and disparagement. Some, because of acknowledged ignorance of its worth, belittle its claims. Others with an air of superiority insist upon confining the attention of our Sunday Schools to the study of the New Testament, and, in some cases, simply to the four gospels. They talk slightly of the Old Testament as compared with the New. In their judgment it is but the gray dawn of the morning compared with the dazzling splendor of the noon-day; it is but the ladder up which we climb to lay hold of the ripened fruit of revelation's harvest. The relation between these parts of God's book is at this moment a subject of frequent discussion in our Sunday School and general religious papers. Let us remember that we do not honor the New Testament by dishonoring the Old. All parts of God's work are perfect. It was a part of this Old book, which David so loved, and in which he meditated both day and night. It was this book with which Timothy was so familiar that Paul could say of him, "from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings." Of these "sacred writings," Paul in addressing Timothy affirms, that they "are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." It was this book, which Christ studied and expounded, and which he commended his hearers for knowing.

The "Higher Criticism," if sincere and devout, will, in the end, do good. It is worth something, that attention is called to the history and distinctive characteristics of the Old Testament. Truth, no matter who brings it to us, is from God. We gladly welcome it. In encaustic tile at the entrance to Tennyson's home in the Isle of Wight are the words, "Truth against the world." We would gladly put these words at the head of every sermon. It is truth we seek. Truth

never fears examination. It invites scrutiny. The stoutest believers in the Old Testament are the readiest to welcome fair criticism. There is a criticism which is merely destructive. This requires only the lowest order of talent. It makes up in bluster what it lacks in ability. Out of the fiercest fires of criticism all that is the truth of God will come without the smell of fire on its pages. The best evidence of Christianity is Christianity. The best evidence of the worth and inspiration of the Old Testament is a knowledge of the Old Testament. The criticism—from whatever motive it arises—which leads to a fuller knowledge of the Old Testament is a blessing. Well will it be for the Churches of Christ, and for all the interests of truth, when this larger knowledge of the Old Testament, is derived from expository preaching, by men who avail themselves of the New, so far as it is true, and who cling lovingly to the Old, so far as it is true.

After an experience of nearly five consecutive years, in preaching expository sermons on Sunday evenings, taking the Old Testament in regular order, the writer is constrained to name some of the homiletical advantages, which this use of the Old Testament possesses.

1. There is the freshness, the novelty, of the Old Testament narratives.

To many, otherwise intelligent men and women, large portions of the Old Testament are a *terra incognita*. If honest, they would have to put at the beginning of many a chapter and book, what we used to see in the old geographies concerning an occasional portion of country, "unexplored region." The pastor who will lead a congregation through these vast regions, will do, as has been suggested, what Stanley and Livingstone did for Central Africa. He will open for many of his hearers a country beautiful beyond their wisest thought, and interesting beyond their highest hope. The Bible is unexhausted; it is inexhaustible. Expounding Shakespeare, no actor in the world could hold an audience year after year. Expounding any other book in the world than the Bible, no man could get an audience weekly for a series of years. The Book never grows old. Much of the majesty of the Divine Author is seen upon its pages. You do not refuse to go up the Hudson on a beautiful moonlight summer night this year, because you went up on a similar night last year. You do not refuse to send your bucket down into this well to-day because yesterday you drank of its delicious water. There is a freshness in these narratives which would put life, power and beauty into the sermons which to-day are marked by wearying platitudes and monotonous hortations. This freshness would stimulate and charm men and women of highest literary attainments. These narratives reveal a new world. The civiliza-

tion of that olden time again lives and moves before us. Its crudities and its charms amuse and instruct. The man who so uses the Old Testament or the New, will give his preaching much of the freshness, variety, and authority of the Divine Word itself. Such a man will not run out. His own mind will catch the inspiration of the Book; his style will have freshness, quaintness, forcefulness, and a certain archaic charm. He will supply a want whose existence the people feel. He will tell them things newer to them than the events which unfortunately they read that morning in their Sunday newspaper. He knows that they are painfully ignorant of the Old Testament. He has often watched their hopeless look, as they tried to find some obscure book. Now he finds that they are reading carefully for each Sunday evening's subject. He finds them with open Bible following him as he preaches. He will find in the congregation men and women from other denominations (whose pastors do not so use the Bible), who are hungry for the Word of God. He will find that a new world is opening for himself and his people. How often have these statements been verified in reading and preaching recently on Saul, David, Jonathan, Mephibosheth and others. The remarks made by men not accustomed to attend church, and by some even who are church members, as to their surprise in finding the Bible so interesting a book would cause a smile at the expense of the dignity of the *Old Testament Student*. How shall ministers prolong their pastorates? One way, is to know more and to preach more Bible. How shall congregations be drawn to the second service? One way is to lead them into the unexplored regions of the Old Testament narratives.

2. There is also the inherent interest and instruction of these narratives. In the preceding paragraph we spoke of their novelty; we are prepared to advance a step. Their freshness arrests attention; their inherent worth imparts instruction. Think of the grandeur which gathers about Abraham, "the father of the faithful!" Consider the charms which the name of Moses, the leader and lawgiver of Israel, suggests. Remember the knightly, rather the saintly, virtues which brave Joshua illustrated; a life of one hundred and ten years without a stain. No wonder that his name fired the imaginations of the poets of the middle ages; no wonder that this man "without fear and without reproach," should have been the ideal of Christian knight-hood. In him submission and authority, strength and gentleness, kingly power and child-like simplicity beautifully blend; he is the soldier of God, the father of his people. What shall we say of David, Jonathan, Isaiah, Daniel, and scores more? The world waits with bated breath to learn the fate of General Gordon. He was a man to

arrest attention and to awaken enthusiasm. With the intrepid virtues of the puritan and the mysticism of the middle age theologian, he combined the fatalism of the dreamy Oriental; imperious as Napoleon, inflexible as Cromwell, he was zealous as Xavier. He appeals to the world's imagination, as he stands or falls the lone sentry at the outermost bounds of civilization and religion, and, whether standing or falling, he is loyal to his country and his God. Go with me into the records of this old Bible and you shall find many men to rank with General Gordon—men "of whom the world was not worthy."

But leave individuals and look at books. Think of the sublimity of the early history of the race, the matchless wisdom of the law, the idyllic beauty of Ruth, the peerless glory of the Psalms! With a sceptre more regal than he ever swayed over subdued Philistine, David sits crowned king in the glorious realm of lyric poetry and religious song. But time would fail to speak exhaustively of this feature of the book; to do so this paragraph would become a volume.

3. There is also the ready adaptation of the Old Testament to the spiritual needs of modern life. We are all familiar with the undue tendency of a former age to spiritualize all scriptural history. That is not the tendency to-day. A judicious use of this method is now in demand. How readily these ancient stories fit modern life, even a cursory student must see. In a real sense every man is his own Adam. All life has at some time its Eden. Every life knows something of the bitterness of the curse against sin, the menace of the flaming sword and the sweetness of the ancient promise of a Deliverer. Exodus is the history of every ransomed soul; each book is a chapter in our own struggling lives. The history of each individual is the history of the race. To this hour the Psalms are the mirror which best reflects the soul's loftiest hopes, lowliest penitence and most beseeching petitions. The fifty-first Psalm has sobbed and wailed through the world for three thousand years. The heart's bitter cry is heard in every line. These Psalms have been the *Miserere* and the *Te Deum* of the heart's noblest sorrow and most exultant joy. To this hour the Christian on the mountain tops of faith and hope, or in the vallies of doubt and despair, can find no vehicle of his thought so expressive, so simple, so sublime as these old Psalms.

4. Lastly, there is also a relation of the Old Testament to the New. Recent criticism has startled many people. Let them not be alarmed. Let the Old Testament be studied with fresh interest and the relation between the two Testaments will be the more helpfully understood. They are not two books; they are one. These sixty-six books are inseparable parts of a sublime whole. They are a divine

oratorio setting forth the might and majesty of Jesus Christ. Some parts of the New cannot be understood without a knowledge of the Old. Were there two Isaiahs? It would be well if we had twenty-two such men. Those who affirm that there were two have certainly not proved their claim. One thing is sure, there is but one God, and he is the glorious Author of this matchless book, this crowning revelation of Himself. This collection of books written by princes and peasants, poets and prophets during hundreds of years, is one book, and God is its author. Let us love it, study it, preach it, live it.

For the careful study of the Old Testament, we need, first, some knowledge of the original Hebrew. Busy pastors may make no claims to extensive Hebraistic attainments. But they would not give the little they know for twice the labor which its acquisition cost. No part of the Bible can be studied critically except it be studied in the original. There is a nameless flavor which the original words put into the mouth which no translation can supply. Going a few years ago in the steamer from Oban, the capital of the Western Highlands of Scotland, to the romantic and historic cave and cathedral of Staffa and Iona, a conversation was heard between a highland sailor and a lowland minister from Glasgow, as to the relative poetic merits of Duncan Ben, the Gaelic poet, and Robert Burns of universal fame. The sailor stood stoutly for Ben; the preacher for Burns. By parental associations the writer's sympathy was with the highlander; by actual knowledge with the lowlander. But the sailor won the day. When the minister was disparaging the Northern Poet, whose rude monument surmounted a hill near Oban, the sailor suddenly asked, with a broad highland accent, "Do you read the Gaelic?" The reply was in the negative. With a delightful scorn he said, "And you assume to pronounce on my Ben, whom you cannot read in his own tongue, but only in an English translation; as well might I pass judgment on your Burns from a French translation!" The sailor was victorious, to the delight of all impartial listeners. Think of Burns in French! Translate "A man's a man for a' that." To get the flavor of the Hebrew we must take the Hebrew into our mouths.

There have been good students of the Scriptures, who knew neither Hebrew, nor Greek. Their measure of success was attained in spite of, not because of, these disadvantages. Given the advantages and the success would have been vastly greater. In this respect our professors of Hebrew are conferring untold benefits on the younger ministry of the country.

There must be, in the second place, prolonged and patient study with the best aids attainable. These abound. We are heirs to a

noble inheritance. The very thought of it stirs one's blood. The intellectual wealth of the ages is ours. Let us fill ourselves with truth; and partake very sparingly of the merely destructive critic. He is often an insufferable offence. A child or an idiot can destroy; but children and idiots ought not to be turned loose in halls of statuary and galleries of paintings. They could destroy in an hour more than Raphael and Angelo could create in a life time. Most of all, we must cultivate a homiletic and devout spirit.

This is scientific. To enjoy the glorious hills, we must have mountains in the brain; to appreciate the sea, we must have oceans in the soul. Nature gives up her secrets only to her devout students. To understand philosophy and art we must be artistic and philosophical. To know God we must be God-like; to see him we must be pure in heart. To understand his word our ear must be trained to catch the music of his voice, our heart must feel the inspiration of his love. There is a knowledge which dictionaries and grammars can never give; he who has only this knowledge sits in the vestibule and is a stranger to the glorious temple. To sit at Christ's feet is the best university. The possession of divine love is absolutely essential to the understanding of the revelation of divine love. Love only can interpret love. The "undevout student" of the Sacred Word "is mad." He lacks the key to unlock the glorious arcana of God. "The people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits."

HERMENEUTICS AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY PROFESSOR MILTON S. TERRY, S. T. D.,

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

The conclusions of the Higher Criticism are mainly drawn from other considerations than the meaning of the several books of Scripture as determined by valid exegesis. We may have the clearest possible apprehension of a writer's words and of the scope of his entire work, and yet be in doubt as to the time and place of his writing, and be utterly ignorant of his name. The questions of the integrity of a given book, of its credibility, and its literary style, are to be discussed upon grounds outside the sphere of Hermeneutics. We carry our appeal to the intuitions of the mind, to a sense of the fitness of things, the probabilities or improbabilities of a given hypothesis. The date and authorship of the Book of Job, for example, are not likely to be decided by any exposition of its contents. The most lucid analysis of its argument and the most satisfactory and convinc-

ing interpretation, may yet leave the question of its origin an open one. And indeed we may well grant that more than one hypothesis is possible. The quite prevalent opinion, that this poem, so highly artistic in its structure, and having so many affinities with the Hochmah literature of the Solomonic and post-Solomonic period, belongs essentially to that classic age of the Hebrew nation, must have great weight with every thoughtful critic. And yet it may be forcibly urged that the reasons alleged for this hypothesis are not altogether convincing. The absence of allusion to the customs of Israel, and the simple and faithful portraiture of patriarchal times, are with many an argument equally strong for showing that the work is non-Israelitish and pre-Mosaic. Certainly, many of the arguments put forth against the high antiquity of the Book of Job would prove equally conclusive against the great age of the Egyptian pyramids and of the poems of Homer. Criticism may, indeed, with much assurance set aside the old notion of the Mosaic authorship of Job, but its reasoning against that particular theory would be without force against the hypothesis of an unknown author contemporary with Moses, or living before his time.

But these questions of Criticism become dependent upon Hermeneutics when, as with a number of critics, an allegorical interpretation of the poem forms the main ground of their judgment. If Job is regarded as a personification of Israel in the midst of the sorrows of exile, then it logically follows that the book belongs to the period of the Babylonian captivity. So, too, those interpreters who maintain that the suffering servant of God, in Isaiah LII., 13—LIII., 12, is the Jewish people in the miseries of exile, naturally assign the composition of Isaiah XL.—LXVI. to that same memorable period of national humiliation and distress. It is apparent, therefore, that in some important questions of the Higher Criticism, a valid interpretation of the language of a writer will either virtually determine the matter in dispute, or open a new issue. Can a well-balanced judgment affirm that the language and structure of the "Later Isaiah" are fairly satisfied with the allegorical interpretation? Is that wise servant, who was led like a lamb to slaughter, and whose wounds served to atone for the transgressions of others, a truthful portraiture of a sinful nation punished with exile because of its rebellion against the Holy One? If so, the conclusions based upon that exegesis may be legitimate, and it is seen at once that the results of the critical procedure are due to the method and principles of interpretation adopted.

The relation of Hermeneutics and the Higher Criticism may also be seen in the discussion of particular words and phrases. The use of the phrase "beyond the Jordan" in Deut. I., 1, 5, has been very nat-

urally cited as serving to indicate the place and time of the composition of Deuteronomy. The translation which reads "on this side Jordan" is now rejected as an error, but the assertion is often made that these words had acquired long before Moses's day a technical meaning, like the geographical term Perea, and can therefore determine nothing as to the position of the writer when he composed his work. The use of the words by Moses, however, as written in Deut. III., 20, 25, hardly comports with this position. Why, on this theory, should Moses employ a technical term in one sense when writing, and in another when addressing the people? Here principles of interpretation are involved, and the candid student, who has no theory to support, no bias one way or another, and who calmly weighs all considerations bearing on the subject in hand, will abstain from all dogmatizing utterances. His search is solely for truth, and truth can never be helped by adherence to a hypothesis, however venerable, which stands in conflict with the legitimate conclusions of sober exegesis.

Impartial criticism may, on the one hand, base itself upon an interpretation of Deuteronomy which reads in such phrases as the one just noticed evidences of post-Mosaic composition; in that case it finds itself opposed to certain ancient and widely-cherished beliefs. It may, on the other hand, with great force allege that a legitimate interpretation of the discourses therein attributed to Moses favors the opinion that in the main they are an accurate and truthful setting forth of the latest legislation of that great hero of the Exodus. No one would now maintain that Moses wrote the account of his own death and burial, as recorded in the last chapter; why might not the author of that chapter have been also the compiler of the whole book? And why, we may add, may he not have been a contemporary of Joshua and Eleazar, who like Luke, thought it good, having had perfect understanding of all things, to write them down in an orderly form (Luke I., 3)? But as soon as one assumes such an hypothesis, he is assailed by critics who allege that the passage concerning a king (Deut. XVII., 14-20) contains so accurate a portraiture of Solomon as to beget the conviction that it is of post-Solomonic origin. Here, however, it should be observed that this new issue opens into questions not to be settled by an interpretation of the text. There can be no dispute about the meaning of the language employed in Deut. XVII., 14-20. It plainly represents Moses as telling the people, prophetically, that when they shall have become settled in the land of promise, they will choose a king; and, in that event, he gives commandments touching his election and behavior. But whether Moses gave any such commandments at all, must be decided by considera-

tions outside the province of interpretation. Our conclusion on this point will not be likely to rest upon any question as to the proper meaning of the language here attributed to Moses.

Criticism may, however, sometimes be influenced by the supposed import of words, which, upon rigid scrutiny, will be found to furnish no convincing evidence in the case. How often have the words of Ezekiel (XIV., 14) been quoted to prove the historical character of the person of Job? It is incredible, say some, that a fictitious character should be thus mentioned in connection with Noah and Daniel. Here the appeal is taken to our sense of the fitness of things, and it should be conceded that there is force in the plea. Moses and Samuel are mentioned in a similar way by Jeremiah (XV., 1), and in the absence of other considerations, there is no good reason for even raising the question of their being real characters. Of Job, however, we have no other trace or knowledge than in the book which bears his name, and if, from a thorough study of the book, one reaches the conclusion that it is not a history of fact, but a dramatic production, that loses none of its beauty or usefulness by being regarded as essentially a parable, we see nothing in Ezekiel's language that compels him to set aside such conclusion. The leading character of a fiction may become so widely known and so familiar to thought as to figure as real in the language of common life. The righteousness and the patience of such a character would become proverbial, and a writer of the present day might, like Ezekiel, cite the familiar example along with real characters, without ever entertaining the question of the historical existence of the person named.

It is an accepted principle of Hermeneutics that an interpreter should identify himself with the spirit of the writer whom he would expound. Would he interpret Isaiah? He must transport himself to Isaiah's age, and become possessed with some measure of the emotion of the prophet when he surveyed the idolatrous abominations of his nation. He must also study his style of address, and seek to grasp the real purport of his imagery, so as not to read in them ideas foreign to the prophet's mind. When, for example, he portrays the sinful nation as diseased in head and in heart, and declares that "from the sole of the foot even unto the head—no soundness in it—wounds, bruises and raw sores" (Isa. I., 6), what exegete will insist upon the extreme literal import of his words? May we not allow that some of these doleful prophetic descriptions contain elements of Oriental hyperbole, and perhaps, at times, are colored by the prophet's own dependency? The language of Elijah, in 1 Kgs. XIX., 10, is manifestly of this character, and very possibly other prophets might have

expressed their heart-sorrow in similar terms, though not flying for their lives. When, therefore we find Isaiah denouncing the burnt-offerings, and the blood of bullocks and of lambs, as an abomination to Jehovah (Isa. I., 11-14), and Amos uttering like words, together with an obscure allusion to Israel's failure to offer sacrifice to Jehovah in the wilderness as contrasted with their idolatrous tendencies (Amos v., 25, 26), is it ingenuous to urge such passages as affording any valid evidence of the opinion of these prophets as to the divine origin of sacrifice or ceremonial? When Jeremiah declares that in the day of the exodus from Egypt, Jehovah gave the fathers no commandment concerning matters of burnt-offering and sacrifice, but rather enjoined obedience (Jer. VII., 22, 23), must we understand his words as a rigid statement of historical fact, which can have no other than a strict literal interpretation? Would not such a position oblige us logically to insist that, according to verse 25 of the same chapter, prophets had been sent unto Israel from the time of the Exodus *early every day* continuously? Here certainly is a question of exegesis, and he will prove the best interpreter who keeps himself freest from the polemical spirit. It scarcely satisfies the purport of Jeremiah's words to say that on the particular *day* of Israel's exodus, no specific commandment was issued touching sacrifice. Nor does the language accord with the view of those who would merely understand that the Decalogue contains no precept touching burnt-offering and sacrifice. Nor does it seem natural to explain the words as applying only to voluntary offerings, or so to paraphrase them as to make Jehovah say, "I did not at the exodus institute or command sacrifices *for their own sake*."

On the other hand, to affirm, as some do, that Isaiah and Amos, and Hosea (VI., 6), and Micah (VI., 8), and Jeremiah teach the utter worthlessness of sacrifices, and their lack of any sanction from Jehovah, is hazarding a proposition exceedingly difficult to reconcile with the whole drift of Old Testament history. Far more reasonable, many will believe, is the interpretation which finds in such a passage as Jer. VII., 21-26, not a sober historical statement to be literally taken, but an impassioned outburst of prophecy peculiar to Jeremiah, in which the utter worthlessness of sacrifice *as opposed to obedience* is made conspicuous. For this same prophet's language in ch. XVII., 26, and XXXIII., 17-22, is, to say the least, difficult to reconcile with the supposition that he regarded sacrifices as without the sanction of Jehovah, or not of divine origin.

And so again and again, in the literature of the Higher Criticism, we come upon questions which depend for solution upon the correct interpretation of a Scripture text. Many of these questions are

of too grave a character to be determined by a merely possible exposition; and, as in the discussion of biblical doctrines, no place or favor should be given to an imperious dogmatism. Nothing should be taken for granted, but every relevant consideration should be calmly weighed. Writers who indulge in frequent declarations of what a passage *must* mean, or of what it *cannot possibly* signify, and are wont to treat learned critics' views with contempt, are not the ones who command the confidence of the true scholar, however much he may admire their learning and ability. Hengstenberg and Ewald (*nomina venerabilia!*) represent two opposite extremes. Their invaluable contributions to biblical literature are everywhere acknowledged. But their opinions will probably have little weight with future generations of students just in proportion to the conspicuous dogmatism with which they were put forth. We can afford to wait a long time for the solution of some important questions of Criticism, but we cannot afford to rest complacently on any conclusion which has been reached through a dogmatic interpretation. Let us have, as far as possible, the exact truth, "though the heavens fall," for in that case the falling heavens will do us no harm.

THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL,—A SYMPOSIUM.

WHY THE OLD TESTAMENT SHOULD ALWAYS HAVE A PROMINENT PLACE IN SUNDAY SCHOOL INSTRUCTION.

1. We shall find nothing that can take the place of the biographies of the Old Testament as a means of conveying religious truth attractively and impressively.

2. We shall find nowhere else the best instruction for nations, for social and political organisms. The New Testament addresses the individual, and reaches society as a whole only in that way. It discloses immortality and the kingdom of heaven. The Old Testament is full of instruction and of warning for the kingdoms of this world, whose life it would regulate and whose destiny it would shape as ending here.

3. The Psalter is behind us only in time; in spirit, as in expression, it must ever be the Psalm-book of the Church on earth.

4. Our grandest Christian enterprises still run largely in prophetic grooves. The patron saint of missions after all, is not St. John

or St. Paul, but the rapt Isaiah. It is his bugle that even now rallies and guides the Christian host.

5. The New Testament can never be fairly understood without the Old. We have a product. To know whence it is, is no small help toward appreciating the force of the promise it has for the future of man and of men.

E. C. BISSELL,
Hartford, Conn.

A MISTAKE TO EXCLUDE THE OLD TESTAMENT FROM THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

It is my opinion that it would be a serious mistake to exclude the Old Testament from Sabbath school instruction or to disparage it as a factor in that instruction. Because

1. It is a part of the inspired Word of God, which has not been abolished nor superseded by the New Testament; and as such it is pronounced by the apostle "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and for instruction in righteousness." Even its typical rites and institutions, which have ceased to be obligatory as outward forms, point as directly as ever to their great Antitype, and in their substantial meaning are of permanent force and value.

2. The New Testament is throughout based upon the Old, and a knowledge of the latter is essential to a correct understanding of the former.

3. The elementary and preliminary character of the Old Testament adapts it in a remarkable degree for the instruction of the young, for whom its narratives have a special attraction, while its facts and institutions serve as object-lessons under proper teaching, and convey the truth more widely even than didactic statements.

4. The prevalent disposition to undervalue the Old Testament, and even to set aside its authority and historical character will be best counteracted by its more diligent and thorough study. The truth of God and his revelation is one in all ages and under both dispensations; his Church is one; true religion is the same and the method of salvation is the same. And it is very important that this unity should be perceived and the whole Bible be recognized as the standard of faith and the rule of duty.

5. Many prevalent errors and misconceptions are traceable to an undue neglect of the Old Testament. False views of the nature of salvation and an inadequate sense of man's absolute need of a divine Savior and his absolute dependence on divine grace result from a failure to emphasize the fall of man and the consequent corruption of the race

as set forth in the Old Testament. The mercy and love of God are set in a false light by him who fails to insist upon the law and justice of God dwelt upon in the Old Testament.

W. HENRY GREEN,
Princeton, N. J.

THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

It should receive studious attention. It has been a sadly neglected field. The more recent time and thought given to it in connection with Bible study, has been a great gain to the Church, and has led to a great enrichment of hearts. To thousands and thousands this Old Testament study has been a *Revelation* indeed, and a richly compensating delight and surprise.

But the morning twilight is not like high noon. Prophecy is good—but fulfilment is better. Should the types occupy us as much as the *Antitype*? Should the symbols claim our thought equally with *Him whom they symbolize*? The crimson thread runs indeed from Genesis to Revelation, but the heart that dyed it broke on Calvary. And we would better be found oftener with *the slain Lamb of God* than with the sacrifices that typified the great atonement.

So I think the New Testament should have more attention in the Sabbath School than the Old. But the dust should not be allowed to gather anywhere along the record of this wonderful Book. And if we would best "see Jesus" we must see Him in type and symbol and shadow and prophecy as well as in the unveiled face of the New Testament.

HERRICK JOHNSON,
Chicago.

THE OLD TESTAMENT A TEXT-BOOK.

The Old Testament is a part of God's Word to the world. It is a concrete putting of great principles involved in the divine administration. In making his revelation to the world God did not directly write a book, but wrought out a history, and caused this history with all that pertained to it to be recorded in a book. Here are the lives of great men, here are events, startling, impressive, suggestive, symbolic, prophetic, and weighted with spiritual significance. Here are laws, promises, sacred poems, and vivid pictures, the knowledge of which enriches the mind and prepares the heart for the appreciation of the spiritual truths which fill the New Testament.

The Old Testament is fulfilled in the New. By the New its meanings are multiplied and its spirit intensified. Much of the vocabulary

of the New Testament would be inexplicable but for the history and institutions of the Old. As a fact children are delighted with it. My observation, and the testimony which I receive from others lead me to believe that the Old Testament is quite as popular with childhood as the New. The only way to neutralize the modern infidelity which sneers at Old Testament history and exaggerates its "cruelties and barbarisms" is to make our young people thoroughly familiar with it, that they may know for themselves how false the charges are which are made against it. I do not distinguish between the Old Testament and the New. Paul said concerning the former that it was "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Believing that nothing is higher, more practical, or better for man than that he should be a man of God, and that he be thoroughly furnished unto all good works, I believe in the Old Testament as a text-book for use in the pulpit, the Sunday School, the family, and the closet of devotion, because it is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," and because it accomplishes the ends which I deem highest and best in human character and life.

J. H. VINCENT,
New Haven, Conn.

SHOULD THE OLD TESTAMENT RECEIVE AS MUCH ATTENTION IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL AS THE NEW?

This question presupposes that it is not a debatable point that the Old Testament should at all be the basis of Sunday School instruction, but asks merely whether this should be the case to the same extent as is done in regard to the New. It is (*sit venia verbo*) a question not of quality, but of quantity. In order to answer it, two things must be considered, namely, first, What does the Old Testament offer of the truths unto salvation; and, secondly, How does it offer these; is it in a way that they can be brought close to the heart and soul of a child? The problem involves both the matter and the manner of pre-Christian revelation.

As far as the matter is concerned we must remember that the Old Testament differs from the New, not in kind, but only in degree. They are the two sides of the one revelation of God given to mankind, to lead them to light and life; in both there is the one covenant of grace and faith, according to which the sinner is acceptable and pardoned, if he has faith and confidence in God's promises and providen-

tial guidance. Justification by faith is the cardinal doctrine of the Old Testament dispensation as it is of the New, as this is seen especially in Paul's argumentation in Romans and Ephesians. The principle of righteousness on the basis of an obedience to the law did not exist in the Old Testament, as might seem to be the case from the false view of the New Testament Pharisees. Abraham and all who lived under the Abrahamic covenant were justified by faith, and the law was given only to make this principle a living one in the national form of the theocracy. The central doctrines of the covenant of grace were in force before Christ as well as after, although in their fulness and depth they were not yet revealed as they are in the New Testament. But in germ they are all contained in the revelation and life of the Old Covenant; a fact that is acknowledged by Christ in placing himself in such a close relationship to the whole development of the kingdom of God before his time. True these central truths were still bound up in the national and local limits of one chosen people, and under the outward direction of a ceremonial law; but they were the potent agents in the Old Testament spiritual life as in the New. As St. Augustine says, "The New Testament lies concealed in the Old, the Old lies revealed in the New." As far as the matter is concerned, we find as much in the Old suitable for young minds as in the New. For the dogmatician and theologian this is not the case. But for those who cannot be expected to learn more than the great and cardinal truths of pardon and salvation through the mercy of God, the Old Testament is fully as fruitful as the New.

The same we must say of the manner of the Old Testament revelation. Seneca declares correctly that the teaching by precept is long, but by example is "*breve et efficax*." Children and youths are not able to comprehend abstract theological statements of the greatness of revelation; but when they see these truths, those of sin, penitence, repentance, pardon, trust, faith in God, in the lives and deportments of men, they can grasp and understand what these ideas mean. For this purpose the Old Testament is an excellent basis of instruction. Israel itself was in training to be educated toward "the fulness of time;" the guidance of God through a legal theocracy was to be "a schoolmaster unto Christ" (Gal. III., 19). Accordingly the history of this people and the documentary records of this history portray the educational process chiefly in the form of historical narrative, and in a way suitable for individuals who are going through a similar educational process towards a higher and deeper conception of Christian truths. The examples of faith even, *e. g.*, in the lives of an Abraham and David will furnish a clearer idea to young minds than a theoretic

statement of the great truth in Paul's Epistles will. Of course, the New Testament also furnishes excellent living examples of Christian truths, but the Old Testament does so at least to an equal degree, if not more. And for this reason I am of the opinion that the Old Testament is fully entitled to the same attention in the Sunday School that the New receives.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE,
Columbus, Ohio.

DIFFERENT SELECTIONS.

I do not think the Old Testament should receive any attention in our Sunday Schools except as related to the New Testament. Many of the lessons selected the last year, were, in my judgment, unsuited to the wants of Sunday School scholars. I believe the purpose of our Sunday Schools to be not to teach history, or language, or the religion of the Jews, but the religion of Christ. I would not discard the Old Testament, but I would make such selections from it, as point to the person and work of Christ. It is easy to criticise, but I do not think, good as the International System is, that it is nearly as good as it ought to be. Unless there is more of unity in the selections in the future, I do not believe all our churches will approve the uniform lessons.

EDWARD F. WILLIAMS,
Chicago.

SEVEN THESES.

Within the limited space assigned to the discussion of the question respecting "the use of the Old Testament in Sunday Schools" I may perhaps express my views to best purpose by presenting a short series of theses, without either elaborating them or supporting them by argument.

1. The point of view from which the question is to be considered, and from which alone an answer just to both Testaments can be given, is the person of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, who fulfills, certifies and illumines the truth of the pre-Christian volume, being Himself the final revelation of God and man, and the only real redemption from sin and death.

2. The canonical books of the pre-Christian volume are related to the pre-Christian economy of divine revelation and redemption, or to the divine-human history of the covenant people, as the books of the Christian volume are related to the Christian economy, that is, to the personal history of Jesus Christ and to the kingdom of God con-

stituted in him by the advent, on the day of Pentecost, of his Holy Spirit.

3. The close connection and the wide difference between the Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Scriptures are equivalent to the close connection and the wide difference between Jesus Christ and Moses, David, Samuel, Isaiah, and John the Baptist, or between the New covenant and the Old covenant, the New volume being spiritually richer and more important for the Christian Church in the sense in which the Christian economy, as the final revelation and the true redemption, is superior to the pre-Christian economy.

4. Of the pre-Christian economy the Messianic idea, announced in the promise concerning the seed of the woman is the fundamental principle, vitalizing the history of God's people, shaping typical persons and typical events, originating the Abrahamic covenants, actualizing the positive religious and ethical history of the chosen nation, inspiring the prophets, sustaining and imparting divine significance to the Mosaic ritual, from age to age with ever fresh power until the fullness of time had come, when the seed of the woman was born in the person of Jesus, who is the second Adam, God manifest in the flesh, the only true propitiatory sacrifice, the resurrection and the life, the glorified head of a new community; fulfilling in himself and his kingdom all pre-Christian promises, types, prophecies and all the positive events of history.

5. The books of the Old Testament may be studied in two ways: either we may read and interpret its persons, events, histories and ordinances in the light, chiefly or exclusively, of the pre-Christian economy, seeking to present the truth possessing, and expressed by, the Old Testament writers; or, we may read and interpret persons, events, histories, ritual and prophecies in the light of the Christian economy, seeking not only to learn historical facts but also at all points to discover and to set forth the Messianic import of facts and inspired teaching.

6. If we pursue the former course, or in the degree in which we fail to interpret the Old Testament by Christianity, we shall teach Sunday School scholars the conceptions of God and of man, the religion and morality, the ritual and worship, prevalent among the chosen people, and so far forth make them Hebrews and Jews instead of Christians.

7. If we pursue the latter course, interpreting all the contents of the pre-Christian Scriptures by Jesus Christ as the true criterion of judgment, we may from these scriptures teach Christian truth as regards religion and morality; but then we shall have to guard against

two dangers: the one, of reading into words, events and persons a degree and kind of Christian meaning which contradicts the lower plane of life and knowledge peculiar to the chosen nation; the other, of regarding either some, or all, parts of these books as wanting in Messianic import, thus reducing them, measurably or altogether, to the level of natural religion. Both errors violate the historical law of Messianic revelation, and do a wrong to the written Word of God.

E. V. GERIART,

Lancaster, Pa.

A CHANGE SUGGESTED.

Paul's inspired opinion that all parts of the Old Testament are "profitable" for conviction, conversion and Christian culture, verified as it is by Christian history, outweighs all the shallow criticisms recently made on the Old Testament lessons. I believe the International Series can be greatly improved by selecting golden texts that are complete watchwords, not such meaningless fragments as that for February 1st, "When they heard that (?) they glorified the Lord," and by putting lessons on Christ regularly into the four months from December 1st to Easter (which in seven years would give the same amount of time to lessons on Christ as is now given, but in better harmony with the Church year than to have a lesson on Saul's Death for Christmas Sunday and another as inappropriate at Easter), but I do not believe there should be any less attention to the Old Testament, "the Savior's Bible." In the present seven years's course, one whole year was given to the book of Mark,—and three-fourths of next year is devoted to John, so that 51 months are given to the New Testament and only 33 to the Old, which is a little more than three times as large, making the proportionate attention given to the Old Testament only one-fifth as much as to the New, which evidently should not be lessened.

WILBUR F. CRAFTS,

New York.

NO STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT BY THE INFANT CLASS.

Without entering upon any general criticism of the present International Sunday School Lesson system, it seems to me that the effort to secure perfect uniformity has prevented such adaptation of topics as is essential to the highest degree of success. The Primary Department, for instance, should be taught only the *Gospels*. Assuming that the usual period of instruction in that Department does not exceed four years, at most, in any fairly graded school, an opportunity is thus

presented for teaching the story of the Gospels in somewhat of fulness, covering from four to seven years. As, at the end of that period, the entire class will have been changed, a new arrangement of the same topics could be presented.

Beyond the Primary Department, I should favor the study of the Old and New Testaments, as at present, six months in each, because the two parts of the one great Book are so interwoven that an understanding of one is essential to an understanding of the other. That which our Lord deemed worth his while to master thoroughly, and which he so freely quoted, ought not to be set aside, or regarded as unworthy of study by our young people.

C. R. BLACKALL,
Philadelphia.

THE OLD TESTAMENT NOT TO BE DISPARAGED.

A scheme of biblical study which omitted the Old Testament would be strikingly defective, and there appears to me no valid reason for departing from the plan adopted in the International Series of Sunday School Lessons. Possibly some of the selections have not been wisely made, but, on the whole, the course pursued has been productive of a great increase of biblical study in the churches. Any change of plan which might seem to disparage the Old Testament revelation would probably effect more harm than good.

M. S. TERRY,
Evanston, Ill.

THE PROMINENCE GIVEN TO OLD TESTAMENT STUDY NOT TO BE DIMINISHED.

The Old Testament is the picture-book of our race. It was prepared for beginners in religion; and it has its attractiveness and its adaptation to such beginners, always. To deprive our children of an acquaintance with the wonderful narratives of the Old Testament story, would be to deny them that which is divinely designed for their enjoyment and profit; and to limit unwisely their means of pleasurable and all-important knowledge.

Moreover, the Old Testament is the basis of our religion. The New Testament has authority and power only as an outgrowth of, and as supplemental to, the truths of the Old Testament. No one can fully know, or can fairly appreciate, the New Testament without an acquaintance with the Old Testament. The study of the two is essential to a right understanding of either.

At the present time, the chief point of attack on the Bible, and on the religion of the Bible, by unbelievers, is the Old Testament. If, however, the Old Testament be rejected the New Testament must go with it—will go with it as a logical necessity. The only way of successfully defending the Old Testament foundation, and so of preserving the New Testament superstructure, is by a study of the Old Testament in conjunction with the New. That study in the Sunday Schools of America within the past twelve years has been a means of strengthening popular conviction in favor of both the Old Testament and the New. To diminish the prominence now given to Old Testament study in our Sunday Schools generally, would be to weaken the defenses of Christianity, and to deprive both young and old of their rights, and of a means of their legitimate pleasure.

H. CLAY TRUMBULL,
Philadelphia.

BETTER ATTENTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

If we are going to abandon the Old Testament, we might as well abandon the New also, and substitute a selection of nice passages from all the best literature of the world, for our current Sunday School Lessons. What we want is not less attention to the Old Testament, but better attention to it—the bringing out of the Gospel that is in it, instead of trying to tack the Gospel to it.

WILLIS J. BEECHER,
Auburn, N. Y.

REASONS WHY SUNDAY SCHOOLS SHOULD STUDY THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. *The New Testament cannot be understood without a knowledge of the Old.*

It is not merely nor chiefly that the Old Testament is quoted in the New, but the whole thinking of the Old Testament is inwoven into the New. The inspired authors were all (except Luke) Jews. They had been brought up on the Old Testament. With all, but Paul and Luke, it had been the one only book of their library, and with Paul it had been the subject of profoundest study. The New Testament, therefore, like the Old, is a Jewish book. It is not a Roman, Grecian, or Egyptian book. It is a book that forms part of the one stream of revelation, and that is Jewish. Allusions to Jewish history and Jewish ecclesiastical customs abound in it, and often lie hidden

from the eye of the reader who is not familiar with the Old Testament. Hebraisms also are many in both style of sentence and style of thought in the New Testament, which need the Old Testament for an interpreter.

2. *The Old Testament is a part of the Gospel.*

The good tidings came to Adam and cheered the Old Testament Church in its patriarchal and Israelitish forms. These tidings came in prophecy and type. Our Lord said of the Old Testament Scriptures, "They testify of me" (John v., 38). The law was a pedagogue to bring men to Christ. This pre-Christian testimony and guidance is not to be set aside because Christ has come. It is full of illustrative power regarding all the gospel truth revealed in the New Testament. Not only does the New Testament illuminate the Old, but the Old illuminates the New, making the Gospel all the clearer and enabling us the better to define the Christian doctrines.

3. *The Old Testament is God's revelation to man, and therefore demands every man's study.*

The idea that the Old Testament is a collection of old myths and the crude writings of semi-barbaric ages is an idea begotten of infidelity and born in carnal ingenuity. Time is wasted that is taken to meet such learned folly. The principles of the divine government are unfolded in the Old Testament history and biography. Man's sinfulness and God's combined justice and mercy are set forth in attractive lessons, by the side of which all human philosophies are distorted and impotent. God speaks in the Old Testament as much as he does in the New. The Church in all ages is one and the revelation is one. The Church of to-day is the same which God led out of the land of Egypt, the same which God preserved in the ark. We cannot sunder the Old Testament from the New without mutilating God's revelation and shrivelling the Church.

HOWARD CROSBY,

New York.

"I AM THAT I AM."

BY PROFESSOR S. T. ANDERSON, D. D..

Tehuacana, Texas.

In the third chapter of Exodus we have the record of the call and commission of Moses to bring forth the children of Israel from Egypt, and to lead them to the land of Canaan, to take possession of it, in accordance with the promise made by the Almighty to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The mind of Moses seems to have been filled with doubt, not only with respect to his own ability and fitness for so important an enterprise, but also as to whether the Israelites would receive him. It had been more than two hundred years since Jacob had gone down to the land of Egypt to sojourn. During this time we have no intimation that God had interposed, in any special manner, in behalf of the chosen people. Though they had increased in numbers more rapidly than any other people on the face of the earth, yet, politically, it had gone ill with them. No longer were they free, and allowed to pursue the active vocations of their fathers, laboring for the maintenance of their families and an increase of wealth; but, as serfs, they were soon reduced to the rigors of an Oriental servitude. Under the lash of relentless task-masters they labored from the early morning till the twilight of evening, under an almost tropical sun, making brick, quarrying and cutting stone, erecting to false gods those temples which constitute the pride of the Pharaohs, and are the wonder and admiration of the world to the present day. Though often, by tradition, they had heard that the land of Palestine was their inheritance, and that it was assigned to them by the Omnipotent Creator, yet so long had he tarried in his appearing to put them in possession, while so often, in the solitude of the night, they had sighed for deliverance from their bondage, and dreamed of the sweets of liberty in a land flowing with milk and honey, that it seemed too much for poor frail human nature. Not only no deliverance had come, but additional burdens were laid upon them. Infidelity had taken possession of their hearts. Hence, when the inquiry was made of the Lord who it was that proposed to give them deliverance, what was the name of him who had commissioned the leader to conduct them forth from the land of bondage, the reply was in the forcible language given in the caption of this article, translated, in the authorized English Version, I AM THAT I AM; and in the Septuagint, *Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*.

There are other reasons, in addition to the one given above, why God on this occasion should announce himself to the chosen people by a new name. Anciently it was customary to give a new name, or an additional title, to individuals when anything remarkable transpired in their history, especially if thereby they sustained a new relation to God or their fellowmen. When God renewed his covenant with Abram, declaring to him that he should be the father of many nations, in token of the great blessing thus conferred upon him, his name was changed to Abraham. When it was made known to Sarai that she would become a mother, and that, through her son, manifold blessings would come to the nations, her name was changed to Sarah. When Jacob wrestled with the angel of the Lord

and prevailed, he was named Israel. Esau was called Edom—Reuel, Jethro. So with the apostle to whom our Lord gave the surname Peter, a rock; though he did not exhibit fully that he was entitled to such a cognomen till after the resurrection. The leading reason for this change of name—the giving to an individual an additional one—was that names were significant, and served to point out some characteristic or peculiarity of the person, some prominent trait in his character, or some marked event in his history. Since these might occur with finite man, how much more with the infinite and eternal God! Hence his name, among primitive people, became manifold as the different aspects of his all-perfect character were brought to view. When his antecedent eternity and his absolute independence are contemplated, he is called Elohim, the Everlasting. When he was regarded as a personal, a free God, manifesting himself to an intelligent universe by the works of his creative power, he is called Jehovah, the Author of all things that exist. When his attributes which pre-eminently set him above all created beings come into view, his name is El 'Eliou, the Most High God. Or if his omnipotence is clearly set before the mind, his name is El Shaddai, the Almighty. But again, Moses had no need to ask the name by which God was commonly known. He was a worshipper of the true God, and hence he must have known the title usually applied to him by his people. God had, from time to time, announced himself to the ancestry of Moses, and therefore, in putting the question, did not have reference to any of the former names of God. Hence the name, in the conception of Moses, was the title which the present aspect of God toward his people would most clearly designate the new relation; or in other words, "What is the principle of thy being or movement of thy will which is now to display itself to thy people?"

Prof. Bush says, "The people were well aware, by tradition, that, whenever God had been pleased to honor any of their ancestors with a new revelation, it was his wont to assume a new characteristic denomination, expressive mainly of that attribute which served as a security for the fulfillment of the promise. Moses took it for granted that, on an occasion so momentous as the present, they would expect the announcement of some new and appropriate name which should carry in its import a kind of pledge for the performance of all that he was pleased to promise." Prompt is the Lord in meeting this new difficulty which presented itself to the mind of Moses. An immediate reply is a new name, differing in some respects, in meaning, from all his former titles—a name making himself known *to be*, by giving *being* to the promise made to Abraham centuries before. Thus Moses is assured that the Israelites will soon find that God *is* by the acts which he will perform in their behalf; hence the infidelity of their hearts will be removed, and they will settle down into a calm, serene faith, which leans upon the promises of a covenant keeping God. Farther, the use of the first person expresses a sentiment that will animate the people with a new hope and a firm resolution. It is not, therefore, a mere name, but a "word of moral power fitted to stir the heart and meet the present occasion."

If the above sentiment be correct, then the English expression of the name, *I am that I am*, is not correct. This any being can truthfully affirm of itself. It is merely a declaration that God is what he is; but it gives no information as to what he is. Surely such an expression applied to the Creator is trivial. By biblical scholars it has been rendered in two ways: First, I AM, because I am; sec-

ond, *I am that which I am*. The English Version, I AM THAT I AM, probably means the same as the second. A serious objection to this is, it takes a whole sentence to be the name. Upon a careful examination, it seems to me that the first word, EHYEH—I AM—is the name, and the latter part of the sentence renders a reason for, and points out the appropriateness of, the name. That the first word is the name, and that the other two form no part of it, is evident from the latter part of the verse, "Thus shalt thou say unto the sons of Israel, EHYEH—I AM—hath sent me unto you." Another objection is that it lays stress upon that which is no part of the name, thus confusing the idea. Such an idea as *I am that I am*, declared on so important an occasion by the Almighty and Ineffable God, was not fitted to implant confidence in Israel, or produce persuasion in their minds. Again, the sentence thus translated does not express the idea of EHYEH, which is the name given in the last part of the verse. This view of the subject affords good sense. It finds in the answer of God the new name and the reason for it. The sense is the same, whether we translate *asher* since, for, or because. Another advantage is that, in the two parts of the verse, it gives the same name, and in each the same sense. My name is I AM, for I am. This translation comports with the Hebrew structure and with the Massoretic pointing. The Massorites seem thus to have understood it; for a pause is inserted by them after the first word.

A critical examination of the verb *haya* will show that, when an intelligent being is the subject, it does not refer to abstract existence, but to the being as active and obvious to the senses. This is well illustrated by its use in Gen. 1, 2, which is thus rendered by Dr. Murphy, "And the earth had become a waste and a void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the water." The verb is in the perfect tense, and hence denotes that the confusion and emptiness had run their course and become a settled thing. According to the idiom of the Hebrew language, even if the verbs were not expressed, the sentence would be complete, and would be rendered, "And the land was waste and void;" but with the verb expressed, it means something more, and hence the propriety of translating it, "had become." It implies that the land which first came under the cognizance of primeval man may not always have been a scene of desolation, but that some catastrophe had brought about such a state, and that there was a time in which it progressed, but its course had run when the Spirit of God was brooding over it as described by the sacred penman. The sentence, therefore, does not describe the condition of the land when it was first created, but only intimates a change that may have taken place after its creation. The verb applied to the Eternal does not imply absolute beginning, or any essential change of being, but, in engaging in a new course of action, as manifesting the agent to have being. But the form *Ehyeh*, is future. It denotes the incipient stage of an action, and means "*I go to be*;" that is, I am about to prove myself *to be* by an action which is noticeable. With respect to the chosen people, heretofore I have *promised*; but now, I am going to *perform*—going to fulfill my promise. The verb ought to be the first person, for the speaker is naming himself, and with all the emphasis of his personal identity. Taking this view of the subject under consideration, "it is obvious that this was a strikingly significant and appropriate name for Moses to bear to the people, as it announced a present God, come down to fulfill his covenant and perform his

promise to the afflicted descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." Prof. Bush, in his comment upon this name, says; "It properly denotes the undivided, eternal, and unchangeable existence of the great Being to whom it is applied, carrying in it also the implication that he, in distinction from all others, is the one only true God who really is. It implies, moreover—as founded upon the immutability of the Divine nature—the certain and faithful performance of every promise which he had uttered, so that whatever he had bound himself by covenant to do for Abraham, for Isaac, and for Jacob, he pledges himself, by the annunciation of this august title, to make the same good to their seed."

▷CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◁

The Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus.—The Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, in consequence of their rejection by Protestants as uninspired, have been neglected by scholars. They have been considered as mainly the vagaries of wild rabbinical fancy, and their value has been correspondingly depreciated. This treatment is far from what these books deserve, for while they do contain much that is frivolous and of little worth; yet much can be gained from their study to illustrate the New Testament, to show the development of doctrine among the Jews. And as literature, they form the connecting link between the Old and New Testaments, being the only Jewish works that have survived from the centuries between the cessation of Old Testament prophecy and the commencement of New Testament fulfillment.

The two works named in our title are the most important of the Apocrypha, and deserve careful attention for their character, style and general contents.

The Book of Wisdom, ascribed by tradition though incorrectly to Solomon, was designed, probably, to commend the Alexandrian philosophy to the Palestinian Jews, and contains much that is truly inspiring and uplifting. It comforts the godly who are in distress by pointing them to a future life, where the ungodly shall be punished and the godly receive the reward of their deeds.

Samuel Davidson says, "With the exception of some extravagant statements, the contents are of a pure, noble, and elevated character, such as few philosophers of the ancient world could have promulgated. The work is not filled with strong prejudices and prepossessions. The meritoriousness of sacrifices, lustrations, asceticism does not appear. The narrow views entertained by the Jewish nation on moral subjects—the particularism which led them to hate all other peoples—are not prominent, except in the latter part, where the old inhabitants of Egypt are spoken of. The writer knows only the pious and the godless in the world; so that he must have been a liberal and enlightened Jew who had risen above some of the littlenesses of his countrymen by the force of an enlarged philosophy. His portrait of a wise man is elevated. We need not, therefore, be surprised at the very favorable reception the book has met with. Its religious and moral tendency entitle it to pre-eminent distinction." In style, this book is very remarkable; it is written in the purest Alexandrian Greek, and contains many passages of great beauty and force of expression.

Here we find much that is fine in thought and apt in wording; for illustration, notice the "the delicate balancing of sentences" in the following extract. We use Deane's translation:

"Short is our life and full of pain,
And there is no healing for the death of man,
And none was ever known to have returned from the grave.
For we were born at all adventure,
And hereafter shall be as though we never had been;
For smoke is the breath in our nostrils,
And thought is a spark at the beat of our heart.

And when this is quenched the body shall turn to ashes,
 And the spirit shall be dispersed as empty air;
 And our name shall be forgotten in time,
 And no man shall remember our works;
 And our life shall pass away as track of cloud,
 And shall be scattered abroad as a mist,
 Chased away by the beams of the sun,
 And by his heat oppressed.
 For the passage of a shadow is our life,
 And there is no return of our death,
 For it is fast sealed, and no man cometh back."

"Many phrases, such as "Love or Charity," "Holy Spirit," "Only Begotten," "Manifold," "philanthropic," "Providence," "the Fatherhood of God," occur here in the Septuagint, some of them in the Greek language, for the first time; and do not appear again till we find them in the New Testament." The book well deserves the title bestowed upon it by some of the Ancient Fathers, *πανάρετος* treasury of virtue.

Ecclesiasticus.—This is the longest and in some respects the most important work in the whole Apocrypha. The original title of the book is "The Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach;" and it consists principally of proverbs inculcating moral duties, grouped together after the manner of Solomon's Proverbs, with little real order of thought. We have in this book an expression of the Palestinian theology and its warm commendation to the Alexandrian school; being the reverse of what is found in the Book of Wisdom. The book is poetic in form, and contains many passages of great elegance and beauty, at times attaining the highest flights of human eloquence. Such, for example, as the skilful comparison between the judgments of the toiling day laborers and the educated few (xxxviii., 24—xxxix., 11), or that grand Song of Praise recounting the mighty heroes of the Jewish nation through the eras from the earliest time even to the author's own day—a roll resembling much the catalogue of worthies found in Hebrews (xliv. sq. 29).

Dean Stanley writes thus of this book, "Its general tone is worthy of that first contact between the two great civilizations of the ancient world, and breathes a spirit which an Isaiah would not have condemned, nor a Sophocles or a Theophrastus have despised. There is not a word in it to countenance the minute casuistries of the later Rabbis, or the metaphysical subtleties of the later Alexandrians. It pours out its whole strength in discussing the conduct of human life, or the direction of the soul to noble aims. . . . Here is a tender compassion which reaches far into the future religion of mankind: 'Let it not grieve thee to bow down thine ear to the poor and give him a friendly answer with gentleness. Be as a father to the fatherless, and instead of a husband to the widow; so shalt thou be as the son of the Most High and He shall love thee more than thy mother doth' (iv., 8, 10)."

On the other hand, it sometimes descends into minute particulars in regard to social duties, which verge on the ridiculous. Thus, "Eat as a man, what is set before thee, and chew not with smacking, lest thou be hated. Leave off first for manner's sake, and be not insatiable, lest thou offend. And if thou sittest among many, reach not thine hand out before them. . . . Sound sleep cometh of moderate eating; he riseth early, and his wits are with him. . . . Show not valiantness in wine, for wine has destroyed many. . . . Wine is as life to men, if it be drunk in its measure; What kind of a life is that which is without wive? And it was

made to make men glad. Wine drunk measurably and in season is gladness of heart, and joy of soul; wine drunken to excess is bitterness of soul, with excitement and quarrelsomeness." (XXXI., 16-18, 20, 21, 25 sq).

The morality, that is urged is extolled because of the recompense to be received in this life; nothing is said of the spiritual motives prompting to right action, the resurrection is unknown, and states of future reward and punishment are not mentioned.

Careful study expended on these works will be well repaid; and the student will find in them much that is attractive and pleasing.

E. R. POPE,

Morgan Park.

1 Samuel II., 35.—"But I will raise up to me a faithful priest who will do according to that which is in my heart and in my soul; and I will build for him a sure house, and he will walk before my anointed all the days."

Prophecy can be interpreted only in the light of history. That we may understand this prediction made by the "man of God" it will be necessary to glance backward at the preceding history of the priesthood and forward at the future of Eli's family.

Verse 28 speaks of the house of Eli's father. This plainly refers to Aaron. To him God promised the priest's office for a perpetual statute (Exod. XXIX., 9); this covenant of an everlasting priesthood was confirmed to his grandson Phinehas, the son of Eleazar (Num. XXV., 13). For many generations the high priests had come from this branch of the family. But now we find as high-priest Eli, who was a descendant not of Eleazar, but of Aaron's younger son, Ithamar. Eli conferred the priest's office upon his sons Hophni and Phinehas, who "trampled upon the sacrifices" and dishonored God by their immoral lives. The man of God was sent to Eli to announce the death of his sons and the downfall of his house. This denunciation was repeated through Samuel (1 Sam. III., 12-14). In the battle with the Philistines Eli's sons were slain and he himself died on learning the issue of the battle. The Ark of God remained away from Shiloh, and for a long time the priesthood seemed to be utterly abandoned. Samuel performed the office of judge and stood between the people and God. However, in the early years of Saul's reign, Eli's great-grandson, Ahiah, was high-priest, and afterward Abiathar, also a descendant of Eli. The latter was thrust from his position by Solomon, and the priesthood was given to Zadok, a descendant not of Eli, nor of Eli's ancestor Ithamar, but of Eleazar. In this branch of the family it continued.

We are now prepared for a study of the passage itself. To whom does the "faithful priest" refer? Four answers have been proposed referring it (1) to Christ, (2) to Samuel, (3) to Zadok, (4) to a line of priests which included Samuel and Zadok, and culminated in Christ.

The first view limiting its application to Christ hardly needs refutation. To introduce such an explicit prediction concerning a *personal* Messiah runs counter to the idea of the historic development of prophecy. Further, such an interpretation is utterly incongruous; the whole passage relates to the downfall of Eli's house and the appointment of its successor. Again, in this view, to whom can "my anointed" refer?

In reference to the second view which applies the prophecy to Samuel exclusively, it has been well remarked that Samuel is never styled a priest, nor does he,

strictly speaking, perform the functions of a priest. The "sure house" is to be a priestly house, but this is not true of Samuel's descent. I might add that I Kgs. II., 27, declares another event to be the fulfillment of this prediction.

In favor of the third view, which points to the time when the priesthood was transferred from Abiathar to Zadok as the fulfillment, I would state the following reasons: Then, and not till then, was Eli's house entirely deprived of the office of high-priest. In relation to this event it is distinctly declared that this is a fulfillment of the prophecy (I Kgs. II., 27).

Yet this interpretation seems too restricted, for the passage conveys the thought not of an individual act, but of a continued state. He is to walk before God's anointed all the days; his is to be a sure house; to him Eli's house is to be in continued subordination (v. 36).

In this connection it would be well to consider the expression "before my anointed." The most natural interpretation of this is that which applies it to the future royalty foretold by Moses (Deut. XVII., 14), and concerning which reference is made in Hannah's prayer (v. 10). Israel's government is to be changed, a theocratic kingdom is to be established, and the priesthood is to be brought into close though *distinct* relationship with the king.

I believe, then, that the substance of this prediction is, that Eli's family is to be removed from the office of high-priest. In his place is to come another line of priests, who would be faithful to God, permanently established. This was to a certain extent fulfilled in Samuel who, though not really a priest, acted as mediator between God and man. But it was only completely fulfilled in Zadok and the line of priests which descended from him. His was a "sure house" enduring for many generations; these priests were as a rule men who did that which was "in God's heart;" they "walked before the anointed" king. At that time Eli's "arm"—his strength—had been "cut off" (v. 31). He and his posterity "beheld distress of dwelling" (v. 32) when the tabernacle was despoiled of the ark and fell into decay. His offspring "died, men," *i. e.*, without coming to old age (v. 33).

The threatened sign of verse 34 was literally fulfilled. In accordance with verses 33 and 36, his family did not become entirely extinct, but those who were left were reduced to a subordinate and humiliating position. All these circumstances coincide with the interpretation of the verse given above.

We might say that the prophecy in a *secondary*, typical sense, applies to Christ who is the great high-priest after God's own heart, whose house is forever.

S. B. RANDALL,
Chicago.

The Date of Deuteronomy.—In the February number of the *Unitarian Review*, the leading article is by Dr. C. H. Toy, of Harvard College, upon "the date of Deuteronomy. A brief sketch, necessarily imperfect, of the argument will be of interest and profit to readers of THE STUDENT:—

1.) The legal portion (IV., 44—XXVI., 19) is an independent law book, unconnected with that given in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.

(1) This appears from the introductory words of chaps. I., IV.; since, had there been an extensive public legislation at Sinai, such as that given in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, there would have been a recognition of it; and, further, these words may really imply that now for the first time since they started from Egypt, Moses had begun to communicate the divine instruction.

(2) It appears also from the general tone of the book, throughout which the law, as therein given, is represented as the only one, and as containing all that is necessary for the guidance of their lives. While the code contained in Exod. XXI.-XXIII., might, indeed, have existed beforehand, and because of its size and its character, no reference to it be expected, it would be different in the case of a body of laws like the Levitical legislation. A study of the texts. IV., 1, 2; IV., 5-8; VI., 6-9; VII., 12, 13; VIII., 1; X., 12, 13; XI., 1, 8, and many others of a similar character must convince one that there is being announced, not something supplementary or fragmentary, but a complete law of God, sufficient for the complete prosperity of Israel for all time. Nothing is to be added or taken away.

(3) It appears, again, from the differences between Deuteronomy and the other legislative portions, *e. g.*, (a) the differences in the decalogue, as given in Exod. XX., and Deut. V.; (b) the difference in the tithing-systems of the two codes; (c) the difference in the system of offerings laid down by the two codes; (d) from XII., 12, 19; XIV., 27, 29; XXVI., 12, it is to be inferred that the Levites were a poor and dependent class, being classified with the widow and the fatherless. But how could a body of persons numbering not over 200,000, who, by the provision made for them in the Levitical code, had thirty-five cities with land attached, and enjoyed one-tenth of all the income of a population of two or three millions, be objects of charity? (e) a comparison of Deut. XVII., 1-8, and X., 8, show that according to this book, all the Levites were priests, and the distinction between "priests," on the one hand, who were only of the family of Aaron, and who alone were authorized to make sacrifices, and on the other, "Levites" who were employed in the menial and other non-sacrificial parts of the religious service,—a distinction so clearly emphasized in the Levitical code, is entirely unknown to the author of Deuteronomy.

2.) The date is to be sought by a comparison between its statements and those of the historical and prophetic books. Linguistic evidence can only show that the book was not later than the fourth or earlier than the eleventh century.

(1) The position of the book in reference to the central sanctuary points to a time subsequent to Hezekiah. While formerly it was lawful to carry on worship anywhere, it is now lawful to worship only at one place (XII., 13, 14, 17, 18; XIV., 25). Once in seven years the law shall be read to the people by the priests, the sons of Levi. The Deuteronomist is concerned to secure unity of public worship. This all points to the reform instituted by Hezekiah. There is no sign that the local worship of Yahwe was a living question till the days of Hezekiah. No objection was ever raised, previous to this time, against worship at local shrines. Such worship was a violation of no religious law until this time.

(2) The same result is reached if there is considered the development of thought in the prophets from Amos to Jeremiah. Amos inveighs sharply against the immoralities of the people and the local shrines at Bethel, Dan, Gilgal, and Beersheba. Hosea, half a century later, speaks against the shrines, but, for the most part, against Baalism. Isaiah, still later, preaches against formality and hypocrisy, and advocates genuine devotion to Yahwe. Micah pours out his soul like a madman, over the crimes of his people. Seventy-five years later, Jeremiah exposes the folly of idolatry. At this time "the high places exist, but they are no longer feared: the main evil is the concentration of a developed, organized idolatry in Jerusalem. It is as if Deuteronomy had done its work, and the nation had passed on to a new religious phase, with which the Deuteronomist is not

acquainted." There is found in Jeremiah about that religious condition of things which might be expected in Judah some years after the regulations in Deuteronomy had been formulated,—the same general religious ideas, the stress laid on the covenant and on obedience, the relatively small prominence given to the ritual, the same evils to be combated, the same religious standard and ideal. The two books seem to belong to the same period.

(3) The portrait of the King (XVII., 14-20) is one suited to the times of Manasseh and Josiah, when connection with Egypt was opposed by the prophets, when there was a stronger feeling against polygamy, when luxuries were multiplying, and foreigners applying for citizenship.

(4) Under Josiah (2 Kgs. XXII.), there was found by Hilkiah, the priest, a book, which may well be regarded as, in substance, the Book of Deuteronomy. The reform of Hezekiah had only been a partial one. Josiah's is fully after the spirit of Deuteronomy, and the book may be placed between these two kings. It may, indeed, be said that the book had been placed in the temple with the knowledge of Hilkiah and Huldah. Both prophets and priests had an interest in the centralization of the worship that Deuteronomy prescribes, since it would not only further the sole worship of Yahwe, but would also increase the importance of the Jerusalem temple and of its governing priests. The objection that such a procedure would be unworthy of priests and prophets seems of little weight; since very little is known of the character of Hilkiah and Huldah; and further, the production of a book in the name of Moses, and a stratagem to bring it impressively to the King's attention would be looked on at that time with different eyes from ours.

The book was therefore composed not long before the time of Josiah, and there may be seen in it the codification of the social, political, and religious principles accepted by the prophetic class at its highest point of growth. The ethical unsavoriness of this view need be no stumbling-block in the way. The assignment of the book to Moses was in accordance with the literary fashion of the day; the hiding of the book in the temple and the bringing it out as an autograph of Moses would be only of a piece with the procedure of the prophet Jeremiah in the case of King Zedekiah and the princes (Jer. XXXVIII.).

This short outline, given whenever possible in the author's own language, will present in general the views of the Wellhausen school of critics as to the origin and date of Deuteronomy.

O. M.

→GENERAL NOTES.←

The Unity of the Nineteenth Psalm.—The perversity of much of the modern criticism of the Scriptures is scarcely anywhere seen so clearly as in the treatment given to this well-known Psalm. Such eminent scholars as Ewald and Hupfeld insist that it consists of two parts composed at different times by different authors and afterwards artificially conjoined. Not a particle of external evidence for this conjecture is or can be produced. The Psalm is found in the Hebrew and in all the ancient versions, just as it stands in the English Bible without even a hint or suggestion of a divided authorship.

But it is insisted that the structure and contents of the poem compel one to give up its unity. The first part (vv. 1-7) is a Psalm of Nature, while the remainder treats only of a written revelation. The first part is also incomplete, for while it is said that both day and night declare God's glory, what follows speaks only of the revelation made by day, whence it follows that the lines treating of what the night reveals have fallen out and been lost! Moreover, there is a difference of tone and rhythm. The first part is simple and powerful, while the second is constrained and artificial and prosaic. And besides, there is no graceful transition from the one to the other, but merely a bold and unpleasing juxtaposition of two strains so unlike. Whence we are to conclude either that two fragments floating around separately were accidentally joined together, or that the first one having been composed by David, there arose ages afterward a writer who, by means of the advanced thought of his time, was able to add the verses which show the glory of God in the Law to those which set forth His glory in Nature.

This whole argument is baseless and absurd. The combination of the two matters treated in this Psalm is one which by the nature of the case must have been easy to any one who possessed the Pentateuch and was familiar with its delineations of God as the author of nature and the giver of His Word to His people. Besides, in the twenty-ninth Psalm and the ninety-third Psalm we have precisely the same passage from nature to revelation, in each case the one being an introduction to the other. Was each of these a piecemeal composition? And as for the lack of transition clauses, the same abruptness in proceeding from one theme to the other is seen in Psalm xxxvi., 6, where the poet avails himself of the traces of the divine goodness in nature to express the protecting care with which God guards His people from their foes.

Moreover, as the first part of the Psalm speaks of the heavens as an utterance of God's glory, how easy was it to pass to His law as an utterance of the same thing, especially when a poet is at work! In truth, the destructive criticism here is as much at war with taste and feeling as it is with good sense and the usage of the Psalter. The noble conception that nature is an eloquent witness for the glory of its Creator, but the Law one still more complete and glowing, or rather that the revelation of God in the heavens is only an introduction to the revelation of Himself in His Word, is one which none but a devout poet could form and express in such a striking way. It is not to an accident or an afterthought that

we owe this lofty and inspiring lyric, but to a sweet singer of Israel whom the Holy Ghost moved and enabled to set forth with brilliaucy and fire the truth that He who reared the whole frame of nature is also the giver of a law, and that that law is sweeter than honey and more precious than much fine gold.—*Talbot W. Chambers, D. D., in Pulpit Treasury.*

Cheyne's Translation of Psalm XC.—

- 1 Lord, thou hast been unto us an asylum from age to age,
- 2 Before the mountains were born,
or the earth and the world were brought forth,
yea, from æon to æon thou art God.
- 3 Thou turnest mortals back to dust,
and sayest, "Return, ye sons of the earth-born."
- 4 For a thousand years are in thine eyes
as yesterday when it is passing,
and a watch in the night.
- 5 Thou floodest them away; they become as a sleep;
in the morning they are as grass which sprouts again;
- 6 In the morning it blossoms and sprouts again,
in the evening it is cut down and withers.
- 7 For we are wasted away through thine anger,
and through thy wrath have we been confounded.
- 8 Thou hast set our iniquities before thee,
those that none can discern in the shining of thy countenance.
- 9 For our days have all died away as a murmur,
through thy fury have we now finished our years.
- 10 The days of our years are threescore years and ten,
and if we are of full strength, then fourscore;
and their proud boasting is travail and vanity,
so quickly is it gone by, and we take our flight.
- 11 (But) who hath learned the strength of thine anger,
and, according to the fear of thee, thy fury?
- 12 Thus learn us to number our days,
and we shall take home wisdom to our heart.
- 13 Return, Jehovah, how long?
and relent over thy servants.
- 14 Satisfy us with thy lovingkindness in the morning,
and we will give ringing shouts of joy all our days:
- 15 Make us to rejoice according to the days thou hast afflicted us,
the years wherein we have seen adversity.
- 16 Let thy doing be manifest to thy servants,
and thy majesty unto their children;
- 17 And let the pleasantness of Jehovah our God brood over us,
and the work of our hands O prosper thou over us,
yea, prosper thou our handiwork.

The Phœnician Ritual.—Our knowledge of the Phœnician ritual is largely derived from a sacrificial tariff discovered at Marseilles in 1845. The stone on which it is engraved is unfortunately not perfect, but what is left of it runs thus: "In the temple of Baal (the following tariff of offerings shall be observed), which was prescribed (in the time of) the judge. . . . Baal, the son of Bod-Tanit, the son of Bod-(Ashmun, and in the time of Halzi-Baal), the judge, the son of Bod-Ashmun, the son of Halzi-Baal and (their comrades). For an ox as a full-offering, whether it be a prayer-offering or a full thank-offering, the priests (shall receive) ten shekels of silver for each beast, and if it be a full-offering the priests shall receive besides this (300 shekel's weight of flesh). And for a prayer-offering they shall receive (besides) the small joints (?) and the roast (?), but the skin and the haunches and the feet and the rest of the flesh shall belong to the offerer. For a bullock which has horns, but is not yet broken in and made to serve, or for a stag, as a full-offering, whether it be a prayer-offering or a full thank-offering, the priests (shall receive) five shekels of silver (for each beast, and if it be a full-offering) they shall receive besides this 150 shekel's weight of flesh; and for a prayer-offering the small joints (?) and the roast (?); but the skin and the haunches and the feet (and the rest of the flesh shall belong to the offerer). For a sheep or a goat as a full-offering, whether it be a prayer-offering or a full thank-offering, the priests (shall receive) one shekel of silver and two *zar* for each beast; and in the case of a prayer-offering they shall have (besides this the small joints [?]) and the roast (?); but the skin and the haunches and the feet and the rest of the flesh shall belong to the offerer. For a lamb or a kid or a fawn as a full-offering, whether it be a prayer-offering or a full thank-offering, the priests (shall receive) three-fourths of a shekel of silver and (two) *zar* (for each beast; and in the case of a prayer-offering they shall have) besides this the small joints (?) and the roast (?); but the skin and the haunches and the feet and the rest of the flesh shall belong to (the offerer). For a bird, whether wild or tame, as a full-offering, whether it be *shetseph* or *khazuth*, the priests (shall receive) three-fourths of a shekel of silver and two *zar* for each bird; and (so much flesh besides). For a bird, or for the offering of the first-born of an animal, or for a meal-offering or for an offering with oil, the priests (shall receive) ten pieces of gold for each. . . . In the case of every prayer-offering which is offered to the gods, the priests shall receive the small joints (?), and the roast (?) and the prayer-offering. . . . for a cake and for milk and for fat, and for every offering which is offered without blood. . . . For every offering which is brought by a poor man in cattle or birds, the priests shall receive nothing. . . . anything leprous or scabby or lean is forbidden, and no one as regards that which he offers (shall taste of) the blood of the dead. The tariff for each offering shall be according to that which is prescribed in this publication. . . . As for every offering which is not prescribed in this table, and is not made according to the regulations which (have been published in the time of. . . . Baal, the son of Bod-Tanit), and of Bod-Ashmun, the son of Halzi-Baal, and of their comrades, every priest who accepts the offering which is not included in that which is prescribed in this table, shall be punished. . . . As for the property of the offerer who does not discharge (his debt) for his offering (he also shall be punished)."

The words that are wanting in the document have been partially supplied from the fragments of another copy of the tariff found among the ruins of Carthage. It will be observed that there is no mention in it of the sacrifice of child-

ren, which, as we know, once played a part in the ritual of the Phœnicians. This is explained by the fact that the tariff belongs to that latter age, when Greek and Roman influence had prevailed upon the Phœnician colonists in the west to give up the horrible practice. The place of the child is taken by the 'ayyal or stag.—*Sayce in Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments.*

Assyrian Domestic Affairs.—The little we know of Assyrian domestic matters is chiefly drawn from the time of Assur-bani-pal, about the year 650 B. C.

The dress of the common people at this period is represented by the sculptures as being a plain tunic with short sleeves, which reached to the knees, and was tied round the waist with a girdle. No head-dress was worn, but the hair fell in large waves from the forehead to the back of the neck, and was considered to afford sufficient protection from both sun and rain.

Men of rank wore long robes, fringed and ornamented round the neck and arms. Also head-dresses shaped like cones. Women of rank were dressed in tunics and cloaks, and wore fillets upon their heads.

A few toilet articles, such as combs and mirrors, have been discovered. Some of these may be seen in the British Museum.

The usual food of the poor consisted of grain, such as wheat or barley, moistened with water, kneaded in a bowl, and then rolled into cakes. The soldiers appear to have eaten meat, for the sculptures show them engaged in killing and cooking oxen and sheep when out on military campaigns; but the people at home were content with more simple fare.

The fruits of the country were grapes, citrons, pomegranates, and apparently pine-apples. These are seen in the reliefs in dishes which the attendants hold high above their heads, and thus bear to the banquets of the king.

The Assyrians drank abundantly at their feasts. They were served by attendants who dipped the wine-cups into huge bowls which stood upon the ground, and then handed the wine to the guests. The visitors were divided into messes of four, and sat upon high stools, two and two, facing one another. Each mess had a separate table and servant. In one drinking scene found at Khorsábád, every guest is represented holding a wine-cup in his hand. The cups are of an elegant shape, the lower part of them being modelled in the form of a lion's head, from which the stem rises in a graceful curve. The guests hold the cups upon a level with their heads, and appear to be pledging one another or else one and all drinking the same toast.

Music usually accompanied the festivities. The Assyrians appear to have delighted in musical sounds. They had eight or nine different musical instruments, stringed, wind, and instruments of percussion. In the early sculptures we notice the harp, the lyre, and the cymbal. Later on the double-pipe, the guitar, the tambourine, and a kind of drum; also a horn (something like the military trumpet of the Greeks and Romans), which is used by the overseers in directing the transport of colossal animals. We know very little of the character of the music, and cannot tell whether the musicians used instruments and voices in combination. In the single instance in which this is the case the singers are Susianians, and not Assyrians. The favorite instrument for the performance of religious music was the harp, and for festivals the lyre. Bands accompanied processions and pageants, and preceded the king on his triumphal return from the field of battle.

Like the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, the Assyrians introduced flowers into their feasts, and the attendants are seen in the reliefs bearing jars filled with flowers to the king's table.

The exports of the Assyrians appear to have been silk, wool, and cotton. Our only certain knowledge concerning them is derived from the notice of the Prophet Ezekiel, which tells us that the Assyrian merchants traded with Tyre "in blue clothes, and broidered work, and in chests of rich apparel" (Ezekiel XXXVII., 23, 24.); the notice of Herodotus, that Assyrian wares had in ancient times been conveyed by the Phœnicians to Greece and sold to the inhabitants; and the notice of Pliny, that the principal Assyrian export was silk.

The imports seem to have been ivory, gems, cedar, and pearls. All other imports are merely conjectural.

Some of the native houses had gardens surrounding them, and these show the taste of the Assyrians in horticultural matters to have resembled that of the modern Dutch. The trees are all of similar character, and are arranged in rows at equal distances; the paths are straight, and meet each other at right angles. Water was abundantly supplied by means of canals from neighboring rivers, or was brought by aqueducts from a distance. Hanging gardens were made either by planting the banks of a stream with trees of different kinds, or else by planting flowers and shrubs upon the roofs of the buildings. These gardens were known in Assyria in the time of Sennacherib.

Although the country abounded in rivers, the art of fishing was carried on in a very rude way. The fisherman held a simple line in his hand, and used neither rod nor float. He generally stood by the brink of the river, but sometimes he seated himself upon the inflated skin of an animal, and floated down the stream, holding the orifice of the skin in one hand, and the fishing-rod in the other. According to the reliefs, the earliest species of boats used were inflated skins; these were followed by rafts, then by boats shaped like Welsh coracles, and finally by river-galleys. In galleys the naval architecture of the Assyrians appears to have culminated, for sails and masts are never seen in the reliefs.

These few details are almost all we know concerning the private life of the Assyrians. The literature of the nation ignores household matters, and concerns itself with greater things. The Sculptures also rarely portray domestic scenes.

This does not surprise us, when we consider the character of the people, and study their faces as shown by the reliefs. The effigies bear a striking resemblance to the Hebrew physiognomy of the present time. The straight but rather low forehead, the full brow, the large almond-shaped eye, the aquiline nose, the strong firm mouth, the rather thick lips, the powerful chin, the abundant curly hair and beard, all these recall the chief peculiarities of the Hebrew of to-day. The traits are for the most part common to the whole Semitic race, and are seen alike in the Arab, the Hebrew, and the Chaldean, while anciently they characterized not only the Assyrians, but also the Phœnicians, Arabs, Syrians, and Hebrews. In form the Assyrians were more robust, broad-shouldered, and large-limbed than the present Oriental Hebrews, but resembled in make the modern Chaldeans. Their limbs, as represented by the reliefs, are too large for beauty, but indicate enormous physical power, and show the strength and force which rendered them so efficient in the field of battle.

The peculiar characteristics of the Assyrians were strength and bravery, also treachery, cruelty (the sculptures show the cruelty of the people in a terrible man-

ner, and portray scenes of torture too painful to dwell upon), and pride. The Hebrew documents endorse this estimate of the Assyrian character, for they speak of the people as "a fierce people" (Is. xxxiii. 19), and describe the nation as "a mighty and strong one, which as a tempest of hail and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, shall cast down to the earth with the hand" (Is. xxviii., 2), and call Nineveh "a bloody city" (Nahum iii., 1). Speaking of Assyrian treachery, the Hebrew prophet says, "Woe to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled; and dealest treacherously, and they dealt not treacherously with thee" (Is. xxxiii., 1); and in the same spirit another prophet declares that Nineveh is "all full of lies and robbery" (Nahum iii., 1). The arrogance of the Assyrians draws forth the sternest denunciations of the Hebrew prophets, and Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah alike dwell upon the feature of their character, and call down Divine judgments to humble their pride. In the emblematic language of Hebrew prophecy, the *lion* is taken as the fittest symbol for Assyria, and the country is painted as "the lion that did tear in pieces enough for his whelps, and strangled enough for his lioness, and filled his holes with prey, and his dens with ravin" (Nahum ii. 12).

The lion was also the favorite national emblem, and accepted by the people as their representative; and this is why the king of animals is so frequently portrayed on the Assyrian monuments, either in his natural form or with a human head.—*Harkness in Assyrian Life and History.*

↳ EDITORIAL NOTES. ◀

The Opposition to Old Testament Study in the Sunday School.—There are many who would give up entirely the study of the Old Testament in the Sunday School. The number is larger than is generally supposed. It includes men of all denominations and of every position. No one ought to be surprised that this question has come up. No one ought to suppose that it will be settled soon or easily. The real occasion of surprise is that attention has not been called to it sooner. The question, whether the Old Testament ought to be given up entirely in Sunday School study, or whether it ought to receive less attention than it has been accustomed to receive is practically the same. For (1) the reasons which would take away from Old Testament study one-half or one-fourth of the time now being given to it, will later be urged in favor of giving up the study of it altogether; and (2) the same thing is effected by either course, viz., a disparagement of Old Testament study; while (3) since, considering its dimensions, the Old Testament is now receiving only one-fifth the attention given to the New (see p. 306 of this number), any diminution of this amount will be really an abandonment of the study. Bible students are entering upon the discussion of a most vital question. If one will but stop to consider all that is here involved he will realize that what have hitherto been regarded as fundamentals are at stake.

Our Symposium.—There is great advantage in approaching a question from many standpoints. To discuss a topic from a single point of view is, of course, to present a narrow, one-sided discussion. And this is true whether the treatment is that of a specialist or of an ignoramus.

There is great advantage also in considering, side by side, the ideas of different men in reference to a given subject, since each man, of necessity, speaks from a different point of view. So far as there may be agreement, well and good; where disagreement is found, there is probably a reason why we should stop and think.

We give our readers, this month, the opinions, briefly stated, of several of our most eminent teachers and preachers, touching the use of the Old Testament in the Sunday School. They do not all consider the same aspect of this question, yet all take up the question. Is there entire agreement in the various positions taken? No. Yet the differences are not marked ones.

There is food, here, for thought. The question is a vital one. If it is a mistake to give so much of the time in Sunday School study to the Old Testament, the mistake has gone uncorrected long enough. If it is *not* a mistake, the sooner this strong under-current of opposition to its use is controlled, the better will it be for the cause of Sunday School instruction and Bible study.

Summer Instruction.—In this country, we go from one extreme to another. "Nothing or everything" is the regulating principle. Five years ago, there

existed very few Schools for summer instruction, principally those of Dr. Sauveur at Amherst, Mass., and of Dr. Vincent at Chautauqua, N. Y. At that time, the opinion prevailed that no really thorough work *was* done in Summer Schools, and the supposition was that no really thorough work *could* be done in such Schools. Schools have increased, and opinions have changed. In every State, almost in every county, a Summer School is held. They are like the sand of the seashore for multitude. Whether this multiplication will continue, or whether there will come a reaction of feeling, and, consequently, a diminishing of the number, is difficult to predict. We incline, however, to the latter view. To a certain extent, the Summer School mania is ephemeral. It will have its sweep, and will pass away. Those Schools in which scientific work is not done, cannot long continue; and there is reason to suppose that there are many such. Those Schools which must depend upon the tuition-fees received for instruction, cannot long continue; and in this category must be included nineteen out of twenty. Those Schools which depend upon the popularity of a certain teacher or class of teachers must, of necessity, die away. Will any remain? Only those which, at the same time, do scientific work, are independent of the tuition-fees, and are backed by a constituency able to carry them through successfully, without reference to the popularity of any one person or class of persons.

But what has all this to do with the Old Testament?

The Summer Schools of Hebrew.—Three points deserve consideration :

1) The past history of an undertaking furnishes a basis from which to judge of its future. If THE INSTITUTE OF HEBREW, of which these Schools are a part, has one thing upon which it may congratulate itself more than another, it is the fact that no word impugning the character of the work done in its Schools, has ever been uttered. It has been the aim in these Schools, not to cover ground, but to do thoroughly, scholarly, critical work. Nor has any man, whether a participant in the work, or a spectator of it, found anything in this line to criticize.

2) If the Schools of Hebrew had depended for their existence on the receipts for tuition-fees, they would have failed. As a matter of fact they *have*, in every instance, *failed*,—financially. If, for every School, it were henceforth necessary to raise funds, one might well doubt whether many Schools would be held. But what are the facts? A sum of money has been secured, sufficient, with what may be reasonably expected from tuition-fees, to carry these Schools for *five* years. During this period, at least, the Schools may be said to be independent of tuition-fees. If there are men who desire to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by the Schools, but are really unable to pay the tuition-fee, the expenses of travelling, boarding, and the cost of books being so great, they will be most gladly admitted without the payment of the fee. Since these Schools are not dependent upon the money received from tuition-fees, there will be no necessity either of using illegitimate means for drawing students, or of retaining those who have come, but who are incapable of being profited by the work. In other words, with such a financial basis, the thoroughness of work, and not the number of the students, will be the thing held in mind. That after five years the work will be cared for financially in even a better way than during those five years, there is no good reason to doubt.

3) With the present organization, it would be difficult to imagine a chain of circumstances which could perceptibly affect, for the worse, the existence of the Schools. They are no longer dependent upon the exertions of a single individual. Their future existence is now guaranteed (1) on the ground of the great and important work which through them it is hoped to accomplish,—a work, inseparably connected with the biblical work to be done, hereafter, in American theological seminaries; (2) on the ground of the character of the men who henceforth stand back of it, to guide and manage it. With the active co-operation of nearly every Old Testament professor in the country, is there not stability and permanency? Note the list of instructors and lecturers in the Schools of 1885:

Professors Ballentine of Oberlin, Beecher of Auburn, Bissell of Hartford, Brown of Newton Centre, Burnham of Hamilton, Briggs of New York, E. L. Curtis and Samuel Ives Curtiss of Chicago, Day of New Haven, Denio of Bangor, Gast of Lancaster, Green of Princeton, Lansing of New Brunswick, Lyon of Cambridge, Peters of Philadelphia, Schodde of Columbus, Taylor of Chester, Terry of Evanston; with Messrs. J. J. Anderson of Tuscaloosa, Ala., C. E. Crandall and F. J. Gurney of Morgan Park, G. R. Hovey of Newton Centre, W. W. Lovejoy of Trenton and D. A. McClenahan of New York.

With such a working-force, with the united zeal of such scholars, men of such position, can there be a doubt as to the character, or the future of the Summer Schools of Hebrew?

These Schools will be held (1) at Philadelphia, in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, June 4th-July 1st; (2) at New Haven, in the Yale Divinity School, June 30th-July 25th; (3) at Morgan Park, in the Baptist Union Theological Seminary, July 21st-August 15th; (4) at Chautauqua, August 4th-31st.

→BOOK NOTICES←

ORIENTAL RECORDS.*

Under the general title above given are included two books that are really companion volumes, the one filling out and completing the other. These books are popular in style, and designed rather for the general reader than the scholar or specialist; the author acknowledges, regretfully, his inability to translate the cuneiform characters, and uses the translations given by such men as the late George Smith, Brugsch-Bey, Lenormant, Fox Talbot, and others.

The books consist of short articles upon different subjects, taken, as it appears, somewhat arbitrarily from the mass of coincidences that can be found between the Bible and the Oriental records. Various biblical passages are taken up; the translations of the records, Assyrian, Egyptian, Arabian, Syrian, Babylonian as the case may be, are given, and the points of resemblance are pointed out.

The author holds the extreme conservative opinion in reference to the biblical narrative, practically denying that any use was made by the sacred writers of antecedent documents; and in some points he thus weakens the very position he strives to establish. At times there is manifested a disposition to find confirmatory evidence in that which is of decidedly doubtful character. For instance, there is given a translation of the Rock Inscriptions as found in the Wady Mokatteb, in the Sinaitic Peninsula; but all the authorities, as the author acknowledges, are opposed to the interpretation given, and it is now well settled that the inscriptions date from a few centuries before Christ, and prove almost nothing in reference to the Bible.

It would be interesting to compare these books with some of the more recent works in the same field, and thus see the great advance made in biblical archaeology during the last five years; but for this we have not space. These books served a valuable purpose in their time, but are now in large measure supplanted; and their original usefulness was greatly impaired by the disposition already mentioned to find more than the facts would warrant. If used at all, it must be with discretion.

HOURS WITH THE BIBLE. VOL. VI.†

The former volumes of this work have been noticed in *THE STUDENT* from time to time they have appeared. This volume covers a period of biblical history, the least known, perhaps, to the average Bible student. The attempt is

* *ORIENTAL RECORDS*. Monumental. Confirmatory of the Old Testament Scripture.—Historical. Confirmatory of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. By W. H. Rule, D. D. London: S. Bayster & Sons. 5¼x7½. Pp. 247, 242. Price, \$1.75 each.

† *HOURS WITH THE BIBLE*, or the Scriptures in the light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge. By Cunningham Gelkle, D. D. Vol. VI. From the Exile to Malachi, completing the Old Testament. New York: James Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place. Pp. 544. Price \$1.50.

made "to incorporate the utterances of the prophets with the special incidents of contemporary history to which so many of them relate." The writer aptly describes their prophetic utterances as the "pulpit literature of the day." Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Isaiah XL-LXVI., Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi are presented in their historical connection, and receive great light from a study of this connection. In reference to this series, now that it is complete, we may say:

1) There are few men who can cover to good advantage in so short a time (five years) so much ground; and it may fairly be questioned whether Dr. Geikie has not hurried his work. There are certainly evidences here and there that his material has not been so thoroughly digested as it might have been. The success of the first volume, doubtless, led him to finish the work within a shorter time than he would otherwise have done.

2) In many chapters, there is a lack of that unity, the existence of which is necessary if the reader is to have a satisfied feeling when his perusal of the chapter has been finished. No clear outline suggests itself. One paragraph runs into another. The reader pushes on headlong till the end is reached and then feels, that "to get hold of the matter" he must go back and analyze it.

3) Notwithstanding this, it is probable that no series of books ever published on the Old Testament, has been more popular; or more helpful to the general reading public. Their study cannot fail to give the student a broader, better, truer knowledge of Bible men, Bible events and Bible truths. The method employed is the only method to understand aright the Book. This work ought to be on the shelf of every man who professes to be a searcher after the truth.

TYNDALE'S PENTATEUCH.*

The thanks of scholars are due the Rev. J. I. Mombert for the labor involved in bringing out this magnificent edition of Tyndale's Pentateuch. But one perfect copy of the edition of 1530 is known to be in existence. All other copies are in some respect deficient. This translation was the first ever made into English from the Hebrew original. That Tyndale did not translate from the Latin and German versions is clearly seen on every page. The reasons which have led to the present issue are stated to be these:—"It is designed to be a grateful tribute to the memory of the martyr-translator; to make this noble version, which as a first translation is not excelled by any other with which I am acquainted, generally accessible to Bible readers; to *fix* its text by actual collation with different editions; to establish its relations to the Latin and German versions; to furnish a contemporary commentary in the notes of Luther and Rogers, and to enrich the philology of the language with a copious vocabulary."

Among the interesting material collected in the Prolegomena is a photographic copy of an autograph-letter written by Tyndale while in prison at Vilvorde, in the winter of 1535. The translation reads as follows:—"I believe, most excellent Sir, that you are not unacquainted with the decision reached concerning me. On which account, I beseech your lordship, even by the Lord Jesus, that if I am to

* WILLIAM TYNDALE'S FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES, CALLED THE PENTATEUCH, being a verbatim reprint of the edition of M.CCCC.XXX. compared with Tyndale's Genesis of 1534, and the Pentateuch in the Vulgate, Luther, and Matthew's Bible, with various collations and prolegomena. By the Rev. J. I. Mombert, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Pp. 635. Price \$5. [First edition limited to five hundred copies.]

pass the winter here, you will urge upon the lord commissary, if he will deign, to send me from my goods in his keeping a warmer cap; for I suffer greatly from cold in the head, being troubled with a continual catarrh, which is aggravated in this prison vault. A warm coat also; for that which I have is very thin. . . . But above all, I beg and entreat your clemency earnestly to intercede with the lord commissary, that he would deign to allow me the use of my Hebrew Bible, Hebrew Grammar and Hebrew Lexicon, and that I may employ my time with that study." The Prolegomena contains also a most interesting biographical notice of Tyndale, as well as a list of his writings.

Of the Book of Deuteronomy, Tyndale says in the Prologue: "This is a book worthy to be read in day and night, and never to be out of hands. For it is the most excellent of all the books of Moses. It is easy also and light and a very pure gospel, that is to wit a preaching of faith and love; deducing the love to God out of faith, and the love of a man's neighbor out of the love of God. Herein also thou mayst learn right meditation or contemplation, which is nothing else save the calling to mind and a repeating in the heart of the glorious and wonderful deeds of God and of his terrible handling of his enemies, and merciful eutreating of them that come when he calleth them, which thing this book doth and almost nothing else."

The quaintness, the simplicity, and the aptness of these prologues is worthy of careful attention.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER.*

For nine years a club of four or five parish ministers living in Lowell, Mass., has been holding weekly meetings for the study of the Old Testament Scriptures in their original tongue. Of this time nearly three years were given in furnishing an exposition of the Sunday School Lessons in their city paper. The last five years have been devoted to the preparation of the book of which notice is here made. The names of these gentlemen are: Rev. Owen Street, D. D., Rev. John W. Haley, M. A., Rev. William P. Alcott, Rev. John M. Greene, D. D.

A book prepared by such men, under such circumstances, deserves special notice. Whatever may be the merit of the work done, the spirit which prompted them to undertake it, and the perseverance which enabled them to continue it year after year, notwithstanding the cares and burdens of their pastoral work, are worthy of all praise.

In this connection we cannot but refer to those most excellent words of Prof. Green, "We need in the ranks of the pastorate, men who can conduct biblical researches and who can prosecute learned critical inquiries; who can do in their own chosen field of Scripture study, what German evangelical pastors have done,—such as Baehr in his "Symbolism of the Mosaic Cultus," and Ranke in the critical defence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and Fuller in the interpretation of the Prophet Daniel, and Keil, who published his learned defence of Chronicles and Ezra when he was a licentiate."†

* THE BOOK OF ESTHER; A new translation with Critical Notes, Excursuses, Maps and Plans, and Illustrations. By the LOWELL HEBREW CLUB. Edited by Rev. John W. Haley, M. A. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 8vo pp. 196. Price, \$1.50.

† In *Moses and the Prophets*, p. 82.

The Introduction," pp. 7-27, prepared by Dr. Street, is full and satisfactory. The claim of the book to a place among the canonical writings is indicated. The events are assigned to the reign of Xerxes, who came to the throne B. C. 485. This king is shown to be the only one in whose time the events narrated could have transpired. The value of the book as a contribution to universal history is considered. The book is anonymous, "but written by a Hebrew who was competent as an author, contemporary with the events, familiar with the localities, characters, and customs of which he speaks, and favored with ample opportunity to consult and to quote the public records and the chronicles of the empire." The style of the author is briefly discussed, and an outline of the work given. The heading of the book might be called, "*the defeated plot of Haman.*"

The translation, of which the gentlemen are joint authors, is certainly a great improvement upon that of the Authorized Version. It is a translation and not a revision. One may doubt the wisdom of renderings so literal as: *What for thee, Queen Esther? and what thy request?* (v., 3) or the elegance of such a rendering as: *Hasten Haman to perform the word of Esther* (v., 5).

For the word *hang, impale* is used throughout. The rendering, *for we are sold, I and my people, to destroy [us], to kill [us], and to cause [us] to perish* (vii., 4), while literal and forcible, is not, we think, desirable. *And Haman was falling upon the couch on which Esther was* (vii., 8), does not seem so good as, *And Haman was fallen*, etc. Is *continued and spoke* (viii., 3) better than *spoke again*? Other renderings might be cited, in reference to which there is doubt in our mind, but they are all of a minor character. With the translation as a whole, including its punctuation, its arrangement in paragraphs, the use of different sizes of type in a few instances, one must be well pleased.

The commentary on chapters I. and II. is by Rev. Mr. Alcott; on chapters III. and IV., by Rev. Mr. Haley; on chapters V., VI. and VII., by Dr. Street; and on chapters VIII., IX. and X., by Dr. Greene.

But the most important feature of the book is the sixteen excursuses (pp. 92-186): (1) Persian Words and Names; (2) Topography and Buildings; (3) Pavement and components; (4) Letters and Posts of the Ancients; (5) Early Modes of Execution; (6) The Jews in Exile; (7) Signet Rings and Seals; (8) The Massacre; (9) Fasting; (10) The Golden Sceptre; (11) Fate of Royal Favorites; (12) Couriers; (13) Coursers; (14) Tribute; (15) The Unwritten Name; (16) The Septuagint Esther. Too much cannot be said of the careful and painstaking work, the results of which are to be seen on every page. The maps added at the end of the volume, complete it.

If any one of our readers desires a fresh and exhaustive "help" to the study of the Book of Esther, let him at once obtain a copy of this work.

LAW OF ASYLUM IN ISRAEL.*

This is a contribution to history, to interpretation and to criticism, though chiefly to the last. According to the Wellhausen School of critics, there are three distinct legislative codes in the Pentateuch. The first, "The Book of the Covenant" (Exod. XXI.-XXIII.) is the earliest and *may*, perhaps, be Mosaic. The

* THE LAW OF ASYLUM IN ISRAEL, historically and critically examined. By Allen Page Bissell, Ph. D. Leipzig: Theodore Stauffer. Pp. 88.

second, Deut. XII.-XXVI., dates between 600 and 700 B. C. The third, called "The Levitical Legislation," and including the most of Exod. XXIV.-XL., Leviticus and Numbers, came into existence in the time of Ezra, about 450 B. C. Each of the "codes" contains something about the Cities of Refuge: (1) Exod. XXI., 14; (2) Deut. XIX.; (3) Num. XXXV. They are also treated of in Deut. IV., 41-43; Josh. XX.; and 1 Chron. VI., 42, 52.

As a preparation for the treatment of his subject, the author first discusses (pp. 8-36) "the Asylum among the Greeks." The principles which he establishes in reference to the Greek Asylum are as follows:

"1. The origin of the Asylum is to be sought in a rude and primitive age and condition of society. It must be a time of personal might when the weak find it impossible to defend themselves against the violence of the strong, and when there is, as yet, no settled law to restrain men's evil passions, and when there prevails a sense of peculiar divine protection associated with certain definite localities where the divine presence is supposed to be especially manifested.

2. The Greek Asylum passed through a series of changes to meet the demands made upon it by the development of the people. Born of the necessity of the early times, it assumed such successive shapes as the exigencies and the national condition of each period required.

3. The law's connection with it was regulative and not creative. It was an institution for lawlessness and not for established law. The law found it, and, in order to be as little hindered by it as possible, laid hand upon it and brought it into a certain condition of control and subjection.

4. This legal oversight began very early in the history and was especially marked in regard to homicide. One of the first steps in establishing an organized community upon a legal basis must be the regulation of manslaughter; and this regulation must draw the reins of legal restraint and control over the asylum where this institution exists. How early in the course of Grecian development, the law thus met the asylum we may infer from the Draconian legislation, although this was far from the beginning of legal interference with the institution, being only a reducing to writing of the *θεσμοί* which had already long been the basis of decision in cases of manslaughter, and being thus the first introduction of mitigations respecting homicide in Athenian law.

5. As the law became firmly established, with a power to execute its sentence and enforce obedience, the asylum had no place. It was then an injury to the state, and, as its privileges were more and more circumscribed by legal enactment, it lost much of its former influence and credit. With the increasing power of law, and the consequent growth of the law-abiding spirit among the people, the better classes ceased to have recourse to the asylum, or, at most, looked upon the *κεσία* as the only reputable use of its privileges. Thus deserted by the well-disposed, it was in some cases, as at Athens, abandoned to slaves or criminals. Thus degenerated through its abuse, and hampered by the fetters of law, it hastened to its end."

The author now proceeds to consider the subject of the Asylum, as presented in the Israelitic laws cited above. The real question at stake is this: Are the passages, found in the Pentateuch relating to the Asylum, of such a nature as to favor or oppose the divisions and dates of the Wellhausen critics? Do these laws show evidence of being by the same author, or by different authors? His conclusions are thus stated:

"1. There are hints or germs of ancient rights of hospitality or guestfriendship similar to those of the Greeks and other primitive communities. These hints are antecedent to the beginning of the national history, or in the first periods of that history, in a time when the nation lay sunk in a condition of anarchy, and largely under the influence of the surrounding Canaanites.

2. The altar is mentioned as an asylum, and, in connection with this mention, positive directions are given to restrict and control this use of it.

3. The primitive blood-revenge is regulated by divine precept, which determines its sphere and enforces its execution.

4. As the correlate of this blood-revenge, and intended to control it, is sketched a complete system of asylum with detailed stipulation of its powers and its administration. This sketch lies before us in a threefold form. From examination and comparison of the notices we conclude

a. That they do not contradict, but supplement each other.

b. That nothing in their contents or form compels the belief that the different notices originated at widely separate dates.

c. That, on the contrary, they are bound together by similarities and by mutual interdependence."

In Chapter IV. the writer compares the facts as brought to light in the previous discussion. Granting to the Israelitic Asylum the same rate and kind of development as is seen to have taken place in the growth of the Greek Asylum, it is found to be impossible to "reconcile the laws found in Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua with the historical circumstances and demands of the ages to which the new criticism assigns these books."

As to the relation and interdependence of the several passages in the various books, the following statements are made :

"1. The records in Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy are of Mosaic origin.

2. The restriction of the altar asylum to the unintentional manslayer, and the promise of the cities of refuge, Exod. xxi., 12-14, is a part of the Sinaitic Legislation.

3. The command to give the cities and the direction for the administration of the asylum, Num. xxxv., are the provision for the fulfillment of the promise of Exod. xxi., 13, and are given to Israel as a part of their national constitution before their entry into Canaan.

4. The direction of Deut. xix. is a recapitulation of Num. xxxv., also dating previous to the crossing of the Jordan by the Children of Israel.

5. The narrative of Joshua xx. relates the fulfillment of the injunction previously given, and dates, at least in its germ, during the lifetime of the generation to whom Moses addressed his last admonitions."

These conclusions, if well established, are certainly satisfactory. It is not our purpose here to criticise the positions taken. It is sufficient to remark that the book throughout shows evidence of accurate and scientific work. By such investigations as this, and only by such investigations, may we ever hope to reach the end of this peculiar discussion. Each separate subject touched upon in the legislation must be subjected to the same critical analysis and test, to which in this pamphlet the laws of the Asylum have been subjected.

❖ SEMITIC ❖ AND ❖ OLD ❖ TESTAMENT ❖ BIBLIOGRAPHY. ❖

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- EDERSHEIM, A. The Witness of Israel to the Messiah. New York: *A. D. F. Randolph & Co.*
- The Book of Esther, with Critical Notes, Excursuses, Maps and Plans, and Illustrations. By the Lowell Hebrew Club. Edited by Rev. J. W. Haley. Andover: *W. F. Draper*. Pp. 196.....\$1.50⁰⁰
- The Lord's Prayer; in the principal languages, dialects, and versions of the world, printed in type and vernaculars of the different nations. Compiled by G. F. Bergholtz. Chicago: *G. F. Bergholtz*. Pp. 200.....\$1.25⁰⁰

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- CAMPBELL, I. K. Through Egypt, Palestine, and Syria. London: *Partridge*, 1884. Pp. 228.....4 s.
- CHEYNE, T. K. Hosea. Cambridge Bible for Schools. Cambridge: *University Press*. Pp. 132.....5 s.
- ERMAN, A. Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben in Alterthum. Mit über 300⁰ abbildungen im Text und 10 Vollbildern. Tübingen: *H. Laupp*, 1885. Pp. 48.....M. 1
- GOULD, S. BARING. The Origin and Development of Religious Belief. Part I., Polytheism and Monotheism; Part II. Christianity. New Ed. London: *Rivingtons*, 1884. Pp. 438, 408.....12 s.
- HUNTER, P. H. The Story of Daniel, his life and times. 2d Ed. London: *Simpkin*, 1884. Pp. 360.....5 s.
- Inspiration; a clerical symposium on. In what sense and within what limits is the Bible the Word of God. London: *Nisbet*, 1884.....6 s.
- KENNEDY, I. The Pentateuch; its Age and Authorship. With an examination of some modern theories. London: *Sunday School Union*, 1884.....1s. 6d.
- KOHLER, A. Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments. 2. Hälfte, 1. Thl. 3. Lfg. Erlangen: *Deichert*, 1884.....M. 4.
- MACKAY, A. B. The Conquest of Canaan. Lectures on first twelve chapters of Joshua. London: *Hodder, Stoughton & Co.*, 1884. Pp. 412.....7 s. 6 d.
- MURPHY, J. G. The Book of Daniel. Translated and Expounded, with a sketch of Antecedent Prophecy. London: *Nisbet*. Pp. 212.....3 s.
- REINACH, TH. Histoire des Israelites depuis l'epoque de leur dispersion jusqu'à nos jours. Paris: *Hachette & Co.*, 1884. Pp. xviii, 423.....4 fr.
- The Ordinances of Manu. Translated from Sanskrit, with Introduction by A. C. Burnell. London: *Truebner*, 1884. Pp. 436.....12 s.
- WENDE, E. Ueberlieferung und Sprache der mitttelenglischen Version des Psalters und ihr Verhältniss zur lateinischen Vorlage. Inaug. Diss. Breslau, 1884.
- WHITFIELD, F. The Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Offerings of Israel. New Ed. London: *Nisbet*. Pp. 362.....5 s.

RECENT ARTICLES.

- SPRINGER, A. Die Genesisbilder in der Kunst des frühen Mittelalters mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den Ashburnham — Pentateuch. Mit Tafeln. *Abhandl. d. K. S. Gesellsch. d. wissensch.*, 1884, No. 21.
- KUENEN, A. De Nederlandsche Bijbels in het Britisch Museum. *Archief voor Nederl. Kerkgeschiedenis*, No. 1.
- RAMSAY, W. M. Explorations in Asia Minor. *Athenæum*, Dec. 20, '84.
- HALEY, J. W. The Study of Assyrian. *Congregationalist*, Jan., 29, '85.
- SIMS, A. Analysis of the Book of Job. *Free Methodist*, Feb. 25, '85.
- PORTER, J. L. The Hittites—Their Influence on the Israelites. *Pulpit Treasury*, Feb., '85.
- ROESCH, G. Die Begegnung Abrahams mit Melchisedek. Eine Studie. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1885, No. 2.
- TOY, C. H. The Date of Deuteronomy. *Unitarian Review*, Feb., '85.
- M'CLENAHAN, D. A. Importance of Hebrew Study. *United Presbyterian*, Feb. 19, 26, '85.
- PRIGER, O. Der Noe der Wiener Genesis. *Ztschr. f. deutsches Alterth. N. F.* No. 17.
- MARTI, K. Das Thal Zeboim Sam. 1., 13, 18. *Ztschr. d. Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1884, No. VIII.
- CLAUSSEN, C. Das Verhältniss der Lehre des Elihu zu derjenigen der drei Freunde Hiob's. *Ztschr. f. kirchliche Wissensch. u. kirchl. Leben*, 1884, Nos. 8, 9, 10.
- FARBER, R. Noch einmal zu Ezechiel XLIII., 13–17. *Ibid.*, 1884, No. 9.
- PREISS, H. Zum Buche Tobit. *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1885, No. 28.
- HILGENFELD, W. Wilhelm Vatke's Gesamtansicht über Pentateuch—Josua *Ibid.*, 1885, No. 28.

REVIEWS.

- BEN TEHILLIM. The Book of Psalms in English Blank-Verse (By C. A. Briggs). *Presbyterian Review*, Jan., '85.
- DAVIDSON, A. B. The Book of Job. *Jewish Advocate*, Feb., '85.
- RAWLINSON, G. Egypt and Babylon, Sacred and Profane Sources. *Sunday School Times*, Feb. 14, '85; *New Englander*, Mar., '85; *Athenæum*, Feb. 14, '85.
- REVILLE, A. The Native Religions of Mexico and Peru. *Westminster Rev.*, Oct., '84.
- SAYCE, A. H. The Ancient Empires of the East (By I. P. Taylor) *Andover Review*, Feb., '85.
- SEINECKE, L. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. II. (By E. König.) *Theol. Litbl.*, 1884, No. 50.
- WRIGHT, C. H. H. The Book of Koheleth. (By Klostermann.) *Stud. u. Krit.* 1885, No. 1.
- WRIGHT, W. The Empire of the Hittites. (By Th. Tyler.) *Academy*, Dec. 7, 13, 20, 27, '84.